POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

David Angus Vogt, Bridgeport.
Harrison P. Gower, Death Valley.
Walter Neipp, Earp.
Harry R. Wendelken, Idyllwild.
Edythe C. McGowan, Julian.
Dudley Wakefield, Moffett Field.
Flora E. Dahl, Mokelumne Hill.
Elvin M. Mitchler, Murphys.
Hetty C. Bryans, Pixley.
Elizabeth M. Taylor, Tulelake.
Myrtle M. Knouse, Westminster.
John F. Wallahan, Yermo.

MASSACHUSETTS

John H. Gilboy, East Brookfield.
Chestina B. Robbins, East Templeton.
James R. Mansfield, Haydenville.
John F. Mack, Housatonic.
Genevieve V. Dion, Linwood.
Alliston S. Barstow, Marshfield.
Frank C. Sheridan, Maynard.
Robert H. Howes, Southboro.
Helen K. Hoxie, Sunderland.
Enlo A. Perham, Tyngsboro.
William J. Bell, Warren.
Sara H. Jones, West Barnstable.
William E. Brennan, Whitman.
James F. Healy, Worcester.

MISSOURI

Felix P. Wulff, Argyle.
Jesse D. Burwell, Browning.
Thomas Wert Gwaltney, Charleston.
Garnett S. Cannon, Fornfelt.
Leonard D. Smith, Fremont.
Thomas A. McQuary, Galena.
Buren Napper, Holcomb.
Edgar G. Hinde, Independence.
Frank M. Story, Kahoka.
Myrtle Rauls, Marquand.
Anna B. Wood, Rosendale.
Fay B. Swicegood, Weaubleau.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Frank Doudera, Dixville Notch.

NEW JERSEY

Edward Brodstein, Asbury Park.
Martin A. Armstrong, Maple Shade.
Leroy Jeffries, Ocean City.

OKLAHOMA

James H. Sellars, Jr., Binger.
Jean C. Petty, Caddo.
Frank J. Kamphaus, Canute.
Louis F. Dievert, Covington.
Weltha Guilford Heflin, Erick.
Hannie B. Melton, Hastings.
James Q. Tucker, Hollis.
Charles H. Hatfield, Hydro.
Thomas F. Green, Meeker.
Roy Rine, Nash.
Earl C. Lucas, Newkirk.
Shelby T. McNutt, Ringwood.

UTAH

Richard R. Francis, Morgan.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, May 13, 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 Saturday, June 22, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 131) providing for the participation of the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be held in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936, and authorizing the President to invite foreign countries and nations to participate therein, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8554) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1935, and June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, 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:

H. R. 7205. An act to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, otherwise known as "section 30" of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, approved June 5, 1920, to allow the benefits of said act to be enjoyed by owners of certain vessels of the United States of less than 200 gross tons; and

H. R. 7652. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the Federal Reserve Board, and for other purposes.

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	Coolidge	Logan	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Costigan	Lonergan	Reynolds
Austin	Davis	Long	Robinson
Bachman	Dickinson	McAdoo	Russell
Bailey	Dieterich	McCarran	Schall
Bankhead	Donahey	McGill	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Fletcher	McKellar	Sheppard
Barkley	Frazier	McNary	Shipstead
Bilbo	George	Maloney	Smith
Black	Gerry	Metcalf	Steiwer
Bone	Glass	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Gore	Moore	Townsend
Brown	Guffey	Murphy	Trammell
Bulkley	Hale	Murray	Truman
Bulow	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Burke	Hatch	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hayden	Norris	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Holt	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Johnson	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Chavez	Keyes	Overton	Wheeler
Clark	King	Pittman	White
Connally	La Follette	Pope	

Mr. McNARY. The senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] has been called away on account of the death of one of his associates and will be absent until Wednesday. I ask that the announcement stand for the day.

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY] are unavoidably detained from the Senate, and that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on important public business. I request that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY], my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] is absent on account of illness, and I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

BRIG. GEN. AARON SIMON DAGGETT

Mr. WALSH presented a letter of appreciation from Brig. Gen. Aaron Simon Daggett, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST ROXBURY, MASS., *June 22, 1935.*

MY DEAR SECRETARY HALSEY: I thank you, with all my heart, for sending me a copy of the Senate resolutions, adopted June 14, 1935, congratulating me on reaching my ninety-eighth birthday, and other reasons.

I never expected to receive such an honor.

Oh, that I were worthy of it!

Sincerely and gratefully yours,

A. S. DAGGETT.

CLAIM OF COLT'S PATENT FIREARMS MANUFACTURING CO. (S. DOC. NO. 76)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying letter from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a deficiency estimate of appropriation for payment of a claim of the Colt's Patent Firearms Manufacturing Co., amounting to $812.91, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 77)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying letter from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1936, amounting to $4,521.13, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS AND SUITS AGAINST THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 78)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying letter from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriations required for the payment of claims against the District of Columbia settled by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia pursuant to law, amounting to $2,541.05, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MAY REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for May 1935, including statements 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.

TEXAS CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 131.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 131) providing for the participation of the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be held in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936, and authorizing the President to invite foreign countries and nations to participate therein, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, lines 9 and 10, after Commission", to insert "and hereinafter referred to as the Commission"; on page 2, line 10, after "the", to insert "Vice President, the"; on page 3, line 7, to strike out "one or more" and insert "not to exceed three"; on page 3, line 12, after "The", to insert "salary and"; on page 3, line 15, after "resolution", to insert "for a period of time covering the duration of the exposition and not to exceed a 6 months' period following the closing thereof"; on page 4, line 19, to strike out "Texas Centennial Commission" and insert "Commission and to the Commission of Control for Texas Centennial Celebrations"; on page 5, line 13, to strike out "expositions and" and insert "expositions"; on page 5, line 13, after "fairs", to insert "and other celebrations"; on page 5, line 25, after "expended", to insert "for the purposes of this joint resolution and any unexpended balances shall be covered back into the Treasury of the United States"; on page 6, line 5, after "Commission,", to insert "the Board of Directors of the Texas Memorial Museum, or the Commission of Control for Texas Centennial Celebrations"; on page 6, line 13, after "thereof", to insert "to grant toward the Texas Memorial Museum such sum as may be specifically provided for that purpose by the act making the appropriation authorized by this joint resolution"; on page 6, line 20, to strike out "and/or" and insert "or the Commission of Control for Texas Centennial Celebrations or"; on page 7, line 8, after "Commission", to insert "or the Commission of Control for Texas Centennial Celebrations"; and on page 8, line 17, after "Commission", to insert "without release of responsibility,".

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Slovak League of America, favoring the enactment of House bill 8163, known as "the Kerr bill", relative to the deportation of aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

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.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens, being deputy collectors of internal revenue for the district of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 1952) extending the classified executive civil service of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was ordered to lie on the table:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 20

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida in session assembled (the house of representatives concurring):

Whereas under $6,000,000 worth of commodities have been shipped into the State during the last year, principally packing-house products from Chicago and other midwestern areas, and distributed by officials in charge of rehabilitation of relief classes; and

Whereas the fishermen of the State of Florida had been overlooked, and have been unable to dispose of any of their products to any of the above mentioned agencies: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the senate and house concurring, respectfully and earnestly request the President of the United States to direct the Federal agencies purchasing commodities for distribution to relief clients within this State and other southeastern parts, a proportionate part of the fish production within this State; be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution under the great seal of the State of Florida be forwarded to the President of the United States, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and a copy to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Florida.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Commerce, to to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 4505. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Maine and the Dominion of Canada to maintain a bridge already constructed across the St. John River between Madawaska, Maine, and Edmundston, New Brunswick, Canada (Rept. No. 945);

H. R. 6988. A bill authorizing the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sabine River at or near a point where Louisiana Highway No. 21 meets Texas Highway No. 45 (Rept. No. 946);

H. R. 7044. A bill authorizing the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sabine River at or near a point where Louisiana Highway No. 6 in Sabine Parish, La., meets Texas Highway No. 21 in Sabine County, Tex. (Rept. No. 947); and

H. R. 7870. A bill to provide a preliminary examination of the Purgatoire (Picketwire) and Apishapa Rivers, in the State of Colorado, with a view to the control of their floods and the conservation of their waters (Rept. No. 948).

Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 3038) to authorize the transfer of certain lands in Rapides Parish, La., to the State of Louisiana for the purpose of a State highway across a portion of the Federal property occupied by the Veterans' Administration facility, Alexandria, La., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 950) thereon.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 2617) to amend the Judicial Code to permit defendants in criminal cases to waive trial by jury, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 949) thereon.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 29) to amend the laws relating to proctors' and marshals' fees and bonds and stipulations in suits in admiralty, reported it without amendment.

Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1892. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Attorney General to compromise suits on certain contracts of insurance (Rept. No. 952);

S. 2303. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, as amended and supplemented; and

S. 2744. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (Rept. No. 953).

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 2369) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the repatriation of certain insane American citizens", approved March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1495), reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 951) thereon.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3059) to authorize the acquisition of land on McNeil Island, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 954) thereon.

MUNITIONS INDUSTRY—NAVAL SHIPBUILDING

Mr. NYE, from the Special Committee on Investigation of the Munitions Industry, submitted a preliminary report relative to naval shipbuilding, which was ordered to be printed, with illustrations, as Report No. 944.

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. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 3135) to authorize the purchase of the *Winnie Mae* by the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3136) for the relief of J. A. McAlister; and

A bill (S. 3137) for the relief of Pauline McKinney; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3138) granting a pension to Sarah E. Wilkerson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 3139) to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, generally known as the "War Minerals Relief Statutes"; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 3140) to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3141) granting a pension to Clifton D. Cochran; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN:

A bill (S. 3142) for the relief of John W. Sargent and John L. Sargent; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

A bill (S. 3143) for the relief of the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH:

A bill (S. 3144) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare a medal with appropriate emblems and inscriptions commemorative of Gen. Robert Edward Lee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) making provision for a national celebration of the bicentenary of the birth of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, wealthiest signer of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Library.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8554) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1935, and June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT TO SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LONERGAN submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation under the Veterans' Administration for hospital and domiciliary facilities from $20,000,000 to $20,228,500, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 8554, the second deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS CAMPS IN TENNESSEE

Mr. McKELLAR. I submit a resolution and ask to have it read. It merely calls for certain information from the Secretary of the Interior, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 159), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, respectfully requested and directed to furnish the following information to the Senate:

1. How many C. C. C. camps there are conducted by the Department of the Interior in Tennessee;
2. The personnel of the central office or offices in Tennessee, with the residences of each of the personnel and salaries paid;
3. The personnel of the several camps, together with the residences of each of such personnel, with salaries paid; and
4. The number of boys in each of said camps from Tennessee and the number from outside States.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

Mr. ADAMS and Mr. STEIWER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 160), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas wool is one of the major agricultural products of many sections of the United States and is used in many industries and provides a substantial part of the commerce of the country; and

Whereas proper methods of marketing wool are essential to the establishment and maintenance of the prosperity of the industry; and

Whereas existing methods of marketing the wool crop have proved unsatisfactory to the wool producers of America: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That a special committee of three Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the production, transportation, and marketing of wool. The committee shall report to the Senate, not later than the beginning of the second

session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-fourth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

INSPECTION OF NAVY YARDS, ETC.

Mr. TRAMMELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 161), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, hereby is authorized to visit for the purposes of inspection United States navy yards, air stations, and other naval activities between July 15 and December 31, 1935, the expenses incurred in pursuance hereof, not to exceed $3,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT] be assigned to service on the following committees: Education and Labor, Immigration, Naval Affairs, Post Offices and Post Roads, and Mines and Mining.

UNITED STATES MUNITIONS INVESTIGATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR NYE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered over the radio on October 3, 1934, by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] on the subject of United States Munitions Investigation.

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

We are coming to learn that, after all, war may not be as unpreventable as pictured. Fast forging their way to the front are facts indicating that war and preparation for war are in many respects not much more than incorporated murder, with the makers of the machinery of war the incorporators.

However far-fetched the foregoing statement might seem, it is not an exaggeration to say that the manufacture and sale of the munitions of war is an unadulterated, unblushing racket—a world racket of large proportions overshadowing completely the rackets of which we have so many. This one is none the less obnoxious because of the partnership of governments and officials in it.

I say these things not at all thoughtlessly, but only after much deliberation of the results of 3 weeks of public hearings by the Senate committee investigating the munitions industry. These 3 weeks of hearings have seen industrialists, capitalists, and salesmen under oath telling cold-blooded stories of what they have done for and to our Government and for their own enrichment. These have been the stories of men calloused to a degree that finds them defending programs and policies which cannot do other than revert, in the event of our country's entry into another war, to the injury of our country, our flag, and those who will rush to their defense. The committee listened daily to men striving to defend acts which found them nothing more than international racketeers bent upon gaining profit through a game of arming the world to fight itself. So successful has been the racket of these industrialists to create and satisfy the desires of nations for an adequate national defense that they virtually have the world marching straight to the hell that another war will be. And the whole motive behind this is what? Not patriotism! Not love for one's country! Only profit, profit, profit.

In preparation for this broadcast I have waited to refrain from expressing heated conclusions. But I'll swear that no one with other than ice cubes in his veins could have heard the testimony and seen the facts which have been made of record through these 3 weeks of hearings and refrain from speaking his mind in no uncertain way. Truth as respects the munitions industry is so simple, as truth always is simple, that there cannot well be any hedging in speaking it.

Let it be understood that in speaking tonight I do not undertake to speak for the Senate committee, for I am here only as one who heard the testimony from the lips and records of leading representatives of the American munitions industry. As chairman of the committee I could not now ignore the splendid cooperation which has been devoted to the ascertainment of the facts by the entire membership of that committee. Not once has there been any indication that any part of the committee was averse to ferreting out the whole truth. I think no congressional committee has ever served as unitedly as has this committee investigating the munitions industry, and it is my wish to pay compliment to my committee colleagues, Senators GEORGE, of Georgia; VANDENBERG, of Michigan; CLARK, of Missouri; BARBOUR, of New Jersey; BONE, of Washington; and POPE, of Idaho. We were especially fortunate in our choice of a staff to coordinate the findings of a larger staff of accountants and research men, and to Stephen Raushenbush and his assistants we owe large credit for the results thus far accomplished.

What the hearings thus far reveal is but a scanty part of the whole story that will be told when the study of the industry is finally completed. Hearings will be resumed early in December. Continuation of the work after January will depend upon the wishes of the Senate respecting the appropriation of more money to complete it.

Though the investigation thus far has but scratched the surface, it has removed scabs and revealed nasty sores to the light of day where all the world may observe the grave symptoms of a disease that now and then assumes proportions threatening civilization in its entirety. That disease is commonly called "war." Many have looked upon it as one of the incurable diseases, a plague which mankind must tolerate. Now we are given to see that this plague is often man-made, its causes traceable in instances directly to men. I venture to guess that the munitions investigation (the first of its kind ever dared or undertaken anywhere in the world) is going to leave fewer doctors declaring the disease incurable and become the education and experience which will find many more doctors looking to the development of remedies and the elimination of filthy breeding spots which will at least lessen the danger of renewal of the disease in plague proportions. Indeed, we may even hope now for segregation, control, and cure of the disease.

The investigation has brought forth painful yelps from some individuals and groups. Some governments and more officials have complained of the committee's program and policy, have said that the study was not sufficiently observant of the niceties or diplomacy at all times, and that the committee has tread upon toes without the exercise of proper discretion, caution, and guard.

An investigation of the arms question without treading upon official and semiofficial toes would be no investigation at all. Of necessity we have had to deal with the secret courses pursued by the manufacturers and sellers of instruments of war. For years these makers and their salesmen have been weaving their way into governments, deceiving, frightening, corrupting as their welfare and profit dictated. Because of the manner in which they have woven themselves into the very frabic of governments, the industry has won a status of sacredness and secrecy which has enlarged in its opportunity to thrive in a way to return good profit to its owners. Rackets thrive best when nourished by dark secrecy, and when governments lend hands to the racketeers the sky is the limit as respects the flow of profits and blood money.

I repeat that there is no racket to compare with that of the sale of munitions of war. Governments have fought, at great cost, the beer, liquor, white slave, dope, and kidnap rackets. The munitions racket, one whose victim is all civilization, has governments as its partners, unconsciously on the part of governments, perhaps. Doubly difficult, then, becomes the task of destroying or controlling the racket—a racket wearing the cloak of respectability by reason of its association with and in governments.

That such a partnership exists is one of the clear conclusions growing out of the present investigation. It must, therefore, be apparent that nothing short of wide and sweeping disclosures of the truth will ever awaken the world to a degree that will win reform to check the mad race now on toward more war. It is my sincerest hope that the pending investigation may be permitted the time and money to develop the whole truth, however embarrassing it may be to governments or individuals.

I cannot undertake to tell all that has been developed by the investigation of the munitions industry to date. But let me recite some of the disclosures which are not to be denied.

That the munitions industry knows no flag is well revealed by their partnership and working agreements with industries and individuals swearing allegiance under different flags. The Electric Boat Co., of Groton, Conn., maker of Uncle Sam's submarines, sells its patents and designs and license to manufacture to, among others, Vickers in Great Britain, who build Britain's submarines. Between them there are agreements as to the division of the world into sections in which each may sell, agreements involving the sharing of profits, with the once mystery man of Europe, Sir Basil Zaharoff, seemingly the master mind in the very profitable game of arming countries against each other with the same instruments and secrets of combat. While Zaharoff may once have been a mystery man, he stands naked of mystery today and is known now as nothing more than a man whose great wealth has come through his ability to cash in on the hates and suspicions of nations, an ability greatly aided by the honors which competing nations and rulers have bestowed upon him.

The great American Du Pont concern, considered the industry which will be of greatest utility to our country in the event of another war, has its tie-up with the great Imperial Chemical Industries of Britain and with like institutions in other lands. Between them is constant exchanging of secrets in the development of instruments intended to give one country an advantage over others in the event of war. During the course of the hearings 2 weeks ago a spokesman for the Du Ponts undertook to justify their sales and profits during the World War by painting a frightful picture of the purposes of Germany and the great cause of the Allies. He didn't hesitate in agreeing that had it not been for

the Du Pont service to the Allies, the United States might very easily today be a German province. There was much of irony in the disclosure the following day that the Du Ponts had entered into contracts which would make their products available to Germany, just as there was irony in the confession of the American Electric Boat Co. that it was American patents that entered into the building of the German submarines which did our American cause so much damage during the World War.

The investigation has revealed that the munition industry employs spies in foreign armies to learn of new developments in armaments, not for the benefit of their own country but for their own benefit in producing and selling like supplies to all the world. That the munitions industry has organized and sponsored war scares to the end that markets might be created for the supplies from their laboratories and shops is very definitely a part of the record of the investigation.

Most revolting is that part of the record revealing that our makers of munitions do not refrain from selling to both sides engaged in a war. Some of them sell to governments which are trying to put down rebellions and, at the same time, to the rebels who are seeking to overthrow the government, as in Cuba.

In this connection the armament race between Peru and Columbia offers a tale most revealing of munition makers' advantage through government cooperation. Not so long ago Peru decided it wanted a more adequate national defense, a desire that the munitions makers had no small hand in creating. Peru appealed to the United States for help in providing this national defense, and we sent to Peru a commission of experts made up of admirals and commanders of our Navy. As a result of this cooperation, Peru bought some submarines from the American Electric Boat Co. A little later, Peru's neighbor, Colombia, grew fearful about this show of military strength. Colombia was sure it needed a national defense against such armament as Peru had annexed, and the Colombian officials appealed to the American Navy for help in planning a national defense of its own. Again Uncle Sam graciously responded and sent a naval expert to that unhappy country to advise with them. Recommendations were made for a plan of defense against submarines, which recommendations again reverted to the advantage of armament manufactures. This story reveals only one of many instances of the part which governments and munitions makers play in starting and then maintaining armament races between countries.

The committee investigation reveals the munitions makers to be spending fortunes in maintaining lobbies to urge armament programs, and the correspondence of these industries shows millions of dollars being paid for commissions and bribes to public officials and those who stand close to public officials.

The record of the investigation contains evidence of the effort made by the munitions industry to block embargoes, make difficult the accomplishment of agreement in disarmament conferences and of their disregard of treaties. We know now that when our country issues an embargo against the shipment of arms to the Chaco, for example, the American manufacturer arranges that business goes on as usual.

To me the most repulsive of all the testimony taken during the committee hearings was that revealing the part our American military forces take in demonstrating and helping to sell American-made munitions to other countries, countries perhaps which might some day be our foes in war. Heads of our Army go abroad and, according to the record, recommend American-made munitions and improved methods intended to make these foreign military forces better fighting units. Our generals, so the record stands, even participate in the recommending of the height of collars to be worn by the soldiers of foreign armies.

In 1928 a number of American naval vessels were equipped with a new type of gun, which, it was presumed, was giving our Navy a great advantage. The gun was the product of an American concern, sold to the Navy at a splendid profit, of course. But this gunmaker was having difficulty in selling the same gun abroad. One day the good ship *Raleigh*, one of the American ships equipped with this new gun, showed up in Turkish waters. On board, with the consent of the Navy, came the salesman of the American gun manufacturer and officers of the Turkish Navy. The guns were demonstrated for the benefit of these foreign officials and the American manufacturer won a fine order for like guns for the Turkish military forces. Shall we say our Navy is a salesman's sample case?

I am sure that before this investigation is finished there is going to be large appreciation of the gravity of commercial situations which finds our military patents, secrets, designs, and specifications available to and peddled all over the world. Surely there must already be appreciation, as a result of investigation disclosures, combined with previously known facts, of the huge profit flowing to those who make and sell the things entering into national-defense programs and the waging of war. These costs and profits constitute a burden upon civilization which grows heavier year by year.

One American aircraft producer is shown with an original capital investment of $1,000. Largely through the cooperation of naval experts and engineers, this company developed an air-cooled engine. In 1926 this company enjoyed 100 percent of its business from the United States Navy. The returns from this venture down to and including 1932, on the basis of the $1,000 investment, was 1,143,725 percent, and this is not inclusive of the capital increase in the value of the original 5,000 shares of stock. Who but the Government was responsible for this great profit? Be it remembered that this gain is a peace-time accomplishment.

The 4 years of the World War paid another American munitions concern something more than an average of 100 percent per year upon its investment. This war profit paid its executives handsome salaries, millions in bonuses, and annual dividends averaging about 50 percent per year. With the balance the corporation went looking for investments which would be profitable. By reason of its war profits, that company today owns or controls scores of lesser corporations. In such corporations in which it has made investment of $200,000 or more in each, it now has a total investment of well over $350,000,000. Only a small part of this could be theirs but for the fact that they reaped rich profits from the conflict that was taking so many lives. While the blood flowed most freely upon the fields of battle their profits rolled in the larger.

We have learned that foreign missionaries can be and are very helpful in the sale of the munitions of war. The president of one American munitions maker has a missionary brother down in South or Central America who delights in demonstrating his brother's products to generals and ministers of war, and advising on the best means of sales. In this case, encountered by the committee, it is difficult to determine just which is this man's side-line, his work as a missionary or his work as a bomb salesman. I am happy that experiences of this kind are very clearly not the rule, but the exception, in the missionary field.

Missionaries, Government officials, Army and Navy officers, international affiliations, smuggling and spying, cash commissions, teasers and bribes, the breeding of fear and suspicion, the growth of national defense into threatened offense, take these, piece them together, each in its place, and we have the picture and machinery which men paint and build to enrich themselves through the sale of munitions of war. Little wonder, as my colleague, Senator VANDENBERG put it, "Little wonder Peace walks on crutches." Yes, indeed; little wonder that the cause of peace remains a constant invalid while war and threat of war struts in greater health than it has ever known before.

Now we begin to understand how and why this world, only 15 years removed from the last terrible war, with all its consequent burdens and sorrow, is spending more money getting ready for more war than it ever spent in peace time before. We begin to see why our own country sets the pace in this preparedness game by having increased its annual military maintenance costs since 1913 by 197 percent, while Italy, Great Britain, France and Russia have ranged from 30 to 44 percent. Now we learn a little of what is behind these everlasting and annual programs of loud national defense talk. Now perhaps we see more clearly that this mad race in armaments is pushed and encouraged by those who profit through the sale of armaments.

Do the facts uncovered by the investigation anger you as they do me? It is but natural that they would, because we and our children must foot the bill. It goes against the grain when we discover that the cause of national defense the world over has been seized upon as the disguise of greedy hands bent alone upon winning profit—profit which is the greatest when blood flows thickest.

Well, what are we going to do about it? Were time mine, I should willingly tell what I see as possible means of remedy. Those means must needs deal with the taking of profit out of war and preparation for it. The most effective way to do this is to make the Government the sole munitions maker and to write now, not after we've gone to war, law which will fix the rates of taxation to apply upon incomes automatically with a declaration of war. Make these rates double existing rates on incomes up to $10,000 and 98 percent on all income over that amount. Do that and then observe the number of jingoists diminish; see then what strength will come to effort to stay out of war; do that and then enjoy seeing those who profit from them paying the costs of wars in a larger way.

If we fail utterly to curb the munitions industry, let us resign ourselves to continued programs of arming boys with guns to defend the country against foes our industrialists have armed with like guns, with gas masks to defend themselves against the gasses our munitions makers have made and sold to other lands and with steel helmets to protect the heads of the boys against shrapnel and shell our profit-hungry manufacturers have sold to our possible foes.

It would be unfair to say that munitions makers were wholly responsible for wars, for they are not. But it can be said with large justification that the danger of more war can be very greatly reduced by simply removing the element of profit from preparedness and the prospect of any profit for anyone from war.

CURB ON WAR PROFITS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR NYE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an address delivered over the radio on April 15, 1935, by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] on the subject "Curb on War Profits."

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

Strange contradictions confront the world. These contradictions would be less difficult of understanding were it not for the fact that they arise in the face of firm contrary resolutions of such recent making as to cause us at times to wonder if we are in our right minds. Indeed, there is an abundance of evidence disclosing that civilization is of unbalanced mind. Perhaps it is unfair to thus indict all people of the world. It might be that only the leaders of this age are deserving of that classification. But at

once we are confronted with the question, "Who makes and keeps these leaders, if it isn't the people?"

In any event, we find a world of people unalterably opposed to more war and convinced that another war would be the undoing of more races than one. There is wide acceptance of the belief that the world could not possibly carry the burden of another war. Yet, though this belief exists, the governments of these people are madly racing in preparation for more war. Only a few years since the war to end war we find all the powers with larger military budgets than were ever known in peace time. Our American increase in military expenditure has been greater than that of any other land, and we will next year spend on our Army three times as much as we were spending the year before we went into the "war to make the world safe for democracy and to end war."

I stand with those who want to see our country amply provided with such preparation as will find us with an adequate defense against attack by foes who would make so bold and foolish as to attack our shores or borders. Plainly, any preparation beyond that ceases to be "national defense." Those who constantly harp about the inadequacy of our national defense are no more satisfied with our defense of today than they were with our defense in 1915, when we were spending but a third of what we are spending now in the name of national defense. Next year we will spend on preparedness for war more money than it was costing the United States in 1914 to run all its establishments of government, including the Army and Navy. Who will answer, when will our defense be adequate?

As a matter of fact, the issue of national defense has become the disguise of profit-hungry men who like nothing better than these armament races between nations. Arming a nation and the world has become a racket that either does not recognize the consequences or remembers that war pays their racket better returns than does national defense.

When a year ago the Senate authorized an investigation of the munitions industry, few dreamed that the study would result in the flood of disclosures unearthed. For nearly a year the committee named to conduct the inquiry has labored, conducted something more than 100 public hearings to make record of its findings, and is now about to report in the Senate its findings, along with legislative recommendations having to do with one particular phase of its study. This does not mean that the investigation is about completed. Much work remains to be done and will be approached as fast as the committee can afford the means and time necessary.

In the public mind the investigation has been primarily one of war-time profit of those industries engaged in the production of war machinery. The actual duties of the investigating committee have been concerned with much more than that. A very large part of its consideration has had to do with the peace-time profit and activities of the same industry. And that consideration has brought conviction that it is quite as important to take profit out of preparedness as to take profit out of war.

For instance, who can recall during the past 10 years the advent of the annual military appropriation bills that was not preceded by a small or large war scare? The appeal is at once made for more adequate preparedness to defend ourselves. As a result, Army and Navy budgets have grown steadily until we find ourselves supporting billion-dollar military programs in times when we cannot balance budgets.

The annual scare about war between Japan and the United States proves very profitable to some. Incidentally those who profit are generally found selling war supplies to Japan as well as to the United States. The munitions racket sells to one and all alike. And in this racket the arms makers have the cooperation of their own Government. Our Army and Navy, for instance, help American armament makers accomplish sales of their supplies in other lands, and officials of our military declare this to be good policy. They say what comes to this: We must encourage larger foreign use of American-made national defense items, so that the American industry can have the capacity to produce what we need if and when those nations to which we have sold decide to use our own instruments against us. However, the munitions racket is not so impressive as when it engages in furnishing munitions for both sides engaged in armed conflict.

One American munitions firm recently sent its salesman, a Mr. Jonas, to Cuba, with instructions to sell munitions to the rebels who were trying to overthrow the Cuban Government. For such sales this salesman received a handsome commission. But a better commission prevailed for him when he sold the same sort of supplies to the government that was trying to put down the rebellion. We can readily understand what this salesman meant when on the day after Christmas in 1933 he wrote another salesman as follows:

"We certainly are in one hell of a business, where a fellow has to wish for trouble so as to make a living. It would be a terrible state of affairs if my conscience started to bother me now."

Mr. Jonas expressed it well. It is a hell of a business, a business that has no room for conscience. The private business of making and selling munitions is one warranting tremendous regulation if not destruction. At least it is time that people were awakening to what probably is largely influencing the mad armament races under way today.

Look at the maddest of all peace-time naval races between our own country and Japan! What might be behind that? Is it possible that the private shipbuilders have any hand in provoking it? Two weeks ago one shipbuilder was made to admit that he had written and urged a newspaper publisher to print stories about the danger of war between Japan and the United States so that there could be newspaper clippings to send to Members of Congress who were slow in approving the appropriations for more and more ships for our Navy.

Assuredly such disclosures warrant programs looking to the control and regulation of this private racket in peace time. Perhaps it calls for the stamping out of this private industry and for Government manufacture of its own national-defense machinery.

But at the moment the committee is confining its effort quite alone to legislative means of taking profit out of war, and it is that to which I wish to devote my remaining minutes tonight.

Does America want to take the profit out of war? If we really want to accomplish that prevention, I believe it possible, and if we do that I am sure that we will at once accomplish large prevention against our being drawn into more war.

The World War witnessed the creation of 22,000 new millionaires in America alone. Individuals and corporations reaped lavishly of profit, while our boys were giving their all in trenches for cause of flag and country. Eugene Grace of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, for example, awarded himself a bonus of $2,800,000 in addition to his salary during the 2 years we were engaged in the World War. It is not easy to forget who is having to pay the bill of the Bethlehem company for war supplies, a bill that included this private bonus for its president. Nor can we forget that it was this same corporation that helped meet the cost of sending a man to Geneva disarmament conference to wreck the chance of accomplishing any measure of disarmament.

To keep the record straight, let us review a few of the gains which corporations enjoyed as a result of 4 years of war. Before me are figures showing the average annual profit during the 4 years preceding the World War, compared with average annual profit during 4 years of war for a list of American corporations. The Republic Iron & Steel Co. saw its profits grow, as a result of war, from $4,000,000 to $17,000,000 a year, while General Motors climbed from $6,000,000 to more than $21,000,000, United States Steel profits jumped from a peace-time average of $105,000,000 to $239,000,000 during the war, while Bethlehem Steel was moving its profit from $6,000,000 to $49,000,000 a year as a result of war. This same comparison shows the Du Ponts, with an average peace-time profit of $6,000,000 and an annual average war-time profit of $58,000,000.

The profit of the Du Pont Corporation for the 4 war years shows a return upon invested capital of more than 400 percent. Other corporations made even larger showings. Individuals enriched themselves while the world was afire and without defense against those who were reaping profit.

To prevent repetition of that experience is no small task, yet I believe the Senate Committee has on its way a legislative program that will largely turn the trick. Starting on Wednesday the committee will write up its program in legislative order, and it hopes by early next week to have its bill before the Senate for consideration.

In light of the disclosures which the investigation has developed, there is in Congress much proposed legislation to take the profit out of war. This is a splendid sign, and indicates a large will to meet the challenge. A week ago the House of Representatives passed and sent to the Senate the McSwain bill as a proposal to take profit out of war. This bill provides for licensing industries and would fix and freeze prices with the declaration of war, using as a base the average prices prevailing during the years immediately preceding the war. At once one is struck by how this program would have worked had it been in effect when the United States entered the World War. The war had been on for 2 years, and our American price structure had reached high. American industry could have wanted nothing finer than a guaranty of the prices that prevailed during those years just before our entry into war.

The Senate Munitions Committee believe that the House bill is quite inadequate, and that it will fail to protect us against repetition of the frightful practices and costs that prevailed during the last war. The bill which our committee is proposing entertains an entirely different approach. The devices of our proposal are: First, taxation; second, a draft of industrial management; third, commodity control; fourth, control of finances and credit during war; fifth, power to commandeer necessary production.

Let us consider these various devices in their order. The first, that of taxation, is aimed at the cause of excessive profit. Excessive profits are really the effect of a more profound cause, namely, the inflation which always accompanies war. In other words, high prices do not produce inflation; rather inflation produces high prices. Therefore, it is upon us to stop inflation.

If high prices is not the cause, what is the cause of inflation? Inflation proceeds from the method of financing war. War is a great business, and as soon as it begins, a tremendous new industry is called into being. There is at once call for vast munition production, costing billions. In the last war we did not even try to pay for these things, instead we borrowed the money to meet the cost. In the war we spent $33,000,000,000. Of this we borrowed $22,000,000,000. Out of every $10 spent to fight we paid $3 and borrowed $7. Most of that we borrowed is left for our children to pay.

That $33,000,000,000 poured into our economic machine produced inflation. Out of this flood, workers were paid. They in turn spent their larger returns in peace-time avenues for luxuries as well as necessaries. This stimulation brought new competition

to the war-time industry; labor became scarce, prices and earnings rose, executives and managers boosted their own salaries. Then workers demanded higher wages and there followed higher prices, larger profits, and more wage demands. And finally this vicious spiral reaches inflated proportions which naturally invite an economic wreck.

The only way, then, to stop inflation is to stop the borrowing and pay for the war as we fight it. If there must be another war, let us, when we send our men into battle, prepare to meet the bills as they come. That can be done only by taxation. And since we are select in choosing the best, youngest, and healthiest to do our fighting in time of war, we should be equally select in levying the taxes to meet its cost, and those most able to pay should bear the brunt of the taxes occasioned by war.

The legislation which the Senate committee proposes provides a tax upon incomes starting at $500. The bill steps up the rate of taxation so that those earning more will contribute proportionately more in paying for the war. The bill provides a tax of 100 percent upon all income in excess of $10,000 per year after all taxes are paid.

As for corporations, our committee proposal fixes a very heavy war-time tax. No effort is made to limit the profits of a corporation, but after the profit is made it is subject, under the pending bill, to severe taxation. That tax would be 50 percent of the first 6 percent of the profit and 100 percent of all profit over 6 percent.

One cannot study taxation without knowing that corporations and individuals, with their highly paid lawyers and accountants, have learned many ways to escape tax laws. Consequently, we have found it necessary to write into the bill provisions to stop every conceivable device which the experts might resort to to get around the law.

Had the provisions of this bill been in effect during our 2 years' participation in the World War, the income of the Government would have exceeded the expenditures without the necessity of borrowing a penny through the sale of Liberty bonds.

The next device in the bill is the industrial management draft. It does not provide, as some would have you believe, for conscription of man power or labor. It reaches only those captains of industry who so often in the last war engaged in schemes to hold up, defraud, and cheat their Government.

As to the commodity-control features of the bill, these provide for the closing of commodity and stock exchanges and the abandonment of all price speculation during war.

Critics say that if you do away with the profit motive or reduce it, you will not be able to get money to finance the war industries. We need not worry about that. In the last war the Government had to finance these industries, and will have to do it again. Therefore, we have set up in our bill a finance-control commission to meet these needs.

Finally, recognizing that there were strikes of capital during the last war, our bill provides strong powers for the Government which will enable it to commandeer plants and operate them during the war.

Roughly, I have summarized the provisions of the Senate committee's pending bill to take the profit out of war. The objectives, I believe, will be strongly endorsed by every American. Yet some, while seeming to endorse them, are unknowingly or deliberately misrepresenting the purpose of the committee and its bill. Opposition is to be expected. Fantastic, yet laudable, reasoning will be resorted to in an effort to preserve for greed the privilege and opportunity which war has given.

One writer calls the program which I have here outlined "syndicalism, socialism, and communism." The crack-down artist of business says that this plan is but a scheme to use a war emergency to destroy the profit system and shift the country over to communism. Another writer of larger reputation and responsibility declares this program to take the profit out of war a scheme to make the greatest war machine the world has ever known, a program playing into the hands of any war party.

Criticism of the program is invited and expected, but I do wish critics would know what they are talking about before they undertake their declarations. It would be well if they would read the bill before undertaking to tell what is in it. Calling the bill communism will hardly register with people who know that Communists are not in the least interested in regulating the profit system. The real Communist wants nothing quite so much as a war with the same old unrestrained, mad, selfish, grasping after profits that existed during and after the last war. He believes—and I think he is right—that if such a thing were to happen again, this system would destroy itself without a bit of aid from the Communists.

Another objection raised is that the proposed bill will not prevent war. No one ever said it would. I wish such a bill could be written, but I recognize the causes of war to be many and progress against these causes to be slow. Yet I am firmly convinced that if we remove the profit from preparing for war, and then destroy in every American mind the prospect of profit from more war, there will be far less danger of war. A first result will be far fewer the numbers who today are saying, to no one's good, "Maybe what we need to get out of this depression is another little war." Seemingly people forget that the last war gave us the depression, and that another might easily destroy our civilization.

This very day has developed the most surprising of critics of the bill. For years Bernard Baruch has been talking about taking profit out of war. For days he appeared before our committee urging drastic programs to accomplish this. Some of us wondered why he withheld endorsement of the proposal to provide a constitutional amendment which would give Government in time of war the same power over property that it had over life. He insisted that the Government already has this power, in spite of the fact that property dictated the terms when the Government asked its cooperation during the last war.

Today Mr. Baruch issues a statement to the press hedging on the position he took when he was before our committee some days ago. According to his newest statement, he has discovered that our committee plan would take the profit out of war—not just a little of it but practically all of it. Now he says the bill is too drastic; that we would be defeated in another war under such legislation because business wouldn't do its share of fighting and helping to win the war when its profits were so restricted.

May heaven preserve us!

I've expected someone to say that. But, Mr. Baruch, I never expected it to come from you.

So American business won't produce what is needed in war if it can't have its profits! So American business will not go into a war on the same basis that the boys go in when they are called!

Well, if this be true, it is high time America knew it. And double is my conviction tonight of the need of a constitutional amendment that will let the Government in time of war commandeer such business as won't do its part, just as it commandeers the men who must make the fight with blood and life in the front lines. It is high time, in light of Mr. Baruch's statement of today, that the people took their pens in hand and let their representatives know that they really wanted to see profit taken out of war, not just talk about it. Here is a challenge if ever there was one. We see how business is going to attack, try to trim, and make harmless any legislative program that really seeks to take the profit out of war.

Profiteers will make themselves heard by Congress, be sure of that. Will the people try to make Congress hear them as well? If they don't they may expect another war to witness the Du Ponts repeating their demand in the last war for larger profits and refusing for 3 months to respond to the request of their Government to build the additional powder factory the Government wanted built with Government money until larger margins of profit were assured.

We ought to want to learn from history and common sense to protect ourselves against being easily drawn into more war, to protect our society from the terrible maladjustments caused by war, the inflation and then the deflation which follows, the rising prices, the outrageous profits, the crushing burdens of debt to be passed on to our children and theirs. It is these causes which have entered into our Senate committee's consideration which is leading to the legislation we shall at once recommend. And none who know its provisions are going to consider it communism simply because it deals drastically with men and institutions whose patriotism is measured by the profit they can gain from war.

FEDERAL ACTIVITIES IN MARYLAND—ADDRESS BY SENATOR RADCLIFFE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, my colleague the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] delivered a commencement address at the University of Baltimore June 8, 1935, entitled "Comments on Some Recent Federal Activities in Maryland." I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

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

No one doubts that the young Maryland lawyer of today is facing problems unprecedented in character and extent. Never before has he had better opportunities for clear-headed thinking and constructive action. Essentially the factors of history will be part and parcel of his work. I don't mean that theory of history which holds that history is merely a record of events. History reflects and illustrates development. History, in telling us what we have been and how changes have come about, tells us in part what we are. And so you lawyers of Maryland who come to the bar today are, of course, affected by the history and traditions of our State. Your views, or at least your mental processes, are influenced very largely by the experiences, beliefs, and activities of Maryland lawyers of bygone years.

I want for a few minutes to touch, in a somewhat rambling way, upon certain economic, financial, and political conditions in America as they were a few years ago and as they are today. These I would refer to, not as the basis of an argument, but merely as illustrative of certain modern-day problems and methods of handling them.

Either as lawyers or as judges, you would say that the evidence before us conclusively demonstrates certain facts regarding these conditions. For instance, you would admit as proved that in the early part of 1933 this country was in a state of economic, financial, and political distress which was unprecedented. A state of virtual collapse existed. You will recall that public confidence generally was shattered and that faith and hope in our country and in our institutions were slowly ebbing away. I do not have to go into details because the memories of those trying days will always be with us.

I am sure you will assume that President Roosevelt and his associates showed alertness, industry, and resourcefulness in attempting to handle these problems. What verdict would you render as to the degree of success which these efforts have met? You would not ask for specific proof that there has been a marked improvement in business conditions since 1933. Our banks were all closed—

now they are reopened and doing business. Almost every form of industry shows marked improvement. No matter what yardstick is used to measure present economic and financial conditions as contrasted with those of 2 years ago, of course it is true that there has been material progress toward recovery. The fact that we stopped going deeper into the hole of depression and have made headway in a return to normal conditions is certainly a matter of great significance.

Has that progress been a satisfactory one? Were the methods utilized suitable for the grave emergency situation and should these methods be continued in their present form or be modified? These are practical problems which we must face and for which we must find an answer.

In considering the nature of the remedial measures used, several points must, of course, be borne in mind. One is that the emergency required prompt action. When a ship is storm-wracked or sinking, steps for its safety must be taken quickly. Since in such cases there is not the usual time for deliberation, an extra allowance for mistakes is customary and justifiable. The case was an emergency one, and consequently the measures adopted must be considered, not necessarily as part of a permanent policy, but largely from the standpoint of their temporary efficacy in helping to solve pressing problems.

Stress must also be laid upon a comparison of the mental attitudes of the people. The psychological stimulus of action, as opposed to inaction, in times of distress is well recognized. People harassed by a burden of troubles and devoid of hope and faith are dangerous, as history has shown upon so many distressing occasions. If the new Administration diverted people's minds from their troubles to any marked extent and created hope again through the suggestion and inauguration of new measures and new activities, then the Administration, in accomplishing that much alone, has produced good results. There is no doubt of the fact that our people found again a spirit of hope and confidence and that such a return was a most helpful factor after the gloomy days of the first 2 months of 1933.

I hope in contrasting conditions as they were in 1933 with what they are today, I can avoid the irritation of a convalescent. While an invalid is seriously ill, he often suffers bravely and cheerfully, and is patiently and confidently ready to give a real test to methods of treatment. However, when he is well on the road to recovery, frequently he complains of everything done or suggested for his benefit.

When we attempt to gauge the results obtained in the recovery program, we realize that our task is so involved in conflicting principles and activities that our job is not an easy one. We can, of course, describe conditions as they were, and then again as they now are, with a feeling of considerable assurance. The decision, however, as to how much these changes were the result of cause and effect and how much one condition merely followed another, involves a problem which is an exceedingly difficult one to solve. The program outlined by the new Administration was a creative one. Is it not also true that no alternative plan of a comprehensive and concrete nature was urged?

We have had a measure of experimentation during the last 2 years. Some of the results we accept as satisfactory, some we disapprove of. In determining what we want to do, we have the advantage now of the results of experiments in many matters, when before we had theories only. We have, therefore, better evidence before us than we had previously. Certainly we are not Bourbons in that we hold we can learn nothing new. Surely some lessons must be learned from the depression. It would be a sad commentary upon our people if we had to admit that the depression, with all of its terrors, losses, and catastrophes has taught us nothing, has suggested no possibilities of improvement.

Many of our people have studied thoughtfully the situation and the methods utilized to handle it. I should like to comment for a few minutes upon some of these methods of analysis. Hasn't there been a tendency to study the questions too much from the standpoint of special individuals or classes? Haven't we also been too ready to assume that the problems of the State of Maryland were, for instance, the problems of the State of Nevada, or of Colorado, or of Texas, that a method of handling an industry in Maryland must necessarily be a suitable one for regulating it in some other section of the country? During my work as a regional advisor of public works a year or two ago, I came in close contact with sections in my region where the economic problems were totally different from anything which prevailed in Maryland. Of course different yardsticks were necessary.

However, it is certainly true that the well-being of our country demands that all sections should enjoy a fair degree, at least, of prosperity. For instance, the East cannot be prosperous if the West is financially distressed, or if the South is staggering under excessive burdens.

When you, as lawyers, are preparing your case for trial, you want evidence that is direct, specific, and not general. When you are considering the effect of the depression in Maryland and of the results obtained in attempting to overcome it, your best evidence is to study what has happened in Maryland and not what has been done in some other state.

Frequently we hear the charges of inefficiency and extravagance made against the Federal Government. Isn't it helpful for us when we attempt to pass upon that question to consider first of all what has been the experience in Maryland? Well over $100,000,000 have been spent or loaned in Maryland by the Federal Government during the last 2 years. Has that assistance from Washington been necessary? Has it been wisely directed? Has it been helpful? Our relief situation, while not as serious as in some states, was and still is a distressing problem. Approximately $18,000,000 a year have been spent in Maryland in order to meet that situation.

It has been suggested that there has been extravagance in the handling of that fund in Maryland. If so, the blame must be laid upon our own officials and not upon Washington, because the relief fund is handled by Maryland officials and not by those in Washington. The officials of Maryland not only handle the fund, but estimate how much is necessary for relief purposes.

Has anyone suggested that Maryland could have, without oppressive taxation or dangerous attempts at borrowing money, been able to handle this relief situation? You will remember the difficulties met in getting the Maryland Legislature during the last session to raise even a small percentage of that amount which was necessary. Officials of Maryland implored Washington to come to the assistance of Maryland by contributing the greater part of the money which these Maryland officials insisted was needed, and Washington is giving the money asked for. You can well realize whether any other method of financing the relief situation in Maryland could have been found.

In 1932 and 1933 some of our banks and other kinds of financial institutions were in sore straits. Help was needed by these institutions or they would have failed. Is there evidence available to show that either the State of Maryland or the city of Baltimore or private sources could have furnished the funds necessary for these institutions? Many of our building-and-loan associations were frozen by inactive loans. The Federal Government has furnished the funds to help these associations, and, in doing so, has saved many thousands of people in Maryland from losing their homes. Incidentally, the city of Baltimore has collected much over $1,000,000 in back taxes because these loans were made by the Federal Government. The result has been a helpful boost in handling our Baltimore tax situation.

This is not the time to stop to go further into details. It is a proper question for you gentlemen, trained in the law, to decide whether or not the activities of the Federal Government for the relief of Maryland were necessary and if they have been helpful; also whether substitute methods of handling the situation could have been found if the Federal Government had not shouldered the principal burden.

If you believe that the Federal Government has been helpful in Maryland, that the expenditures here have, in the main, been necessarily made and, on the whole, been conducted fairly reasonably, have you sufficient evidence before you to show that the payments or loans by the Federal Government in Tennessee or North Dakota have been unnecessary and improper? It is difficult enough for you to understand the situation in your own state. An analysis becomes exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, when you attempt to study conditions with which you do not have close contact and where, consequently, the evidence you have is necessarily so remote and incomplete.

As I have said, general and sweeping statements are frequently made as to extravagancies and inefficiency in Washington. But it is admitted by everyone that many of the departments in Washington, handling considerable bulk of the operations of the Federal Government, have been effective and economical. Since this is the case, does not the law of averages preclude such generalizations of inefficiency?

Perhaps you may say that the mistakes which have been made in Washington preclude also any sweeping generalization as to the complete success of the recovery program of the Administration. You have some warrant for that, but in stating your conclusions you should observe a true sense of proportion and of relative values. If you do this, you cannot fail to agree that the marked improvement in business conditions, in addition to other desirable results, justifies a favorable verdict, on the whole, upon the remedial program of Washington, and demonstrates clearly that President Roosevelt has put up a winning fight against the depression.

Some of our problems have been accentuated by recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. How are we going to handle these problems, both from a legal and a business standpoint? Many of us, I fear, are inclined to prejudice our judgments by our approach to the subject. We insist, as advocates of either the new deal, rugged individualism, conservatism, or liberalism, as the case may be, that we must come at the matter from some particular angle. We insist upon wearing a label and try to adhere to what that label stands for. You don't handle your mental processes in business matters handicapped by such absurd shackles. You try to work out a problem in your business or in your profession according to special factors. You don't, as a lawyer or business man, insist that you must handle each business matter from the viewpoint of a "new dealer" or of a conservative. As a matter of fact, if you tried to live up to any such classification, it would possibly have a significance in your mind totally different from what it would have in the opinions of your neighbors.

When some of us suggest that we must return to the old times, what do we mean by that statement? History shows us that at any period in the life of our country, or of any other country, there is a certain amount of change in process,—always there is movement. Nobody can assume that some changes will not come about in the future. Someone in the Bible said: "Ye are the people and wisdom shall die with you." The founders of our Constitution would have combated very strenuously the application of such language to themselves. They did not believe that their judgment was conclusive for all time. They took special pains to provide machinery for amendment of the Constitution. Washington and Madison, for instance, would have been the first to have objected to unqualified

praise of their work or to the theory that their judgment in framing the Constitution was final in every respect.

Certainly amendments to the Constitution of the United States should not be made until the most careful deliberation and consideration have been given to them, not only concerning the intrinsic merit of the proposed changes, but also as to their probable effect upon the general basic structure of the Constitution, after due regard is paid to the doctrine of the "wisdom of the ancients." However, many changes have, of course, been made in the Constitution since its adoption. The suggestion, therefore, that other changes should be made does not warrant any loose statements to the effect that someone is trying to make an assault on the Constitution.

We would be equally as foolish if we were given to adopting new panaceas without careful thought and study. No one questions that the fanatic is a menace. There is an equal danger, however, from the man who fails to see the light when it is brought to him. The man who believes that no improvement is possible is as great a menace as the harebrained enthusiast, and doubtless as much so as the unscrupulous demagogue.

You recall that the old-fashioned histories devoted most of their contents to the accounts of battles and wars and very little to the economic and social life of the people. Do you believe that our country ever faced more serious problems or greater dangers of any character than those which existed in March 1933? Certainly you must assume that if emergency measures have ever been essential and justifiable in the past they were needed then.

Emergency measures are not new in our government. The World War illustrated that fact. The people of the country have acquiesced often in emergency legislation which may or may not have been constitutional. That happened, for instance, during the Civil War. Lincoln is justly regarded as a defender of our Constitution, yet it is significant that on one occasion the Chief Justice of the United States, who, by the way, was a Marylander, criticized the President in one of the most severe opinions ever submitted from the bench. You will recall that President Lincoln had, as a war measure, suspended the writ of habeas corpus. Chief Justice Taney, in the case of Ex parte Merryman, declared that this suspension was a violation of the Constitution of the United States and, in doing so, expressed his views in very vigorous language.

Incidentally, I should like to add that in my opinion no other president in our history, not even President Lincoln, has ever met adverse criticism and harassing problems of administration with more poise, cheerfulness, self-control, and equanimity than has President Roosevelt. In the light of that fact, I believe that criticism of his discussion of the recent Supreme Court decision is quite lacking in sense of proportion at least.

Often in our history, as I have said, emergency measures have been adopted and actual extensions by legislative action of our Constitution have been made. In the end, matters have usually righted themselves, either by the elimination of such emergency activities, by subsequent judicial approval, or by constitutional amendment. Certainly no thoughtful person can believe that in this present situation the people of the United States will fail to dispose of such pending questions of constitutionality just as satisfactorily and efficiently as our forefathers have done before us.

It may be that we are too ready to assume that the Administration should have anticipated certain conclusions reached later by the court. Frequently we refer in these days to the Dred Scott decision. In doing so, let us bear in mind that apparently the master minds of that period and of the generation preceding, Webster, Clay, Calhoun, and other great constitutional lawyers, did not foresee the Dred Scott decision.

In the beginning of this talk I commented on the fact that you, as Maryland lawyers, have certain heritages. Let me dwell on one of them for a moment. I have reference to the attitude of the people of Maryland some years prior to the Civil War and during its early stages. At that time Marylanders believed that both the people of the North and the people of the South were too intense and partisan in their feelings, and that prejudice, and not good judgment, prevailed in those sections. They insisted that a method of adjustment of the general problems which for many years had hung over our country was possible through peaceful means. It is to the everlasting credit of Maryland that constantly efforts were thus being made by our people to compose the differences between the North and South and to avoid or to end the war by wise counsel rather than by the sword.

So I believe that, in the study and determination of the problems which now engross the people of our country, much of that same old spirit of tolerance, of fair play, and of mutual regard for the wishes and views of other people, will characterize the citizens of Maryland. If we are consistent with the policy of our fathers, we will avoid sweeping statements either of condemnation or of excessive praise. We will try to keep away from unsound legal processes, but we will not exclude from our thought and considerations any facts or suggested solutions, irrespective of whether they support any particular brand of political philosophy or any specific theory of economic and financial activity.

Some of the discussion recently in regard to the N. R. A., on the other hand, illustrates a spirit of intolerance of judgment and lopsidedness of criticism. Problems growing out of maladjustment between production and distribution, out of increase of monopolistic tendencies and of anti-trust regulations, were acute. The N. R. A., which was unusual and far-reaching in its operations, was designed to play an important role in the handling of such matters. Thoughtful people have been inclined to agree that some of the results of the N. R. A. have been beneficial,—some of them have been probably unsatisfactory. Yet how seldom did we hear a discussion in Maryland which was even-tempered on the subject. We heard glowing statements of unqualified praise, or denunciation of the N. R. A. as being vicious. Our Maryland forefathers of 75 or 100 years ago, in considering the important problems of the day, showed more poise and more orderly processes of reasoning. If they had been summarizing the purposes and results of the N. R. A., they would have formed doubtless a much better judgment in recognizing its strong points and in decrying its weak ones. After analyzing the situation they also would have suggested what should be retained and what should be modified or omitted. In this discussion I am referring to economic aspects of the N. R. A. and not to constitutional questions involved.

If you lawyers from Maryland live up to the heritage of your Maryland forefathers, you will take a leading part in shaping the policies of Maryland in the handling of the vexatious economic and legal problems which now absorb our attention. You have, as I stated before, a glorious opportunity to do helpful and constructive work for your state and for your nation. Let me urge you to stand steadfast, not necessarily for any particular views, because these may properly be subject to change. I would urge you, however, to stand steadfast for sound processes in the collection of evidence, in its analysis, and in the forming of your opinions.

THE TAX PROGRAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans Item on the subject of the Present Tax Program.

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

[From the New Orleans Item of June 22, 1935]

IF DONE, 'TWERE WELL IF IT WERE DONE QUICKLY

It is possible that among the many memorable messages that President Roosevelt has sent to the Congress historians will record that of Wednesday, calling for increased inheritance and gift taxes on great bequests, higher taxes for vast personal incomes, and a higher tax on net corporate incomes, as being the most important.

If these recommendations are adopted, our country is at the beginning of a new era. For we would no longer go on the theory that national development, progress, and prosperity result from accumulation of huge fortunes and excessive expansion of the greatest corporations.

The multi-multi-millionaire and the billionaire would fade out of our society, not immediately, but at any rate inevitably. The chief heir to every great fortune will not be the children of the accumulator or possessor of it, but the Government, and hence the whole people.

The President proposes to break up the vaster fortunes of the country by taxation, and to apply the proceeds to retiring the national debt, thereby relieving small and large taxpayers of that much of the heavy taxation that this debt imposes.

Generally speaking, our views were expressed by a Congressman who discussed the message on Thursday. He does not believe in soaking either the rich or the poor. Comparatively few have vast fortunes. These are naturally known to the Government through their income returns. So there can be no question of the ability of a Government controlled by popular vote to take part of their gains this way. The same applies to inheritances.

The question is one solely of a national policy and philosophy of government. Whatever is permanently best for the most people should be done in any representative government.

That the Nation and States and cities must come to taxation of future securities of the sort now exempt seems to us beyond question. We cannot continue to issue these public bonds and other securities in enormous quantities and exempt them from taxation. They can be multiplied until a vast part of the real wealth and income of the country would be represented in tax-exempt securities. This would eventually mean a class of privileged persons investing their money in tax-exempt securities and living on their incomes without any due contribution to government for the protection and privileges the taxpayers afford them.

We believe there are no tax-exempt securities in Great Britain. We do not recall what the situation is in other countries.

The reaction on the stock market to the President's proposal was not as serious as might have been anticipated. The real value of securities do not depend very much on their concentration in the hands of the few.

In normal times it might be possible to liquidate over a period of months all the securities held by the Rockefellers, for example, without unduly depressing the market.

If the Federal Government were made the heir to a great part of the Ford fortune, a more difficult problem in liquidation might arise. But the answer on ways and means of collecting Government revenue through superincome taxes, and through what the British call "death taxes", is to be found in a record already established in England.

The British, confronted by the problem of unemployment after the war, put on inheritance, gift, and income taxes to such an extent that the British Government has derived a vast part of its great revenue from these sources. They did not do this in order to break up great fortunes. Their people stood for these taxes out of the necessities of the case.

In theory, the old laws of primogeniture and entail survive in England. In practice a supertax is collected, and heavy "death duties" are dividing and redistributing the great fortunes.

So far as general business and recovery are concerned, we incline to believe, now that President Roosevelt has come forward with these recommendations, that Congress had better stay in session long enough to shape and adopt them. The very rich have been in a sort of apprehension ever since 1929. If the Federal Government is to make itself an heir by great inheritance taxes and the like, it is better to go ahead with it and let everybody know the most that the administration contemplates as early as possible.

There is no need for dragging an issue of this kind into a political campaign, where rival sets of politicians are seeking office on rival promises of confiscation and on futile promises of making every man rich. This just can't be done, though the Federal Government can gradually retire its bonds out of supertaxes on great incomes and on increased inheritance taxes.

Those bonds were issued to carry on a war of arms and a succeeding war on destitution and national decay. By means of that first war, some of the great fortunes of the country were accumulated. This made the war against national dissolution necessary. We trust that coming legislation will prevent this ever happening again.

When our own Government was set up on this side of the Atlantic by revolting English colonists, a policy was adopted against "entailing"—or perpetuating—great fortunes in single families. In Great Britain the oldest son inherited the ancestral estate and the ancestral fortunes, and the younger children of the wealthy families had to scramble for themselves. This country established a policy against the time-honored practice of passing down lands, which represented wealth, to one member only of the holder's family, for many succeeding generations. Wealth is now represented by a great many other things than land. But there is nothing new in the principle of preventing an accumulation of wealth through the generations as snowballs expand into boulders as they roll down hill.

Our civil law was inherited from the French. The code Napoleon provided that every man's accumulation must be divided among his wife and all his children. This disperses large fortunes to a large degree. We cannot see that it has worked to the detriment of society in Louisiana. On the contrary, we think the result of it is good.

For some time we have had a feeling that it does not matter so much in what direction we move as a nation, so long as we get things settled, get the rules of the game understood, and can adjust ourselves to the idea that we are not going to wake up tomorrow to embark on some further course.

It is not going to make a great deal of difference to Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Sr., what is done with his great fortune. We are not sure that it is going to make any great difference to Henry Ford. But it is important to the country, if new rules are to be adopted, that these be formulated and put in force as soon as possible, so that the country can begin to build permanently in the direction in which it is to move.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION OF RAILWAYS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution favoring Government ownership and operation of railways, adopted by the Railway Labor Executives' Association at a meeting held in Washington, D. C., June 19 and 20, together with a letter of transmittal thereof.

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

RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1935.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: At the meeting of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, held in the Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C., June 19 and 20, the attached resolution favoring Government ownership and operation of the railways of the United States was adopted.

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Switchmen's Union of North America did not join in this action.

I thought you would be interested in the attitude of the organized railway employees, especially so in view of the fact that you now have pending a Government ownership bill.

Respectfully yours,

G. M. HARRISON, *Chairman.*

Whereas it has become increasingly clear, since the beginning of the depression, that a fundamental revision of the public policy respecting the railways of the United States is necessary. Isolated problems have been given the attention of Congress and of the regulatory bureaus concerned with railway affairs; emergency measures of several kinds have been taken, dealing with different aspects of railway difficulties; new regulatory agencies have been established, old agencies have been revamped, and new duties have been given to existing bodies. But the continuance of the basic abuses of the industry and the reappearance of old problems under new forms as regulation was evaded indicate that none of the proposals adopted have reached to the causes of the general railway distress; and

Whereas study of the many problems of the industry shows conclusively that the responsibility for most of its major difficulties is to be found in the fact that the railways have come under the practically complete domination of the banking and financial interests of the country. Control by these interests, which center in a few powerful Wall Street banking houses, is exerted largely through their representation upon the boards of directors of the railway corporations. In many cases ownership by financial institutions of large amounts of railway bonds has given to them the power to control railway managements. Because of the wide distribution of railway stocks among individual investors, it has also been possible for banking institutions by ownership of a relatively small proportion of the total railway capital to exert an unduly great influence upon railway managements. By these and other means, such as the creation of highly questionable holding companies, the bankers have riveted their control upon this, our most vital industry; and

Whereas railway financiers had, during the decade preceding the depression, pursued in an especially reckless manner their general policy of taking for themselves as large a proportion of railway revenue as possible, while they loaded the industry down with a heavy and unjustified burden of debt. The growth of competing transportation agencies and the need for improved managerial methods to meet that competition were neglected by the railways under the urge of this purely financial control. The demand for increased returns to railway financiers and the efforts to unify specific properties along the lines which haphazard intercorporate relationships dictated resulted in relocations of facilities and various types of unifications and mergers which had no relationship whatever to the transportation needs of the country. Hundreds of thousands of railway workers were thus thrown out of employment and a large number of communities throughout the country were destroyed to increase the returns to the wholly irresponsible groups controlling the railways. These short-sighted policies, planned only to produce immediate gains for railway financiers, inflicted upon the industry very serious injury; and

Whereas the effects of the depression, which would have been serious even had the industry been properly financed, were under the circumstances disastrous. Railway revenues naturally declined, until the net income was in many cases barely sufficient to meet the swollen fixed charges brought about by pre-depression finance. The railway industry, which had been so rich a harvest for these financiers and which merited their forbearance and protection, was now not only to be abandoned, so far as further financing was concerned, but was to feel a demand for a continuance of payments to its security owners, which has brought the industry to the verge of complete collapse. Necessary new financing has been denied. Refinancing of maturing obligations has been denied. Railway managements throughout the country have been forced to reduce expenditures for operating purposes not only to the minimum but far below the lowest level consistent with proper operations. Railway facilities have been allowed to deteriorate to the point where the efficiency of railway service has been seriously impaired and where its safety has been greatly reduced. Railway workers absolutely necessary to a proper maintenance and operation of the railways have been thrown out of employment in order that the money which should have been paid in wages might be diverted to satisfy the demands of the railway financiers. The conditions thus brought about, already grave enough, will become even more dangerous unless they are immediately corrected. Railway roadbeds and equipment, already badly undermaintained, must show in future months in still greater degree the results of these years of neglect; and

Whereas it has become clear that neither railway revenues nor new private financing within any reasonable time in the future will permit the restoring of proper conditions upon the railroads. Any future increase in revenues will certainly be diverted as past revenues have been, to the satisfaction of the demands of railway financiers. The United States Government has, during the depression, taken over the duties and the responsibilities of these financial groups to the railway industry. Refinancing of maturing obligations and the financing of necessary maintenance and improvement of equipment has had to be undertaken by the Federal Government. Whatever advantages may come to the industry as a result of such public financing will certainly be taken by private financial groups if they are permitted to do so. It is evident that the industry will be dependent upon public financing for a long time to come; as a result of that financing, the holdings of private financial groups will increase in value; and

Whereas a multiplicity of abuses which developed in the industry as a result of private ownership and operation had brought about in the half century preceding the depression a complex and chaotic body of regulatory laws, both State and National. These laws were in large part designed to check the abuses of private financing and operation of the roads. Of necessity, they were almost entirely negative in character. The railway corporations, by the diversion of railway revenues for the employment of an army of attorneys, persistently sought methods by which governmental regulation could be evaded or could be turned to the advantage of railway corporations. The real purposes of regulation were thus defeated; and

Whereas the railway industry faces the necessity not alone of restoring its equipment and service to normal, but also of adapting itself to the new conditions brought about by the development of other transportation facilities. The chaotic operating and management conditions caused by the peculiarities of financial relationships must be corrected. All of these conditions will require constructive and positive measures in the public interest; and

Whereas governmental regulation by its very character is unfitted for such positive and constructive measures and there is every

reason to believe that the financial interests controlling the railways will endeavor to thwart rather than to foster the public interest in the era of reorganization which confronts the industry; and

Whereas public ownership and operation of the railways under the Federal Government will permit the integration of the railways in the manner most conducive to safe, efficient, and economical operation. Federal financing under Federal ownership will cost much less and can be much more wisely directed than either private or public financing under private ownership and operation. The necessary coordination of railways with other types of transportation can be done in a manner to safeguard public interests only if there is complete governmental control of the railways. The immediate rehabilitation of railway facilities, which is absolutely essential to the safe and efficient operation of the railways, is not possible excepting through Federal financing, and will be very difficult unless with Federal financing there is also Federal ownership and operation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Railway Labor Executives' Association hereby declare themselves as favoring the immediate taking over of the railways of the United States by the Federal Government and the creation of agencies within the Federal Government to manage and operate the railways.

FARMERS' HOME CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2367) to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present forms of farm tenancy, to engage in rural rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]. Two amendments, that of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and that of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], went over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, first, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma was the one pending at the conclusion of the session on Saturday last.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Both amendments to which the Chair has referred went over. The Senator from Oklahoma offered his amendment prior to the Senator from Minnesota offering his amendment. That is the reason the Chair said the question was on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 16, line 25, beginning with the words "or otherwise", it is proposed to strike out down to and including the word "forestation", in line 2 on page 17, as follows:

or otherwise made available for rural rehabilitation, and prevention of soil erosion, reforestation, and forestation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am sorry that I do not discern at this time the presence in the Chamber of the Senator from Oklahoma. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Alabama. As I recall, the appropriation for the governmental activities referred to in the clause proposed to be stricken out is carried in the $4,800,000,000 appropriation passed here a few months ago. That work now has been placed in charge of Dr. Tugwell, as I recall. Is this an effort to take the work and the appropriation away from Dr. Tugwell and cast them into the lap of the board to be created by this bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I could not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. McNARY. Will this take the supervision and control of the work away from Dr. Tugwell and repose it in the board to be created under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection to eliminating the words "prevention of soil erosion", but the words were included in the bill at the suggestion of Dr. Tugwell. The insertion of the words is agreeable to Dr. Tugwell, but I have no objection to striking out the words "prevention of soil erosion."

Mr. McNARY. I am not speaking of soil erosion. I am not particular whether the language referred to is in the bill or not. My inquiry was developed by a suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma. I am merely wondering if the Forest Service is to be deprived of reforestation work, and if this is an effort to take away from their jurisdiction the work of reforestation and place it under the jurisdiction of the board to be created by this bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is not. It is simply a question of the source from which the funds may come. It does not interfere in any way with the administration of the work of the prevention of soil erosion, forestation, or reforestation.

Mr. McNARY. Is some of this work, particularly that relating to soil erosion and reforestation, left with Dr. Tugwell? If the money is taken away as proposed, would not the work then be placed within the jurisdiction of the board to be created by the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The provision does not give the board any power whatever over soil erosion, forestation, or reforestation. It is simply a permissive plan for the allocation of money under the Work Relief Act which might be devoted to this purpose.

I do not know why soil erosion was suggested to be included, but I can well understand why reforestation ought to be left in the bill, because under the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] the bill authorizes the creation and development of farms in the forests, subject to approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the great work which has been done and which is now being done by the Forest Service, I am anxious to know are we to duplicate that work now by transferring to this proposed corporation funds which have heretofore been appropriated by the Congress? In other words, is the corporation to do the same work in the matter of reforestation that the Forest Service is now doing and has been doing so very well?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No. The corporation is to deal solely with the acquisition of farms for tenants and others who are specified in the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

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

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. KING. May I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that, as I interpret the language of the bill, the proposal is to deduct from the funds which in the $5,000,000,000 bill were allocated for reforestation and the prevention of soil erosion, $300,000,000. This sum, under the bill, is to be transferred to the corporation which is to be organized under the measure before us and to be employed by it to carry out in part the project—I was about to say, the fantastic project—which it is organized to develop. If this amendment prevails, then $300,000,000 which were to have been employed for reforestation and other purposes will be deducted from the amount allotted for such purposes.

Mr. McNARY. I think that is true, and that would bring about a duplication of the work by two separate governmental agencies.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, that is not the way I understand the provision. My impression, from a casual reading, is that this provision merely has relation to the transfer of funds which have been allocated under the Work Relief Act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON. There was a certain fund allocated to rural rehabilitation, prevention of soil erosion, forestation, and reforestation, and out of that fund so allocated the President may transfer a sufficient amount to pay this subscription. That is all I understand to be involved in the provision.

Mr. McNARY. If that be true, it is a depletion of the amount of money allotted for this purpose, to be transferred to the proposed corporation for expenditure in connection with its activities.

Mr. ROBINSON. In one sense that is true, but the Senator will also recall there is a provision in the Work Relief Act giving the President power to transfer from one allocation to another a percentage of the whole fund; so it perhaps would not be of controlling importance.

Mr. McNARY. I have an interest merely to prevent duplication of governmental activities, and further, I do not think there should be a depletion of this work by the transfer of these funds to the corporation to be set up under the bill. Inasmuch as the question has been raised by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], I think it would be well to let it go over until he is present. As a matter of courtesy I make that request of the Senator from Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the amendment go over until such time as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] may be present.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I should not wish to see entered, as I do not think the Senator from Oregon would, an agreement which would make it impossible to dispose of the bill. I do not know where the Senator from Oklahoma is detained. I suggest that the amendment be passed over for the present. To such an arrangement I would have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I am asking.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma be passed over temporarily. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, before we leave the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, I desire to invite the attention of the Senator from Oregon to one phase of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado reserve the right to object to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ADAMS. Only for the purpose of calling the attention of the Senator from Oregon to a particular clause in the Work Relief Act which is broader than the language contained in the bill now before us. There was an allocation under the Work Relief Act of $350,000,000 not merely for soil erosion and reforestation but for other purposes. I read the clause:

> Sanitation, prevention of soil erosion, prevention of stream pollution, seacoast erosion, reforestation, forestation, flood control, rivers and harbors, and miscellaneous projects.

We heard much said during the debate to the effect that the phrase "miscellaneous projects" covered many things. If we take away from this allocation of $350,000,000 money to be used in the farm-tenant program, we are going to take funds away from flood control and the other projects. While the matter is under consideration, I merely wished to bring that clause to the attention of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the supplemental remarks of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GORE entered the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma is now present. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to continue consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think the point raised, that the amendment should go over because the Senator from Oklahoma was not present, is not now well taken, because the Senator is present.

I simply desire to say that, so far as I am concerned, I do not want to see the Forest Service work taken out of the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. I do not want to see that work interfered with, and if this provision of the bill does interfere with it, I should feel inclined to oppose it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not understand that this provision transfers the Forest Service from the Department of Agriculture to any other department, nor do I understand that it makes any transfer of any service as now assigned. Its only effect, as I attempted to say a few minutes ago, is to empower the President to authorize payment of the subscription to the capital stock of the corporation proposed to be created from the fund provided in the Work Relief Act which was allocated to these various purposes. It would tend to deplete that fund.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas has stated generally the effect of this amendment. I agree with him that it does not contemplate, as I read it, the transfer of any part of the work of the Forest Service to the organization which under the terms of the bill is to be created. But, as was stated a moment ago by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] the measure which was passed, known as the "$5,000,000,000 work-relief joint resolution", carries several hundred million dollars for soil erosion, flood control, sanitation, removal of pollution from interstate streams, and so forth. This bill authorizes the President to divert a part of that fund to carrying out the purposes of this measure. The sole discretion in the matter, as I read the bill, rests with the President, and if this bill were passed tomorrow the President could immediately subtract from the $5,000,000,000 fund $300,000,000, and allocate it to the corporation which is being created by the bill under consideration.

I may be in error, but I cannot help but believe that the thought was entertained by some of the proponents of this measure that there would be opposition to a direct appropriation of $300,000,000 to be added to the $50,000,000 provided as the initial capital of the corporation, and that to soften or remove this opposition resort would be had to the $5,000,000,000 fund, and $300,000,000 subtracted from it to be made available for use by the corporation which this bill creates.

Undoubtedly this bill would have met increased opposition if there had been a direct appropriation of the amount indicated. It is about enough to appropriate $50,000,000 as the first subscription to the capital stock of the corporation, but it would have been much more objectionable to have added $300,000,000 more as a direct appropriation from the Treasury to be met, of course, by increased taxes and increased borrowings. I have no doubt that it was believed that we were reconciled to the enormous appropriation of nearly $5,000,000,000 for relief and for divers and sundry purposes indicated in the bill, and that to utilize $300,000,000 of that stupendous sum to aid in carrying out the purposes of the measure under consideration would not be regarded as of any great importance. In other words, having committed to the Government the expenditure of this enormous sum of nearly $5,000,000,000, it would not meet with any particular opposition to divert $300,000,000 to be used to carry out this unsound adventure, provision for which is found in the bill under consideration.

I confess that I have been somewhat surprised at the lack of interest evinced by Senators in the bill before us, and I have marveled at the lack of opposition to a measure which confessedly so inadequately deals with the broad question of providing farms for the millions of tenant farmers of the United States if it is regarded as a proper function of the Government to undertake this stupendous task. I think it is conceded by some Senators that the measure is doomed to failure; that similar schemes in this and other countries have proved futile; but the habit is being developed of accepting with but little opposition almost any measure that is presented for consideration. Executive departments and agencies and "brain trusters" prepare bills and bring them to Congress where they are offered, and where it is expected they will meet with immediate favor and be passed without amendment or opposition. Not infrequently the statement is made that opposition will be unavailing and, therefore, it is better to expeditiously dispose of bills that are drafted by various persons in executive branches of the Government.

Formerly proposed legislation was prepared by Members of Congress after investigation and consideration. That procedure has been departed from very largely, and now-a-days we accept, usually without much question, the bills that are handed to us by executive agencies and by representatives of various organizations and groups.

Mr. President, in my opinion it would be for the best interest of the country to adopt a different policy in connection with the preparation and consideration of proposed legisla-

tive measures. Certainly it would be in keeping with the duties and responsibilities of Congress if the stupendous sum of $4,880,000,000 carried in the so-called "relief measure" was required for the purposes therein indicated, then it is unfair to deduct from it the $350,000,000 which I assume will constitute a part of the amount that may be expended under the terms of the pending measure. If $350,000,000 and additional sums are to be used in this adventure, it seems to me that we should frankly confess that fact and make direct appropriations or authorizations, and take the necessary steps to levy taxes in order to meet the expenditures.

An examination of the bill shows the latitude which is permitted to the corporation. Not only is it to have $350,000,000 but it is authorized to issue an unlimited amount of capital stock and to issue bonds to the extent of $1,000,000,000. There are no adequate checks or restrictions such as it would seem should be made where such enormous sums are to be expended by a corporation which is to be organized under the pending bill. As I read the bill there is no limit as to the capital stock which may be issued and there are no proper restrictions in connection with the issue of bonds amounting to $1,000,000,000 and in the expenditure of funds derived therefrom.

Mr. President, I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]. I am opposed to deducting from the funds provided for sanitation, flood control, and other important purposes, either the $50,000,000 provided in this bill for the initial capital or $300,000,000 to aid in executing the purposes of this proposed legislation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am glad to be assured of the support of the Senator from Utah; and I wish to add that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is entirely correct when he says that the pending bill does not provide that the Reforestation Service or Soil Conservation Service shall be transferred from the Department of Agriculture to this new tenant corporation. He is entirely correct about that. It does not direct such transfer. It does not even authorize the transfer of the Reforestation or Soil Conservation Service from the Department of Agriculture to this corporation. That is not the point. It does, however, authorize the President to transfer the money which has heretofore been set aside for the Reforestation and Soil Conservation Service from that Service to the corporation being created by this bill. The Service remains where it was. The Reforestation and Conservation Service remains with the Department of Agriculture. It is the money only that is being taken away from the Service. I must confess that we feel some little solicitude about the money as well as the Service.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GORE. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the use of continuing the Service where it is if there is not to be any money to operate it? That is the thing to which I object.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, that is just the point. As Senators know, the $4,800,000,000 act was broken down into eight general categories, designating eight general schemes or projects to which the money could be devoted. The eighth and last carried some $350,000,000, but in that general classification or category were some five or six different kinds of services or projects to which that particular appropriation could be applied. Five or six general objects were to be covered by the $350,000,000 carried in that category. Among them were, I believe, sanitation, rehabilitation, reforestation, and soil conservation.

Up to date only $25,000,000 have been set aside for the Soil Conservation Service. As I stated on Saturday, delegations of Senators and Representatives waited both on the Secretary of Agriculture and on the President, requesting that $150,000,000 be allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for 2 years. So far only $25,000,000 has been set aside for that purpose. I understand that a requisition has been presented to the proper authorities requesting a much larger allotment. The exact amount I do not know. So far it is confidential. I have been unable to ascertain it. What action will be taken it is also impossible to ascertain, but Senators all appreciate the importance of the Soil Conservation Service, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] no less than the rest of us, and no less than the most ardent of us; and I hope the Senator will accept the pending amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in view of the evident misunderstanding of the purpose of this part of the committee amendment, and as I regard it as of no particular value to the bill—it was put in at the suggestion of the very people who are going to administer the soil-erosion program—in view of the discussion and misunderstanding and misapprehension about it, I am perfectly willing to have the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment which I have on the desk be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 20, beginning at line 3, it is proposed to strike out all of the first sentence of subsection (e), and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

> The Corporation is authorized to appoint attorneys and shall, subject to the civil-service laws, employ such officers, examiners, and other experts and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this act and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, is there any provision that any of these officials must be confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. No; there is no provision to that effect.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that there is a provision in the bill, as I understand, that those receiving salaries in excess of $4,000 shall be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Not in this amendment.

Mr. KING. No; not in this amendment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. But in the bill itself.

Mr. KING. That may be.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, whose amendment is this? Is it the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. My amendment is now pending.

Mr. LONG. Whose amendment is it which was just read?

Mr. ROBINSON. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate to discuss this amendment, because I think it is unnecessary to do so. I have modified the amendment to comply with the objection of the two Senators from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to the committee amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 22, line 18, after the word "thereof" and the period, it is proposed to insert a new sentence as follows:

> No separate tract of property shall be bought at a price in excess of the value shown by the appraisal as herein provided for.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Alabama has no objection to the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment. On page 20 of the committee amendment, lines 22 and 23, I move to strike out the words "without regard to the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds." Let me read a portion of the preceding sentence. Before doing so let me suggest that it must not be forgotten that this bill provides for a corporation, upon which is conferred enormous power with almost unlimited authority. There are no provisions ample and satisfactory to guide it or to restrain it in its activities. It may spend the $50,000,000 of capital stock authorized and also $300,000,000 provided in the bill. It may also issue unlimited capital stock following the $50,000,000 issue, and then issue bonds to the extent of $1,000,000,000.

It seems inconceivable that Congress would pass a measure of this character and confer such unrestrained power upon a corporation controlled by three directors. No one can determine the amount which will be expended, nor where and when expended. I repeat, because that fact should be emphasized, that Congress, in my opinion, is failing in its duty when it gives a charter to a corporation authorizing it to perform public functions and private activities and to expend enormous sums, the aggregate of which may not be determined.

A few years ago Congress was cautious in making appropriations. It was meticulous in its demands to know how public funds were to be expended, but it seems that the habit has grown so upon us of making enormous appropriations, too often without adequate restrictions and reservations, that even the suggestion that we halt for the purpose of providing proper limitations meets with no support, but, upon the contrary, with opposition.

I now read a portion of the preceding sentence:

> The Corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails for its official business in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government, and shall determine the necessary administrative and other expenditures under this act and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

Following this language of the bill are the words which I have moved to strike out, namely:

> Without regard to the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. President, I am amazed that a measure should have been submitted for our consideration which contains the words which I have moved to eliminate. Why should this corporation proceed without regard to the provisions of laws governing the expenditure of public funds? It would seem from the language of the bill that this corporation, which is to be created and which will expend hundreds of millions of public funds, will not be subjected to whatever laws are found upon the statute books governing public expenditures. The funds to be expended by this corporation come out of the Treasury of the United States; they are wrung from the taxpayers of the United States; and yet it is proposed that the three directors who are to control this proposed corporation may expend hundreds of millions of dollars without supervision or restraint or without being subject to the provisions of laws dealing with public expenditures.

Recently an act was passed by Congress creating a corporation to handle and deal with funds and expenditures in connection with Federal prisons. It was provided in that law, as I recall, that the corporation should be subject to examination provided for under the act of Congress providing a national Budget system and in an independent audit of Government accounts. Senators will recall that under that act there was created an establishment of the Government to be known as the General Accounting Office. It was to be independent of the executive departments and under the control and direction of the Comptroller General of the United States. Senators know that this important provision found in the Budget Act has saved the Government many millions of dollars. It has had a most salutary effect upon executive organizations and upon spending branches and agencies of the Federal Government. I am unwilling that this corporation which it is proposed we shall create shall not be brought under the scrutiny and supervision of the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General of the United States.

As stated, I have offered an amendment to strike out the words:

> Without regard to the provisions of any other law governing the expenditures of public funds—

And the amendment which I offer will contain the following provision:

> That all expenditures of said Corporation shall be in accordance with the laws generally applicable to the expenditures of the several departments and establishments of the Government. All claims and accounts of said Corporation shall be submitted to the General Accounting Office as provided in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

I think it would be most unfortunate to relieve this proposed corporation of the obligation to have its proceedings and expenditures examined by the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General of the United States. Certainly it would be reassuring to the taxpayers to know that a corporation which has such unlimited authority to expend hundreds of millions of dollars was subject to examination as to its accounts and expenditures by an independent agency provided by the Federal Government. I cannot believe that there will be opposition to the amendment which I have submitted; and I take the liberty of inquiring of the Senator from Alabama whether he will not accept the amendment. If so, I shall not further discuss it.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. LONG. This amendment merely provides that the corporation shall be subject to accounting?

Mr. KING. Subject to the same scrutiny and examination as other agencies of the Government and corporations which it has created for various purposes. In other words, this amendment brings this proposed corporation under the terms of title 3 of the National Budget System Act. Title 3, among other things, requires that the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General of the United States shall examine all claims and demands and accounts whatever in which the Government of the United States is concerned, either as debtor or creditor, and shall settle and adjust the same in the General Accounting Office.

Mr. LONG. Who is objecting to that?

Mr. KING. I am trying to find out.

Mr. LONG. I myself should like to find out.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, the Senator from Utah is opposed to the whole program——

Mr. KING. If the Senator puts his consent to the amendment on that ground, I do not know that I am concerned about it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not said anything about consent. I desired to state why the provision referred to was put in the bill. It is immaterial to me whether it remains in it or not.

The corporate organization proposed to be set up was fashioned after the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and a provision similar to that under discussion is in the act setting up that Corporation. Where a corporation such as the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, or such as the corporation proposed here, is engaged in a program in the field, I assume the theory is that there are many items and transactions which cannot well be handled if they are required to go through the General Accounting Office.

I followed this program really because, as I have stated, it is the same as the structure of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Federal land bank is operating under

the same program, as is the Federal farm agency. But if the Senate thinks that everything ought to go through the General Accounting Office, I have no objection to it.

I am simply following the precedents set by the Congress in establishing other organizations and corporations. That is the only reason why this provision is here; it was believed to be in line with what the Senate has decided as to corporations of a similar nature, and that it was advisable to have this provision in the law.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. Since the Senator from Utah is offering this amendment, may I ask him whether or not in his judgment, if the law should apply as he suggests, it will result in any way in handicapping the activities or retarding the necessary expedition with which matters frequently have to be decided?

Mr. KING. I have no hesitancy whatever in saying, "No; it would not affect it at all." It calls for scrutiny, examination of claims and accounts, and only such examination as is provided by the General Accounting Office, found in the Budget law. I have before me the Budget law, and it provides for the General Accounting Office, and for the examination of certain accounts.

Mr. BLACK. I can state to the Senator, so far as my own attitude is concerned, that there are some agencies which do not come under the General Accounting Office, a large part of whose activities should be subject to examination by that office. Simply for the purpose of offering a cooperative suggestion, I am wondering whether there should be any limitation as to the type of examination or the amount involved in the particular transaction which should be scrutinized by the Accounting Office, with a view to preventing any unnecessary delay, and unnecessary burden upon the Accounting Office.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am merely accepting the spirit and theory of the general accounting law, which applies to all the departments and most of the independent establishments of the Government. I may say to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], in answer to the statement made by him respecting the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, that I am certain that its accounts and expenditures, sooner or later, must come under the provisions of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. LONG. It already has been, Mr. President.

Mr. KING. That is my understanding.

Mr. LONG. The Chairman of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation himself appeared before a committee here and made the most vigorous kind of comment on what had occurred in connection with the home loan business.

Mr. KING. I do not desire to take up time if the Senate is willing to accept my amendment. I call for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the committee amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment. On page 23, line 13, after the word "sell", I propose to insert the words "or lease", and on line 14, after the word "contracts", to strike out the period and to insert the words "*Provided, however,* That no such lease shall be for a period of more than 5 years."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 13, of the committee amendment, after the word "sell", it is proposed to insert the words "or lease", and on line 14, before the period, to insert the words "*Provided, however,* That no such lease shall be for a period of more than 5 years", so as to read:

(6) To enter into contracts to sell or lease its properties, and to make conveyances under the terms of such contracts, *Provided, however,* That no such lease shall be for a period of more than 5 years. The Corporation may lease any farm which has been repossessed by it, pending a resale of said farm.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, when the bill was under consideration some weeks ago it provided an unlimited grant of authority to make leases, and upon the suggestion of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] that permissive authority was stricken from the bill.

The situation which this amendment is designed to cover is that of individuals who may not have had successful agricultural experience but who have other qualifications which would indicate that they are capable of making a success of the operation if they are given sufficient assistance in the technical problems of farming.

In order to meet the objection, which I think is well founded, to the Authority to make indeterminate leases granted by the original bill, I have endeavored, by the inclusion of the proviso that no lease shall be for more than a period of 5 years. That, I think, will meet the objections of those who did not wish to see the Authority unlimited.

I sincerely hope the amendment will be agreed to. I have conferred with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] in charge of the bill, and with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who were primarily concerned with the previous amendment, and I find that they have no objection to the amendment I have now offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Alabama, in charge of the bill, to page 22, the matter which we discussed briefly on Friday. I refer to the provision beginning on line 9, as follows:

(4) The Corporation shall limit the loan made to any purchaser to the amount that will provide a farm to be limited in area to the size of an average farm in the State where the land is located as determined by the preceding Federal census, and not to exceed in cost the price of property of similar size and value in the same section or area.

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is my understanding that an amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] was agreed to, limiting the price which may be paid to the appraised value.

Mr. BORAH. I did not know that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Chair is not putting the question on the entire committee amendment as a single amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending question.

Mr. ADAMS. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator in charge of the bill in reference to what seems to me would be a most unfortunate provision. I refer to the provision regarding interest. The provision of subsection (d) on page 25 provides that—

The rate of interest to be charged by the Corporation upon indebtedness owed to it shall be at as low a rate of interest as the Government shall secure the money.

It does not limit it to the rate of interest which the Corporation pays for its money but to as low a rate of interest as that for which the Government shall secure the money.

The money which will be used during the first year will come from the money provided by the Work Relief Act. The relief money may come from taxes and not from bonds. If it comes from taxes, the Government will pay no interest on it. In other words, then the Corporation will be required to lend the money without any interest.

If the money which the Government obtains and turns over to the Corporation comes from its borrowing, there are at least 20 rates of interest at which the Government gets its money. Some of its short-time borrowings have been at a rate as low as one-fourth of 1 percent. Other borrowings of Government money have been at 3½, 4, and 4¼ percent. The rate of interest varies in accordance with the money market and in accordance with the maturity date of the

security issue and in accordance with its character. So this provision is utterly unworkable.

It seems to me the sane thing to do is to frame the provision in such a way that the practice may be followed which is pursued in the case of the Home Loan organization and in the Federal land-bank organization, where the rate of interest is fair and just, and is not left in the situation which will exist under the provisions of this bill, which is an impossible situation.

We are loaning, in the case of some of these agencies, at the rate of 3½ percent. There was a controversy on the floor over that. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation is making loans at very reasonable rates. In this bill we are proposing to lend money to the tenant to buy property at as low a rate as that for which the Government can get the money.

The most we can expect the Corporation to get out of its loans will be a fraction of 1 percent. We are putting the tenant in competition with the farmer who owns his property. We are permitting the tenant to buy property without submitting any margin of security, and then his interest rate is practically nothing.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think there is a further vice in this particular language, which we encountered particularly in connection with merchant-marine loans. This is the vice: In the first instance, the Government will borrow its money on, let us say, 90-day commitments, and will get the benefit of a rate as low as one-half of 1 percent. Finally, however, the loan will be refinanced on a bonding basis, and the Government will pay 3 percent or 3½ percent for its money. I am speaking now in terms of experience we have had under the merchant marine laws. The bonds will be issued on at least a 2½-percent or 3-percent basis under the existing circumstances. However, under the language in this bill I agree with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] that we would have precisely the situation we had under our merchant marine laws. The borrower would have the benefit of the Government's short-time rate all through the period of his loan, when subsequently the Government itself must pay the long-time rate. Therefore the Government definitely and specifically is losing money on the loan.

Mr. ADAMS. Ultimately the Government has to pay a long-time rate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. The short-time rate, as the term indicates, is a short-time obligation. Sooner or later it has to be converted into a long-time obligation, and a higher rate has to be paid by the Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. We corrected a similar situation in respect to merchant-marine construction loans by adding some such language as this:

> But at not less than 3½ percent in the case of the merchant-marine loans.

Perhaps that rate is too high under present circumstances, but I agree with the Senator from Colorado that there ought to be a floor put under this rate of interest.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me suggest to the Senators who are discussing this subject that we previously had this question before us, and the suggestion made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was really adopted as to one phase of the matter. Of course, practically all this money is intended to come from bond issues, and I assume that the rate of interest contemplated by this section will be the rate which will have to be paid on the bond issue; that is, the rate at which the money will be loaned will be the same as the rate for which the money is obtained under the bond issue.

Mr. ADAMS. It will be a Government issue, not the Corporation's.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It can be changed from "Government" to "Corporation."

Mr. ADAMS. The difficulty then is that the Corporation does not pay anything for the money it gets from the Government. On the first $100,000,000 it does not pay anything.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand there is an amount which would not be covered by a bond issue. I do not know what the Government will pay for that. It is a comparatively small item, and that money is already appropriated.

Mr. ADAMS. I desire to suggest an amendment so that the discussion may be concentrated. I move, on page 25, line 5, following the word "shall", to strike out "be at as low a rate of interest as the Government shall secure the money", and that there be inserted in lieu thereof "not to exceed 3½ percent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it seems to me that under present circumstances that is a high rate.

Mr. ADAMS. That is to be the maximum. The provision is that it shall not exceed 3½ percent.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I misunderstood the Senator. I understood him to suggest that the rate should be 3½ percent.

Mr. ADAMS. No.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may the amendment be again stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, line 5, after the word "shall", it is proposed to strike out the words "be at as low a rate of interest as the Government shall secure the money" and to insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed 3½ percent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a few observations on the committee amendment as a whole, which seem to me rather essential. That it is desirable from the national standpoint to substitute ownership for tenancy is obvious. It needs no discussion. There is no question that revolutions and rebellions do not arise from the owners of land, and that wherever ownership can be established we ought to establish it. But from that premise it does not follow that the Government of the United States should provide the funds to make the change from tenancy to ownership.

In the pending bill it is to be noted that the money which is to be used to convert tenancy into ownership comes, in the first year at least, from moneys appropriated for relief purposes. Some of us felt that the $5,000,000,000 appropriation was a little large, but those who insisted upon the $5,000,000,000 appropriation are most urgent that we take part of that money and divert it from the relief purposes over to the purchase of farms.

I know from recent experience that in the western section of the country, where applications have been made for projects, the kind of projects in which the West is interested, permanent projects, increasing the wealth of the country, we have been met with the statement that the permanent projects of that kind do not meet with the standard and the rule laid down under the Work Relief Act; that we did not appropriate enough money; that the money must be expended on a basis of not to exceed $1,150 per man where wages and material must be provided for in connection with a project. So those things which my section of the country has dreamed would come to it under the Work Relief Act cannot come to it. If we adopt the pending measure, it will result in reducing the amount available for work relief, and it will lower the standard by whatever amount is diverted.

This bill, if I read it correctly, proposes to loan the full value of the farm which is to be purchased. That is the intention. It is proposed to take care of the man who is a tenant, and to provide him a farm at Government cost, he

to owe the full amount of the purchase price, but to contribute no down payment, no equity. In that respect it is different entirely from the Home Owners' Loan and the Farm Loan Acts. We have loaned our credit to help men save property in which they had an equity. So far we have pursued the policy that where a man had an equity in his home, representing down payments, representing work, representing labor, the Government would save his home and save his farm from foreclosure. We are now taking the other step, and are going to say that every tenant shall have a farm. That, however, is not all.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. KING. In addition to the amount loaned on the farm, the full appraised value, as I read the bill, credit is to be extended for the purchase of machinery and other personal property.

Mr. ADAMS. I was about to reach that point. The bill provides that in addition to the farm the tenant will get livestock, equipment, implements, machinery, furnishings, and then there follow these very broad words: "Supplies and facilities." What "supplies and facilities" may mean after he has been supplied with livestock, equipment, implements, machinery, and furnishings I do not know, but that is what he is to be given, and the full purchase price is to be furnished by the Government.

The purpose of the bill is commendable. The farm provided under the bill is to be of the size and fertility, and so stocked and equipped, as reasonably to indicate returns which will permit the repayment of the purchase price.

Mr. President, there is a little mathematics connected with this subject to which I should like to invite attention.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has been discussing the question of loans. I have not been present during the entire debate on this bill, and I have just noticed some language on page 23 to which I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Colorado and obtain his viewpoint thereon. In line 2, on page 23, the words "make loans or grants or both" appear. Is it proposed under the bill to make grants?

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator is asking a question which I cannot answer; and it is not the only question about this bill I cannot answer. I cannot understand why the Corporation to be created should make grants.

Mr. HATCH. May I intrude on the time of the Senator from Colorado to ask the Senator from Alabama if that is proposed under the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. There may be growing out of the work-relief program some phases, such as rural rehabilitation, in which grants are involved. Of course, in the long run, no grants are intended, and they are not to be made unless there is something along that line under the present emergency.

Mr. HATCH. As I have said, I was unavoidably detained during the explanation given by the Senator from Alabama. I do not want to take up the time of the Senator from Colorado, but those words indicate to me that the policy will be inaugurated by the Corporation of purchasing land and then making gifts of such land.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is not intended.

Mr. HATCH. It is not intended?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I am speaking under a time limit.

Mr. HATCH. Very well; I will not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. ADAMS. It is provided in the bill, roughly, that the tenant shall be provided with what is an average farm at not to exceed the average cost of such a farm in his neighborhood, adequately equipped.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LONERGAN] put into the RECORD day before yesterday a most interesting tabulation which shows that the average value of the average farm in the United States is $7,614. It also shows that the average acreage of farms in the United States is 156 acres. I think those who are supporting this bill have failed to recognize that there is a difference as between agricultural conditions in the various sections of our country. This tabulation, which appears at page 9919 of the RECORD, shows these facts: That the average farm in Colorado has 481 acres and that its average value is $10,497; that the average farm in California has a value of $25,000; that the average farm in Wyoming has 1,469 acres and a value of $12,919; in Nebraska 345 is the average acreage, and the average value is $19,274.

It is proposed to provide for some tenants average farms——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Farms which will not exceed the average.

Mr. ADAMS. Very well. The average value is in excess of $7,000. Suppose we cut that value down to $5,000, and are only going to expend the first year, according to the statement made on the floor the other day, $50,000,000, that money to be allocated by the President. If we spend $50,000,000 in the first year, we will take care of 10,000 out of 2,266,000 tenants. In other words, we take care of less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the tenants of the United States. Yet this bill is being advanced as a great measure designed to solve the deplorable tenancy situation in the United States.

Within 3 years the bill contemplates that there may be spent an additional $300,000,000, seven times as much as during the first year. With such an expenditure we would be able to take care of 2.6 percent of the tenants. What are those who expect to go home and say to the tenants, "We passed a great bill to relieve your deplorable situation", going to reply to the 99 percent who are not taken care of in the first year? Mind you, 99¾ percent of the tenants will not be taken care of the first year. In other words, this bill is a gesture. If we believe sincerely in taking care of the tenancy evil in this country—and it is an evil—let us meet the problem squarely; let us put up the money; let us take care of them and not merely appropriate sufficient to take care of one-fourth of 1 percent the first year.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. KING. An appropriation adequate, however, to meet the entire situation would run into the billions.

Mr. ADAMS. If we bought farms for all tenants at the average price, the amount would be $20,000,000,000. If we bought them $5,000 farms, it would be $13,322,000,000. However, I say to the Senator from Utah that if we are going to enter upon such a program, let us not do so on that kind of a basis, saying as we do in the opening of this bill that we are going "to create a Farmers' Home Corporation, to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present forms of farm tenancy", when we are going to correct such economic instability for one-fourth of 1 percent in the first year and for 2½ percent within the limit of the subsequent appropriations.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator believe that this is largely intended to meet a situation in 2, 3, or 4 of the Southern States where, by reason of the cotton policy which we inaugurated at the last session under the Bankhead cotton bill, as a result of which many of the tenants were driven from the farm, we are now to take care of those tenants who were thus driven from the farm?

Mr. ADAMS. I cannot attempt to answer that question, but I will say that statistics show that in the State of the Senator in charge of the bill the average farm has 68 acres and its average value is only $1,952, while in the adjoining State of Mississippi the average acreage is 55 and the average value is $1,818. In other words, an entirely different economic situation prevails in that section than prevails in other parts of the country. In Kansas, for instance, the

average farm value is $13,735; in Iowa it is $19,655; Illinois, $15,553; in South Dakota, $15,455.

If we are going to establish a man upon a farm, it must be an economic unit upon which he can make a living, and while we are proposing to provide him with a farm, with the equipment, with the supplies, and the facilities we are not proposing to provide him with any capital. I do not know how it may be in Alabama or other States, but in my State one cannot operate a farm without capital with which to buy seed, and so forth.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator know how the Government will ever be able to say to one tenant, "Yea; you may have a farm", and to another tenant, "Nay; you may not have a farm"?

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that it cannot be done. That is the problem. Either the bill we are passing is merely a futile gesture or it is an entering wedge upon a program which will literally destroy the ability of the United States to borrow money. We have passed within a week or two bills involving additional taxes; additional indebtedness has been incurred. We have appropriations to be met by borrowing. Our indebtedness is now approximately $40,000,000,000. Then, when we go out into the markets and borrow we are going to meet trouble. A tax bill is predicted which may lessen our capacity to sell bonds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado on the amendment has expired.

Mr. ADAMS. Then, I will take my time on the bill.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I am at a loss, listening to the Senator, to determine whether he thinks we ought to take the whole plunge and go the whole length or whether we ought to defeat the bill entirely.

Mr. ADAMS. I can readily answer the Senator. In my judgment, it is not the function of the Federal Government to buy farms for anybody. I think we have gone the full way in that direction in what we have already done. In other words, if we say that it is the obligation of the Federal Government to provide a farm for every tenant and finance him, I have in my State, as every other Senator has in his State, men who will say, "I want a home"; and there will be an equal demand on the Federal Government to provide him with a home, as our country rests upon the homes as well as upon the farms. I have in my State young men working in foundries and in factories who would like to have a factory or a manufacturing plant of their own. I do not know how we are going to draw the line and say we will finance the farm tenant, but we will not finance the man who desires a home, who desires to operate an industry, who desires to own a store. I think I might say to the Senator from Nebraska not only is it an unwise policy, one financially destructive, but I do not know where, in the Constitution of the United States as it stands today, we can find authority to take money out of the Treasury and use it for the private welfare of an individual.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not trying to belittle the Senator's argument by the question I have asked and by the question which I wish now to ask.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator need not restrict himself.

Mr. NORRIS. I realize just as fully as does the Senator that it is an enormous proposition; yet I should like to get back to the fact whether it would be better for us to do nothing or try to do something, even though we admit that we are not doing as much as we should like to do. I am fearful, I am worried a great deal about the facts which have been accumulating for years, showing that farm tenancy is increasing at a rapid rate; and I confess that, in my anxiety to stop it, I am willing to do some things which under ordinary circumstances I would not think of doing. What would the Senator do? Is there something we can do instead of this to stop the rapid tendency toward farms being tilled by tenants and the owners living somewhere else?

Mr. ADAMS. If I may I shall answer in two aspects. The fact that a situation is deplorable does not necessarily in and of itself impose upon the Federal Government the obligation to remedy it. The fact that a purpose may be noble does not of itself impose upon the Federal Government an obligation to carry it out.

In the State of Nebraska practically every acre of tillable land was at one time in private ownership. All the Midwest Mississippi Valley country was once privately owned. It is the most fertile section not only of this country, but almost of the world. Despite that situation we have seen tenancy increase. What is the cause of it? There are economic causes, agricultural causes. A man cannot hold a farm without marginal resources unless economic conditions are fundamentally sound. What I thought the present Congress and the preceding Congress had been endeavoring to do was to correct the underlying economic causes so that the man on the farm could live. If such a condition could be maintained, we would not have a farm tenancy problem in the State of Nebraska or in the Northern States.

Mr. NORRIS. Is there some other way? Has the Senator in mind some other remedy which would bring about that desirable condition?

Mr. ADAMS. We have tried to remedy several conditions. We have tried to put the farmer on a parity with industry.

Mr. NORRIS. But we have not done so.

Mr. ADAMS. No; but we have tried. We cannot do it merely by putting upon his back an obligation to pay for a farm upon which he cannot make a living under existing conditions. If we could establish conditions upon a sound basis we would have no trouble with the tenant. He would get a farm.

Throughout my section of the country many foreclosures have taken place. In the Senator's State of Nebraska foreclosures have taken place by insurance companies, loan agencies, and banks. They are more than eager to sell and dispose of the farms they hold. All the farms are now in some form of private ownership. The man who does not own his farm in 99 out of 100 cases makes a failure of it. I know in my own State, Colorado, there is no one so eager to get rid of the tenancy situation and to establish ownership as those who own farm property and try to operate it from town.

My theory is that we should improve tax conditions, make it easier for a man to live, take off his back some of the tariff burdens and some of the tax burdens. By such means we will solve the farm tenant's problem.

I do not know a thing about the South so far as this problem is concerned. I am talking about the section of the country with which I am familiar, where the Senator from Nebraska lives and where I live. I feel that this bill would not meet that condition, but would clearly put us in a position where we would have to have a remedy to undertake to cure what is impossible under unsatisfactory economic conditions. We are asked to buy a man a farm and livestock and equipment, and put him on it without capital, and then if there should be a bad year or a drought or low prices he would be perfectly helpless and the Government would have to go into the farming business.

That, in substance, is what I have to say about the bill. The actual number of farmers to be helped is infinitesimal. The first year the number would be one-fourth of 1 percent, with the possibility in 3 years of 2½ percent of those who nominally come under the bill. In other words, it is a program so small that it is not worth considering. It is a futile gesture. If I considered such a program as is proposed to be sound, I should be willing to go along with it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. It seems to me there is only one argument in favor of the pending bill. We enacted a good deal of economic legislation, benevolently intended, passed with the best possible intentions to help the farmers in the South and other sections. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] argued and demonstrated, I believe, a few days ago that in the South the uneconomic legislation which we have already enacted has driven 300,000 tenants and share-croppers in the South from the farms to the towns, has driven 300,000 tenants and share-croppers from the farms to the relief rolls in the towns and in the cities, 30,000 in the State of North Carolina alone. No one anticipated this result, no one desired this result, but that was the unforeseen reaction to uneconomic legislation.

The pending bill is intended in a way to reverse that tendency and to remedy that mischief, to set in operation another set of economic measures to counteract the mistakes we have already made. Since the Government has virtually evicted these tenants who now have no farms to cultivate and has sent them to the relief rolls, does not the Senator think that might possibly be considered as an excuse if not a reason for the Government's doing something of this sort and trying to undo its mistaken policy insofar as the tenant farmers are concerned?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. I do not want it to be assumed, by sitting silent when a statement is made such as that which has just been made, that the Senate acquiesces in it. It seems a little peculiar to me to suggest that the tenant farmers of the South, for instance, have been sent back to the relief rolls on 10- and 12-cent cotton when they would gladly, and in a lordly way, sustain themselves on 4-cent cotton. It seems a little strange to me to suggest that the farmers of the Nation have been sent to the relief rolls on $1 wheat when they could sustain themselves in luxury, and with their rugged initiative and their magnificent ability, on 25-cent wheat. It seems a little strange to me to argue that the farmers have been sent to the relief rolls in America by corn at 75 cents and a dollar a bushel, when corn was so cheap before the depression began that they burned it for fuel in the West, and in many places sold it at 9 and 10 cents a bushel.

It may be possible that in these economic laws there is something of exploitation which is frequently manufactured by those who want to support conditions as they are. There may be something in these economic laws which leads us to believe that 4- and 5-cent cotton will keep men off the relief rolls, that 10- and 12-cent cotton will place them there; that 8-cent corn will keep them off the relief rolls, but 75-cent corn will send them to the relief rolls; that 25-cent wheat will necessarily send the people out to live on their farms, with their rugged initiative standing out uppermost to show how great they are, but when they get a dollar a bushel for their wheat they must go out with hat in hand begging for relief. That may be true, but I cannot agree to such logic.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ADAMS. Gladly.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Alabama has made a perfectly splendid stump speech. It ought to secure the desired reaction upon the part of those to whom it is addressed.

Mr. BLACK. I was addressing it to the Senator from Oklahoma with little hope that it would avail anything.

Mr. GORE. Then I doubly appreciate it. The only fault with the Senator's speech is that it has no reference to the facts. I mention that merely as an incidental infirmity. I would not suggest that as any serious matter to consider in connection with so eloquent an outburst, but I know of cases where landlords, under the A. A. A. and the Bankhead Act, have discharged their tenants and have sent them to town or let them go their way, and have taken their benefits and rental payments and hired farm labor at 50 cents a day and have cultivated the remaining portions of their land. If that commends itself to the Senator from Alabama, I, for one, do not agree with him. I deplore such consequences as that, and the Government ought not to lend its sanction to policies which work such mischief among the tenants of the country who are entitled at least to justice, if not to favor.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. The bad thing about the remarks I made, so far as the Senator from Oklahoma is concerned, is that they are the facts, they are the evidence; and those who seek to attack the program which has been brought about are the ones who ignore the facts and who ignore the evidence.

It is easy enough for a man living in luxury or in comfort, or who may be prompted by some malevolent desire to injure an individual holding office, to criticize every part of a program. I shall wait until my time comes to discuss this question further; but I wish it distinctly understood what the facts are, as may be ascertained by any one who will investigate and as the farmers of the country have shown by their votes, and as every man who has gone out among them knows. I went into 61 counties in Alabama last summer. I am not talking from hearsay. I am talking from absolute knowledge of the way those farmers live, and what has happened to them; and I deny that so far as the farmers of Alabama are concerned, any evidence can be secured that they have been sent to the relief rolls on 12-cent cotton when they were rolling in luxury in the good old days of 5-cent cotton.

I shall wait until the time of the Senator from Colorado is up before replying further.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. I do.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if anybody is going to contend that under present prices 12-cent cotton is a living.

Mr. BLACK. If the Senator from Colorado will yield to me, I do not claim that 12-cent cotton under present prices places agriculture on a parity with industry; but I claim that agriculture is a lot further toward parity with industry on 12-cent cotton than it was on 5-cent cotton. I claim that agriculture is a lot further toward parity with industry on 75-cent corn and $1 corn than it was on 8- and 10-cent corn.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator mean that we shall have to take either Roosevelt or Hoover, and that we can not have anything better?

Mr. BLACK. I think we shall take Roosevelt again, and not take LONG, if that is what the Senator means. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. We shall see about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired on the amendment and on the bill.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment. On page 26, line 8, beginning with the words "No land", I move to strike out the remainder of the sentence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado offers an amendment to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 8, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out the following words:

No land purchased from the Corporation herein created, up to the value of $2,500, shall ever be encumbered with any lien or obligation, either statutory or contractual.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in reference to this particular amendment, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

We are endeavoring to set up a tenant under a purchase from the Government by which he will owe the entire purchase price of his farm and its equipment. The tenant who becomes a landowner, in order that he may operate the farm, will in many instances be compelled to provide capital for feed and for various purposes. We are putting into the bill, however, a provision which will destroy any possibility of the former tenant securing any credit. We are providing that he may never voluntarily encumber the property he purchases, even after he has completed his payments. It is one thing to protect him against involuntary obligations, against his debts, against judgments, and executions; but we are here forbidding the former tenant who becomes the owner from securing credit based upon his ownership of the land, and we make this a permanent disability. It seems to me that limitation should go out, especially when we follow that provision in the bill with a provision that—

> Such land shall not be subject to any debt, or debts, or obligations of any kind of the owner, except taxes—

and then go on to make that obligation run with the land.

I shall be glad now to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, if he so desires.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that I do not desire the issue between the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] and myself to be misunderstood. I am concerned about the tenant farmer who has been obliged to leave the farm, who has no farm products of any sort to sell—no cotton to sell either at 5 cents or at 10 cents; no corn to sell either at 8 cents or at 80 cents; no wheat to sell either at 25 cents or at $1—the tenant farmer who is now on the relief roll.

I do not for one moment suggest that the rental payments and the benefit payments made to farmers in the South and other sections have not brought substantial benefits to them; that the increased prices have not been of substantial benefit to the farmers, particularly to the landlords, and in some instances to the tenants themselves. There are two kinds of payments, rental payments and benefit payments, one of which is shared with the tenants; but 300,000 tenant farmers in the South have recently left the farms, and in the United States as a whole I believe some 850,000 tenants have left the farms and gone elsewhere. Many of them have gone to the relief rolls. That is the point I was emphasizing.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, there is one group of persons who will secure great benefits in addition to the tenants if the bill shall pass and its provisions shall be carried through into an enlarged scale, and those will be the owners of land who have land to sell.

This measure might well be called a "landowners' bill." It is designed to enable the owner of undesirable farm land—that is, land that it is undesirable for him to own—to dispose of it to the Government, and then to enable the Government to dispose of it to the farm tenant under such conditions that the farm tenant, supplied with stock, equipment, machinery, and so forth, may live upon it without making any payments for 1, 2, or 3 years.

We are going to have good farmers and poor farmers. The better farmers today are the owners. The poorer farmers are among the tenant class. We propose to put the poor farmer on a good farm, under conditions where he will get the entire crop, as he will under this bill, and he will let his taxes go, let his payments go, and the Government will be a lenient landlord to him, and we shall have a condition which will be most deplorable financially to the Government.

So I think the bill is unsound in departing from sound governmental policies. I think it is unsound from the point of having the Government engage in activities which it is beyond the power of the United States, under the Constitution as it now stands, to engage in. I believe that the bill, limited to its present scope, is a bill which will mislead. It will cause the tenants of the country to think a bill has been passed which will enable them to get farms, when, as I say, only 10,000 farmers out of two and a half million will have farms made available to them; and the Lord be merciful to those who are responsible for this bill when they go home, if it shall be passed, and meet the 99¾ percent of the farmers who think they should be taken care of but who cannot be brought under the bill.

Furthermore, the immediate financing of the bill is taken out of relief funds, which will prevent the construction of projects which the people of the land desire. It seems to me the bill will impair the borrowing capacity of our country, and that in the future it may become somewhat difficult for us to make further loans. I really think this body, having already been rebuked upon several occasions by the Supreme Court, might be a little bit scrupulous in passing upon measures of at least doubtful constitutionality.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I happened to come into the Chamber while the Senators from Oklahoma and Alabama were engaged in a little controversy, and to get the backwash of the remarks of my friend from Alabama, my fellow southerner. I think we have both picked cotton a little and know something about it. I have hoed a little cotton—not any more than I had to hoe—and I never picked any more than I had to pick, when the purchasers were paying about 15 and 16 cents a pound for it. It is too hard work for me. Then we were allowed to pick and plant all the cotton we wanted to, and things cost much less than they do now when we had 15-cent cotton. I cannot, however, fail to supplement the remarks of my friend from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] with this additional statement, which we all know to be true:

I should like to know what is our policy. I should like to vote for any policy that is consistent. Is it the policy to restrict production or to encourage production? We have just gone out for another year and signed up everybody not to raise stuff to eat. We have just gone out and signed up the cotton farmers not to raise cotton to pick. In my old country in Louisiana, where the grass was higher than my head, they killed the cows on the ground that there was a drought, although the grass was so high that I could not get to my own place; they killed the cows and laid them out there because there was nothing for them to eat, no water to drink, or anything of the kind!

What I should like to find out occasionally is this: What is the policy? If we are going one way, we are likely to get somewhere. It may not be the best place in the world, but eventually, if we keep going in any one direction, with any one policy, we are likely to get to the end of the rainbow. But when we go out in the month of March and sign up a man not to plant any cotton, and to take his colored labor in the South off his own pay roll and put them on the relief roll—and that has been done; I can give the Senate all the names and dates it wishes to have me send to get to prove that that is true, and I do not understand that it is disputed—when we have restricted planting, and have restricted acreage, and have signed up farmers and paid them a bounty not to plant, and a bounty to plough under, and a bounty not to raise this and not to raise that, and now we propose to go back to the same man and lend him a wad of money to go into the farming business, what is this thing we are doing? That is what I want to find out. What is it? I do not know. I realize that I have not the literacy that Senators are more or less supposed to have; but what is it we are doing? Are we going to sign up a farmer in 1935, this very year, not to plant cotton, and put him on the relief rolls, and then loan him money to go back and plant cotton after we have moved him off his farm, and go back next year and pay him again not to raise cotton?

Perhaps that is consistent. My friend from Alabama is a smart man. I do not disagree with him politically on many things. I think he thinks about as I do on most things. He does not vote as I think all the time, and I do not either. [Laughter.] I should like, however, to be able to tell these people, when I go back, "We are going to do this", or "we are going to do something else." I should like to vote for a consistent policy. If this is farm relief, all right; but now the Senator from Alabama brings up another point.

We have decided that the share-tenant business is bad; and so, of the 100 percent, we are going to provide for one-fourth of 1 percent and leave 99¾ percent without a dime. How is that going to look? I go out there and I get on the stump with those people and I am trying to get their votes—and, God knows, I need them—and I say to them, "See what I have done for you." I am good at that myself. I always try to let them know what I have done for them. I have done so little that I state it twice so that they will not forget it.

"See what I have done for you. I voted for a law that means that every living man here has a right to go and get a loan from the United States Government, if he owns a farm, giving a mortgage, and he can give the farm to the Government the next year."

I would never go and tell a farmer that I fixed it for him to go in debt on his farm unless I had it explained to him that he could go off and let the Government take it the next year. So I would say, "I voted for a bill to give you money to own a farm one-fourth of 1 percent, and there are 99¾ percent out there who cannot get a copper cent."

Manifestly the only thing for me to do is to get out of the country; and I give my colleagues some good political advice. Do not ever put one of these Mother Hubbard things out that is going to accommodate just 1 percent. Unless it is a fine thing, we are making a proposal which, from the Government's standpoint, is disastrous.

I do not propose to vote for the pending bill. I would not think of voting for a thing like this. Do you think I would vote for a bill which would mean that I would go back and tell the people that the best they could hope for would be to have one-fourth of one man out of every hundred to get a loan, and that 99¾ of them would not get loans? Do you think I would do that? I have better sense than to do that. I had better sense than that before I ever went to school, and the Senate has better sense.

I will come back to another thing, repetition as it is. What is the policy? Is the policy not to plant and not to raise, or is it the policy to plant? We cannot go both ways at the same time. I want to say to my learned friends of the Committee on Agriculture that the time has come when they, with their good sound sense—and they have as good as anybody—are going to have to adopt a farm policy for the Senate, and not depend upon one bill coming from one source at one time and another bill coming from another source the next time, and perhaps another one coming from some Member of the Senate.

If we continue this policy for a few years more I hesitate to say where the agricultural condition will finally lead us. Some days ago I mentioned a town, and I will mention it again, the town of Arcadia, La., where they put the colored folks on the relief rolls because they cut the acreage down and they gave the poor colored man about $4 or $5 a week relief. In order that the white man there who has been working his colored labor will be able to make enough cotton to take care of himself and his family, and not to divide what is made off the land between himself and the colored people, they have taken the colored people and moved them into town, where they have no gardens, where they do not raise any turnips, they do not raise any radishes, they do not raise any snap beans, they do not raise a thousand other things they might cook and eat, but they put them in town a few miles off the farm and give them $4 or $5 worth of store-bought grub and sign up the foreman and the owner under some contract.

Now, we go back to the colored man—and that is the man who is generally the tenant—there are more colored people tenants than of any other class of people in my part of the country. There are plenty of white people who are tenants, but I am using the colored merely for the illustration. You go back to that man today and say, "We are going to lend you some money to put you back on relief."

"How much cotton can I raise?"

"If you raise any cotton, we will have to cut down the amount John Smith is allowed to raise, because we moved him away from Old Sparta last year so that the cotton that is to be raised in that country would not have to be divided between all of you."

So if you move the same man back down there and put him on the farm you must necessarily restrict the amount of cotton that the old man who had him hired there last year was raising, because why did you move him off last year if you were going to move him back there, unless you are going to abandon your cotton-restriction program?

There is another thing that statistics show. I do not believe in hiding these facts. I would vote for this bill if I thought it was anything right. I have a liberal record in the Congress. I have voted for every liberal measure that has been offered since I have been here that was sensible or half sensible, which I thought, according to my limited mentality, was sensible or half sensible. But I do not want to think of going back and telling these people that law after law, as to which I must admit some of doubtful constitutionality has been enacted, and that I have done nothing except to propound and to propose and to support this kind of legislation for the relief of agriculture or industry, or anything else.

What is the condition of these farmers today? I say to my friend from Alabama that a paper in New Orleans which is very much opposed to me, thank God, published an editorial as to our farm program a while back, and it showed that, taking the price of cotton as it existed under Hoover, and taking the price of cotton as it existed under Roosevelt, the farmer could buy less for a bale of cotton under Roosevelt than he could buy for a bale of cotton under Hoover.

I am no Hoover man. God help us if we get down to the point where we have to make a choice between what we have right now and what we had under Hoover. I would certainly go fishing on that day. [Laughter.]

I am not advocating any Hoover policy. I hope my friend from Alabama does not charge that to me. He makes the suggestion that he would take Roosevelt instead of LONG. Do not be too hasty about that, because I might have a good parade to offer before we get through. I never bar myself from anybody away in advance. I am always open to propositions as they occur in these changing cycles of time. So that I do not want a good politician like my friend from Alabama to make too many attempts to put me in or out of the picture.

If the figures to which I have referred are true and we can buy less of the necessities of life with a bale of cotton now than we did last year, or the year before, or the year before that, the point I am making is that, although you may put men on the relief and although you may be appropriating enough money out of the Federal Treasury to cover up that situation, nonetheless, in the essence of affairs, things are bound to be getting worse and worse as time goes on, and some day everybody is going to have to pay for it.

There have been benefits from this extra $10,000,000,000. I certainly would not be one of those who would say that if a billion dollars was put out among the people it would not buy something. I certainly would not deny that somebody ought to have gotten some good or that everybody ought to have gotten some good, having mortgaged themselves for ten or fifteen billion dollars, which they are going to have to pay some day. But I would like to see a policy for the farm people of this country that meant that more or less every man could farm who wanted to farm; that would mean that if the people desired to have the right to buy farms, they would not have to be one of the elect out of one-fourth of a hundred percent.

As was said here the other day by my friend the Senator from Nebraska, when we were debating another bill——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana on the amendment has expired.

Mr. LONG. I should like to speak on the bill. Have I 10 minutes on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes on the bill if he desires to use it.

Mr. LONG. I hope I will not use it all. The Chair, by his expression, seems to agree with that statement. [Laughter.]

My friend the Senator from Nebraska said, when we had another bill before us the other day—I have forgotten what bill it was—

There is that much good in the bill.

That is true. There may be some little good in the bill, but there is also harm in the bill when we go to the people who have been suffering 4 or 5 years and undertake to tell them that we are going to give them some relief. When we tell them that we are going to pick 1 out of 400 and give him something, and turn 399 down, which we have to do, as I understand the figures given here by the Senator from Colorado, we do not do them good. We do them absolute harm, because they have to enter into some kind of a political jigger as to which one of the 400 is going to get the particular money that is spent.

I do not care how you write this thing; you can put all the civil-service protection around it you want to, it is going to be politically administered. Such a law always will be. You cannot have a thing administered by public officials that is not politically administered. But if you provide for everybody evenly, then politics cannot get into it. When you provide for 1 out of 400, politics becomes disastrous in the administration of the Government's relief program.

I should like to have an answer to the question I again propound. What is the policy we are following? Do we propose to continually restrict production? If so, let us do it. Do we propose to give the farmers the right to raise not more than eight or nine bales of cotton, where the very people on the cotton farms have not clothing enough on their backs today to cover them? Are we to put them back under a restriction proposition, or are we going to adopt some kind of a reasonable farm program?

There has been entirely too much bitterness in the Senate if anybody proposes anything different from what comes from the Government departments. It is almost a crime; it is looked upon as almost a reprehensible thing in itself, when one of the "brain trusters" walks onto the floor of the Senate and shakes his head to an amendment, for a Senator to persist. I have seen them run right down the aisle by me and shake their heads, and thereupon give advice and admonition either to the Senator in charge of the bill, or to some other Senator, that it would be against the policy of the department to have this or to have that amendment.

I know that when one of these bills comes in any amendments are looked upon with a ferocious belligerency which almost spoils the friendly contact and almost destroys the right to give one another advice and suggestion here in undertaking to pass legislation.

I would rather say to my friend from Alabama, or to my friend from Colorado, or my colleague from Louisiana, "Let us take your parish"—we call them parishes in Louisiana—"or take your county", as they call them in the other 47 States, "or let us take my parish." We are allowed to raise so many bales of cotton in Wynn Parish, my home parish. So many people have been compelled to leave the farms. We are going to be allowed to raise only so many thousand bales of cotton.

Whether the number be 100, 200, 300, or 1,000 farmers, they have left the farms because the limit of cotton we are allowed to raise here is so much, and there is no work there for those hands; and so we had to put them on the relief rolls, and locate them in town. And now we are going to say to those people, "We are getting you money from the Government. For what? To move you back out onto the farm. For what? To raise more stuff in this parish? No, not to raise any more stuff, because we have limits there which the parishes have got to respect, otherwise it will conflict with the program of limiting what is to be produced." It all runs into an impossible situation under the restrictions which have been imposed; so that even in the cotton fields the cotton pickers have not enough clothes to clothe them even in the summertime, let alone in the wintertime.

I am not going to vote for any more of this kind of legislation. I would not have voted for this bill the last time we had it before us. I am not afraid to vote against it, either—not a bit at all. I have too much sense to put my head in this kind of a halter. I would not think of supporting this kind of legislation and going back to my people in the State of Louisiana and telling them I voted for a share-tenant bill when I voted for a thing like this.

Let me say that. It is bad enough to have had experience which was not pleasant. Experience is a dear teacher. There is an old saying that experience is a dear teacher, but it is a terrible thing when you have had to pay the cost of experience that it still does not teach you anything. We have been going at this thing for 3 years, gentlemen of the Senate. We did not start it under Mr. Roosevelt entirely. We started some of it under Mr. Hoover. Mr. Roosevelt did not start the relief roll. That was started under the R. F. C. under Mr. Hoover. He started the relief roll, and he started some of these farm programs, most of which we would not pass for him at the time. If experience is a dear teacher, how much worse is it if the experience which has been bought at such a terrible cost still does not teach us a thing upon God's earth? I pause for a Senator on this floor to tell me how we are to make consistent two policies of this Congress, one of which is to limit the production and move people away from the farms, and the other of which is, with the limited production prevailing, to move the same people back on the farm again and tell them, "You are going to buy this place with Government money."

Mr. KING. And have to borrow the money.

Mr. LONG. He will not borrow the money. Here is what these people will do. I know them. I have been messed up with them. I remember when the Federal land bank started in Louisiana. I was appointed attorney in my territory for the Federal land bank. That was so much better than what we are now proposing that the two measures are not even close. In that case there was no limitation of production, there were no relief rolls, and all that sort of business. I saw that what those men were doing, in 9 cases out of 10, was picking up some little fellow not worth a 5-cent piece and have him buy a place that belonged to them, which they wanted to get rid of, and borrow all the money he could from the Federal land bank with which to buy the place. They would pay the man for buying the place, and then they would move him off of it.

The big landowner down there was doing another thing. He would pick up some colored man or some white man and say to him, "I do not want to sign that note, because I would be personally responsible for it, but you want to buy a place. Now, you just come here and make application to buy this place, and then move right off after you get the money that you are going to pay me, and that is the end of that."

They are going to sell the Government more land. The Government is already making them do it. This bill would compel them to commit a fraud, because we are only permitting them to raise a certain amount of produce in a community, and we are giving them more money with which to raise that limited amount.

Here is what they are going to do with this little old "pie dough" money. I know these "birds"; I know what they will do. They will call a little colored man down there who has been removed from the farm and placed on the relief roll, and they will say to him, "Come here, Mose; sign your name." [Laughter.] "They are going to move you on this ground. Sign your name." And he signs his name, and that is all the colored man is going to get out of it, and they are going to sell about 30 acres of land down there which otherwise they could not sell, and which has already probably been mortgaged for double what they could get for it under the hammer, and the United States will be filched, conservatively speaking, to the extent of from 50 percent to 75 percent more money than it should take to buy land they are going to pretend to sell to the little colored man. If

land is going to be sold to one, let us sell it to all. Let us permit them all to have a farm. Do not let us go down there and give 1 man out of 400 a farm. Let them all have one. If we permit all to have farms, then let us make one further provision; let us not limit the production and say "We have too much produce", and make contracts to limit the amount which is going to be raised on those places, and then still try to put people back on the farms, when those who are there now are not allowed to raise enough to support themselves in anything like respectable poverty.

I do not care whether we pass the bill or not. It will not be much worse than we are doing in some other respects. I am not going to vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOORE in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may we have the amendment of the Senator from Colorado again stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 8, after the word "payable", it is proposed to strike out the following words:

No land purchased from the Corporation herein created up to the value of $2,500 shall ever be encumbered with any lien or obligation, either statutory or contractual.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment, though I have no doubt it will receive the earnest support of the Senator from Alabama. Those of us in the West have had some experience with reclamation and irrigation projects. Men have come from the East and from other sections, and entered upon lands which were to be cultivated under the reclamation projects. As stated by the Senator from Colorado it is necessary that they obtain capital in order to maintain their families and establish homes. I have seen many persons who have gone upon the arid lands for the purpose of developing them, and establishing homes. After they had exhausted their small capital, perhaps $1,000 to $2,000 or $3,000, they have had nothing left other than the land itself.

In many cases before title was obtained from the Government, the settlers could not obtain credit, and were compelled to abandon the land and sustain the losses to which they had been subjected. When they obtained title they were then permitted to mortgage the land and obtain credit with which to continue their operations. I concede that some persons who may take advantage of this bill, if they were permitted to incumber the same, might act improvidently and execute mortgages for the purpose of obtaining credit when possibly they might have "pulled through", to use the language of the street, without mortgaging and possibly losing their homes.

However, generally speaking, if those who acquire farms and are industrious and frugal will not mortgage their farms unless under such circumstances as will enable them to foresee emancipation from their obligations and to make reasonably sure that they are going to make a success of the venture.

So, notwithstanding there will be some evils resulting and some loss of property from debts improvidently incurred, I think the advantages which will result from permitting them to obtain credit, as indicated by the Senator from Colorado, outweigh the disadvantages and dangers which may result.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has presented some facts which I think are worthy of consideration. In my opinion, if this bill becomes law, efforts will be made by landowners to dispose of some of their holdings to the Government—holdings which have not been profitable to the owners. I think there is ample evidence to sustain the proposition that the policy of the Government, in restricting the production of cotton and some other agricultural commodities, has resulted in increasing the number of tenant farmers, particularly in some of the cotton States. My recollection is that when the so-called "Bankhead cotton bill" was under consideration at the last session of Congress the statement was made that it would result in restricting production; that it would disastrously affect tenants and the so-called "small croppers." When the Department of Agriculture put into operation its policy of materially restricting the production of cotton, thousands of small farmers and tenants were the principal sufferers. The tenants were driven from the farms and many of them onto the relief rolls.

I have heard it stated by persons familiar with the facts that there are thousands of tenant farmers now on the relief rolls who had it not been for the unsound and unwise policy of the Government with respect to the limitation of the production of cotton would have been engaged in agricultural pursuits to their advantage as well as to the advantage of their landlords. The philosophy of the Department of Agriculture seems to have been that the creation of wealth is a mistake; that it is imperative that cattle and livestock be destroyed, and that the production of wheat and corn and cotton and other commodities be materially restricted.

It has been the accepted doctrine that wealth results from production; from the creative genius and thrift and the industry of the people; but our present philosophy seems to be that scarcity produces wealth. There are in the United States today millions of people who do not have a sufficient supply of food and clothing, and yet under the prevailing philosophy this policy of restriction is to be continued. Millions of acres of land have been withdrawn from production, and millions of dollars paid the owners by way of bounties and subsidies. The owners have been paid large sums not to farm their land. I have heard of many cases where landowners have received large payments from the Government for withholding land from cultivation though they did not intend to cultivate it. A friend of mine told me a few days ago that he had received five payments but had refused to cash the checks because the lands had not been cultivated and he did not intend to cultivate them.

I am told that hundreds of millions of dollars have been distributed by the Department of Agriculture to landowners in the execution of what I regard as an unsound and absurd plan, but we are to continue this policy, as I am advised, of paying the landowners enormous sums of money for not planting crops. Fields are to lie idle; productive lands are to remain fallow; weeds are to grow where crops should be produced; and paralleling this absurd policy is the plan embodied in this bill to purchase lands which perhaps have been productive and attempt to establish and place former tenant farmers upon the same in order that crops may be produced. On the one hand, the Government lavishly dispenses its bounties to landowners, subsidizing them for not producing crops, and at the same time purchases their lands, or other lands, some of which doubtless are fallow, and places persons upon the same in order to grow crops. There is no logic or consistency in the course which has been pursued; and this measure, in my opinion, is confirmative of the folly of the course which has been pursued by some of the executive agencies of the Government. Crops have been destroyed and pigs have been slaughtered.

Scarcity has been urged as a necessity and now to mitigate some of the evils resulting from this course, we are asked to authorize an appropriation of hundreds of millions of dollars and to provide for a bond issue of $1,000,000,000. Undoubtedly the Bankhead cotton bill is largely responsible for this unjustifiable experiment which, as I have stated, is doomed to failure. There have been too many doctrinaires, impracticable and theoretical persons engaged in formulating and executing some of the policies of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I condemn the doctrine that our country can become prosperous by destroying wealth.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot, of course, speak authoritatively about individual cases, but the Senator from Utah must realize that farmers are making very much more out of

their crops since this plan was evolved and put into effect than they previously made, and they are very greatly satisfied with it.

Mr. KING. I am not in agreement with the statement made by the Senator. Undoubtedly there are some persons who have been benefited by the course to which I have referred. But I respectfully insist that by and large the policy pursued has proven disadvantageous and has retarded recovery. The contention is made by some that we must establish parity between industry and agriculture, and the agricultural prices in 1926 are frequently referred to as the goal to be achieved. There is no doubt that a number of years ago the agricultural products of the United States exceeded in volume and in value those produced during the past 2 or 3 years.

Mr. President, cotton farmers of the United States, when they were producing from 15,000,000 to 18,000,000 bales per annum and shipping abroad 60 percent of their production, were far better off than they have been under the policies which have been enforced by the Agriculture Department during the past 2 years. Our total exports a few years ago reached the high level of $8,000,000,000, and our foreign trade amounted to as much as $13,000,000,000. With tariff restrictions and unwise and unsound domestic policies, our foreign trade has been reduced until during the past year it amounted to considerably less than $4,000,000,000.

What we need in the United States is greater production and greater consumption. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] referred to the fact that in the United States there were many persons who lacked sufficient cotton clothing, and, if I understood him correctly, he contended that there should be an increase in the production of cotton and of agricultural crops. It seems to me that all must accept the view that what is needed in the world today is increased production, which will be followed by increased consumption. It is true that by this policy of destroying cattle and other products there has been an increase in prices. Senators know that prices in a number of commodities, among them meat, have reached such levels as to restrict consumption. We read in the papers of buyers' strikes because of the alleged abnormally high prices of such commodities.

Mr. President, there are those who believe that by ignoring the economic laws and policies which have made our country great we can surmount all difficulties and reach the summits of prosperity, indeed, of affluence. Coupled with the philosophy of some of the doctrinaires who are in part responsible for some of our recent policies, there are those who are carrying on aggressive campaigns for the socialization of business and of industry. There are those who would destroy the foundations of our economic and political system and plunge our Government into the arms of a national capitalistic state or an enervating and destructive socialistic regime.

There are some in important places in the Government who are loudly clamoring for a modification of our Government; who are demanding that the power of the Federal Government should be greatly augmented; that the rights of the States should be reduced to a vanishing point and that individuals should be subjected to a regimentation destructive of initiative and of that proper individualism essential not only to individual, but to State and national growth and progress.

Mr. President, I believe in our form of government; that the fathers of this Republic were wiser than some of the doctrinaires and faddists who are trying to force their philosophy upon the American people. The philosophy of Jefferson and the principles of Washington and Lincoln have builded the greatest nation the world has ever seen. This Republic, if it follows the teachings of the fathers, and adheres to Democratic principles and Democratic ideals, will continue to lead the world and will be the standard-bearer of liberty and progress among all the nations.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, as I understand this bill, the corporation proposed to be created by it may loan a sufficient amount of money to pay the appraised value of the farms proposed therein to be purchased. Under the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], indebtedness also may be incurred and liens may be filed against the land so purchased in addition to the mortgage. There was one thing about this bill which I thought had merit, and that was that the land would be exempt from lien of any character except the mortgage held by the corporation.

Knowing a little something about farm conditions during the last 40 or 50 years, I cannot understand how any man can borrow money to the full appraised value of his farm, then borrow whatever more he can, and mortgage his farm even beyond its appraised value, carry the fixed charges, and make sufficient money to provide a decent living upon that farm. He will have a very hard time to do so if he is permitted to do no more than to borrow sufficient money to pay the full appraised value of the farm; but if we let him borrow any more we will load him down with fixed charges and overhead which, over a period of time, will tie him to the farm for the remainder of his life; he will not be able to get away if we permit him to incur such an amount of indebtedness. Far better than that would be the position of a renter. At least in my section of the country he would be far better off as a renter than to be saddled down with fixed charges that can be piled upon him by this increased indebtedness even beyond the full appraisal of the land. If I were a farmer, I should not for 5 minutes undertake to settle on a farm where I had to borrow the full value of the farm and then borrow sufficient with which to buy machinery, cattle, horses, and seed. The farmers had a hard time when they acquired their land free as homesteads, but they made a success; they had virgin soil; their local township, county, and State taxes were very low. Now they are very high. The farmer must not only pay the interest on this mortgage but he must pay the local, county, and State taxes. So, it seems to me the amendment of the Senator from Colorado will make it possible to saddle down the farmer even more than was ever contemplated by the bill or was contemplated by those who levy taxes upon farm lands.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was out of the Chamber when the Senator from Colorado offered his amendment, but, as I understand, the Senator seeks by his amendment to strike from the bill the following language:

> No land purchased from the Corporation herein created up to the value of $2,500 shall ever be encumbered with any lien or obligation, either statutory or contractual.

If I do not have the correct idea of the amendment, I should be glad to have the Chair inform me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, Mr. President, I want to speak on that amendment.

As I see it, if this amendment shall prevail it will be a blow against successful operation of the proposed law. The effect of the bill now is that these farms purchased by the corporation shall be exempt from levy by execution, by mortgage, or by any other means. Ordinarily, I presume, in every State in the Union there is provision for the exemption of the homestead from debts. This bill would extend that provision and make it impossible to mortgage the homestead. That is a provision which it seems to me is wise. A homestead never ought to be mortgaged or allowed to be mortgaged except, perhaps, for a part of the purchase of the land itself.

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

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. If the Senator will permit me just in a word to explain the purpose of the amendment, let me say that I was thinking in offering the amendment of the farmer who had bought from the Government his property and paid for it but struck a bad year or had a bad crop and needed to borrow money to replenish, for instance, his livestock or perhaps for living expenses. Under this bill he could have no credit, that is, so far as his land is concerned.

Mr. NORRIS. No; he could not.

Mr. ADAMS. The amendment was designed merely to permit him voluntarily to secure credit which he might desperately need.

Mr. NORRIS. I think I understand the Senator's motive. It is a perfectly honorable one, a perfectly worthy one, and, at first blush, it looks to be the right thing to do; but the homestead laws in nearly every State are to a great extent perverted and nullified by the fact that the owner of the homestead can give a mortgage and thus relieve himself from the protection which the homestead law is intended to supply. There would be instances, as the Senator from Colorado has said, where it would probably work to the owner's benefit if he had a right to mortgage his homestead, but ninety-nine times out of one hundred the homestead is lost, not in the payment of a judgment, but in the payment of a mortgage. The permission given by law to put a mortgage on a homestead has been the means, in practical effect, of taking away the benefits which otherwise would have accrued because of the exemption allowed for a homestead under the law.

In my judgment every man who has had any experience with litigation believes that an exemption law for the homestead is absolutely justifiable, although there might be cases where, in the event of a drought or crop failure, it would be of benefit to some particular homesteader if his homestead could be subject to mortgage. As a general rule, that principle does not apply, and that is the reason for all homesteads being allowed, by the laws of the various States, to be free from execution for any debt excepting a mortgage. This provision goes one step further.

I presume it has been the experience of other Senators, as it has been mine, to have seen title to land in whole counties or whole communities in a new country such as the West, where the land was being settled, changed completely through the foreclosure of mortgages on homesteads. The Federal law granting homes, under which most of the great West was settled, exempted such homesteads from execution for debt, but the first thing that happened, as a rule, when the farmer proved up his homestead, was that he placed a mortgage on it. Then when the mortgage came due, five-sixths of the time or nine-tenths of the time he lost his homestead by virtue of that mortgage.

Such an experience demonstrates conclusively to my mind that we ought to have some provision of this kind in the bill. I will admit, for argument's sake, that it does not make any difference whether one is in favor of the bill or not, even if he is opposed to it, it seems to me he ought to be opposed to the amendment. Even if a Senator is opposed to the bill he ought to be at least willing to go so far as to help make the bill as effective as possible if it should become the law.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON. What about discrimination? Here is one man living on a Government-purchased homestead on one side of the road. Across the road is another man living on a privately procured piece of land as to which he has only the exemption provided for in the State law. Would it not create a discrimination as between citizens of the same community?

Mr. NORRIS. It would give an advantage to the man who got his homestead through the operation of this bill. What the States ought to do, what I have believed in for years, is to make it impossible for a man to mortgage a homestead. Let a man have a homestead exempt from mortgaging, as we now make it exempt from execution for the payment of ordinary debts. Let it be also exempt from mortgaging, so that no matter what happens his home may be free, and he will have a foundation upon which to make a fresh start if any calamity should overtake him.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. DICKINSON. I have just received a letter from the Federal Housing Corporation. They are advertising to the public at large urging them to make applications to repair their homes. In red letters along the edge of the letter they list the various kinds of repairs which the Federal Housing Corporation will finance, such as new bedrooms, new tile, different types of floors, and various other kinds of repairs. That is an invitation by the Government to a person to mortgage his home to pay for the repairs on the installment plan.

Mr. NORRIS. That is much the same as mortgaging a homestead to buy it from the Government. I am not going to be led into a discussion of whether the procedure to which the Senator from Iowa calls attention is a good one or bad. Much can be said on either side. It is sufficient to say, as I see it, that it has nothing whatever to do with the question now pending to strike out the exemption feature.

I appeal to Senators, whether they believe in the bill or not—and I admit there are many appealing arguments against it—if we are going to pass the bill let us have one which will be a real homestead law, which will protect the homestead against execution for the payment of any debt. It is not a hardship upon the creditor. The man who lends money, the man who sells something on time to one of these homesteaders, knows in the beginning what the law is. He knows that the man has a homestead which is exempt from execution, and that it cannot be taken for the payment of debts; that he cannot get a mortgage on it.

Conceding that both parties are honest, if I were running a store and a man wanted to get credit from me for groceries or hardware, I would rather give credit to the man who could not mortgage his homestead than to give it to the man who could, because I would know that no matter what happened he would have a nest egg left, and something upon which he could base his hope for the payment of his debts. On the other hand, if he could mortgage his homestead he might, if he wanted to do so, defeat the payment of an ordinary debt for groceries or hardware. Assuming an honest homesteader, and most of them will be honest men who want to pay their debts, when a homesteader contracts for groceries or hardware he will be considered a better risk because he will be bound always to have something upon which he can make a start in case calamity overtakes him, and he will not be thrown out in the cold with his family. It will be known to the hardware dealer and the grocer that this man will have his farm left no matter what may happen. If he is honest he is going to pay, and he will have the ability to pay because he will have a farm upon which, under ordinary circumstances, he can make some money with which to pay his debts.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. DICKINSON. If a purchaser had liquidated his claim to the Government and had received title in fee from the Government, I wonder whether or not the Government could continue to impose a covenant running with the land that it should not be subject to mortgage?

Mr. NORRIS. It may be the Senator has raised a constitutional question. It would be queer indeed if we should enact a law wherein a constitutional question was not raised somewhere along the line. It may be that some court would hold it to be unconstitutional. I would be in favor of it just the same. I would give the court an opportunity to be right and to say that the provision was constitutional. I believe the court would so say. Of course, that is only my opinion. The opinion of the court might be different. A different opinion might be rendered if some other man were to pass upon the question. However, it is done with the best of motives, namely, to save men's homes. If the courts afterward say, "You tried to save the homes of these men, but you have not done it, and we shall not allow you to do it", at least the responsibility will have been taken off our shoulders.

I desire to say to the Senate that, in my judgment, if we pass this bill, we ought to leave this language in the bill. Much as I respect the judgment of the Senator from Colo-

rado [Mr. ADAMS], I think in this instance he is absolutely wrong.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am in sympathy with the thought which the Senator from Nebraska expresses. The question arises in my mind, however, as to the practical application of the language which the Senator from Nebraska is now discussing. I should like also the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The language is:

> No land purchased from the Corporation herein created up to the value of $2,500 shall ever be encumbered with any lien or obligation, either statutory or contractual.

The particular words to which I now refer are the words "up to the value of $2,500." How would that provision be worked out?

Let me use an illustration. Take the case of a home which has acquired a value of, say, $6,000. What would be the privilege of the home owner in that case? Could he execute a mortgage, and, if so, how would it be executed?

Mr. NORRIS. Possibly. I am acquainted with one State, and I think most States have similar provisions, where in their exemption laws they provide——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska on the amendment has expired.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not desire to speak on the bill while this amendment is pending, because I expect to use that time later.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will take the floor on the amendment for the purpose of enabling the Senator from Nebraska to give thought to that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is a practical question which I am asking, and I should like to know the views of the Senator from Alabama regarding it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the usual procedure, as indicated by the Senator from Nebraska, is that where a State law gives an exemption in value, as most of them do to a certain amount, and the value of the homestead exceeds that amount, the equity court, or whatever court has jurisdiction, works out the matter so that in the event of a sale of the home the amount of the exemption is preserved for the homesteader.

Mr. ROBINSON. Two thousand five hundred dollars of the proceeds would be preserved for the home owner?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; $2,500 of the proceeds would be preserved.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I did not quite hear the statement of the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I say, the usual system in the States is that a limitation both in area and particularly in value is established as a homestead exemption. Where the value of the homestead exceeds the exemption, the court, on a sale, carves out the amount of the exemption for the benefit of the homesteader to put into another home.

Mr. ROBINSON. The language, however, provides that no land purchased from the Corporation shall ever be encumbered with any lien or obligation, either statutory or contractual, up to the value of $2,500.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That protects the land up to that value from an incumbrance. It does not prevent an incumbrance, but up to that amount the land is not covered by the incumbrance, and the homesteader is protected in that amount.

Mr. ROBINSON. I know there are States where there is a value which is exempt to the home owner.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. It is necessary, I think, that a maximum amount be fixed; otherwise there might be an injustice. Various things might happen to make one of these homesteads worth $100,000, and it would be manifestly unfair to keep all that amount exempt; so I think there ought to be a limitation in the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. I agree to that; but it does not appear to me that I have made clear the thought I was trying to express.

There is a provision that the land shall not be encumbered "with any obligation or lien."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Up to $2,500.

Mr. ROBINSON. It comes back again to the question, "up to $2,500."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; and, in excess of that amount, it can be encumbered.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield with reference to this language?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. The language is not limited to the purchaser from the Government. It says:

> No land purchased from the Corporation * * * shall ever be encumbered.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is what I have been trying to say—that there is a prohibition against encumbering the land. No lien can be created up to the value of $2,500. It is a very difficult thing to express; but the point I am making is that the land cannot be mortgaged at all, under this language, so far as the value of $2,500 is concerned.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There cannot be a lien up to that amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] to the amendment of the committee.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Coolidge	Logan	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Costigan	Lonergan	Reynolds
Austin	Davis	Long	Robinson
Bachman	Dickinson	McAdoo	Russell
Bailey	Dieterich	McCarran	Schall
Bankhead	Donahey	McGill	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Fletcher	McKellar	Sheppard
Barkley	Frazier	McNary	Shipstead
Bilbo	George	Maloney	Smith
Black	Gerry	Metcalf	Steiwer
Bone	Glass	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Gore	Moore	Townsend
Brown	Guffey	Murphy	Trammell
Bulkley	Hale	Murray	Truman
Bulow	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Burke	Hatch	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hayden	Norris	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Holt	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Johnson	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Chavez	Keyes	Overton	Wheeler
Clark	King	Pittman	White
Connally	La Follette	Pope	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on page 23 of the committee amendment, line 2, following the word "loans", I move to strike out the words "or grants, or both."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico offers an amendment to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 2, after the word "loans", it is proposed to strike out the words "or grants, or both."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection to that amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer to the committee amendment the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 24, after the word "person", it is proposed to insert "outside the civil service law."

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To the committee amendment I offer another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$6,000."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask to have that amendment restated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 20, line 24, was adopted. The proviso as printed in the bill reads:

> That the appointment of any person receiving a salary of $4,000 or more per annum from the funds of the Corporation shall be subject to the confirmation of the Senate of the United States.

Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, any one in the civil service would not be subject to confirmation; and that would virtually nullify this provision, because these employees would be appointed only from those in the civil service. I hope that amendment will be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee moves to reconsider the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment. The amendment which it is proposed to reconsider will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 24, after the word "person", there have been inserted the words "outside the civil-service law."

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which that amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to may be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I raised no objection to the reconsideration of the vote, because I thought it was very advisable that there should be a statement in the RECORD of the purpose of the amendment, and of the effect of the bill as it now stands.

Earlier in the day we adopted an amendment, offered by the Senator from Minnesota, which provided that attorneys might be appointed without reference to the civil-service laws. Every other employee in the commission, under the terms of the bill as reported by the committee, and under the terms of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, must be appointed from the civil-service register. In other words, the civil-service law is made applicable to all appointments under the bill with the exception of attorneys.

The provision which the amendment which I have offered seeks to amend reads as follows:

> *Provided*, That the appointment of any person receiving a salary of $4,000 or more per annum from the funds of the corporation shall be subject to confirmation by the Senate.

I submit that that provision amounts to a change of the civil-service law, because it means that no person, whether he passes a civil-service examination or not, if he is appointed to a place carrying a salary of $4,000, may be appointed unless he is confirmed by the Senate.

It will wreck the entire civil-service system. As that operates now, in the scientific and professional branches of the service, for example, a man acquiring a civil-service status is appointed at $3,800 a year, let us say. He earns a promotion. His promotions may go up to about $4,400, under the Classification Act of 1923.

This amendment means that no civil-service employee could be promoted to a $4,000 position, or to any position carrying a salary above that, without obtaining confirmation by the Senate, and I do not believe it is the intention of the Senate to provide that the civil-service law should be wrecked in that manner.

I think there can be no objection at all to confirmation by the Senate of persons who are outside of the civil service, but when we undertake in this bill to provide that civil-service employees must obtain confirmation by the Senate, then we are undermining the entire civil-service system, and we might just as well understand it.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. KING. May I inquire how it would undermine the civil-service system? A man could retain his position in the civil service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The object of the civil-service law was to build up a personnel in which a man or a woman could be promoted from one place to another as the result of efficiency.

We all know, from our familiarity with the executive departments of the Government, that there are numerous employees, probably thousands, drawing salaries of $4,000 or more, who are occupying subordinate positions. They do not occupy key positions; they occupy subordinate positions. This provision would mean that those in charge of the Commission would be deprived of any reasonable authority to make promotions within the service.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KING. Suppose a person is on the civil-service register and has a position; and, because of his efficiency, those who have charge of the organization to be set up would like to have his services, they suggest his name; and it is sent to the Senate by the President of the United States. It would seem to me that the fact that he has a civil-service status would practically insure his prompt confirmation by the Senate, so that it would not be a disadvantage but rather an advantage to the man, and would probably insure his appointment and his promotion, perhaps, to a position better than that he was occupying.

ALASKAN COLONIZATION BY F. E. R. A.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to take advantage of the pending amendment to put into the RECORD some additional information regarding the Alaskan experiment, about which the Senate has requested a report from Director Hopkins. I had hoped that the report of Director Hopkins would be available today, because it has some bearing, as a matter of fact, upon the proposed legislation now pending before the Senate.

It has been stated that the pending bill is the first proposal that has ever been made for the Government to provide all the land and equipment for a farmer and all his working capital, the net result being, of course, that he will be 100 percent in debt and will lack anything upon which to build credit for subsequent operations which, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, is an utterly untenable and ridiculous proposition. In my humble judgment, nothing sillier has ever been proposed.

I was about to say that it is not the first time such a thing has been proposed, for that is the precise basis upon which this crazy Alaskan adventure has been undertaken.

Last Friday the Senate passed a resolution asking Mr. Hopkins for certain information. I do not complain that the information is not as yet forthcoming, because there has scarcely been time for an adequate inquiry to produce the information. But I desire to call attention to some of the supplemental information which is available as a result of more recent publications in the newspapers.

For example, I refer to the Associated Press report of this morning under a Seattle date line, from which I read the opening sentence:

> Alaska's Matanuska Valley was pictured as a "dusty, mosquito-infested country" instead of a promised land by 31 California transient workers after their return here from the Government's colonization project.

I drop down in the article to the following quotation:

> All but three of the returning transients had asked to leave the Matanuska, a spokesman said. He added 178 more of the 400 tem-

porary F. E. R. A. workers there had "begged to come back" but were told there was insufficient room on the homeward-bound ship.

"Three women colonists begged me to give them my identification tag", said William Peck, one of the returning men, "so that they could clip their hair, put on men's clothes, and get back to the States." They wanted to get back here and work to send their families enough money to break away, too.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire clipping may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my observations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

WORKERS CLAIM ALASKAN COLONY IS NO PARADISE—RETURNING TRANSIENTS HIT CONDITIONS AND CLIMATE

SEATTLE, June 23.—Alaska's Matanuska Valley was pictured today as a "dusty, mosquito-infested country" instead of a promised land by 31 California transient workers after their return here from the Government's colonization project.

Their chorus of dissatisfaction came on the heels of criticism from some 40 or 50 of the colonists themselves, whose charges of inefficiency were passed on to Washington and resulted in a Senate demand for a report on conditions.

Project Manager Don Irwin asserted that the disaffected colonists' charges were "greatly exaggerated."

Reports were circulated in Palmer, however, that Eugene Carr, a personal representative of Relief Administrator Harry L. Hopkins, had been appointed to "take charge" and was on his way there from Seattle.

It also was announced at Palmer that N. Lester Troast of the Indian Affairs Office, who had been assisting Irwin, had been recalled to Washington.

Work at the colony was at a Sabbath standstill today and the 1,000 colonists were saddened by the first death among their number, Donald Henry Koenen, 4, son of Henry Koenen, formerly of South Range, Wis., succumbed to measles and pneumonia and was buried yesterday.

All but three of the returning transients had asked to leave the Matanuska, a spokesman said. He added 178 more of the 400 temporary F. E. R. A. workers there had "begged to come back" but were told there was insufficient room on the homeward-bound ship.

"Three women colonists begged me to give them my identification tag", said William Peek, one of the returning men, "so that they could clip their hair, put on men's clothes, and get back to the States.

"They wanted to get back here and work to send their families enough money to break away, too."

Statements similar to the charges of the disaffected groups were made by several members of the returning contingent.

"They had carpenters helping in the kitchen, kitchen workers bossing logging gangs, and tractor men doing the carpenter work", said E. R. Skaggs, one of the 31.

"When we left", said Murl H. Montgomery, another returning transient, "there was only one cabin where they need 200. It's a crime for those families with tiny children to face the winter with prospects like that. I only wish I could testify before a Senate investigating committee."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I call attention to other newspaper information of the same character, indicating that if something is not done very promptly to restore these people to continental United States, or at least to civilization, there will be a major tragedy and a major calamity under the aegis of this amazing governmental experiment.

I have in my hand a copy, which I procured this morning, of the contract under which these unfortunate people have bound themselves in making this trip to the Alaskan experimental field, a field, by the way, which is many miles from a railroad, and to which no roads have been constructed.

Under the terms of this contract these poor people are provided with ample transportation facilities to reach Palmer, Alaska, but there is absolutely no way by which they can get back, and that of itself adds to the challenge of the moment, in view of the charge that this colony of 2,000 people is disease infested and contagion threatened.

I desire particularly to call attention, in passing, to two clauses of this contract under which these people have bound themselves to this Alaskan adventure. I read from the third paragraph in chapter 6 of the contract:

The colonist further agrees that he and the members of his family will abide by all Corporation administrative directions and supervision in connection with control of crop production, processing, marketing, distribution, crop rotation, soil management, sanitation, and other measures for the welfare of the community.

The other measures for the welfare of the community are defined in the first paragraph of this chapter, which I now quote:

The Corporation will build and equip such educational, cultural, recreational, health, work, and business centers in the community as the life of the community may require, and make the same available to the colonist and members of his family and other members of the community, and will furnish social and economic direction, supervisory and consultation services to the colonist, members of his family, and other members of the community on terms of mutual agreement and accord.

In other words, there is no one single element in the life and livelihood of the members of this community which is not contracted into the exclusive jurisdiction of the Corporation, namely, the Alaskan Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, which puts on this amazing experiment. So that we have in net essence a complete commune under the American flag at Palmer, Alaska. That is bad enough in its ethical contemplation; but when on top of that, in the face of a complete surrender of every possible individual function and every individual reliance, we find, as indicated in the special dispatch from Palmer, Alaska, to the Washington Star of June 20, 1935, that the responsible governmental Corporation has provided nothing in respect to the facilities which has been promised, and that these people are left stranded 5,000 miles from home in the face of threatening calamity, I submit that the information which the Senate has sought is not only highly important but it ought to be forthcoming with the least possible delay.

In connection with these observations I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the article from the Washington Star to which I have referred and a copy of the contract.

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

The matters referred to are as follows:

[From Washington Star of June 20, 1935]

DESERTION THREATENS AS WORK LAGS IN ALASKAN EXPERIMENT—TOOLS WHICH WERE TO HAVE BEEN READY FOR COLONISTS HAVE NOT ARRIVED, AND ONLY ONE HOUSE HAS BEEN STARTED

By Arville Schalefen

PALMER, ALASKA, June 20.—It is now confessed by officials that the magnitude of the task of settling 200 families in the Matanuska Valley was not realized when undertaken, and, recognizing the tremendous amount of work remaining to be done, authorities here are making desperate efforts to get more help.

Already the administrative personnel of the colonization division—as differentiated from the construction division, manned mainly by California transients—has been bolstered. Howard Lyng, of Nome, has been added as assistant to General Manager Don Irwin, and Ed Croning, of Anchorage, as purchasing and disbursing agent.

To date the transient laborers and some of the colonists have been in the valley more than a month and have not made a dent in work promised the settlers.

MUCH WORK TO BE DONE

Trouble ahead is revealed by a brief summary of the work to be done. The colony must:

Construct a community center, a monumental task in itself, considering available facilities.

Erect homes for all colonists (except for a few who happened to draw tracts with houses on them). Just one cottage is now started.

Erect shelters for livestock.

Provide a water supply for settlers' homes and livestock.

Clear 12 acres of land for each colonist.

Build thirty-odd miles of new roads in the valley, plus 12 miles connecting Palmer with the Anchorage road, now ending at Eklutna; and this includes a $150,000 bridge.

Prepare and harvest community garden and field crops for settlers and livestock during the winter.

Most of these tasks have not even been started and others just barely touched. For instance, the road program, under the Alaskan Highway Commission, is about a month behind. Director Irwin concedes that conditions are serious and other officials privately admit the situation is most alarming.

The colonists themselves the becoming apprehensive. Some of them talk about cutting loose and going into the woods and building their own shelters, even if they must give up their colony tracts to do it.

Others of the new settlers are sick and tired of delays, bickering, and mismanagement. Irwin says that four families have asked to be sent home, but rumors around the camps are that more than 30 are ready to quit. Those with serious complaints are asked to sign affidavits that conditions were misrepresented to them by case workers back home. Then the Alaska Rural Rehabilitation Cor-

poration will investigate the charges and may provide transportation, according to Irwin. Nothing is definitely promised, however.

Transportation, more than any other colonization problem, was overlooked. In the first place, just two bands of steel, representing the Alaska Railroad, connect this wilderness with the rest of Alaska, there being no highway. It is a small system whose trains chase themselves around innumerable curves. The entire railroad has only some 70 cars and there are some 12,000 and more tons of freight coming into the colony.

RAILROAD SWAMPED

Approximately 4,000 tons have come into Palmer to date and it has kept the railroad practically swamped. Costly freight that never should be left uncovered has had to be dumped off and piled around Palmer to make cars available for more shipment. Bad weather could ruin thousands of dollars' worth of equipment.

Complicating the problem, materials have been shipped out of the United States that will not be needed for months.

"I've wired the shipping agent at Seattle time after time what we needed and had to have", Director Irwin declares. "I've told him ahead of time, so we'd have things here when needed."

What has happened? Two hundred kits of tools, such as hammers, axes, saws, levels, and planes for cutting house timber and erecting cottages should have been here when the colonists arrived. They are still missing. Authorities here bought up all available tools at Anchorage and Seward, and these, with what the colonists brought along, are all that there has been to work with. Sixty-nine horses arrived a month ago. They were to be hooked to wagons to haul timber out of the woods and supplement the overtaxed trucks on other haulage, but no wagons have come. The colonists finally borrowed six in the valley and that is all they could get.

But among the things which have arrived are eight carloads of cement which won't be used for months, retorts for a cannery whose site is not even staked out, radiators for a school house which still is just a blueprint, and onion graders for a prospective marketing cooperative, although onions are just beginning to shoot sprouts through the fertile soil.

Speaking of soil, it was most disheartening last week for 11 colonists to discover that, through error by surveyors, they had been allotted tracts which were mostly gravel covered only by moss, instead of the rich earth they so loudly lauded when they looked at it around Palmer. Irwin, who has stuck with the colonists through many annoying and unanticipated problems, immediately ordered new tracts for the unfortunate "gravel-pit owners", as they designated themselves.

Once again fisticuffs have been resorted to in the new colony, and this time the results were serious.

The latest difficulties involving personalities occurred in camp 6, one of eight temporary home camps scattered throughout the valley. The camp is split wide into two factions, so bitter toward each other that their members refuse to work with opposing members.

COLONISTS SETTLE DIFFERENCES

What to do about sawing logs caused the trouble. A group headed by Camp Councilman George Conners from Douglas County, Wis., wanted to go into the woods and cut down logs for their own houses and later get a sawmill. Other groups wanted to join camp 5 in operating a sawmill now there.

Conners was voted out as councilman because of his views and replaced by Ernest Porterfield, of Michigan. After the meeting the men stood around arguing until John Bradley, of Douglas County, told Al Covert, of Michigan, to "keep your mouth shut, so Conners can talk."

"You keep your mouth shut," Covert answered, "or I'll shut it for you!"

It happens that Covert and Bradley hold adjoining tracts, and Bradley said: "If we're going to have an argument, let's settle it now."

They grappled and fell (with Bradley on top). The Bradley faction stood at one side, yelling, "Let him have it, John! Let him have it!"

And someone on the other side answered, "Yeah, they're both 21; let them go."

WIFE GOES TO RESCUE

Mrs. Covert, in tears, jumped on Bradley as he held her husband down, but men in the crowd pulled her away. Bradley said he wouldn't hit a man while he was down, but he kept Covert pinned down so long that the Michigan man finally suggested, "Why don't someone serve cake and coffee?" And in a few minutes the two agreed to shake hands.

Since then, however, the Conners faction, badly outnumbered by the Porterfield faction, has refused to join in general colony sawmill operations, in which all men colonists are divided into work crews according to whatever they're fitted for, and declare they will build their own houses. They have asked for a team and wagon with which to get out logs.

"I don't care if we get only a shack," Bradley said. "I don't need a mansion this year, anyway. The only thing is that people back home think we are working in harmony, and I wish we could."

AROUSES LITTLE SYMPATHY

LANSING, MICH., June 20 (A. P.).—Complaints from Michigan farmers pioneering at Palmer, Alaska, aroused little sympathy at emergency welfare headquarters today.

Roswell G. Carr, director of rural rehabilitation, who directed the enrollment and transfer of the Michigan contingent, said its members "went into it with their eyes open."

Carr said complaints were to be expected, as the pioneers were entering a new land and facing unavoidable hardships. Those who complain because they are not given their food and clothing, he explained, were told before they started that they would be expected to buy them with Government loans.

Complaints about food prices, he said, were understandable, since prices in Alaska are high and farmers were moved there to produce the food, of which there is a scarcity.

ALASKA RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATION—MATANUSKA VALLEY SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This agreement made this — day of ———, 1935, between the Alaska Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, whose principal office is at Juneau, Alaska, hereinafter known as the corporation, and ——— ——— of the county of ———, State of ———, whose post-office address is ———, hereinafter known as the colonist, in behalf of himself and family, consisting of the following members: ——— ———, witnesseth: That

Whereas the colonist and his family desire to settle on tillable land in the Matanuska Valley in the Territory of Alaska, in order to obtain subsistence and gainful employment from the soil and coordinated enterprises, establish a home, and enjoy the benefits of the rural community now being formed there; and

Whereas the corporation is a nonprofit corporation and has been organized and established to assist worthy and well-qualified individuals and families to accomplish the above-mentioned purposes and it desires to assist the colonist and the members of his family in doing so;

Therefore be it agreed, for and in consideration of the above premises and the mutual covenants herein contained, as follows:

1. TRANSPORTATION TO ALASKA

The corporation will assume the obligation to the transportation companies of the freight transportation of household and other effects up to 2,000 pounds of the colonist, and the above-mentioned members of his family from the point of departure to Palmer Station in the Matanuska Valley, and advance and pay for the purchase of, and include in said freight and its transportation, such needed household furniture, small tools, and home equipment as shall be agreed upon; same to be ultimately repaid by the colonist at the same low cost and special colonist rates as that charged the corporation. (The expense of travel of the colonist and the members of his family and the carriage of their baggage from the point of departure to destination in Alaska is to be attended to by the emergency relief administration of the home State at no cost to the colonist or members of his family and with no obligation of repayment.)

2. TEMPORARY CAMP

Upon arrival of the colonist and his family at Palmer Station the corporation will make available tents for their temporary shelter and habitation pending construction of their dwelling house and their moving on the land which they expect to make their permanent home.

3. LAND AND HOME IN THE RURAL COMMUNITY

The corporation will make available to the colonist for a farm and home for himself and his family not less than 40 acres of land on terms of payment running over a period of 30 years. (The corporation is in a position to make available to the colonists timbered land as low as $5 an acre and other land at prices in proportion thereto depending upon the location and the extent to which the land has been cleared.)

The Corporation will finance the colonist in building his dwelling house and other permanent improvements on the land. The colonist will repay for the same on an amortized plan over a period of 30 years.

4. FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT

The Corporation will furnish the colonist farm machinery, equipment, livestock, and other supplies and furnishings on such use-charge, lease, rental, or sale basis as may be agreed upon.

5. SUBSISTENCE

The Corporation will furnish subsistence to the colonist and the above members of his family at actual cost from their arrival at Palmer Station until such time as the products which the colonist and his family raise will enable him directly, or by exchange or sale, to furnish subsistence for himself and family.

6. COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

The Corporation will build and equip such educational, cultural, recreational, health, work, and business centers in the community as the life of the community shall require, and make the same available to the colonist and members of his family and other members of the community, and will furnish social and economic direction, supervisory and consultation services to the colonist, members of his family and other members of the community on terms of mutual agreement and accord.

FULFILLMENT OF THIS AGREEMENT

The colonist agrees that the relationship established by this contract between him and the Corporation is to assist him and the members of his family to become established in a new home on a self-sustaining and self-supporting basis, and that he will repay all loans made to him by the Corporation in connection with the provisions under the above-numbered headings of this

agreement or otherwise made to him by the Corporation, and pay for all material, supplies, equipment, furnishings, services, and personal, real, or mixed property referred to in the provisions under the above-numbered headings of this agreement or otherwise furnished him by the Corporation, which are rented, leased, or sold to him by or through the Corporation, upon such terms as are agreed upon, and will enter into and perform all obligations and contracts necessary in order to do so, it being understood that interest rates on all obligations shall not be greater than 3 percent per annum from the time they are incurred, and that payment of said interest shall not begin until the 1st day of September 1938, and that payment of installments of the principal on all said obligations shall not begin until the 1st day of September 1940, unless the colonist elects to make such payments at an earlier date.

The colonist further agrees that he and the members of his family will abide by all Corporation administrative directions and supervision in connection with control of crop production, processing, marketing, distribution, crop rotation, soil management, sanitation, and other measures for the welfare of the community, and to cooperate with the Corporation, its representatives, and with the other colonists in building up a successful rural community.

It is mutually agreed by the parties hereto that this agreement is subject to any Federal, State, or Territorial laws now existing or which may be hereafter enacted.

ALASKA RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATION,
By ——— ——— (name).
——— ——— (title).
——— ——— (the colonist).

Witnesses:
——— ———.
——— ———.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union.

PARTICIPATION OF UNITED STATES IN INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. PITTMAN) submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

KEY PITTMAN,
JOE T. ROBINSON,
WM. E. BORAH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
S. D. MCREYNOLDS,
SOL BLOOM,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

FARMERS' HOME CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2367) to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present forms of farm tenancy, to engage in rural rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the provision now contained in the bill, is that the appointment of any person receiving a salary of $4,000 or more from the funds of the corporation, shall be subject to confirmation by the United States Senate. I think that is a very wise provision. It applies to civil-service employees and it applies to all those who are not civil-service employees. If it should apply to anybody it should apply to all alike, otherwise we would have a top-heavy organization. Under the Classification Act those connected with the civil service can be paid salaries up to $9,500, if I remember the act correctly. So this organization could be filled with any civil-service employees that any department of the Government wanted to get rid of.

I think if we are going to make the provision apply to anyone we ought to make it apply to all alike. There is nothing sacred about the civil service. Those under the civil service may be better prepared, it is true, but, if so, it makes their appointment just that much more easily confirmed, and if the Senate confirmation is good for ordinary nominees why should it not also be good for those in the civil service? There is no reason why it should not be. If we do not apply it to all alike, mark my word we are going to have this particular agency filled up with employees getting more money than those who manage and control it.

The only salary of $10,000 provided in the bill is to be paid to the appointive members of the board. Of course the other employees will be graduated in pay according to their positions, and it is provided that they shall be graduated accordingly. However, if we allow civil-service employees to be placed in this agency we will have it absolutely filled up with civil-service employees from other departments that want to get rid of them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not intend to dispute the statements which the Senator is making. What I am calling attention to is that this provision in the bill amounts to an amendment of the present civil-service law.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That law can be amended. Strange as it may seem, Congress has the right to amend that law. We are amending a number of laws in passing this bill, and there is no reason why we cannot amend the civil-service law if we so desire.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly not; but I desired to call attention to the fact that such would be the effect of the provision as it now stands. I think it advisable that that statement should appear in the RECORD.

I may say to the Senator that there is a further consideration. The efficient management of any body, of any bureau, of any commission, or of any department demands that the persons in charge shall be in complete charge. However, under the system which is proposed here, the corporation to be created will be loaded up with Presidential appointees who will not be subject to the control of their superiors, and I submit that such a condition cannot serve the ends of efficiency and will break down the efficient administration of the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The President can appoint civil-service employees. There are no restrictions on the President. He has the right to send in the name of a civil-service employee for any place paying a salary of over $4,000.

I submit it would be unfair and unjust for this amendment to be adopted, and I hope it will not be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The noes appear to have it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 20, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the figures "$4,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figures "$6,000", so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That the appointment of any person receiving a salary of $6,000 or more per annum from the funds of the Corporation shall be subject to the confirmation of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say in this connection that the same statements I made in connection with the previous amendment apply with respect to this amendment. I wish particularly to call attention to the thought that the Senate should concern itself rather with the confirmation of persons nominated to hold key positions, and should not be concerned with the appointment of those who are to hold minor positions.

It is for that reason that I suggest changing the figure from $4,000 to $6,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. President, in my opinion, if we were engaged in the consideration of a bill to help an industrious and worthy man to acquire from 5 to 10 acres of land to assist him in the support of his family, we should have before us a proposal of merit. Last year 35,000,000 acres were withdrawn from productivity, for which the Federal Government paid the owners in excess of $400,000,000. The figures procured by me from the Agricultural Department last Saturday showed that the estimates of land withdrawals for this year are 30,000,000 acres, and, therefore, there will be paid five-sixths of the sum which was paid last year. Six hundred thousand farmers in the United States are in distress, and the Agricultural Department estimates that the number will be increased to 800,000 during the present summer.

In analyzing the pending bill, which provides for a capitalization of $50,000,000, which may be increased, and also for a bond issue of $1,000,000,000, it is easy to figure that all the applications may come from one State or from a portion of one State. There is no provision for equal distribution among the 48 States. There is no limitation as to the amount which may be advanced to the buyer of a farm. A farm in the great Northwest may cost $30,000, and a farm in New England may cost from $3,000 to $5,000. There are some inequalities in the bill.

Mr. President, the figures I procured at the Department of Agriculture on Saturday last amongst other things show that $2,609,881,538 represents the amount of mortgages under Federal farm mortgage loans outstanding on February 28, 1935.

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

Mr. LONERGAN. I yield.

Mr. KING. May I say that in the Judiciary Committee this morning statements were made that in some States farm mortgages were being foreclosed, so it is obvious that farmers will need hundreds of millions of dollars to meet their obligations and to save their farms from foreclosure. Would it not be better to try to protect the farmers who are trying to protect their homes and to raise sufficient food for the United States than to embark upon this unsound adventure, which, judging from all the facts available, is certain to end in disaster?

Mr. LONERGAN. It would, Mr. President, but what I do not understand is that the Federal Government paid $400,000,000 to induce farmers not to plant crops, and now we are setting up machinery with a capital of $50,000,000, which may be increased, and a bond issue of a billion dollars, for the purpose of enabling them to buy farms. On the one side, we tell them not to raise certain crops and pay them not to do it. On the other side, we are offering to aid people to buy farms. The bill contains inconsistencies; there is no demand for it and it should be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table headed "Appendix C—Rental and Benefit Payments Actually Disbursed", which appears on pages 350 and 351 of the publication Agricultural Adjustment in 1934, being a report of the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, February 15, 1934, to December 31, 1934, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The table referred to is as follows:

APPENDIX C—RENTAL AND BENEFIT PAYMENTS ACTUALLY DISBURSED

EXHIBIT 6

Summary statement of rental and benefit payments—all commodities through Dec. 31, 1934—analyzed by State and month

State	Total	July 1933	August 1933	September 1933	October 1933	November 1933	December 1933
Alabama	$18,305,690.64		$12,043.55	$4,113,873.87	$4,766,182.92	$492,097.68	$152,809.23
Arizona	987,399.41			66,397.00	153,277.96	32,461.00	16,058.20
Arkansas	20,281,307.23		105,655.04	3,699,078.13	5,271,162.39	1,129,909.64	461,793.62
California	3,537,661.44			12,001.00	125,463.67	19,287.00	86,601.80
Colorado	4,337,779.31						267,418.40
Connecticut	844,634.44				108,659.34	25,065.95	36,032.70
Delaware	173,983.76						66,431.40
Florida	878,977.86		9,936.00	155,572.00	114,810.20	9,003.09	33,834.85
Georgia	17,650,740.11		7,382.00	2,942,839.45	4,221,802.07	556,279.01	197,918.34
Idaho	5,544,153.19						12,380.80
Illinois	22,812,945.26				156.00	28,721.20	620,690.64
Indiana	16,799,710.26					323,806.06	632,927.16
Iowa	40,040,805.88					90,034.60	91,061.80
Kansas	45,380,040.52				2,475.00	804,876.60	6,632,759.41
Kentucky	5,213,926.68				33,375.00	11,935.40	108,115.40
Louisiana	10,116,560.87			1,831,342.97	2,672,551.00	368,616.61	97,332.33
Maine	2,006.00						
Maryland	1,567,166.69					233,315.90	265,409.40
Massachusetts	547,826.97				56,344.50	8,409.80	13,558.80
Michigan	2,729,252.10					23,225.00	342,525.80
Minnesota	13,099,480.93					54,766.60	474,915.71
Mississippi	19,769,666.47		7,092.66	2,505,451.17	5,726,543.79	1,116,853.64	568,893.31
Missouri	18,808,231.46		12,802.00	665,418.57	947,430.86	337,996.02	586,635.77
Montana	9,265,512.77						
Nebraska	24,509,066.25					102,427.44	909,489.73
Nevada	69,960.81						15,988.80
New Hampshire	25,377.50				906.50	246.80	600.90
New Jersey	182,543.69						6,147.60
New Mexico	1,828,026.01			99,149.00	217,986.50	33,042.40	177,554.44
New York	236,140.14					19,742.18	11,065.45
North Carolina	13,141,978.98		78,903.85	840,644.45	1,671,428.80	168,808.42	70,131.20
North Dakota	24,415,874.23						
Ohio	12,675,393.30				75,504.92	249,735.36	869,363.10
Oklahoma	31,300,311.05		4,414.20	6,129,734.25	4,442,796.13	804,771.49	1,363,805.20
Oregon	4,246,515.29						60,961.80
Pennsylvania	1,618,841.17				217,066.48	78,895.55	122,919.60
Puerto Rico	1,188,639.00						
Rhode Island	2,176.84						
South Carolina	12,432,993.10		123,507.50	1,818,136.37	2,422,830.74	253,444.95	67,010.63
South Dakota	14,997,981.97					24,772.60	674,953.00
Tennessee	8,639,072.29		96,350.57	1,084,908.01	1,720,486.80	283,964.66	171,737.55
Texas	80,341,652.08	$517.00	312,973.25	23,303,095.13	16,200,516.61	2,407,969.25	2,355,806.13
Utah	1,096,736.73						243,930.80
Vermont	40,966.80				1,382.00	35.35	967.10
Virginia	2,675,421.02			27,868.00	91,479.56	276,991.98	63,673.58
Washington	6,462,548.41						16,091.60
West Virginia	299,518.42					12,921.40	30,244.00
Wisconsin	5,052,513.95		924.60		119,663.70	128,387.95	110,797.19
Wyoming	826,086.64						4,025.60
Total	527,501,795.92	517.00	771,985.22	49,295,509.37	51,382,283.43	10,512,818.58	19,113,373.90

APPENDIX C—RENTAL AND BENEFIT PAYMENTS ACTUALLY DISBURSED

EXHIBIT 6

Summary statement of rental and benefit payments—all commodities through Dec. 31, 1934—analyzed by State and month—Continued

State	January 1934	February 1934	March 1934	April 1934	May 1934	June 1934
Alabama	$47,785.29	$15,709.01	$9,245.66	$2,498.76	$1,009,840.69	$2,073,259.83
Arizona	11,326.40	1,136.40	1,376.60	387.10	20.00	132,270.86
Arkansas	107,835.65	36,455.85	17,736.04	4,419.52	789,776.69	2,168,577.23
California	459,279.29	126,566.82	113,228.33	34,425.69	302,358.14	50,466.56
Colorado	873,218.28	180,039.44	111,827.38	39,559.56	21,344.75	21,704.41
Connecticut	18,339.60	8,348.50	2,173.15	199.70	17,726.34	10,898.43
Delaware	1,108.95	6,081.60	2,179.05	1,298.96		668.83
Florida	1,632.60	302.00	42.00	90,995.43	21,437.42	72,150.34
Georgia	41,772.25	21,619.57	15,274.18	778,134.01	2,123,381.68	1,305,873.95
Idaho	1,593,287.40	486,039.39	192,817.23	61,881.98	29,089.02	11,906.55
Illinois	862,423.59	82,171.30	99,061.47	39,388.21	19,223.25	15,787.48
Indiana	256,266.34	67,717.25	43,995.90	17,355.62	8,794.15	91,076.85
Iowa	79,736.43	23,059.90	10,321.87	45,456.36	1,944,461.48	3,013,276.33
Kansas	7,220,689.32	1,330,731.01	610,209.47	214,615.07	133,152.93	114,171.34
Kentucky	50,500.37	4,869.47	6,829.65	2,466.43	726,604.76	1,198,716.54
Louisiana	24,900.05	7,557.62	2,877.81	604.00	643,311.48	1,121,933.05
Maryland	28,711.35	20,784.13	7,275.73	3,045.14	25,982.49	14,078.01
Massachusetts	14,064.00	3,385.20	537.30	168.80	6,611.44	2,705.90
Michigan	155,465.20	40,215.71	15,312.73	10,862.13	5,146.80	2,056.61
Minnesota	537,251.94	146,561.93	69,091.58	29,078.37	61,942.29	953,043.09
Mississippi	134,494.69	22,248.01	15,024.75	2,248.00	480,118.72	2,810,566.18
Missouri	247,661.84	64,822.25	45,353.13	16,950.48	34,282.43	1,099,062.78
Montana	882,578.50	2,326,927.45	471,480.97	557,295.36	109,516.20	63,662.79
Nebraska	2,421,213.97	287,230.00	241,077.57	79,306.81	45,474.13	44,148.57
Nevada	593.10	4,019.00	81.40	156.00		14,932.30
New Hampshire	534.40				95.36	
New Jersey	1,234.34	226.40	412.07		68.40	170.30
New Mexico	157,659.92	12,311.76	7,827.14	3,659.29	63,525.65	148,962.18
New York	18,163.50	3,691.02	1,664.60	1,478.88	1,187.97	289.20
North Carolina	18,639.53	11,578.20	1,802.90	1,544,114.56	2,613,809.33	1,829,098.19
North Dakota	959,374.97	5,416,834.38	2,916,565.01	519,355.93	197,332.57	151,209.04
Ohio	207,971.55	53,092.01	36,247.57	13,128.24	35,113.80	109,900.95
Oklahoma	2,055,268.50	1,296,666.16	245,972.42	75,848.58	26,631.66	513,664.99
Oregon	1,083,122.83	540,624.40	105,186.24	39,352.98	12,453.95	12,511.69
Pennsylvania	184,647.95	11,818.79	12,730.79	34,195.93	24,275.70	9,161.79
South Carolina	26,512.02	5,823.09	1,147.62	849,201.94	1,338,859.98	1,665,485.79
South Dakota	2,145,057.38	423,540.33	157,354.11	97,648.76	54,819.29	94,484.19
Tennessee	41,555.51	10,196.91	6,337.67	1,782.38	65,816.51	834,768.96
Texas	1,667,660.35	551,469.71	187,818.53	56,414.14	1,995,834.84	5,893,694.05
Utah	172,115.97	20,889.55	20,162.55	9,846.74	2,054.53	3,544.69
Vermont	219.60	120.90			108.38	
Virginia	36,598.55	10,803.60	6,815.92	317,279.69	165,090.07	126,137.86
Washington	2,791,792.06	808,600.67	300,436.91	62,866.66	23,814.51	96,756.13
West Virginia	3,144.20	3,921.82	1,654.40	857.60	30,291.20	10,425.57
Wisconsin	77,122.77	16,619.54	4,415.58	11,411.60	15,855.01	126,700.16
Wyoming	197,493.15	62,608.10	13,155.86	6,611.78	1,291.69	1,217.05
Total	27,918,025.45	14,576,036.15	6,132,138.84	5,677,823.17	15,227,887.68	28,025,277.62

State	July 1934	August 1934	September 1934	October 1934	November 1934	December 1934
Alabama	$398,042.44	$484,258.39	$96,420.07	$1,807,889.64	$1,597,247.20	$1,226,486.38
Arizona	44,034.81	112,326.26	14,573.89	64,703.30	298,894.13	38,195.50
Arkansas	521,965.55	702,692.85	351,712.83	1,625,341.88	1,937,549.60	1,349,644.72
California	95,558.16	767,169.67	211,553.60	234,023.28	566,436.34	333,242.09
Colorado	35,071.50	82,856.45	67,689.66	707,976.10	1,253,655.75	675,417.63
Connecticut	23,350.83	33,435.12	24,473.63	11,858.56	419,751.62	104,320.97
Delaware	147.40	848.55	12,969.65	16,388.41	56,151.57	9,739.39
Florida	12,833.90	103,255.75	52,513.31	89,779.01	69,707.48	41,172.48
Georgia	523,386.56	249,895.40	233,806.35	1,516,830.04	1,657,383.50	1,257,161.75
Idaho	16,366.41	27,194.64	42,229.77	616,700.32	1,585,739.72	868,519.96
Illinois	50,282.50	1,038,721.63	5,990,497.68	9,690,562.66	2,290,277.65	1,984,980.00
Indiana	672,404.66	4,212,788.36	4,058,085.35	2,422,009.49	955,502.96	3,036,980.11
Iowa	1,606,363.77	8,380,093.56	12,828,659.43	3,657,782.59	999,330.35	7,271,167.41
Kansas	419,710.99	3,464,196.73	3,876,684.77	14,604,667.55	3,497,288.72	2,953,811.61
Kentucky	277,718.26	367,427.70	206,745.57	1,564,114.08	326,066.93	328,441.12
Louisiana	257,238.64	174,164.27	113,602.87	907,333.82	1,088,589.11	804,605.21
Maine					2,096.00	
Maryland	7,396.52	52,270.43	217,224.47	531,183.66	75,128.11	85,361.35
Massachusetts	1,735.77	150,376.37	18,390.93	26,530.18	239,326.38	5,681.60
Michigan	2,181.23	45,975.88	462,163.47	1,008,671.75	370,732.01	244,717.78
Minnesota	1,427,231.99	1,362,966.82	3,749,247.32	1,663,821.34	957,563.74	1,611,998.21
Mississippi	672,678.69	459,212.81	223,954.69	465,973.70	3,396,306.14	1,162,002.52
Missouri	2,335,740.20	4,093,960.25	3,491,915.76	1,467,098.85	1,221,589.41	2,139,510.86
Montana	81,075.72	142,377.67	116,020.87	1,992,639.47	1,883,691.47	638,246.30
Nebraska	1,008,079.74	4,836,276.84	4,771,663.07	5,117,357.14	2,200,930.76	2,444,390.48
Nevada	3,138.90	7,391.75	2,009.65	10,331.64	489.87	10,828.40
New Hampshire		1,507.73	7,994.76	1,199.45	7,038.00	5,253.60
New Jersey	656.71		98.96	116,391.18	23,061.52	34,076.21
New Mexico	9,833.17	78,416.20	50,502.20	336,333.09	270,846.64	160,416.43
New York	475.81	6,376.12	22,209.02	76,549.33	55,618.80	17,627.26
North Carolina	1,199,876.31	288,203.07	269,685.30	626,786.48	1,291,230.92	617,237.47
North Dakota	132,224.17	197,036.91	468,579.42	5,055,993.70	6,531,187.06	1,870,081.07
Ohio	1,939,840.84	4,864,696.29	679,930.18	676,555.47	820,021.50	2,044,291.52
Oklahoma	1,008,731.03	1,235,666.52	1,356,341.04	5,958,536.36	2,925,209.20	1,856,253.33
Oregon	9,322.76	5,537.49	29,898.64	855,965.63	666,273.93	825,302.95
Pennsylvania	6,252.16	37,263.52	39,946.93	184,641.72	571,591.97	83,432.29
Puerto Rico		1,158,051.50				30,587.50
Rhode Island		36.84		2,140.00		
South Carolina	264,544.05	187,742.78	110,914.66	1,163,898.01	1,251,915.83	882,017.14
South Dakota	165,277.74	3,120,970.29	1,938,958.05	1,582,793.44	3,015,614.43	1,501,738.36
Tennessee	729,623.40	413,915.15	685,167.03	1,021,386.76	949,058.94	522,015.48
Texas	2,821,997.07	2,062,589.01	1,800,251.79	5,549,306.23	9,253,128.08	3,920,610.91
Utah	18,589.73	36,300.41	34,671.60	330,824.08	141,188.13	62,617.95
Vermont		1,600.00	2,236.28	20,661.75	12,247.65	1,387.79
Virginia	153,752.90	579,251.44	121,157.48	255,405.26	201,068.26	242,046.87
Washington	87,850.60	144,127.66	56,482.34	47,151.55	1,179,363.90	847,213.82
West Virginia	17,466.67	36,031.81	24,563.01	42,472.06	46,981.18	38,543.50
Wisconsin	399,144.47	906,586.78	1,801,642.83	168,113.67	320,487.58	854,640.52
Wyoming	968.59	1,686.72	47,878.30	209,229.12	164,365.97	115,554.71
Total	19,460,163.32	46,715,728.39	50,783,918.48	76,103,902.80	58,644,836.01	47,159,570.51

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

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I propose an amendment on page 20, line 11, after the word "Corporation", the last three syllables of the word being on line 11, to insert:

Nor compensation in excess of that received by employees of the Government in like or similar services.

May I say, Mr. President, that to my knowledge a similar amendment has been offered in a number of bills. It merely provides that employees in this organization shall not receive greater compensation than that which is paid in like employment in various activities and establishments of the Government.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, when this bill was previously before the Senate I made some observations with reference thereto, and I do not now see that the bill has been improved in any way by the substitution of the committee amendment. I call attention to the fact that on page 16, paragraph 3, there is found the following provision:

(c) The Corporation shall have capital stock in the amount of $50,000,000, and the board, with the approval of the President, is authorized to increase such capital stock from time to time in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Corporation.

I do not believe that Congress ought ever to permit a delegation of power to the President which involves the right of the President to increase the capital stock of a corporation in any amount he may see fit in order to carry out the policies of the corporation. It seems to me that, and that alone, ought to be enough to defeat the bill.

Second, on page 17, line 22, I find the following language:

Such bonds shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof, and such bonds shall be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States of any officer or officers thereof.

In other words, there is a direct guaranty on the part of every taxpayer in this country to put Uncle Sam into the real-estate promotion business in whatever section of the country the corporation to be created may see fit to invest in land, and to guarantee, if you please, the entire expenditure as to both interest and principal. I do not believe that there is any authority in the Constitution for Uncle Sam to go into the real-estate promotion business. I do not think such authority may be found under any section of the Constitution. On the other hand, it is my belief that this is just another case where we are trying to read into the Constitution something that is not there. In other words, the result will be the same as in the "chicken" case, and the Supreme Court of the United States will finally determine that such a law is not authorized under the Constitution and may not be enacted.

Reference has already been made to the exemption carried in the bill, and it has been admitted on the floor that if the exemption be granted which is authorized under the bill on page 26, section 5, there will not only be the homestead exemption, which is now permissible in every State in the Union, but there will also be another exemption which will be for the amount of the $2,500 as specified in the bill. Therefore, there may be two men, one living on one side of the road on a farm purchased from the Federal Government and another man living on the other side of the road on a piece of land privately purchased with his own money, one of whom will have a special exemption from debt and, therefore, he may go into debt in excess and say to his creditors, after they have given him credit on the theory that he was the owner of land, "You just cannot do anything about it, because my land is exempt under the law passed by Congress." That would be a discrimination in favor of one citizen as against another citizen.

Mr. AUSTIN. And in favor of the one who would not deserve it.

Mr. DICKINSON. It would be a discrimination in favor of one who would not really deserve a favor.

Secondly, I want to say that socialization programs of this kind never have worked. I think we have had some experience in reclamation which has shown us that the Government is not always able, through its type of leadership, to determine what is or is not cultivable land; to determine when land may be properly irrigated in order to produce crops.

We also find that practically every socialization program of this kind which has ever been attempted has proven to be a failure.

When this bill was previously before the Senate I read, to some extent, from the final report filed June 30, 1931, by the division of land settlement, department of agriculture, State of California. Two projects had been set up, one known as the "Durham land settlement" and the other known as the "Delhi land settlement." I find that these settlements were not a success; they never were a success; and on page 20 of the report, to which I have heretofore referred, I find this is the conclusion of the State of California:

It cannot be gainsaid that there was a serious land colonization problem facing the State at the time the State land settlements were started, and that there is still a definite service to be performed by the State government along colonization lines, but that service apparently can best be carried out through rigid State regulation of those private agencies seeking to colonize the lands of the State for profit, as the demand for settlement develops and conditions affecting agricultural activity warrant.

In other words, there is a direct finding on the part of the State commission that a land settlement of that kind could not be made a success under State supervision. I also find in a final report, reading from the last paragraph, the following:

As to the deeds of trust which have been extinguished at both settlements where the amount was $152,862.98, we have received the sum of $101,063.69, which represents a loss of $51,799.29, or a loss of 33.89 percent.

Respectfully submitted.

ARLIN E. STOCKBURGER,
Director of Finance.

JANUARY 26, 1935.

In order to understand just what is proposed in this bill I think it is well to read the statements of some of those who would naturally be interested in this type of program. I find that M. L. C. Gray, Chief of the Division of Land Economics in the Department of Agriculture, made this statement:

It is proposed that the credit facilities of the Government be made available to farm owners for adjusting the size of farm tracts in certain areas and for promotion of farm ownership in areas where tenancy is prevalent. One proposal is that the Government acquire the present extensive areas of farm lands held by banks and insurance companies and by other classes of landowners who are not interested directly in operating their land and extend long-term credit to tenant operators for the buying of farms of profitable size.

No one objects to that. But, on the other hand, let me suggest that the trouble with most of the tenants in the United States and most of the men who have found themselves in distress on account of land ownership and debts against their land has been due to the fact that they were able to borrow too much money against their land and not too little. It was not the question of being able to secure finances; it was a question of getting so much credit that the borrowers were not able to pay the interest and taxes on their investment. Therefore when economic conditions changed and the depression began and prices declined, when the revenues from a farm decreased from 50 to 60 percent, as they did in many other lines of endeavor, we found that farmers were not able to carry through.

Commenting on this, Harvey Ingham, in the Des Moines Register of Saturday morning, June 22, 1935, states:

One thing is plain to those who have known the farm situation from the early days, and that is that the Government must stabilize the values of lands and keep them stabilized if a lot of landowners

of one year are not to become the tenants the next. The shift in the Middle West in this last period of deflation has been terrific, and not at all at the instance of the banks, insurance companies, and private citizens who have been forced to take over the lands. So long as land is like other property open to purchase and sale for a profit there will be a steady shifting of ownership. It is this, unquestionably, that explains the demand for Government regimentation.

In other words, so long as there is a shifting in values anywhere along the line, it is going to affect land just as it affects every other investment. We have seen stocks go up and down; we know that they do go up and down according to the demand for the commodity manufactured by the particular concern whose stock is affected. So we find in this respect that stocks are just like land. The farmer in the Middle West now is not suffering from lack of credit; he is suffering from too much credit. I used to think a banker was a good friend of mine when he would lend me a little money. I found, after about 3 years of the depression, that he was the worst enemy I ever had. If he had not loaned me the money I would not have been in distress as a debtor, as I proved to be. That is the reason why we find a great many people talking about the present lack of credit.

A while ago I called attention to a Federal Housing Corporation letter. That agency is handing out invitations to the landowner, to the home owner, "Come in and borrow money; put a new bathroom in your house; reshingle it; put new linoleum in your kitchen; put in a new bedroom; add a new porch; put a mortgage on your home." Under the old philosophy we always found that a mortgage was the first step to dispossession of a man's home. Therefore, there should be no mortgage permissible on a home at the invitation and suggestion of the Government.

I think it was Mr. Rubin, after his return from Europe, in relation to the socialization of the affairs of the world, who made this statement:

I would rather live in a country where there is an unequal enjoyment of credit than in a country where there is an absolutely impartial distribution of money. One extreme always yields to the other.

Do Senators appreciate the philosophy?

I would rather live in a country where there is an unequal enjoyment of credit—

Suppose the other fellow does have a little more than you have. Perhaps it is a good thing that he has, but you ought not to be jealous because he may have a little more than you have. Therefore—

I would rather live in a country where there is an unequal enjoyment of credit than in a country where there is absolutely impartial distribution of money.

I think there is a great deal of philosophy in that statement.

Mr. President, in order to present the matter and show what I believe is the socialistic trend in a great deal of the legislation we are now proposing, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD a statement made by myself before the Amen Corner Club at Pittsburgh, Pa., with reference to socialistic trends.

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

Although the Democratic platform was accepted by the Presidential nominee in 1932 without equivocation or reserve, none of the fundamentals endorsed in that platform are being followed at this date.

That platform declared for a drastic reduction in Government expenditure; the abolishment of useless commissions and offices; the consolidation of departments and bureaus; and the elimination of extravagance. None of these promises have been fulfilled.

Let us go back several years and check the activities and proposals of those of the Socialist faith.

In 1921 the Socialist Party, as such, concluded that it might get further by joining a movement with other discordant groups, and adopted a resolution calling for a conference of all such groups to develop a plan of united political action. This conference, known as the "national conference for progressive political action", was held in Cleveland in December of 1922.

In 1924 the conference for progressive political action met in Cleveland and nominated Senator Robert M. La Follette as their candidate for President.

It is interesting to note that the keynote speech by the national chairman of the conference was headlined as: "New deal is text of keynote." In a congratulatory message to Senator La Follette after his nomination, signed by A. A. Berle, Jr., Frederic C. Howe, and others, there was this statement: "We believe that the time has come for a new deal * * *."

Some of the resolutions adopted by this convention of the conference for progressive political action were as follows:

"Public ownership of * * * water power and creation of a public superpower system."

"Strict public control and permanent conservation of all natural resources * * *."

"Promotion of public works in times of business depression."

"Reconstruction of the Federal Reserve and Federal Farm Loan Systems to provide for direct public control of the Nation's money and credit * * *."

"We favor submitting * * * a constitutional amendment providing that Congress may by enacting a statute make it effective over a judicial veto."

Who was the chairman of the resolutions committee that reported these resolutions to that Socialist meeting in 1924? It was none other than Mr. Donald R. Richberg, now "assistant President of the United States."

Other prominent members of the present new deal who played important parts in the program and campaign of the conference for progressive political action are: Mr. Basil Manly, now a member of the Federal Power Commission; Sidney Hillman, a member of the Consumers' Advisory Board in the N. R. A.; Frederic C. Howe, consumer's counsel of the A. A. A.; J. A. Franklin and Rose Schneiderman, both members of the Labor Advisory Board in the N. R. A.; A. A. Berle, Jr., one of the original members of the "brain trust", and Rexford G. Tugwell, now Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

These Democratic officeholders of today were actively engaged in defeating the Democratic Party in 1924, which was led by John W. Davis and C. W. Bryan.

The views of those connected with the Socialist faith have not changed since 1924. This is shown by the national platform of the Socialist Party in 1932. In reading that platform, I find the following:

"We favor an immediate appropriation of $5,000,000,000 for relief to supplement State and local expenditures and the appropriation of an equal amount for public works, including roads, reforestation, slum clearance, and housing."

I read further and find declarations for "the creation of national, regional, and State boards to determine the best utilization of rural land; Government ownership of the liquor business; abolition of the power of the Supreme Court to pass on the constitutionality of legislation enacted by Congress; complete acquisition of the Federal Reserve Banks by the Government; the operation of the power industry by administration board; the recognition of Soviet Russia."

In all candor, I ask you to compare the program of the present administration with the program above suggested.

Consistent Democrats should be willing to admit that outside influences have taken control of their party. By working from within, this former third party group now dominates the Democratic Party. The party platform of 1932 has been abandoned, although definitely accepted by Roosevelt as the Presidential nominee. The Socialist platform of 1924 has been substituted therefor.

The leadership of the Democratic Party, so far as policy is concerned, is now in the hands of those who were in key positions of the progressive, Socialist Party of 1924.

This is why many of our Democratic leaders are supporting the new deal with lip service only. This is why they give the administration program support with their tongue in their cheek.

This change of program has never been ratified by the sound-thinking Democrats of the South. State-rights Democrats have no place in the present-day program of centralized Federal control and bureaucratic domination.

The Democratic Party of Roosevelt and Farley is not the Democratic Party of Jefferson, or Cleveland, or Wilson, or Al Smith. Through the influence of the Socialist group now holding positions in the present administration, Roosevelt has directed the program of the Democratic Party towards socialistic reform.

Verily, Miss Democracy, through the direction of Roosevelt and under the management of Farley, is being taken for a ride.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON. Very well; I shall take my time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I find in the Annals of the American Academy for March 1935, a statement from Donald Richberg on Constitutional Aspects of the New Deal, from which I quote as follows:

This school of thought argues that the Government must organize and direct the essential industries of a nation for public service, and that for the incentive of private profit we must substitute the obligation of service to the general welfare.

Further quoting:

We could not establish a political determination of what goods shall be produced, what prices shall be charged, and what wages shall be paid, and at the same time maintain those individual rights of property and individual liberties of conduct which are

guaranteed in the Constitution. We could not administer the infinite details of regimenting the lives of millions of citizens and preserve a judicial review of the justice of each separate restraint upon the freedom of the individual. In a word, we could not achieve such a planned economy as is embodied in any program of State socialism without a political revolution and the definite abandonment of our constitutional safeguards of individual freedom.

I quote further:

In various activities of the Federal Government, particularly in the N. R. A. and the A. A. A., we have been seeking to carry forward our constitutional principles of self-government into a political-economic order which will serve the needs of the twentieth century and which can be established under our fundamental law and in harmony with the traditions and purposes of American life.

It has been found that the views expressed by Mr. Richberg are not at this time in accord with the rights under the Constitution and, therefore, I take it that as a prophet of planned economy to eliminate individual initiative Mr. Richberg is no longer going to consider himself an authority. In other words, his reputation seems to have passed with the decision of the Supreme Court in the "chicken" case that the N. R. A. was absolutely unconstitutional.

I also find further that most of these experiments have not resulted in a wholesome development in any line of endeavor. From Mr. David Lawrence's article of a few evenings ago I quote:

The latest of these is the passing of the dream of the "planned economy" experts on the subject of "rural resettlement" and "subsistence homesteads."

It will be recalled that populations were to be moved about, small communities were to be built, and, in short, America was to be remade by the new deal.

I take it many Members of the Senate have learned the truth about what is known as "Red House", a rural section nearby. In a picture in the February number of the Nation's Business we see a large number of houses being built in that locality. I understand that now practically none of those houses are occupied, that the loans cannot be paid, that the amount suggested to be paid is excessive, and the opportunities to make money in that locality do not permit men to carry the overhead expenses of either maintaining or owning a home of such magnitude in that vicinity. In other words, instead of thinking about how much money could be made in that locality, they went ahead and built a large number of houses, and then found there was no one to live in them and there was not enough money to be made in the vicinity to support any of the homes, or, at least, more than a very limited number of them.

I quote further from Mr. Lawrence:

But now, alas, the whole thing is being liquidated as impractical, or to put it more gracefully, the idea is being recast with plans much more modest.

In two years with $25,000,000 to spend only 33 projects were started, involving 1,065 houses either completed or under construction. At present only about 268 of these houses are occupied.

The troubles are manifold. In the first place, sticking a rural settlement in the middle of a vast area and trying to make a community where there is no employment for the inhabitants has been found to be an obstacle. Take Reedsville, W. Va., in which Mrs. Roosevelt had a special interest. Well, they are still trying to persuade a certain captain of industry to have his company put a factory or branch or something there so as to give the town a start.

But town building on the whole has proved a flop. The rumor is that even the left wing Dr. Tugwell does not like the sociological aspects of these communities. They turn into "company towns" if dominated by one industry or they become centers of intensive or excessive reform, with more conservation than work.

* * * * * * *

So the projects turned out to be interesting only to stranded miners or destitute farmers or run-down city persons who were willing to try anything once. Also, the record of repayment to the Government on the loans made for the subsistence homes has been poor, and other discouraging aspects have entered into the picture.

In other words, the people who could occupy those homes were not able to buy the homes, were not able to pay the overhead expenses of the homes, were not able to do the things required of them to be done in order to comply with the requirements of the Government. The only thing the Government could possibly have done was to permit them to occupy the homes without having to pay anything.

I quote further from David Lawrence:

The first news of what happened came officially with a brief bulletin posted on the Department of Agriculture's board recently stating that the Subsistence Homestead Division had to be liquidated this month. This was based, of course, on the expiration of the provisions of the old National Industrial Recovery Act. But then there was in the offing the $4,000,000,000 work-relief program. Dr. Tugwell had been made Rural Resettlement Administrator.

The President too bad earmarked $100,000,000 for the Resettlement Division. But the mathematical bugaboo which limited to only about $1,140 the amount to be spent on each man employed has put a damper on the whole resettlement plan. At a recent meeting of key executives in the administration, the President looked ruefully at Undersecretary Tugwell as he remarked that some of Rex's pet projects would have to go by the boards.

Dr. Tugwell is represented as believing that the best method would be to set up projects of suburban homes or what are called "satellite cities." These would be homes built on an acre of ground and sold to city workers on the edge of a town or city. Experience with this type of project at Houston, Tex., has convinced Dr. Tugwell that it would be useful.

That simply shows the impractical phase of many of the projects which are now being advocated.

It is my belief that there is a great deal of "boring from within." I have shown the socialistic trend of various types of legislation proposed here. The Government is being gradually woven into various socialistic schemes. Now, I am going to refer to one further thing, and that is the suggestion that a man in a position where he receives confidential information may be able to carry on without the Government knowing very much about what his motives are, and in that way he may secure information which will afterward permit him to further a plan of his own.

Only today, as I understand, the report of the Munitions Committee has been filed. It contains a great deal of testimony from Mr. H. S. Raushenbush. I find in an article by Mr. Raushenbush, which is printed in the Socialism of Our Times, such statements as that—

The students coming from the colleges today can do something more than be filled with wholesome and cleansing indignation. They can be of enormous use to the movement as Government officials, starting in small and definitely working on the reasonable hope that in the course of another 10 years we shall have Government control of a much more definite kind over our trusts, banks, and general industries—

And so forth. He also says that—

One good man, with his eyes, ears, and wits about him, inside the Department—whether it be the Interior, where the oil scandal started and the Boulder Dam bill received most active support, or the Treasury, where the taxation scandals breed and the Government tax policies originate—can do more to perfect the technique of control over industry than a hundred men outside.

Mr. President, I have every sympathy with the good work that the Munitions Committee has been doing, but in reading the report I believe we should have the background of this man. Therefore, I ask that this article of his be printed in RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SOME MEASURES IN TRANSITION

By H. S. Raushenbush

There is reason for optimism at present in considering the transitional state. We can see more clearly the function which liberals and socialists—both those who are essentially scholars and students and those who are politicians—can have in changing the social order.

The very subject "transitional state" implies that we have accepted the alternative of encroaching control in place of the dream of cataclysmic socialism which has engrossed people dissatisfied with the world for so many years. There is an acceptance here of our own realities. The drama of conflict—the last of the great St. Petersburgs of the world—does not represent the world we live in. It is not pleasant to give up that dream of a violent triumph. We are sensitive about it. We hear the charge of cowardliness, of the unheroic quality of compromise. Let us face that and have it done. It is a conflict and extends into all phases of life. In literature people who wish to escape from the world are romanticists. Those who have the same desire but more sense of truth and actuality becomes our realists, bitter that the world is so little like what they want it to be.

To refuse to face the fact that we live in a dynamic world rather than in the Hegelian world of Marx is cowardly. And if we are aware that there is no longer any prophetic destiny in Marx and still (for want of a better cause and because we like or are unable to detach ourselves from the dreams of our youth) preach revolu-

tion and get other men to spend their efforts toward the fulfillment of a prophecy that is not divinely inspired, that is a cowardly compromise. It is playing fast and loose with the rank and file who starve and strike upon the leaders' say-so. Every union compromises when it signs an agreement with the employer. And the Communist unions do it as much as the A. F. of L. unions. We live in a world that can be changed slowly, but it can be changed by people who are willing enough to identify themselves with the small common desires of the people of the country, who are willing to work in realistic ways toward power.

POWER VERSUS SPIRITUAL VALUES

Here I wish to note a dissension from Henri de Man. He claims that the real foe is the capitalist spirit, that the spirit of service and the pride in things well done would have to be substituted as leading motives of social activity for the desires for wealth and power—that freedom, self-determination, and dignity were to be the rallying cries. Here he goes mystic to some extent. These spiritual values move people somewhat. There will always be audiences who applaud appeals to the dignity of man, the pleasure of voting to determine one's lot. But men vote today mainly for their own economic interests and for some sense of power. The bandwagon has human springs. To throw over economic interest and power for more spiritual values seems a bad and forced second choice. According to Stolberg, Christ did exactly that. In the first stages He was a revolutionary patriot—wanted power. When He saw that He could not have that, He said, "Well, then, at least I will possess My own soul—blessed are the meek." He saw that power, such as all human, full-blooded people want, could not be had without compromise, except at one point—death. The revolutionists today are the true Christians. The rest of us are the people who stay alive. And the majority of the people in this country are going to stay alive and think in simple demands of "more" and "more."

To the very extent that we are liberals or Socialists, we have already differentiated ourselves from the mass of the workers and shopkeepers and academically trained people of today. They want such small favors as the political machines can give them—jobs, protection, financial help in time of stress. They are uninterested in schemes or theories of government. They have not the free space to think far ahead. They also have some terrible need to be thought well of by their neighbors, some fear of losing their jobs, that keeps them out of the radical camp. When we say, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free", we perform a remarkable act of faith in intellect. It is power that will make people free. We can be a hundred times right and be authors of brilliant books telling how rotten the world is, and have less influence during our whole lives on the welfare of the people of the country than a lieutenant in a Tammany precinct.

Some of us are introverted and turn away from the bustle of politics to our books and dialectic discussions with so much relief that our political efficacy will probably always be amateurish and slight. Others of us have the capacity to be politicians, and in them our hope for the speeding up of the transitional state rests now.

AMERICA PRAGMATIC

The carrying drive of any movement or organization in this country today is simply pragmatic. This side of revolution (Russia, Italy, Germany) we can only take what opportunities we can make ourselves or are suffered for illustrations in socialist practice, to convince both the workers and the middle class that we are right, that the abolition of the profit system is to their interest and will result in higher real wages, greater security, freedom from wars, and other forms of autocracy. Unless we can show workers results from day to day, they will turn to someone who can, or who can promise to. Meanwhile the local machines give them small favors and protection. The Socialist candidate for president gives them only the glory of shaking his hand. Marx has convinced his thousands, but the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission has convinced its hundreds of thousands. We need more leverage places like the latter. And there are parts of our political life today where we have such a wedge.

The students coming from the colleges today can do something more than be filled with wholesome and cleansing indignation. They can be of enormous use to the movement as Government officials, starting in small and definitely working on the reasonable hope that in the course of another 10 years we shall have Government control of a much more definite kind over our trusts, banks, and general industries; that there will be Government corporations operating and managing, not only the port of New York and Muscle Shoals, but many other developments. There is a chance here for young men, not only to keep the liberal groups informed about the dirty work going on and times and ways to prevent it, but also to look forward to careers of usefulness in executive positions, making the Government control over industry more adequate, pioneering in a field of essential importance.

Government officials in the bureaus and departments at Washington, Albany, Trenton, Harrisburg, and other State capitals are of great importance. The wages are not high. That is one reason why so many of them go over to private industries and favor private industries before they do go over to them—earn their jobs ahead of time. Yet the problem of Government officials is a major problem of immediate socialism. In Germany, after the revolution, the bureaucracy was nationalist and nearly sabotaged the republican government, until it had been replaced. One good man with his eyes, ears, and wits about him, inside the Department—whether it be the Interior, where the oil scandal started and the Boulder Dam bill received most active support, or the Treasury, where the taxation scandals breed and the Government tax policies originate—can do more to perfect the technique of control over industry than a hundred men outside. His reward will be more immediate than if he becomes a teacher. If he finally decides to leave the Government for labor, he will bring something more than a general willingness. He will bring a background.

THE NEED IN POLITICS

With the weakness of the unions today in the industrial field, Congress and the Legislature have become more important. Senator Smoot knows everything that moves anywhere in Washington and so is invaluable to his side. We need a group of men who will do and be the same for the opposition.

Now this is power politics—just as the proposal that we give our help, support, and honors to the men who are politicians enough to know and help the people in their own districts well enough to be elected by them, is power politics. I admit its dangers in the transitional state of affairs. The men who want success only will go Tammany or to the Thompson machine, unable to wait—or become merely cheap politicians.

The very idea of saying to people that you want government ownership of railroads or electric power, not because it is eternally right, but because it is cheaper for the workers and can be so proved, will be hailed by some as a compromise or betrayal of socialism. But as I understand it, Lenin himself summed up each situation by itself and met it as he could, practically and pragmatically, and after that was done sat down to write these long, dry theses of rationalization proving that Engels and Marx would have agreed.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union compromises with its employers, holds so little (on the face of it) by the doctrine of inveterate struggle between the two classes, that it finances some of the employers when their bankruptcy would throw union members out of work. Still we know that there are some things the Amalgamated will not compromise on.

The spiritual leaders of the liberal and radical movement will see to it that the new power is used for the purposes we have always desired, that the ideals are not forgotten.

I admit that the process is full of pitfalls. So is the whole progress of the transitional state. Properly engineered, a period of high prices, low wages, and unemployment may set us back a long time. Fear of too rapid transition dropped the franc another cent in 1926 and overthrew even a liberal ministry in France. Herriot thought it so important that the radical group should regain the confidence of the country and have a part in stabilizing the franc that he joined the Poincare Cabinet and spent a large part of his last campaign (1928) claiming that he had not been responsible for the drop originally and had nobly helped restore the franc to 4 cents. This was an important thing to the workers of the country, and a nasty position for any honest man to be in, but important because indicative not only of how many tricks the controlling powers have in the bag to make the transitional state difficult, but of the danger of compromising at the wrong time. Still, the business of having leaders at all involves this danger.

There has been more said about the development of a political party that will have some power to effect a transitional state, than about the relative places of industrial, parliamentary, cooperative, and educational action in such a state. It is likely that within 10 years the dominant unions of the country will have exhausted the possibility of their present policy of being respectable at any price. Virtue can be its own streetwalker for only so long. By that time we may expect new leaders and a different drive behind them.

EFFECTIVE TRUST CONTROL

In the field of governmental control of industry, however, possibilities are more definite.

Trust control: There is a considerable movement on now to repeal the Clayton Act in the coal industry, to allow trustification. Once that barrier has been let down we may expect trustification to be allowed in other industries. This process is as important as anything on the American scene today. In return for giving up our beloved system of competition for monopoly, it is not impossible to exact a price; to get some share of control which can then be extended as the need for it becomes evident. In Germany the Government sits in on every trust and in some cases Government-owned corporations are parts of the trust. The antitrust act and the Federal Trade Commission Act were cease and desist acts—the policeman with the club stopping traffic. Actually, our regulation to replace the supposedly automatic safeguards of competition is more complicated and potential. Regulation by public-service commissions, North Dakota's governmental competition in grain elevating, banking, and insurance, and the Federal Government's participation in formulation of banking policy are cases in point.

Very moderate control, under the press of social need, can develop rapidly. The Interstate Commerce Commission started with the duty of eliminating rebates and now has some measure of supervision over the activities of the railroads, their combination, and the distribution of their group earnings. If the courts allow the railroads to add another $11,000,000,000 to the present valuation, we may expect enough indignation from shippers and public generally to lead to further control.

In the Federal Reserve Bank Act we brought under national jurisdiction the banking organizations in which we previously had no say at all. All national banks were required to join this system. A situation was created where many State banks found

it advisable to join. On each Federal Reserve bank we have three directors appointed by the Federal Reserve Board representing the banking policy of the Government. The Board has considerable power, not only in appointment and supervision, but in control of the rediscount rate. In its open-market operations it can exercise some influence over the business cycle. There is nothing in a long line of judicial decisions which prevents a control analagous to that which is exercised by the Federal Government over banks from being applied by a State legislature to any industry which is held to be affected with the public interest * * *.

The Court has even held it easier for a State government to go into business itself than to regulate business. North Dakota's attempts to go into all sorts of businesses were attacked, but upheld. Meanwhile the regulatory attempts involved in the Kansas Industrial Court Act were not upheld.

Once an industry is declared affected with the public interest it is reasonable to have the books opened, then to go on with the clamping down on excess profits, stock dividends, inflated mergers, and to have a positive hand in stabilization of employment, uniform working conditions, minimum wage, supervision of all mergers, establishment of the principle of recapturing excess earnings as in the railroads, to go into a retirement fund through which the State can finally buy out the industry on an annuity plan.

In the electric power industry we have four things to go on:

(1) The desire of the people to keep their natural resources.

(2) The weakness of regulation as to a protection to the people.

(3) The evidence of what unscrupulous influence the industry has been exerting in our schools, press, and political life.

(4) The fact that the State not only has the power to cancel charters, but that the companies must constantly come to it for new grants of privilege, power to condemn land and riparian rights, to merge, etc.

We have made three attempts at control. We have set up municipal plants. Their status is changing, and we should face that fact. Outside of the large cities they can rarely compete in rates and efficiency with the new plants being established by private companies having the benefit of the connected load of wide interconnections. We have tried regulation by State commissions. It has gotten out of hand. A third attempt to control the water power was in the Federal Water Power Act of 1920. Here we have set down the principle that rates shall not exceed a return on the net cost of the money actually invested, that excess earnings shall be recaptured, and that the project may be bought at the end of 50 years by the Government at the net cost.

The fourth attempt is that of having Government corporations, like the Port Authority of New York, operating the power at Muscle Shoals, Boulder Dam, and on the St. Lawrence. With these developments furnishing cheap power, these great sections of the country will realize the advantages of public as opposed to private ownership. We cannot hope to take over the whole $8,000,000,000 industry successfully, even if it were generally thought advisable to do so at the moment. There would be danger of sabotage. But by putting in a preference that power from these developments shall be furnished by State and municipal plants, we can move toward a system of linked-up plants such as the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission.

While the long-time aim of the liberal and radical groups is the abolition of the profit system for private use, our present strategy should be to make and take every opportunity to prove that there is something better than the profit system. Within the next 10 years we are going to have a chance such as we have not had for the last 40.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, this being the case, I am convinced that this bill is just another step in a direction which I think is most dangerous, and I do not believe it will be wholesome. I do not believe we can cure tenancy by any such step. Therefore, it is my hope that the bill will be again recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, knowing something of the recent policies of the Agriculture Department, I was not surprised at the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LONERGAN] when he referred to the enormous amount of money taken from the Treasury of the United States, or from alleged processing taxes, and paid to persons in the United States for withdrawing land from cultivation.

As I have heretofore indicated, no little evidence has been brought to my attention that some of the land alleged to have been withdrawn from cultivation had not been cultivated or would not have been cultivated. Nevertheless, during the past year a stupendous sum, more than $400,000,000, has been paid to persons for failure to farm lands which they probably would not have farmed and some lands which they would have farmed.

Moreover, as I indicated sometime ago in speaking to one of the amendments, large sums have been paid for bounties and subsidies in connection with agricultural crops and agricultural developments.

The scheme before us—and, in my judgment, it is a very unsound one—will result in failures such as have not been infrequent during the past 100 years in the United States and in other countries. I think the facts warrant many of the statements made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] this afternoon.

We are promising to purchase farms for persons who have been driven from the farm by unwise policies, and promising to loan to them considerable sums, involving them in debt which they cannot pay; and paralleling this scheme we found thousands of farmers who now are voluntarily withdrawing their lands from cultivation, and thousands of others who are unable to meet their obligations, and are being forced into the courts under foreclosure proceedings, or feel compelled to avail themselves of the bankruptcy law.

Mr. President, I am in receipt of an article appearing in The State, a Democratic newspaper of South Carolina, which, while I do not agree with some of the statements contained therein, reveals somewhat the views of some people of the United States. It is entitled:

EATING AT DAD'S TABLE IS A PRIVILEGE PAID FOR BY OBEYING DAD'S WILL

Esau was not the last to trade his birthright for a mess of pottage. Americans are slowly but surely doing it now.

Observe a group of threescore jobless transients standing in front of a mission. A youth appears and barks at them: "All right, men; fall in line. This way." They follow him single file, block after block, to their destination, and there stand in line, silent, listless, to get a shower bath, a bowl of soup, and a bunk.

Observe another line of men, rich planters, poor whites, and colored tenants, patiently waiting their turn to get gin tickets, which are Government permits to have their crop prepared for market.

Farmers in other regions are planting the number of acres they are told to plant.

Manufacturers, until the Supreme Court interfered, were employing the men they were told to employ, keeping the hours they were told to keep, charging the price they were told to charge.

And everywhere in the land, unfortunately, people are answering questions and revealing the details of their misery to establish their right to the Government's charity.

Never before in the history of our race have so many free men swallowed their pride, surrendered their independence, and accepted official direction of their private affairs.

The intent of all this is good and in many instances the result achieved is beneficial. But is that enough?

Beyond doubt, the business of the Nation would be managed more efficiently and the people as a whole would be more prosperous and more secure if one central authority controlled all industry and business as a general controls an army.

But prosperity and security are not the things men value most. Again and again they have been sacrificed to gain liberty.

Caged animals are better fed and better housed than free ones, but they are not better satisfied.

There are still millions of high-spirited Americans who would rather eat crusts in freedom than to gain security and wealth by meekly obeying the impudent underlings of a paternal bureaucracy.

And these must be eternally vigilant and clamorously vocal if they would preserve their heritage and birthright.

Mr. President, undoubtedly there is a strong movement to socialize the industries of our country, and to superimpose upon industry and upon individuals a regimentation which is hateful to men who love liberty and freedom. This bill, in my view, is in line with the policy to which I have referred; and it will fail, as socialistic and other unsound schemes have failed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GERRY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (putting the question). The ayes have it, and the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is too late; is it not? The committee amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. KING. May I inquire what the committee amendment is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The amendment, as amended, has been agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was clamoring for recognition when the Chair stated the question which prevents the Senator from Utah from offering his amendment. I ask unanimous consent for reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to reconsidering the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I now move to strike out on line 14, page 17, the figures "$1,000,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$200,000,000", so that, if amended, it will read:

> The Corporation is authorized to issue bonds in an aggregate amount not to exceed $200,000,000, which may be sold—

And so forth.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Should not the Senator's amendment be $21,000,000,000 in order to take care of all of the tenants, as indicated by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS]?

Mr. KING. If this bill is to be consistent and to care for all of the tenants in the United States it should authorize an expenditure of $21,000,000,000 instead of $1,000,000,000.

Mr. LONG. That is the principle.

Mr. KING. But in view of the fact that consistency and logic are not accepted as our guides, I will have to accept the charge of being inconsistent and illogical.

Calling attention to page 16—and I ask for information—the Corporation is to have a capital stock of $50,000,000. I do not know from the bill where the $50,000,000 is to come from. I had assumed that it was to be taken from the $4,800,000,000 relief appropriation. Yet it is not clear that that is the source from which this sum is to be supplied. I should like to ask the Senator if he will advise me whether the $50,000,000 is to be taken from the appropriation of $4,880,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. KING. It is certain that it is to come from that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; under the authority specifically granted by the Senate when the $4,000,000,000 bill was pending.

Mr. KING. Another question: The bill provides that the capital stock of the Corporation may be further increased. There is no limit, as I read the bill, as to the amount of capital stock which may be issued.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is no authority for the payment of that capital stock. Of course, if bonds are sold and money is brought into the Corporation, it ought to have capital stock to correspond.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I do not think that necessarily follows. This is the language:

> And the Board, with the approval of the President, is authorized to increase such capital stock from time to time in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Corporation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator knows that there is no authority and no arrangement for the payment for any additional capital stock, therefore there is no way for paying for it except by the proceeds of the sale of bonds. There is no authority for the Treasury to pay it, and no direction for the Treasury to pay it, and therefore it could not do so.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator is correct, but I find here unlimited authority given to the board of directors, three men, to issue further capital stock. We do not know whether it will be $100,000,000 or a billion. I do not think the language of the bill restricts the stock issue to the one billion, nor is the authorization to increase the capital stock without limit dependent upon the sale of bonds.

In other words, as I read the bill, the capital stock may be a billion or two or more billion dollars; then bonds may be sold for a billion dollars, notwithstanding the authorization apparently is limited to $50,000,000, as found in line 16 on page 16.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I suggest to the Senator from Utah that it is a most unusual proceeding to provide capital stock out of borrowings. If the capital stock comes from the sale of bonds, we immediately have our capital stock wiped out by a liability equal to the assets. As I read the bill, the capital stock is and must be provided by the President out of the emergency relief appropriation. I think there is no other interpretation possible.

Mr. KING. I hope the interpretation placed upon the bill by the Senator from Colorado is correct; but I am not sure that capital stock must be taken from the $4,880,000,000. Undoubtedly, there is authority given to the board of directors to issue capital stock without limit. It is not limited to one billion; it is not limited to the $300,000,000 which may be expended within 3 years. The board may issue a billion dollars of capital stock, and, as the Senator has stated, bonds will not be sold in order to obtain money for the capital stock. Capital stock is one thing, the bond issue is another; and the bill gives authority to issue capital stock in any sum which the desires of the board may dictate, and, in addition, to borrow a billion dollars.

Mr. President, it seems to me that to give authority to a board to issue bonds and to borrow money as they see fit, without limit, is unwise, unsound, and indefensible legislation.

It had been supposed that Congress controlled the purse strings of the country, but we are getting so now that the purse strings of the country are controlled entirely by executive departments, agencies, and bureaucratic organizations set up in the various Federal establishments.

The least that we can do is to limit the authority to issue bonds to $200,000,000. I ask for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. McNARY. 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	Costigan	Logan	Reynolds
Austin	Davis	Lonergan	Robinson
Bachman	Dickinson	Long	Russell
Bailey	Donahey	McCarran	Schall
Bankhead	Fletcher	McGill	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	McKellar	Sheppard
Barkley	George	McNary	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gerry	Maloney	Smith
Black	Glass	Metcalf	Steiwer
Bone	Gore	Minton	Townsend
Brown	Guffey	Moore	Trammell
Bulow	Hale	Murray	Truman
Burke	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Byrd	Hatch	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hayden	Norris	Van Nuys
Caraway	Holt	Nye	Walsh
Chavez	Johnson	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Clark	Keyes	Overton	White
Connally	King	Pope	
Coolidge	La Follette	Radcliffe	

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

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. ADAMS (when Mr. WAGNER's name was called). I wish to announce that the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent, being detained on important committee work.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY]. They have a general pair.

I also announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] and the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who are paired on this question. If the Senator from Vermont were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "nay", and if the Senator from Utah were present and at liberty to vote he would vote "yea."

I also announce that on this question the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. If present and at liberty to vote, the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay", and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON. I wish to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY] are detained from the Senate on important public business.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], the Senator from California [Mr. MCADOO], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily detained from the Senate on important committee work.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—45

Bachman	Clark	McCarran	Russell
Bailey	Connally	McGill	Schall
Bankhead	Costigan	McKellar	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Donahey	Murray	Sheppard
Bilbo	Fletcher	Neely	Shipstead
Black	Frazier	Norris	Trammell
Bone	Harrison	Nye	Truman
Brown	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Bulow	Hayden	Overton	Wheeler
Byrnes	Holt	Pope	
Caraway	La Follette	Reynolds	
Chavez	Logan	Robinson	

NAYS—32

Adams	George	King	Radcliffe
Austin	Gerry	Lonergan	Smith
Barbour	Glass	Long	Steiwer
Burke	Gore	Maloney	Townsend
Byrd	Guffey	Metcalf	Tydings
Coolidge	Hale	Minton	Vandenberg
Davis	Johnson	Moore	Walsh
Dickinson	Keyes	Norbeck	White

NOT VOTING—19

Ashurst	Copeland	Hastings	Pittman
Borah	Couzens	Lewis	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkley	Dieterich	McAdoo	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Duffy	McNary	Wagner
Carey	Gibson	Murphy	

So the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Farmers' Home Act."

SEC. 2. The powers conferred in this act shall be exercised with a view to checking the increase of tenancy in the United States, and dealing in an adequate way with the problem of farm tenancy in the United States, aiding in rural rehabilitation, and encouraging the ownership of farm homes.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a Corporation to be known as the "Farmers' Home Corporation" (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), which shall be an instrumentality of the United States.

(b) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "board") of 5 members, consisting of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration as members ex officio, and 3 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and not more than 2 of said 3 members shall be members of the same political party. Each of the three appointive members shall receive a salary at the rate fixed in the bylaws of the Corporation, but not in excess of $10,000 a year, and shall hold office for a term of 6 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 4 years, and one at the end of 6 years, after the date of the enactment of this act. The President shall designate one of the appointive members as the chairman of the board. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and any of the appointive members who hold another Government office shall receive no additional compensation for their services as members of the board. The members of the board who are first appointed shall be deemed to be the incorporators, and the incorporation shall be deemed to have been effected from the date of the first meeting of the board.

(c) The Corporation shall have capital stock in the amount of $50,000,000, and the board, with the approval of the President, is authorized to increase such capital stock from time to time in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Corporation. Such original capital stock shall be subscribed for by the President on behalf of the United States, and payments for such subscriptions may be made from any sums appropriated by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935; and the President is further authorized to transfer to the Corporation, from the sums so allocated, such sums as he may from time to time deem desirable to carry out the purposes of this act. Payments for such stock and other sums to be so transferred shall be made to the Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury at such time or times as the President may direct and the amount of all payments so received shall be available to the Corporation for administrative expenses under, and also to carry out the provisions of this Act. The Corporation shall issue to the Secretary of the Treasury receipts for payments by him for or on account of such stock, and such receipts shall be evidence of the stock ownership of the United States.

(d) The Corporation is authorized to issue bonds in an aggregate amount not to exceed $1,000,000,000, which may be sold by the Corporation to obtain funds for carrying out the purpose of this act. Such bonds shall be in such forms and denominations, shall mature within such periods from the date of their issue, shall bear such rates of interest, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and shall be issued in such manner and sold at such prices, as may be prescribed by the Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such bonds shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof, and such bonds shall be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States or any officer or officers thereof. In the event that the Corporation shall be unable to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of, or interest on, such bonds, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holder the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon to the extent of the amount so paid the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such bonds. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, is authorized to purchase any bonds of the Corporation issued under this subsection, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's bonds hereunder. The Secretary of the Treasury may, at any time, sell any of the bonds of the Corporation acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of the bonds of the Corporation shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. The bonds issued by the Corporation under this subsection shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes), now or hereafter imposed by the United States or any District, Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. The Corporation, including its franchise, its capital, reserves, and surplus, its loans and income, and its personal property, shall likewise be exempt from such taxation. The Corporation shall have power, however, to make payments to States and governmental subdivisions thereof for the furnishing of such public services and facilities as are customarily provided for out of taxes and assessments, to the farms, farm homes, and farm communities established as provided for hereinafter. The Corporation shall have power to purchase in the open market at any time and at any price, not to exceed par, any of the bonds issued by it. Any such bonds so purchased may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be sold or resold at any time and at any price. The Corporation shall make appropriate provision for applying payments received by it to the retirement of the bonds issued under the provisions of this Act.

None of said bonds shall be issued within 1 year after the approval of this act. Within 3 years after the approval of this act not more than $300,000,000 of said bonds may be issued.

(e) The Corporation is authorized to appoint attorneys and shall, subject to the civil-service laws, employ such officers, examiners, and other experts and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this act and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. No such officer, employee, attorney, or agent shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of the rate hereinabove provided in the case of directors of the Corporation, nor compensation in excess of that received by employees of the Government in like or similar services. Insofar as applicable, the benefits of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance

of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, shall extend to persons given employment under the provisions of this act. The Corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails for its official business in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government, and shall determine its necessary administrative and other expenditures under this act and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid. All expenditures of said Corporation shall be in accordance with the laws generally applicable to the expenditures of the several departments and establishments of the Government. All claims and accounts of said Corporation shall be submitted to the General Accounting Office as provided in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921: *Provided*, That the appointment of any person receiving a salary of $4,000 or more per annum from the funds of the Corporation shall be subject to the confirmation of the Senate of the United States.

The Corporation shall, at the close of each fiscal year, make a report in writing to Congress stating in detail its activities, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ of or under the supervision of the Corporation, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

(f) The Board is authorized to make such bylaws, rules, and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, as may be necessary for the proper conduct of the affairs of the Corporation.

SEC. 4. (a) The Corporation shall have succession in its corporate name, and shall have power—

(1) To sue and be sued in its corporate name in any court of competent jurisdiction, Federal or State.

(2) To adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(3) To establish, and to assist in the establishment of farms and farm homes, together with the necessary buildings and other structures, livestock, equipment, implements and machinery, furnishings, supplies, facilities, and to assist the beneficiaries of this act in the organization of cooperatives: *Provided*, That any individual farm shall be of such size and fertility and so stocked and equipped as to reasonably indicate returns which will permit the occupants thereof to repay any obligations incurred by them for the purchase thereof, and to maintain a decent standard of living: *And provided further*, That the Corporation shall have power under rules and regulations to be promulgated by the Corporation and the Secretary of the Interior to finance in the same manner the establishment of individual farms and homes upon the public domain or upon lands within any reclamation project.

(4) The Corporation shall limit the loan made to any purchaser to the amount that will provide a farm to be limited in area to the size of an average farm in the State where the land is located as determined by the preceding Federal census, and not to exceed in cost the price of property of similar size and value in the same section or area. No property, real or personal, shall be purchased hereunder save upon an appraisal by competent experts, reported in writing and sworn to and filed and preserved for inspection by the Congress, or any Member thereof. No separate tract of property shall be bought at a price in excess of the value shown by the appraisal as herein provided for. If the services of appraisers of the Federal land bank are available, no farm land shall be bought by the Corporation save upon an appraisal by one or more appraisers of the Federal land bank, reported in writing and sworn to and filed and preserved for inspection by the Congress, or any Member thereof.

(5) In carrying out the provisions and purposes of this act, to enter into contracts, make loans, and to acquire, by purchase, gift, or otherwise any real or personal property or any interest therein, and to improve, develop, maintain, and sell any such property or interest therein. The provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, shall not apply to lands acquired, or construction work undertaken by the Corporation under the provisions of this act, and title to all land, chattels, and other property, real or personal, acquired under the provisions of this act, shall vest in the Corporation for the purposes of this act.

(6) To enter into contracts to sell or lease its properties, and to make conveyances under the terms of such contracts: *Provided, however*, That no such lease shall be for a period of more than 5 years. The Corporation may lease any farm which has been repossessed by it, pending a resale of said farm.

(7) To pay all expenses incident to the examination and survey of the necessary areas and the acquisition of title to lands to be acquired, including fees for the services of abstractors, title attorneys, and escrows, official certifications and evidences of title, and title insurance policies, recording fees, and options when deemed necessary, to assist the beneficiaries of the program to secure and maintain appropriate insurance policies, and to pay such other expenses as may be determined necessary to the efficient carrying out of the programs herein authorized.

(8) To accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, cooperate with such Federal and State agencies, and utilize, with the consent of the State, such State and local officers and employees as may be necessary.

(9) To establish such branch and local offices as it may deem necessary, but the principal office of the Corporation shall be in the District of Columbia.

(10) To utilize the service of other corporations and agencies on such terms and conditions as the board may prescribe, and to exercise such other powers as may be necessary or appropriate to the efficient exercise of the powers specifically conferred.

(b) Preference shall be given applicants who are married or who have dependent families, farm tenants, share-croppers, farm laborers, or those who recently were farmers; but the Corporation shall not approve any application for the benefits of this act if it finds that the income of the applicant derived from farm property owned by him is sufficient to support his family and to pay the expenses of operating such property and the fixed charges on his indebtedness in connection with such property.

(c) The Corporation may provide for such amortization periods for the repayment of indebtedness owed to it, and may postpone the date when the initial installment shall be due, as it may deem advisable, but in no event shall the amortization period exceed 60 years.

(d) The rate of interest to be charged by the Corporation upon indebtedness owed to it shall be not to exceed 3½ percent per annum, and may include a reasonable charge to be applied toward the expenses of administering the provisions of this act, not to exceed 1 percent per annum.

(e) The board and the Corporation shall give due consideration to the desirability of avoiding the expansion of production for the market of basic commodities for which the price is lower than the parity price as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended; and shall, so far as practicable, assist beneficiaries of the program to become established upon lands now in cultivation.

(f) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Corporation to make a loan to any corporation for the purpose of purchasing real property, to sell or otherwise dispose of any real property or interest therein owned or held by the Corporation to any other corporation, or to enter into any contract or agreement with any other corporation with respect to the acquisition by it of any real property or interest therein.

SEC. 5. All contracts of sale executed by the Corporation and all mortgages taken by it shall contain a provision that if a voluntary lien is created by the debtor on any of the property covered by such contract or mortgage, or if an involuntary lien is established on any of such property, the Corporation may declare all unpaid installments of principal and interest (accrued or to accrue) to be immediately due and payable. No land purchased from the Corporation herein created up to the value of $2,500 shall ever be encumbered with any lien or obligation, either statutory or contractual. Such land shall not be subject to any debt, or debts, or obligations of any kind of the owner, except taxes, and every conveyance, lease, or contract executed by the Corporation herein created shall contain a provision that the land shall forever remain free of all liens or encumbrances of whatever kind, and such provision shall be a covenant running with the land as long as it shall be used as a farm homestead. This provision shall not affect the lien of the Corporation for the money loaned for the purchase of the land, or equipment for the land or judgment for tort or a statutory offense or for contractual obligations in which enter the elements of fraud or deceit.

SEC. 6. No purchasers of property from the Corporation shall, so long as the purchase price is not paid in full, without the written consent of the Corporation, sell, lease, mortgage, transfer, assign, or convey any such property included in a contract of sale by the Corporation or in a mortgage to the Corporation: *Provided*, That if he shall have first given the Corporation 60 days' notice of his intention to sell and convey said property, and unless the Corporation, within such 60-day period, does not purchase such property at a price equal to the appraised value thereof, as established by an independent appraisal, such sale shall not be prohibited hereby. If any sale, lease, transfer, assignment, mortgage, or conveyance of such property is made without complying with the foregoing requirements, or if any property is abandoned, the Corporation may declare all unpaid installments of principal and interest (accrued or to accrue) to be immediately due and payable.

SEC. 7. (a) The jurisdiction, both civil and criminal, over lands acquired under the provisions of this act shall not be changed by reason of such acquisition: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not be deemed to affect the jurisdiction of the United States to punish offenses against the United States; the intent of this section being that the several States in which such lands are situated shall not, by reason of such acquisition, lose their jurisdiction, nor the inhabitants thereof, their rights and privileges as citizens, or be absolved from their duties as citizens, of the respective States.

(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed to exempt any real property held by any purchasers from the Corporation, notwithstanding the legal title remains in the Corporation, from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

SEC. 8. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Corporation.

SEC. 9. (a) Whoever makes any statement, knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any property, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation or the board upon any application, advance, purchase, or repurchase agreement, or loan, under this act, or any extension thereof, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000.

(b) Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation or coupon, in imitation of or purporting to be a note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon issued by the Corporation; or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to utter, pass, or publish any false, forged, or counterfeited note, debenture, or other obligation or coupon, purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the

same to be false, forged, or counterfeited; or (3) falsely alters any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation; or (4) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, as true, any falsely altered or spurious note, debenture, bond, or other obligation or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to have been falsely altered or spurious, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise intrusted to it; or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiners of the board or the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the board or the Corporation, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

(d) The provisions of sections 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 202–207, inclusive), insofar as applicable, are extended to apply to contracts or agreements of the Corporation, which for the purposes hereof shall be held to include advances, loans, purchase and repurchase agreements, extensions and renewals thereof, acceptances, releases, and subtitutions of security therefor, and sales of property to the Corporation.

(e) No person, partnership, association, or corporation shall directly or indirectly solicit, contract for, charge, or receive, or attempt to solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee, charge, or other consideration from any person applying to the Corporation for a loan or other assistance, whether bond or cash, except ordinary fees authorized and required by the Corporation for services actually rendered for examination and perfection of title, appraisal, and like necessary services. Any person, partnership, association, or corporation violating the provisions of this subsection shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Several Senators called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. ADAMS (when Mr. WAGNER's name was called). The junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is unavoidably detained on an important committee matter.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON. I wish to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the Senator from Utah, [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY] are detained from the Senate on important public business.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily detained from the Senate on important committee work.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY]. They have a general pair.

I also announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] and the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who are paired on this question. If the Senator from Vermont were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "nay", and if the Senator from Utah were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "yea."

I also announce that on this question the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. If present and at liberty to vote, the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay", and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—45

Bachman	Clark	Logan	Russell
Bailey	Connally	McCarran	Schall
Bankhead	Costigan	McGill	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Donahey	McKellar	Sheppard
Bilbo	Fletcher	Murray	Shipstead
Black	Frazier	Neely	Trammell
Bone	Guffey	Norris	Truman
Brown	Harrison	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Bulow	Hatch	Overton	Wheeler
Byrnes	Hayden	Pope	
Caraway	Holt	Reynolds	
Chavez	La Follette	Robinson	

NAYS—32

Adams	George	Lonergan	Radcliffe
Austin	Gerry	Long	Smith
Barbour	Glass	Maloney	Steiwer
Burke	Gore	Metcalf	Townsend
Byrd	Hale	Minton	Tydings
Coolidge	Johnson	Moore	Vandenberg
Davis	Keyes	Norbeck	Walsh
Dickinson	King	Nye	White

NOT VOTING—19

Ashurst	Copeland	Hastings	Pittman
Borah	Couzens	Lewis	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkley	Dieterich	McAdoo	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Duffy	McNary	Wagner
Carey	Gibson	Murphy	

So the bill was passed.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR AND RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its labors today it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the first portion of the request nor have I objection to taking up unobjected bills on the calendar, but I think we should have a time fixed when we should desist from consideration of bills on the calendar. I suggest that hour be fixed at 5 o'clock this evening.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well. I modify my request accordingly, that until the hour of 5 o'clock the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar, that the hour of 5 o'clock an executive session be held, after which the Senate shall take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN TAXES

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that tomorrow I expect to call up the joint resolution extending the so-called "nuisance taxes" for another year.

THE CALENDAR—BILLS PASSED OVER

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

The bill (S. 396) to amend section 1180 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to usury was announced as first in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 944) to amend section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 213) to amend section 113 of the Criminal Code of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1109, U. S. C., title 18, sec. 203), and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1506) to change the name of the Pickwick Landing Dam to Quin Dam was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1878) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Mack Copper Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 574) relative to Members of Congress acting as attorneys in matters where the United States has an interest was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR (and others). Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 35) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate certain phases of the National Recovery Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 875) for the relief of Michael F. Calnan was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1162) to regulate the business of making small loans in the District of Columbia, and to amend an act to regulate the business of loaning money, and so forth, approved February 4, 1913, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 509) to prevent the use of Federal offices or patronage in elections and to prohibit Federal officeholders from misuse of positions of public trust for private and partisan ends was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

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 was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 164) for the relief of Donald L. Bruner was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1452) providing for the employment of skilled shorthand reporters in the executive branch of the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 87) to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of certain articles and commodities, in connection with which persons are employed more than 5 days per week or 6 hours per day, and prescribing certain conditions with respect to purchases and loans by the United States, and codes, agreements, and licenses under the National Industrial Recovery Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1589) authorizing the purchase of the United States Supreme Court Decisions and Digest was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

STRENGTH AND DISTRIBUTION OF LINE OF NAVY

The bill (H. R. 5599) to regulate the strength and distribution of the line of the Navy and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, personally I have no objection to the present consideration of the bill, but the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], who is necessarily absent, desired me to request, if the bill should be called, that it should go over. He left a memorandum with me asking that I request that the bill go over. In his absence I am compelled to respect his request.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I had very much hoped we could have the bill considered at this time. It has been on the calendar 4 or 5 weeks. It is an important measure, and has to do merely with a matter of administration in order that the line of the Navy may be increased commensurately with the present building program. I very much hope we may have the proposed legislation enacted at this time instead of having to make it a special order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah, at the request of the Senator from New York, has asked that the bill go over. It will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2213) to define the exterior boundaries of the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 626) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act so as to include hops as a basic agricultural commodity, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2481) to stabilize the bituminous coal-mining industry and promote its interstate commerce; to provide for cooperative marketing of bituminous coal; to levy a tax on bituminous coal and provide for a drawback under certain conditions; to declare the production, distribution, and use of bituminous coal to be affected with a national public interest; to conserve the bituminous-coal resources of the United States and to establish a national bituminous-coal reserve; to provide for the general welfare; and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

LOSSES OF COOPERATIVE MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) for the adjustment and settlement of losses sustained by the cooperative marketing associations was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection to enable me to make a brief statement?

Mr. KING. Very well.

Mr. FRAZIER. This is the same as a joint resolution which was passed last year. As originally introduced it applied only to grain cooperatives. I am perfectly willing, if it shall meet with the approval of those who object to the bill, to move to strike out, on page 1, line 9, the words "and/or cotton", and the same words in lines 6 to 8, on page 2, so it shall apply only to grain cooperatives.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that I have asked for information and for data respecting the measure. I expect to obtain it tomorrow, and I shall then be glad to join with the Senator in asking that the matter may be considered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say he had offered an amendment?

Mr. FRAZIER. I should be willing to offer the amendment stated if it should meet with the approval of those who object to the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to going that far.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1460) to fix standards for till baskets, Climax baskets, round stave baskets, market baskets, drums, hampers, cartons, crates, boxes, barrels, and other containers for fruits or vegetables, to consolidate existing laws on this subject, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

The bill (S. 2416) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the

United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. FRAZIER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that order of business 516, being the bill (S. 2416) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, may be indefinitely postponed. It is a proposed amendment to an act which has been declared to be unconstitutional.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1227) to authorize the issuance and sale to the United States of certain bonds of municipal governments in Puerto Rico, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LONG. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

The bill (S. 2228) to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges and agricultural experiment stations was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President, can I persuade my friend from Utah [Mr. KING] to let us take up Senate bill 2228? It is merely a bill to provide for extension work in land-grant colleges.

Mr. KING. We passed a bill the other day giving large grants to the colleges, and I think the measures are parallel. Let the bill go over. I shall look into it.

FRANK FISHER

The bill (S. 1689) for the relief of Frank Fisher was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Frank Fisher, who was a member of Troop E, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on the 19th day of June 1884: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE LIBRARIES

The bill (S. 1861) to incorporate the National Association of State Libraries was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mabel R. Gillis, State librarian of California; Horace E. Flack, executive, department of legislative reference, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, State librarian, Nashville, Tenn.; Margaret C. Norton, superintendent, department of archives, State library, Springfield, Ill.; Irma A. Watts, reference librarian, Pennsylvania Legislative Reference Bureau, Harrisburg, Pa.; Joseph Schafer, superintendent, State historical society, Madison, Wis.; Ella May Thornton, State librarian, Atlanta, Ga.; Johnson Brigham, State librarian, Des Moines, Iowa; George S. Godard, State librarian, Hartford, Conn.; Herbert O. Brigham, State librarian, Providence, R. I.; Gilson G. Glasier, State librarian, Madison, Wis.; Edward H. Redstone, State librarian, Boston, Mass.; Harrison J. Conant, State librarian, Montpelier, Vt.; Henry E. Dunnack, State librarian, Augusta, Maine; Louis J. Bailey, State librarian, Indianapolis, Ind.; Harriet M. Skogh, superintendent, general library division, State library, Springfield, Ill.; Alice M. Magee, State librarian, New Court Building, New Orleans, La.; their associates and successors, are hereby created a body corporate of the District of Columbia with the name of "National Association of State Libraries" (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation").

SEC. 2. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be to develop and increase the usefulness and efficiency of State libraries and other libraries doing the work of State libraries.

SEC. 3. The corporation shall have perpetual succession with power (1) to sue and be sued in its corporate name; (2) to make contracts; (3) to acquire by gift, purchase, devise, bequest, or in any other lawful manner, and to hold, convey, or otherwise dispose of, such property, real or personal, as may be necessary for, or in furtherance of, its corporate objects and purposes; (4) to receive contributions of money from individuals, foundations, or corporations and make expenditures thereof; (5) to adopt a corporate seal and alter the same at pleasure; (6) to adopt and alter a constitution and bylaws not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or of any State; (7) to determine the times and places of its meetings, and the number, tenure, and duties of the officers and committees of the corporation; (8) to elect its officers, who shall conduct the business of the corporation within the powers granted by this act; (9) to determine eligibility for membership in the corporation; and (10) to do any and all acts necessary or appropriate to carry into effect the objects and purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 4. The principal office of the corporation shall be maintained in the city in which the president of the corporation resides, but annual or other meetings may be held in any place in the United States.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2644) for the relief of the estate of Harry F. Stern was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JACK DOYLE

The bill (S. 166) for the relief of Jack Doyle was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights and privileges upon honorably discharged officers and enlisted men who have served in the Army of the United States between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, Jack Doyle shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service on September 29, 1920: *Provided*, That no back pay, compensation, benefit, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

BILLS PASSSED OVER

The bill (S. 1697) providing old-age pensions for Indian citizens of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2027) to regulate commerce in petroleum, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LONG. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2652) to authorize the President to attach certain possessions of the United States to internal revenue collection districts for the purpose of collecting processing taxes was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 212) to liquidate and refinance agricultural indebtedness at a reduced rate of interest by establishing an efficient credit system, through the use of the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Reserve Banking System, and creating a Board of Agriculture to supervise the same was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1476) to provide for unemployment relief through development of mineral resources; to assist the development of privately owned mineral claims; to provide for the development of emergency and deficiency minerals; and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

The bill (S. 2313) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, with respect to farm prices was announced as next in order.

Mr. LONG. Let that go over.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, this bill should be indefinitely postponed. The subject matter was dealt with in another bill. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is this Senate bill 2313, introduced by the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and Senate bill 2313 will be indefinitely postponed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 738) to aid in providing the people of the United States with adequate facilities for park, parkway, and recreational area purposes, and to provide for the transfer of certain lands chiefly valuable for such purposes to States and political subdivisions thereof was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I am advised that there are some amendments to be offered to this bill. I ask that it go over.

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

The bill (S. 2288) to provide for the measurement of vessels using the Panama Canal, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that go over.

Mr. KING. I have been requested by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] to have the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REPAIRS OR CHANGES TO NAVAL VESSELS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4760) to increase the statutory limit of expenditure for repairs or changes to naval vessels, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$600,000 for any two consecutive fiscal years" and insert "$450,000 for any 18 consecutive months", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the total appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy undertaken in a navy yard shall not exceed $450,000 for any 18 consecutive months: *Provided*, That if, during the overhaul of a vessel, the estimated cost for such overhaul having been approved as within the limits herein imposed, accomplishment of essential items will involve expenditures in excess of such limits, the Secretary of the Navy may, and he is hereby authorized, appropriation otherwise being available, to complete the work, and it shall thereupon be his duty to report to the Congress at the next regular session thereof the expenditures from each of the appropriations involving expenditures in excess of the authorized limit for such work: *Provided further*, That such parts of the acts of March 2, 1907, March 3, 1909, and August 29, 1916, contained in section 468, title 5, of the United States Code, as relate to statutory limit of expenditure for repairs or changes on naval vessels, are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill limiting expenditures for repairs or changes to naval vessels."

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 86) authorizing an annual appropriation of $10,000 to enable the United States to become a member of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, authorizing the President to invite the institute to hold its second general assembly in the United States in 1935, and authorizing appropriation of $10,000 for expenses of such meeting, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2762) to exempt from taxation, under certain conditions, on the basis of reciprocity, official compensation of a consular officer, nondiplomatic representative, or employee of a foreign country was announced as next in order.

Mr. LONG. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

USE OF WATERS OF THE RIO GRANDE

The bill (H. R. 6453) to amend the act of May 13, 1924, entitled "An act providing for a study regarding the equitable use of the waters of the Rio Grande", etc., as amended by the public resolution of March 3, 1927, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, we have an international commission which has been functioning for many years, and I understand its jurisdiction would enable it to carry out the purposes of this measure. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 665, being House bill 6453. Objection was made, but I think the Senator making the objection is ready to withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Texas a question. Does the bill relate to the waters of the Colorado River, or to the utilization of its waters in the United States or in Mexico?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the bill provides for a study preparatory to negotiations with Mexico with relation to the utilization of the waters of several international streams, including the Colorado, Rio Grande, the Tia Juana, and other streams. It does not bind the Government to anything, because a treaty must finally be made. The State Department asks for the legislation. The Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is a member, and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] is chairman, has given very careful consideration to the matter, and I think we have satisfied all parties that it is a meritorious measure.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the Senator's statement, and the information which I have obtained, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill. I desire, however, to make a very brief statement which is pertinent to the measure before us.

Many years ago there was created what is known as the "Mexican Boundary Commission", which was charged with the duty, among other things, of determining the rights of the United States and Mexico in and to the waters of the Rio Grande River and of fixing the boundaries of the two Republics. The boundaries of the Rio Grande, by reason of floods, underwent many changes so that it became necessary to redefine the boundaries of the two countries and also to determine the proprietary rights abutting on it. I have not been able to learn the reason for the delay attending the work of this Commission.

Years ago, when I was in the House, there was some discussion concerning its operations, and since I have been in the Senate references have been made to the lack of progress upon the part of the Commission in determining matters committed to its charge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 1, line 9, to strike out the words "The Secretary of State, with the approval of the" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "The"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "Mexico", to insert the words "or other Federal agency"; on line 7, after the word "information", to strike out the words "on which to base" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "which may be used as a basis for the negotiation of", so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 13, 1924, entitled "An act providing for a study regarding the equitable use of the waters of the Rio Grande below Fort Quitman, Tex., in cooperation with the United States of Mexico", as amended by the public resolution of March 3, 1927, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The President is hereby authorized to designate the American Commissioner on the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, or other Federal agency to cooperate with a representative or representatives of the Government of Mexico in a study regarding the equitable use of the waters of the lower Rio Grande and the lower Colorado and Tia Juana Rivers, for the purpose of obtaining information which may be used as a basis for the negotiation of a treaty with the Government of Mexico relative to the use of the waters of these rivers and to matters closely related thereto. On completion of such study the results shall be reported to the Secretary of State."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 14, after the word "authorized", to strike out "(a)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 22, after the word "and", to strike out the words "Mexico or upon a stream or watercourse constituting or crossing the boundary between the two countries and upon the tributaries of any such stream or watercourse where international matters are involved; (b)" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "Mexico", so as to read:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State, acting through the American Commissioner, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, is further authorized to conduct technical and other investigations relating to the defining, demarcation, fencing, or monumentation of the land and water boundary between the United States and Mexico, to flood control, water resources, conservation, and utilization of water, sanitation and prevention of pollution, channel rectification, and stabilization and other related matters upon the international boundary between the United States and Mexico.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of the Senator from California if he does not have an amendment he desires to offer to the bill at this point?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, an amendment was prepared, and if the Senator from Texas will offer it, I shall be very glad.

Mr. CONNALLY. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered to the amendment of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 3, line 2, after the word "Mexico", it is proposed to insert the words "and is authorized and empowered to construct, operate, and maintain any and all works or projects which are recommended to the President as a result of such investigations and are approved by him as necessary and proper."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of that amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that this is an amendment drawn for the purpose of protecting some municipality in California which is now using the water. I do not really understand the details of it; probably the Senator from California can explain it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, the amendment was prepared by Mr. Stanley Reed, and is one intended for the protection of all those interested in the Mexican situation in that vicinity; that is all.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from California whether it would afford any basis for any claim upon the part of Mexico or its nationals in or to the waters of the Colorado River? The Senator knows the upper basin States, of which Utah is one, are profoundly interested in the waters of the Colorado River, and desire to take all necessary steps to protect their rights.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, there is no such intention, and the amendment would have no such result, in my opinion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me state to the Senator from Utah the general purpose of the bill. It is true that the International Boundary Commission has for many years kept records about the flow of the streams, and things of that kind, which is merely preparatory to what we now propose to do by this bill, to providing for an intensive study of the situation with a view to making a treaty with Mexico, so as to settle the question with Mexico. The treaty, of course, will have to be ratified by the Senate. The treaty will have no force unless ratified. The purpose is to bring to a head the thing which the Senator has in mind.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I shall not object, but I wish it distinctly understood that Mexico has no right to any waters in the Colorado River, by treaty or otherwise, and that any water Mexico gets from the United States she gets by an act of grace on the part of the United States.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from Texas regarding the work to be done by the International Boundary Commission. Is it not true that at each session the Congress passes some bill imposing duties on the International Boundary Commission?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know whether it does so at every session, but I know it is very often done. Let me say that the International Boundary Commission is now engaged in a very useful function imposed by the Congress, to wit, the absolute fixation of the boundary on the ground, by dikes and channels and other marks, and the International Boundary Commission has really been performing a very fine public service.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, as indicated, Utah and the upper-basin States are determined to take every necessary step to protect their rights, and the rights of their citizens, in and to the waters of the Colorado River. There have been intimations from time to time that Mexico laid claim to a part of the waters of the Colorado River and denied that all said waters had been appropriated and used in the United States. As Senators know, the waters of the Colorado River have their sources in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona. These States and their inhabitants, as well as the States of California and Nevada, and their inhabitants, claim to have appropriated for beneficial use all the waters of the Colorado River. These States and their inhabitants would be unwilling to support any measure that would weaken or jeopardize their rights or would afford any basis for Mexico's claiming any of the waters of the Colorado River.

Several years ago I was informed by a United States ambassador that some conversations had been carried on between the United States and the Republic of Mexico regarding the Colorado River, and that the Mexican Government had indicated that it would abandon any claim which it might have in and to the waters of the Colorado River upon payment of a certain sum which was to be retained by the United States to apply in liquidation of claims of American nationals against Mexico and its nationals. I stated to him that so far as I was advised the States above referred to, as well as their residents, denied that Mexico had any rights in the Colorado River and were unwilling to compose differences if any existed between the two Republics based upon any theory that Mexico had any interest in the Colorado River or its tributaries.

I am sure that the States referred to would protest against any treaty that conceded any rights to the Mexican Government or its nationals in and to the waters of the Colorado River.

Mr. JOHNSON. I may say that I reecho the sentiments just expressed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and also the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. There is no such purpose in this bill, I am perfectly assured; it is a bill which the people of Texas have sought here for a long period of time, and it has undergone the scrutiny of the State Department and of all the parties in interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in section 3, page 3, line 3, to insert the words "SEC. 3. (a) The President is further authorized"; in line 5, after the word "Mexico", to strike out the words "as contemplated in section 1 of this act, or which it may be appropriate to construct independently of a treaty with Mexico and for the repair, protection, maintenance, or completion of" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "and to repair, protect, maintain, or complete"; in line 10, after the words "construction or", to insert the word "those"; in line 14, after the word "and" where it first occurs, to strike out "(c)" and to insert in lieu thereof "(b)"; in line 16, after the word "Commissioner", to strike out the words "as the Secretary of State may promulgate" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "or any Federal agency as the President may cause to be promulgated"; in line 23, after the words "requirement as the", to strike out the words "Secretary of State" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "President", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. (a) The President is further authorized to construct any project or works which may be provided for in a treaty entered into with Mexico and to repair, protect, maintain, or complete works

now existing or now under construction or those that may be constructed under the treaty provisions aforesaid; and to construct any project or works designed to facilitate compliance with the provisions of treaties between the United States and Mexico; and (b) to operate and maintain any project or works so constructed or, subject to such rules and regulations for continuing supervision by the said American Commissioner or any Federal agency as the President may cause to be promulgated, to turn over the operation and maintenance of such project or works to any Federal agency, or any State, county, municipality, district, or other political subdivision within which such project or works may be in whole or in part situated, upon such terms, conditions, and requirements as the President may deem appropriate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 1, to change the number of the section from "3" to "4"; on line 2, after the words "act, the", to strike out the words "Secretary of State" and to insert in lieu thereof "President, or any Federal agency he may designate"; on line 6, after the word "section", to strike out the figure "2" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "3"; in line 19, after the words "discretion of the", to strike out the word "Secretary of State" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "President"; on page 5, in line 2, after "(c) to", to strike out the words "request the withdrawal" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "withdraw"; in line 4, after the words "States as", to strike out the words "the Secretary of State" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "he"; in line 5, after the words "necessary and", to strike out the words "upon receipt of any such request that", and to insert in lieu thereof the word "thereupon"; in line 14, after the words "removed by the", to strike out the words "Secretary of the Interior with the approval of the Secretary of State" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "President"; in line 16, after the word "regulations", to strike out the words "and, in his discretion, to delegate to the American Commissioner, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, any of his functions and powers provided for herein", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. In order to carry out the provisions of this act, the President, or any Federal agency he may designate is authorized, (a) in his direction, to enter into agreements with any one or more of said political subdivisions, in connection with the construction of any project or works provided for in section 3 hereof, under the terms of which agreements there shall be furnished to the United States, gratuitously, except for the examination and approval of titles, the lands or easements in lands necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance in whole or in part of any such project or works, or for the assumption by one or more of any such political subdivisions making such agreement, of the operation and maintenance of such project or works in whole or in part upon the completion thereof: *Provided, however,* That when an agreement is reached that necessary lands or easements shall be provided by any such political subdivision and for the future operation and maintenance by it of a project or works or a part thereof, in the discretion of the President the title to such lands and easements for such projects or works need not be required to be conveyed to the United States but may be required only to be vested in and remain in such political subdivision; (b) to acquire by purchase, exercise of the power of eminent domain, or by donation, any real or personal property which may be necessary; (c) to withdraw from sale, public entry or disposal of such public lands of the United States as he may find to be necessary and thereupon the Secretary of the Interior shall cause the lands so designated to be withdrawn from any public entry whatsoever, and from sale, disposal, location, or settlement under the mining laws or any other law relating to the public domain and shall cause such withdrawal to appear upon the records in the appropriate land office having jurisdiction over such lands, and such lands may be used for carrying out the purposes of this act: *Provided,* That any such withdrawal may subsequently be revoked by the President; and (d) to make or approve all necessary rules and regulations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 21, to change the number of the section from "4" to "5", and in line 23, after the words "provisions of", to strike out "section 1", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. Any moneys contributed by or received from the United Mexican States for the purpose of cooperating or assisting in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be available for expenditure in connection with any appropriation which may be made for the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WAIVER OF INDICTMENT IN CERTAIN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

The bill (S. 1313) providing for waiver of prosecution by indictment in certain criminal proceedings was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter all prosecutions for capital or otherwise infamous crimes, in the courts of the United States and the courts of the District of Columbia, shall be by presentment or indictment of a grand jury unless the accused shall, in open court and in writing, and under such rules as the court may prescribe, expressly waive prosecution by presentment or indictment, and consent to the filing of an information against him. In the event of such waiver the prosecution shall, with the approval of the court, be by information, and any judgment rendered and sentence imposed in any such case shall have the same force and effect in all respects as if the same had been rendered and imposed pursuant to a prosecution by presentment or indictment.

PROMOTION OF CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 476) relating to promotions of civil-service employees was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that bill go over.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Utah to state the last time this bill was reached on the calendar that he would look into it.

Mr. KING. To be frank with the Senator, I have not done so. I withhold the objection to permit an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator objected before, and I thought he said he did not intend to object again.

It is now contrary to the postal regulations for a civil-service employee to be promoted on political endorsement. I have on my desk the exact terms of the regulation which forbids it. This bill simply provides a method of enforcing that regulation.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, what is the method?

Mr. BLACK. The method of enforcement is that when a civil-service employee is promoted he shall file an affidavit that he has not sought or obtained political recommendations for the promotion. The regulations now provide that he shall not seek or obtain such recommendations. This bill provides that he shall make an affidavit that he has not done so, and, if he has sought promotion in that way, contrary to the regulations, that he shall not be promoted.

If we are going to have promotion by political endorsement, of course, that is perfectly all right. Then let us do away with the regulation and the law, and not have them standing there continuously and constantly violated. If, on the contrary, we wish to have promotion in obedience to law and in obedience to regulation, this bill will provide it.

I have introduced the bill to see whether or not we wish to have real, genuine, honest promotion on merit in the civil service. If we do not wish to have promotion on merit, the fact should be known. Usually, everybody is for promotion on merit, until a law is proposed which provides for promotion on merit, and then somebody is against promotion on merit. I have introduced this measure to find out if everybody is for promotion on merit. If we are not, I favor abolishing the civil-service law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, do I understand that this bill requires that the employees referred to shall make affidavit that they have not had any political endorsements?

Mr. BLACK. That they have not sought political endorsements. That is exactly what the regulation says they shall not do.

Mr. CONNALLY. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not believe in making employees swear that they have not had any influence, because there is more influence inside the departments than anywhere else; and if we pass this bill, nobody but the pets of the bureau chiefs will ever be promoted.

Mr. BLACK. I do not know about that; but I do know, as I stated a while ago, that if we are not going to have promotion on merit we ought to abolish the law. I agree with the Senator that the pets of bureau chiefs ought not to be promoted, nor should those promoted be the pets of Senators or Representatives or political committeemen.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true; but if we should pass this bill, a Representative or a Senator would not have any influence at all, and all these good jobs would go to persons who stand in with the bureau chiefs.

I dislike exceedingly to object to the Senator's bill, because I usually agree with him; but I do not believe in laws of the Inquisition, bringing in men and putting thumbscrews on them and making them swear that they have not done this, that, or the other.

Mr. BLACK. Let me say to the Senator that if he can devise any other way besides what he calls a method of the Inquisition, I shall be glad to have him do so. This is not a method of the Inquisition; but let us be honest in the Senate, anyhow, and if we are not going to have promotion on merit, let us repeal the law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course no law is ever going to work to the extent of 100 percent, the civil-service law or any other; but if this bill should be passed, whenever the departments wished to give a man the "skiddoo", or discharge him, they would find some place where he had solicited somebody's endorsement, and then, having his affidavit that he had not done so, out he would go.

Mr. BLACK. Of course this bill would not prevent any employee from coming before a committee of the Senate, or from having a matter taken up; but I know, and everybody else knows, that, so far as civil service being real, genuine, honest civil service, it is an illusion and a farce.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BLACK. I favor as soon as possible either having a real, genuine, honest civil service, based on integrity and based on promotion on merit, or repealing it and letting the country know that there is no civil service.

Mr. CONNALLY. Allow me to say to the Senator from Alabama that if he ever anticipates any such system as promotion only on merit, integrity, and character, he will have to wait until he goes up yonder, and walks on the golden streets and through the alabaster halls.

Mr. BLACK. I will say to the Senator that he may be correct. I myself think there is a very excellent civil-service system in England; but that is no reason why the Senate and the House should constantly stand in the way of enforcement legislation when it is written on the books that there shall be no political interference in promotion, and when the regulations of the Post Office Department so prescribe. We have had constant violations of all the laws in this country. We write them and then permit them to be disobeyed; and when we make an effort to have them obeyed we cannot get them obeyed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, let me preface my remarks by saying that I should like to see the civil-service law enforced and observed. This difficulty, however, may arise: Someone might recommend an employee within the civil service for promotion, and blame might be attached to such employee when he had not invited the recommendation. I may cite an instance. Within the last 30 days relatives of an employee in one of the Government services wrote me requesting that I suggest certain action on the part of the department in behalf of the employee. Before taking the action I communicated with the individual, and he said that it was done without his knowledge, and that if it were done it would be done over his objection.

I will be frank. There is a regulation of the War Department which forbids an Army officer from seeking political influence to aid in his promotion. Frequently friends of an Army officer who regard him as in every respect worthy of promotion, desiring to help him, volunteer their suggestions to persons in political places; and it is entirely possible, under such conditions, that one who is in no way to blame would be censured and fail to secure recognition which he might otherwise obtain.

Of course, it would not happen often that someone would volunteer a recommendation without the consent of the person supposed to be benefited by it, but I know it has happened a number of times.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I may suggest to the Senator that the circumstances to which he refers would not be touched by this measure? It requires that the person himself must have sought the influence.

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand that fully.

Mr. BLACK. Which is usually the case, of course.

Mr. ROBINSON. If someone's brother writes to an official asking for his brother's promotion, there is such a powerful presumption that it was done with the knowledge or consent of the employee that it would be very difficult for him to convince the official receiving the letter that the contrary was true, although in a particular case it might not be true.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I merely desire to state, in order to clear my record, that I not only observe this regulation of the Civil Service, but I never write a letter of recommendation for anyone for any office, showing how far ahead of my time I am.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator just goes ahead and appoints them, or tells someone that he has to appoint them, and if he does not, he will put him out of office. That is the way the Senator from Louisiana proceeds.

Mr. President, what is the status of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas objected, and the Chair was about to announce that the bill would go over and the clerk should announce the next bill on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1952) extending the classified executive civil service of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

HARRY H. A. LUDWIG

The bill (S. 1225) for the relief of Harry H. A. Ludwig, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes", approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof', approved July 3, 1926, as amended", approved May 29, 1930, the United States Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to extend the benefits of such act to Harry H. A. Ludwig, formerly an employee of the War Department, Engineer Department at large, in the same manner and to the same extent as if application had been made within 3 months after the effective date of such act of May 29, 1930. The application of the said Harry H. A. Ludwig for the benefits of such act of May 29, 1930, shall be filed with the United States Civil Service Commission within 3 months from the date of the approval of this act.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2405) to provide for a special clerk and liaison officer was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 373) for the relief of the American Surety Co., of New York, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LUTHER M. TURPIN AND AMANDA TURPIN

The bill (H. R. 805) for the relief of Luther M. Turpin and Amanda Turpin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES M. PACE

The bill (H. R. 2708) for the relief of James M. Pace was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we ought to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. BURKE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee if he will not withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I withhold the objection.

Mr. BURKE. This is a bill to credit the postmaster at Macomb, Ill., with approximately $21,000 covering stamps and cash which were stolen. Burglars with the most up-to-date burglary tools entered the post office in the dead of night and looted the safe. The Post Office Department recommends that payment be made. The House has passed the bill, and there seems to be no reason why this postmaster should not be credited on his accounts with the amount provided for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to recurring to the consideration of House bill 2708?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit James M. Pace, former postmaster at Macomb, McDonough County, Ill., in his accounts with the sum of $21,476.99, the amount of money and postage stamps lost in the burglary of the post office at Macomb, Ill., on April 5, 1929.

THOMAS J. GOULD

The bill (H. R. 1315) for the relief of Thomas J. Gould was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. G. ANDIS

The bill (S. 1690) for the relief of R. G. Andis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to cancel the charge, in the amount of $68, entered on the accounts of R. G. Andis, former postmaster at Presho, S. Dak., by reason of his deposit of funds of the United States in the First State Bank of Presho, Presho, S. Dak., and the subsequent failure of such bank.

MATTHEW E. HANNA

The bill (H. R. 4817) for the relief of Matthew E. Hanna was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLETUS F. HOBAN

The bill (H. R. 1703) for the relief of Cletus F. Hoban was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 760) for the relief of John L. Hoffman, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MARION SHOBER PHILLIPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1935) for the relief of Marion Shober Phillips, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of" to strike out "$5,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$2,500", and to add a proviso at the end of the bill, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marion Shober Phillips the sum of $2,500, the payment of such sum being in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States by reason of injuries sustained by the said Phillips on May 27, 1934, while assisting Government officers under their orders, in seizing and destroying an illicit liquor distillery: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

E. W. TARRENCE

The bill (H. R. 2987) for the relief of E. W. Tarrence was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RIO GRANDE BRIDGE, TEX.

The bill (H. R. 6630) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE AIR MAIL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6511) to amend the air mail laws and to authorize the extension of the Air Mail Service, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the following amendments are made to the act of June 12, 1934, as amended by the act of June 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 933, 1243; 39 U. S. C. 469, Supp. VIII): Section 3 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"The Postmaster General is authorized to award contracts for the transportation of air mail by airplane between such points as he may designate, and for initial periods of not exceeding 3 years, to the lowest responsible bidders tendering sufficient guaranty for faithful performance in accordance with the terms of the advertisement at fixed rates per airplane-mile: *Provided*, That where the Postmaster General holds that a low bidder is not responsible or qualified under this act, such bidder shall have the right to appeal to the Comptroller General, who shall speedily determine the issue, and his decision shall be final: *Provided further*, That the base rate of pay which may be bid and accepted in awarding such contracts shall in no case exceed 33⅓ cents per airplane-mile for transporting a mail load not exceeding 300 pounds. Payment for transportation shall be at the base rate fixed in the contract for the first 300 pounds of mail or fraction thereof plus one-tenth of such base rate for each additional 100 pounds of mail or fraction thereof, computed at the end of each calendar month on the basis of the average mail load carried per mile over the route during such month, except that in no case shall payment exceed 40 cents per airplane-mile."

SEC. 2. Section 3 (c) is amended to read as follows:

"If, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, the public interest requires it, he may grant extensions of any route: *Provided*, That the aggregate mileage of all such extensions on any route in effect at one time shall not exceed 200 miles, and that the rate of pay for such extensions shall not be in excess of the rate fixed for the service thus extended."

SEC. 3. Section 3 (d) is amended to read as follows:

"The Postmaster General may designate certain routes as primary and as secondary routes. He shall designate as primary routes at least three transcontinental routes, with such termini as he may deem advisable, and, in addition thereto, such other routes as he may consider in the public interest, but no route less than 1,000 miles in length shall be designated as a primary route: *Provided*, That the present route from Seattle to San Diego may be held and regarded as other than a primary route: *Provided further*, That the eastern coastal route from Newark (or New York City, as the case may be) to Miami, Fla., and the southern transcontinental route from Boston via New York (or Newark, as the case may be) and Washington to Los Angeles, shall be designated as primary routes."

SEC. 4. Section 3 (f) is amended to read as follows:

"The Postmaster General shall not award contracts for air mail routes or extend such routes in excess of an aggregate of 32,000 miles, and shall not pay for air mail transportation on such routes and extensions in excess of an annual aggregate of 45,000,000 airplane miles. Subject to the foregoing, the Postmaster General shall prescribe the number and frequency of schedules, intermediate regular stops, and time of departure of all planes carrying air mail, with due regard for the volume of mail carried over each route and for connecting schedules, and he may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, authorize and notwithstanding any other provisions of this act compensate for a special schedule or an extra or emergency trip in addition to any regular schedule over air mail routes or portions thereof at the same mileage rate paid for regular schedules on the contract route or routes, or at a lesser rate if agreed to by the contractor and the Postmaster General, and he may utilize therefor any scheduled passenger or express flight of the contractor between the terminal points or over a portion of any route whenever the needs of the service may so require: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, upon

application by an air mail contractor, authorize said contractor for his own convenience to transport air mail on any nonmail schedule or plane, with the understanding that the weights of mail so transported will be credited to regular mail schedules and no mileage compensation will be claimed therefor and the miles flown in such cases will not be computed in the annual aggregate of flown mileage authorized under this section."

SEC. 5. Subsection (a) of section 6 of such act of June 12, 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby empowered and directed, after notice and hearing, to fix and determine by order, as soon as practicable and from time to time, the fair and reasonable rates of compensation within the limitations of this act for the transportation of air mail by airplane and the service connected therewith over each air mail route, and over each section thereof covered by a separate contract, prescribing the method or methods by weight or space, or both, or otherwise, for ascertaining such rates of compensation, and to publish the same, which shall continue in force until changed by the said Commission after due notice and hearing, and so much of subsection (g) of section 3 of said act as is in conflict with this section is hereby repealed."

SEC. 6. Section 6 (e) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows:

"In arriving at such determination the Commission shall disregard losses resulting, in the opinion of the Commission, from the unprofitable maintenance of nonmail schedules, in cases where the Commission may find that the gross receipts from such schedules fail to meet the additional operating expense occasioned thereby.

"In fixing and determining such rates, if it shall be contended or alleged by the holder of an air mail contract that the rate of compensation in force for the service involved is insufficient, the burden of establishing such insufficiency and the extent thereof shall be assumed by him. In no case shall the rates fixed and determined by the said Commission hereunder exceed the limits prescribed in section 3 (a) of this act."

SEC. 7. Section 6 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby directed at least once in each calendar year from the date of the award of any contract to examine the books, accounts, contracts, and entire business records of the contracting company, to review the rates of compensation to be paid to the holder of such contract in order to be assured that no unreasonable profit is being derived or accruing therefrom and in order to fix just rates. In determining what may constitute an unreasonable profit the said Commission shall take into consideration the income derived from the operation of airplanes over the routes affected, and in addition to the requirements of section 4 hereof, shall take into consideration all forms of expenditures of said companies in order to ascertain whether or not the expenditures have been upon a fair and reasonable basis on the part of said company and whether or not the said company has paid more than a fair and reasonable market value for the purchase or rent of planes, engines, or any other types or kind, or class, or goods, or services, including spare parts of all kinds, and whether or not the air mail contracting company has purchased or rented any kind of goods, commodities, or services from any individuals who own stock in or are connected with the said contracting companies or has purchased such goods and services from any company or corporations in which any of the individuals employed by or owning stock in the air mail contracting company have any interest or from which such purchase or rents any of the employees or stockholders of air mail contracting company would be directly or indirectly benefited.

"Within 30 days after a decision has been reached by the Interstate Commerce Commission touching such profit a report of its results shall be made to the Postmaster General, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

SEC. 8. The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 6 is amended to read as follows:

"Any contract (1) let, extended, or assigned pursuant to the provisions of this act, and in full force and effect on March 1, 1935, or (2) which may be let subsequent to such date pursuant to the provisions of this act and shall have been satisfactorily performed by the contractor during its full initial period, shall, from and after such date, or from and after the termination of its initial period, as the case may be, be continued in effect for an indefinite period, and compensation therefor, on or after March 1, 1935, during such period of indefinite continuance, shall be paid at the rate fixed by order of the Commission under this act, subject to such additional conditions and terms as the Commission may prescribe, upon recommendation of the Postmaster General, which shall be consistent with the requirements and limitations contained in section 1 of this act; but any contract so continued in effect may be terminated for cause by the Commission upon 60 days' notice, upon such hearing and notice thereof to interested parties as the Commission may determine to be reasonable; and may also be terminated, in whole or in part, by mutual agreement of the Postmaster General and the contractor, or by the contractor at its option at 60 days' notice, or by the Postmaster General at his option at 60 days' notice."

SEC. 9. Section 7 (d) is amended to read as follows:

"No person shall be qualified to enter upon the performance of, or thereafter to hold an air mail contract, (1) if, at or after the time specified for the commencement of mail transportation under such contract, such person is (or, if a partnership, association, or corporation, has) a member, officer, or director, or an employee performing general managerial duties, that is, an individual who has theretofore entered into any unlawful combination to prevent the making of any bids for carrying the mails: *Provided*, That whenever required by the Postmaster General or Interstate Commerce Commission the bidder shall submit an affidavit executed by the bidder, or by such of its officers, directors, or general managerial employees as the Postmaster General or Interstate Commerce Commission may designate, sworn to before an officer authorized and empowered to administer oaths, stating in such affidavit that the affiant has not entered nor proposed to enter into any combination to prevent the making of any bid for carrying the mails, nor made any agreement, or given or performed, or promised to give or perform, any consideration whatever to induce any other person to bid or not to bid for any mail contract, or (2) if it pays any officer, director, or regular employee compensation in any form, whether as salary, bonus, commission, or otherwise, at a rate exceeding $17,500 per year for full time: *Provided further*, That it shall be unlawful for any such officer, director, or regular employee to draw a salary of more than $17,500 per year from any air mail contractor, or a salary from any other company if such salary from any company makes his total compensation more than $17,500 per year."

SEC. 10. Section 13 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. It shall be a condition upon the holding of any air mail contract that the rate of compensation and the working conditions and relations for all pilots and other employees of the holder of such contract shall conform to decisions heretofore or hereafter made by the National Labor Board, or its successor in authority, notwithstanding any limitation as to the period of its effectiveness included in any such decision heretofore rendered. This section shall not be construed as restricting the right of any such employees by collective bargaining to obtain higher rates of compensation or more favorable working conditions and relations."

SEC. 11. Section 15, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 15. After June 30, 1935, no person holding a contract or contracts for carrying air mail on a primary route shall be awarded or hold any contract for carrying air mail on any other primary route, nor on more than three additional routes other than primary routes. In case one person holds several contracts covering different sections of one air mail route as designated by the Postmaster General, such several contracts shall be counted as one contract for the purpose of the preceding sentence. It shall be unlawful for air mail contractors, competing in parallel routes, to merge or to enter into any agreement, express or implied, which may result in common control or ownership. After June 30, 1935, no air mail contractor shall be allowed to maintain passenger or express service off the line of his air mail route which in any way competes with passenger or express service available upon another air mail route, except that off-line competitive service which has been regularly maintained for at least 4 months next preceding July 1, 1935, and such seasonal schedules as may have been regularly maintained during the year prior to July 1, 1935, may be continued if restricted to the number of schedules and to the stops scheduled and in effect during such period or season: *Provided, however*, That if the Interstate Commerce Commission, after due notice to the Postmaster General and all parties in interest and a hearing thereon, shall be of the opinion that the public interest so requires, it may by order require the suspension or the decrease or may permit an increase in the frequency of such schedules.

"The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby authorized to hear any complaint filed by the Postmaster General or any interested air mail contractor setting forth that the general transport business or earnings upon an air mail route are being adversely affected by any off-line flights or extra schedules not provided for in the original contract, nor authorized by the Postmaster General, of another air mail contractor or for any alleged unfair practice by another air mail contractor. Upon the filing of such complaint the Commission shall give personal notice to the person complained of, inquire fully into the subject matter of the allegations; and if the Commission shall find such competition or practice, or any part thereof, to be unfair, or that such competitive service, in whole or in part, is not reasonably required in the interest of public convenience and necessity, then the Commission may enter an order requiring such air mail contractor to discontinue or restrict such competition or practice in accordance with the findings and order of the Commission, and the compensation of such air mail contractor shall be withheld while it continues to violate such order."

Mr. BULKLEY. I desire to ask that the bill go over, but I will withhold the objection temporarily.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there are several perfecting amendments which I wish to offer for the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the Senator from Vermont will be stated in order.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 9, line 16, after the word "route" and the semicolon, it is proposed to strike out the following provisos:

Provided, That the present route from Seattle to San Diego may be held and regarded as other than a primary route: *Provided further*, That the eastern coastal route from Newark (or New York

City, as the case may be) to Miami, Fla., and the southern transcontinental route from Boston via New York (or Newark, as the case may be) and Washington to Los Angeles, shall be designated as primary routes.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Provided, That the present routes from Seattle to San Diego and from Boston via Newark (or New York City, as the case may be) to Miami, Fla., may be held and regarded as other than primary routes: *Provided further*, That the southern transcontinental route from Boston via New York (or Newark, as the case may be) and Washington to Los Angeles, shall be designated as a primary route.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I understand it is proposed to strike out all the remainder of section 3 after the words "primary route" in line 16?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I could not hear the amendment as it was read by the clerk. Does the amendment make any change?

Mr. McKELLAR. None whatever.

Mr. KING. I should like to have some explanation of this bill. It is a very important one. I do not know whether under the 5-minute rule we ought to take it up for consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will let us take up amendments which have been offered by certain Senators, I shall make an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the amendment.

The next amendment to the committee amendment was, on page 14, line 19, after the word "contractor", to strike out the comma and the words "or by the contractor at its option at 60 days' notice, or by the Postmaster General at his option at 60 days' notice."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment to the committee amendment was, on page 17, line 10, after the word "maintained", to strike out "for at least 4 months next preceding" and to insert "prior to."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment to the amendment was, on page 17, line 12, after the word "maintained", to strike out "during the year."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to line 16, after the comma. Should not the words "on petition of any contractor interested or on its own initiative" be inserted there?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will send those words to the clerk he can state the amendment, and we can act on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 16, after the word "Commission", it is proposed to insert "on petition of any contractor interested or on its own initiative."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment, offered by Mr. McKELLAR to the committee amendment, was, on page 17, line 20, after the word "schedules", to insert "and after such hearing it may permit an air-mail contractor to maintain passenger or express service off the line of his air-mail route whether it competes with passenger or express service available upon another air-mail route or not."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment to the amendment was, on page 18, line 1, after the word "in", to strike out "the original contract" and to insert "this section."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment to the amendment was, on page 18, line 10, after the word "necessity", to insert "and is not permitted by this section."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will state for the benefit of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and for the benefit of other Senators that there was considerable opposition manifested to this bill by a number of Senators who cooperated with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], and we have finally agreed upon amendments which we think are satisfactory. The bill is satisfactory to the Department, and I hope the Senator from Utah will not object.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator let the bill go over until we have the next call of the calendar. I have had some correspondence about it and should like to check up on the effect of the amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator permit it to be called up tomorrow sometime? It has to go back to the House for consideration of the Senate amendments. Would the Senator be willing to have it passed and then, if he finds he desires reconsideration for any reason, I should be glad to agree to that.

Mr. BULKLEY. I should prefer that it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, referring to Order of Business No. 718, being the bill (H. R. 6511) to amend the air mail laws and to authorize the extension of the Air Mail Service, which went over until tomorrow at the request of the Senator from Ohio, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as amended today may be printed in the RECORD, so that all Senators may have an opportunity to examine it and see that it is all right.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the following amendments are made to the act of June 12, 1934, as amended by the act of June 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 933, 1243; 39 U. S. C. 469, Supp. VIII): Section 3 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"The Postmaster General is authorized to award contracts for the transportation of air mail by airplane between such points as he may designate, and for initial periods of not exceeding 3 years, to the lowest responsible bidders tendering sufficient guaranty for faithful performance in accordance with the terms of the advertisement at fixed rates per airplane-mile: *Provided*, That where the Postmaster General holds that a low bidder is not responsible or qualified under this act, such bidder shall have the right to appeal to the Comptroller General, who shall speedily determine the issue, and his decision shall be final: *Provided further*, That the base rate of pay which may be bid and accepted in awarding such contracts shall in no case exceed 33⅓ cents per airplane-mile for transporting a mail load not exceeding 300 pounds. Payment for transportation shall be at the base rate fixed in the contract for the first 300 pounds of mail or fraction thereof plus one-tenth of such base rate for each additional 100 pounds of mail or fraction thereof, computed at the end of each calendar month on the basis of the average mail load carried per mile over the route during such month, except that in no case shall payment exceed 40 cents per airplane-mile."

SEC. 2. Section 3 (c) is amended to read as follows:

"If, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, the public interest requires it, he may grant extensions of any route: *Provided*, That the aggregate mileage of all such extensions on any route in effect at one time shall not exceed 200 miles, and that the rate of pay for such extensions shall not be in excess of the rate fixed for the service thus extended."

SEC. 3. Section 3 (d) is amended to read as follows:

"The Postmaster General may designate certain routes as primary and as secondary routes. He shall designate as primary routes at least three transcontinental routes, with such termini as he may deem advisable, and, in addition thereto, such other routes as he may consider in the public interest, but no route less than 1,000 miles in length shall be designated as a primary route: *Provided*, That the present routes from Seattle to San Diego and from Boston via Newark (or New York City, as the case may be) to Miami, Fla., may be held and regarded as other than primary routes: *Provided further*, That the southern transcontinental route from Boston via New York (or Newark, as the case may be) and Washington to Los Angeles, shall be designated as a primary route."

SEC. 4. Section 3 (f) is amended to read as follows:

"The Postmaster General shall not award contracts for air mail routes or extend such routes in excess of an aggregate of 32,000 miles, and shall not pay for air mail transportation on such routes and extensions in excess of an annual aggregate of 45,000,000 airplane-miles. Subject to the foregoing, the Postmaster General shall prescribe the number and frequency of schedules, intermediate regular stops, and time of departure of all planes carrying air mail, with due regard for the volume of mail carried over each route and for connecting schedules, and he may under such regulations as he may prescribe authorize and notwithstanding any

other provisions of this act compensate for a special schedule or an extra or emergency trip in addition to any regular schedule over air mail routes or portions thereof at the same mileage rate paid for regular schedules on the contract route or routes, or at a lesser rate if agreed to by the contractor and the Postmaster General, and he may utilize therefor any scheduled passenger or express flight of the contractor between the terminal points or over a portion of any route whenever the needs of the service may so require: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, upon application by an air mail contractor, authorize said contractor for his own convenience to transport air mail on any nonmail schedule or plane, with the understanding that the weights of mail so transported will be credited to regular mail schedules and no mileage compensation will be claimed therefor and the miles flown in such cases will not be computed in the annual aggregate of flown mileage authorized under this section."

SEC. 5. Subsection (a) of section 6 of such act of June 12, 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby empowered and directed, after notice and hearing, to fix and determine by order, as soon as practicable and from time to time, the fair and reasonable rates of compensation within the limitations of this act for the transportation of air mail by airplane and the service connected therewith over each air mail route, and over each section thereof covered by a separate contract, prescribing the method or methods by weight or space, or both, or otherwise, for ascertaining such rates of compensation, and to publish the same, which shall continue in force until changed by the said Commission after due notice and hearing, and so much of subsection (g) of section 3 of said act as is in conflict with this section is hereby repealed."

SEC. 6. Section 6 (e) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows:

"In arriving at such determination the Commission shall disregard losses resulting, in the opinion of the Commission, from the unprofitable maintenance of nonmail schedules, in cases where the Commission may find that the gross receipts from such schedules fail to meet the additional operating expense occasioned thereby.

"In fixing and determining such rates, if it shall be contended or alleged by the holder of an air mail contract that the rate of compensation in force for the service involved is insufficient, the burden of establishing such insufficiency and the extent thereof shall be assumed by him. In no case shall the rates fixed and determined by the said Commission hereunder exceed the limits prescribed in section 3 (a) of this act."

SEC. 7. Section 6 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby directed at least once in each calendar year from the date of the award of any contract to examine the books, accounts, contracts, and entire business records of the contracting company, to review the rates of compensation to be paid to the holder of such contract in order to be assured that no unreasonable profit is being derived or accruing therefrom and in order to fix just rates. In determining what may constitute an unreasonable profit the said Commission shall take into consideration the income derived from the operation of airplanes over the routes affected, and in addition to the requirements of section 4 hereof, shall take into consideration all forms of expenditures of said companies in order to ascertain whether or not the expenditures have been upon a fair and reasonable basis on the part of said company and whether or not the said company has paid more than a fair and reasonable market value for the purchase or rent of planes, engines, or any other types or kind, or class, or goods, or services, including spare parts of all kinds, and whether or not the air mail contracting company has purchased or rented any kind of goods, commodities, or services from any individuals who own stock in or are connected with the said contracting companies or has purchased such goods and services from any company or corporations in which any of the individuals employed by or owning stock in the air mail contracting company have any interest or from which such purchase or rents any of the employees or stockholders of air mail contracting company would be directly or indirectly benefited.

"Within 30 days after a decision has been reached by the Interstate Commerce Commission touching such profit a report of its results shall be made to the Postmaster General, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

SEC. 8. The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 6 is amended to read as follows:

"Any contract (1) let, extended, or assigned pursuant to the provisions of this act, and in full force and effect on March 1, 1935, or (2) which may be let subsequent to such date pursuant to the provisions of this act and shall have been satisfactorily performed by the contractor during its full initial period, shall, from and after such date, or from and after the termination of its initial period, as the case may be, be continued in effect for an indefinite period, and compensation therefor, on or after March 1, 1935, during such period of indefinite continuance, shall be paid at the rate fixed by order of the Commission under this act, subject to such additional conditions and terms as the Commission may prescribe, upon recommendation of the Postmaster General, which shall be consistent with the requirements and limitations contained in section 1 of this act; but any contract so continued in effect may be terminated for cause by the Commission upon 60 days' notice, upon such hearing and notice thereof to interested parties as the Commission may determine to be reasonable; and may also be terminated, in whole or in part, by mutual agreement of the Postmaster General and the contractor.

SEC. 9. Section 7 (d) is amended to read as follows:

"No person shall be qualified to enter upon the performance of, or thereafter to hold an air mail contract, (1) if, at or after the time specified for the commencement of mail transportation under such contract, such person is (or, if a partnership, association, or corporation, has) a member, officer, or director, or an employee performing general managerial duties, that is, an individual who has theretofore entered into any unlawful combination to prevent the making of any bids for carrying the mails: *Provided*, That whenever required by the Postmaster General or Interstate Commerce Commission the bidder shall submit an affidavit executed by the bidder, or by such of its officers, directors, or general managerial employees as the Postmaster General or Interstate Commerce Commission may designate, sworn to before an officer authorized and empowered to administer oaths, stating in such affidavit that the affiant has not entered nor proposed to enter into any combination to prevent the making of any bid for carrying the mails, nor made any agreement, or given or performed, or promised to give or perform, any consideration whatever to induce any other person to bid or not to bid for any mail contract, or (2) if it pays any officer, director, or regular employee compensation in any form, whether as salary, bonus, commission, or otherwise, at a rate exceeding $17,500 per year for full time: *Provided further*, That it shall be unlawful for any such officer, director, or regular employee to draw a salary of more than $17,500 per year from any air mail contractor, or a salary from any other company if such salary from any company makes his total compensation more than $17,500 per year."

SEC. 10. Section 13 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. It shall be a condition upon the holding of any air mail contract that the rate of compensation and the working conditions and relations for all pilots and other employees of the holder of such contract shall conform to decisions heretofore or hereafter made by the National Labor Board, or its successor in authority, notwithstanding any limitation as to the period of its effectiveness included in any such decision heretofore rendered. This section shall not be construed as restricting the right of any such employees by collective bargaining to obtain higher rates of compensation or more favorable working conditions and relations."

SEC. 11. Section 15, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 15. After June 30, 1935, no person holding a contract or contracts for carrying air mail on a primary route shall be awarded or hold any contract for carrying air mail on any other primary route, nor on more than three additional routes other than primary routes. In case one person holds several contracts covering different sections of one air mail route as designated by the Postmaster General, such several contracts shall be counted as one contract for the purpose of the preceding sentence. It shall be unlawful for air mail contractors, competing in parallel routes, to merge or to enter into any agreement, express or implied, which may result in common control or ownership. After June 30, 1935, no air mail contractor shall be allowed to maintain passenger or express service off the line of his air mail route which in any way competes with passenger or express service available upon another air mail route, except that off-line competitive service which has been regularly maintained prior to July 1, 1935, and such seasonal schedules as may have been regularly maintained prior to July 1, 1935, may be continued if restricted to the number of schedules and to the stops scheduled and in effect during such period or season: *Provided, however*, That if the Interstate Commerce Commission, on petition of any contractor interested or on its own initiative after due notice to the Postmaster General and all parties in interest and a hearing thereon, shall be of the opinion that the public interest so requires, it may by order require the suspension or the decrease or may permit an increase in the frequency of such schedules and after such hearing it may permit an air mail contractor to maintain passenger or express service off the line of his air mail route, whether it competes with passenger or express service available upon another air mail route or not.'

"The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby authorized to hear any complaint filed by the Postmaster General or any interested air mail contractor setting forth that the general transport business or earnings upon an air mail route are being adversely affected by any off-line flights or extra schedules not provided for in this section, nor authorized by the Postmaster General, of another air mail contractor or for any alleged unfair practice by another air mail contractor. Upon the filing of such complaint the Commission shall give personal notice to the person complained of, inquire fully into the subject matter of the allegations; and if the Commission shall find such competition or practice, or any part thereof, to be unfair, or that such competitive service, in whole or in part, is not reasonably required in the interest of public convenience and necessity and is not permitted by this section, then the Commission may enter an order requiring such air mail contractor to discontinue or restrict such competition or practice in accordance with the findings and order of the Commission, and the compensation of such air mail contractor shall be withheld while it continues to violate such order."

PRACTICE BEFORE DEPARTMENTS BY NAVAL AND RESERVE CORPS OFFICERS

The bill (S. 1607) to amend section 109 of the Criminal Code so as to except officers of the Naval and Marine Corps

Reserve not on active duty from certain of its provisions was announced as next in order.

Mr. NYE. Let the bill go over.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, may I make an explanation before the bill is passed over?

Mr. NYE. Very well.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The substance of the proposed legislation is that naval and marine officers who are not on active duty shall not be subject to the criminal statutes which prohibit them from practicing before the Government departments. The question arose, and there was a decision that Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers not on active duty had no right or authority to practice before the departments on account of the general statute, which provides that officers may not prosecute claims before Government departments. The object of the bill is to suspend that feature of the statute insofar as it applies to Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers not on the active list.

Mr. McGILL. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that the law now applies only to Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers, but does not apply to Reserve officers of the Army.

Mr. TRAMMELL. That is correct.

Mr. McGILL. The bill would place Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers on exactly the same basis as are Reserve officers of the Army.

Mr. TRAMMELL. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it seems to me that the gentleman who rendered the decision did not know what the law was or he would not have made the ruling which he did. Two wrongs do not make a right. The bar should never have been let down with reference to Reserve officers of the Army.

Before the committee investigating the munitions industry we discovered that Reserve officers—in one case a Reserve officer of the Army—were actually contracting with the War Department for the sale of various commodities of war. In the particular case it happened to be poison gases. They were not only doing that but they were sending out catalogs to foreign countries trying to sell poison gases to them and volunteering to go to foreign countries to establish poison-gas factories and to train foreign armies and navies in the use of poison gases, and signing themselves, for instance, "Colonel, Reserve, United States Army." The catalogues contained pictures of the president of the company, the vice president of the company, and other leading officials of the company, all in the uniform of the Reserve Corps.

I say not only that Reserve officers ought not to be permitted to practice before the departments, either of the Army or the Navy, but they should not be permitted to contract with Government departments. Instead of making the regulations more lenient, we should make them more stringent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over.

Mr. NYE. Yes; let it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2590) for the relief of James E. McDonald was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LEWIS WORTHY AND DENNIS O. PENN

The bill (S. 1980) for the relief of Lewis Worthy and Dennis O. Penn was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States, to Lewis Worthy, private (1599113), $211.96, and Dennis O. Penn, private (1599044), $213.97, being amount of salary deducted on account of general court-martial sentences June 1918: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

NAVAL WARRANT OFFICERS' RETIRED PAY

The bill (S. 2460) to amend the act of June 6, 1924, entitled "An act to amend in certain particulars the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes", was announced as next in order.

Mr. NYE. Let the bill go over.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, may I make a brief explanation before the bill goes over? The purport of the bill is that an enlisted man who has been serving in the Navy upon retirement may have a warrant officer's retirement pay. Under the law he can leave the Navy, enlist in the Army, and go through that formality and be retired as a warrant officer as specified in the bill. The bill is to relieve the man who is retiring from the necessity of the perfunctory act of enlisting in the Army and being retired as a warrant officer. He can enlist and retire as a warrant officer through the Army in that way. The bill is merely to do an act of justice for the men and remove all the trouble and necessity for that procedure under the present law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

FOREIGN DECORATIONS FOR NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS OFFICERS

The bill (S. 1975) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy and officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps to accept such medals, orders, diplomas, decorations, and photographs as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered, was announced as next in order.

Mr. NYE. Let the bill go over.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to offer a perfecting amendment, an amendment containing the names of officers and enlisted men of the Army who are in the same position as the officers of the Navy and Marine Corps mentioned in the bill, and to have the amendment printed in the RECORD and pending?

Mr. NYE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the amendment proposed by Mr. SHEPPARD was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

That the following-named officers and enlisted men of the United States Army are hereby authorized to accept such medals, orders, diplomas, decorations, and photographs as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered:

Gen. Douglas MacArthur; Maj. Gen. Dennis E. Nolan; Maj. Gen. Malin Craig; Maj. Gen. Paul B. Malone; Maj. Gen. Frank Parker; Maj. Gen. Frank R. McCoy; Maj. Gen. Albert J. Bowley; Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois; Brig. Gen. Frank C. Bolles; Brig. Gen. Casper H. Conrad, Jr.; Brig. Gen. Andrew Moses; Brig. Gen. Thomas W. Darrah; Brig. Gen. Francis LeJ. Parker; Brig. Gen. Guy V. Henry; Brig. Gen. John W. Gulick; Brig. Gen. Robert C. Foy; Col. Joseph A. Baer; Col. Charles Burnett; Col. W. Goff Caples; Col. Edward Davis; Col. Charles W. Exton; Col. James Malcolm Graham; Col. W. Lee Hart; Col. Jacob C. Johnson; Col. Roy C. Kirtland; Col. Osmun Latrobe; Col. E. R. Warner McCabe; Col. Charles H. Patterson; Col. Russell P. Reeder; Col. Francis A. Ruggles; Col. Frederick W. Van Duyne; Col. Richard H. Williams; Lt. Col. Frank M. Andrews; Lt. Col. Lester D. Baker; Lt. Col. Reginald B. Cocroft; Lt. Col. John F. Curry; Lt. Col. Ernest J. Dawley; Lt. Col. Robert H. Fletcher, Jr.; Lt. Col. William W. Hicks; Lt. Col. Donald C. McDonald; Lt. Col. Frederick W. Manley; Lt. Col. Maxwell Murray; Lt. Col. Henry C. Pratt; Lt. Col. John W. N. Schulz; Lt. Col. Martin C. Shallenberger; Lt. Col. Daniel I. Sultan; Lt. Col. Edwin M. Watson; Lt. Col. Barton K. Yount; Maj. George E. Arneman; Maj. Rosenham Beam; Maj. Enrique M. Benitez; Maj. Peter C. Bullard; Maj. Henry B. Cheadle; Maj. Joseph O. Daly; Maj. Herbert A. Dargue; Maj. James A. Dorst; Maj. Asa N. Duncan; Maj. Charles R. Finley; Maj. Abraham Garfinckel; Maj. James A. Gillespie; Maj. Paul R. Hawley; Maj. Charles B. Hazeltine; Maj. Edgar Erskine Hume; Maj. George E. Lovell, Jr.; Maj. Davenport Johnson; Maj. Raymond E. McQuillin; Maj. Joseph J. O'Hare; Maj. James B. Ord; Maj. Alvan C. Sandeford; Maj. Martin F. Scanlon; Maj. James C. R. Schwenck; Chaplain (Major) Aristeo V. Simoni; Maj. Julia C. Stimson; Maj. Robert H. Van Volkenburgh; Maj. Robert LeG. Walsh; Maj. Charles A. Willoughby; Maj. Walter F. Winton; Capt. John R. D. Cleland; Capt. Carl W. Connell; Capt. Virgil N. Cordero; Capt. Robert E. Cummings; Capt. Thomas J. Davis; Capt. Vernon C.

DeVotie; Capt. Fernand G. Dumont; Capt. Ira C. Eaker; Capt. Richard E. Elvins; Capt. Muir S. Fairchild; Capt. James M. Gillespie; Capt. Leslie R. Groves, Jr.; Capt. Albert F. Hegenberger; Capt. Eugene J. Heller; Capt. Jack C. Hodgson; Capt. Arthur B. McDaniel; Capt. William J. McKiernan, Jr.; Capt. Eugene A. Regnier; Capt. Charles McK. Robinson; Capt. Timothy Sapia-Bosch; Capt. Kinsley W. Slauson; Capt. Bernard S. Thompson; Capt. Leonard D. Weddington; Capt. Ennis C. Whitehead; Capt. Royden Williamson; Capt. Ralph H. Wooten; First Lt. Joseph M. Glasgow; First Lt. John L. Hines, Jr.; First Lt. Kenneth C. Nichols; First Lt. Benjamin B. Talley First Lt. Hugh B. Waddell; Staff Sgt. Edward F. Springer; Sgt. Leslie B. Hopkins.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] the bill will be passed over.

ALLOWANCES FOR ENLISTED MEN'S QUARTERS AND SUBSISTENCE

The bill (S. 1976) to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes", approved April 15, 1926, so as to equalize the allowances for quarters and subsistence of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps was announced as next in order.

Mr. NYE. Let the bill go over.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what is his objection to the bill?

Mr. NYE. I have not had an opportunity to give the bill the consideration which I desire to give it. I have already called attention to some amendments which should be offered before this bill and others following it on the calendar are approved. I am not prepared at the moment to offer the amendments.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The bill has been pending on the calendar since May 24, just 1 month today. I respectfully ask the Senator if he thinks it would not be proper for him to state his objections? I think he should state what his objections are to the bill. It is not sufficient merely to say "I object to the bill."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The Senate is proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement to consider unobjected bills of the calendar. The Senator from North Dakota has objected, and the bill will be passed over on his objection.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2257) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty", to include officers assigned to duty at submarine training tanks and diving units, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PUNISHMENT FOR INCITING DISOBEDIENCE IN MILITARY FORCES

The bill (S. 2253) to make better provision for the government of the military and naval forces of the United States by the suppression of attempts to incite the members thereof to disobedience was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well. This is a short bill. The War Department and the Navy Department both favor it. They have asked that the bill be introduced and passed.

The bill simply provides that it shall be unlawful to circularize among the enlisted personnel of the Army and the Navy matter which tells them not to obey their officers. A number of pamphlets are in my office—I am sorry they are not here—which have been sent around the fleet. The pamphlets say that the men should not obey their officers; that they are all brothers; and call attention to several instances where troops in other countries have mutinied against their officers.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have read some of those pamphlets, and to my mind they are very, very bad. This bill ought by all means to be passed.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is the Senator able to tell me any reason why these regulations should be applied to the Army and Navy and not to the C. C. C. camps? For instance, I have in my possession a paper published at Maryville, in the State of Missouri, by one of the C. C. C. camps under the editorship of the commanding officer of the camp, a Lieutenant Taylor, which is devoted almost exclusively to a laudation of Mr. Lenin and very fulsome praise of the Soviet institutions.

Mr. KING. He ought to be court-martialed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have seen the pamphlet to which the Senator refers, and I should be very glad to support such a bill affecting the C. C. C. camps.

Mr. McKELLAR. So should I.

Mr. CLARK. However, I certainly am not going to object to the pending bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. This bill came here at the instance of the War Department and the Navy Department. It simply forbids and imposes a penalty for the act of circularizing information which incites or advises men in the Army or Navy not to obey their officers. It is a short bill, and I hope it will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever advises, counsels, urges, or solicits any member of the military or naval forces of the United States, including the reserves thereof, to disobey the laws or regulations governing such military or naval forces, or whoever publishes or distributes any book, pamphlet, paper, print, article, letter, or other writing which advises, counsels, urges, or solicits any member of such military or naval force of the United States to disobey the laws or regulations governing such military or naval forces, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 2. Any book, pamphlet, paper, print, article, letter, or other writing of the character described in section 1 of this act may be taken from any house or other place in which it may be found, or from any person in whose possession it may be, under a search warrant issued pursuant to the provisions of title XI of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes", approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 228; U. S. C., title 18, ch. 18).

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2582) to develop a strong American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid national defense, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. CLARK (and other Senators). Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PENSIONS FOR NEEDY BLIND PERSONS IN THE DISTRICT

The bill (H. R. 5711) to provide pensions for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations therefor was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. F. LUEDERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1084) for the relief of W. F. Lueders, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after "$5,595", to strike out "as compensation" and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the Government", and at the end of the bill to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to W. F. Lueders, of San Antonio, Tex., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,595 in full settlement of all claims against the Government for permanent injuries received and expenses incurred by reason of having been struck by a United States Army ambulance while riding in his own car in the city of San Antonio, Tex., on the 12th day of May 1930: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services

rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. W. M'PETERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1735) for the relief of the estate of W. W. McPeters, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$2,500", and at the end of the bill to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of W. W. McPeters, late of Madison County, N. C., the sum of $2,500, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the death of such W. W. McPeters, who was fatally injured through the negligence of employees of the Civil Works Administration while said employees were engaged in the construction of a road in Madison County, N. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1152) relating to the carriage of goods by sea was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) for designation of a street to be known as "Missouri Avenue" was announced as next in order.

Mr. BULKLEY. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 916) to carry into effect the decision of the Court of Claims in favor of claimants in French spoliation was announced as next in order.

Mr. BURKE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

GRADING AND CLASSIFICATION OF CLERKS IN FOREIGN SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 6504) to amend an act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America and providing compensation therefor" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BLANCHE L. GRAY

The bill (S. 2818) for the relief of Blanche L. Gray was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Blanche L. Gray, wife of Paul Judson Gray, late third Secretary, Department of State, the sum of $3,000, being 1 year's salary of her deceased husband, who died while in the Foreign Service; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sufficient sum to carry out the purpose of this act.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4901) to authorize appropriation to pay the annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and associated unions was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6673) providing for an annual appropriation to meet the share of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee on Aerial Legal Experts and for participation in the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and the commissions established by that committee was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

UNITED STATES COURT FOR CHINA

The bill (H. R. 7909) to amend the act creating a United States Court for China and prescribing the title thereof, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, this subject matter is under consideration by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, which is giving it special attention. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Vermont whether this bill ought not to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. AUSTIN. Perhaps it should be. It involves the same subject matter, though not the identical bill.

Mr. KING. I shall not make the request, but it seems to me the bill ought to go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to House bill 7909, to amend the act creating a United States Court for China and prescribing the title thereof. A similar bill—in fact, an identical one—is now pending before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask that House bill 7909 be referred to that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will recur to House bill 7909; and the question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 182) to provide for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History; and to authorize the President to extend an invitation for the next general assembly of the institute to meet in the United States in 1935, and to provide an appropriation for expenses thereof, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

RECONSTRUCTION OF ROADS AND BRIDGES IN FLOOD AREAS

The bill (S. 2551) to make immediately available the unexpended balances of certain appropriations for the construction or reconstruction of roads and bridges in the flood areas of Missouri, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Kentucky, and Alabama, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LONG. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President, I objected to Senate bill 2551, not understanding its purpose. I have no objection to the bill, and I ask unanimous consent to revert to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert:

That the unexpended balances of the road and bridge flood relief appropriations for the State of Alabama contained in the First Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1930, for the State of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Missouri contained in the act approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1381), and for the State of Kentucky contained in the act approved May 16, 1928 (45 Stat. 570), shall be and remain available until June 30, 1936, and may be expended for the purposes for which appropriated without being matched by like sums from State funds and without regard to any restrictions or limitations contained in the acts making or authorizing such appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2583) establishing certain commodity divisions in the Department of Agriculture was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING and Mr. LONG. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ANNUAL LEAVE OF AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES STATIONED ABROAD

The bill (S. 810) equalizing annual leave of employees of the Department of Agriculture stationed outside the continental limits of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a measure similar to this has twice passed the Senate. This bill merely provides that persons representing the Department of Agriculture in various places such as Panama, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii shall have equal annual leave. In one place the employees have 30 days' leave per year, and the leave accumulates. In Panama, for example, the employees have 15 days' leave. It takes a week to come from there to this country and a week to return and by that time their vacation has expired. The Senate has twice passed a similar bill.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That employees of the Department of Agriculture assigned to permanent duty outside the continental limits of the United States, including those in Alaska, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, without additional expense to the Government, be granted leave of absence not to exceed 30 days in any 1 year, which leave may, in exceptional and meritorious cases where an employee is ill, be extended, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, not to exceed 30 days additional in any 1 year; and, if any such employees shall elect to postpone the taking of any or all of the annual leave to which he may be entitled hereunder, he may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the interests of the public service, be allowed to take at one time unused annual leave which may have accumulated within not to exceed 4 years, and be paid at the rate prevailing at the time the leave is taken.

SEC. 2. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the foregoing are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2689) for the relief of the city of New York was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1389) to amend section 7, title I, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. LONG. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

APPEALS FROM DISTRICT PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

The bill (H. R. 3462) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913", and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to make a brief explanation of this bill if the Senator desires it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Maryland, let me say that at a recent meeting a number of the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia stated they understood that this bill, after it had been considered by the subcommittee, should be considered by the full committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct about that, except that he probably has forgotten that when he turned over the bill to the subcommittee he gave us one particular section to reconcile, and said that if we could reconcile it we were authorized to report the bill. On behalf of the committee and both sides of the controversy we finally agreed on the amendment which has been reported, and the committee felt bound to report the bill to the Senate; but it had no idea of going over the head of the full committee in doing so.

Mr. KING. I may say to the Senator that representatives of the District of Columbia came before the committee and said that the differences had not been reconciled, and that they were not in agreement with the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sure the gentleman who told the Senator that has misinformed him, because the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] sat with me on the subcommittee, and we sat one whole afternoon; and finally, when we worked out this amendment, both sides accepted it. It was accepted on behalf of the District of Columbia by Mr. Prettyman and Mr. Roberts, and accepted on behalf of the utilities by someone else. I have forgotten who represented them. I have no objection to the bill going over, however, if the Senator desires.

Mr. KING. That was my understanding; but Mr. Roberts came before the committee the other day and stated that he did not agree to what was done.

Mr. TYDINGS. The amendment which Mr. Roberts desired, the subcommittee never would have reported, and there would have been no use in holding a hearing, because Mr. Roberts wished to have a case go up to the court of appeals so that it could be decided only one way, no matter what the court of appeals found the record to be, and the subcommittee did not feel that that was fair.

Mr. KING. In the light of the objection made by Mr. Roberts, I feel constrained to ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the hour of 5 o'clock has arrived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the call of the calendar will be suspended.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next time the calendar is called for the consideration of unobjected bills we shall begin with the next order following the one acted upon at this call.

Mr. LONG. Is not that irregular?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. LONG. The reason for my inquiry is that I am interested in some bills that were passed over this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate can do anything by unanimous consent.

Mr. LONG. I object to that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not object. There are a great many bills on the calendar. As the Senator knows, they run to many hundreds of numbers beyond the measure we have just reached, and on several previous calls of the calendar we have begun at the beginning, we have gotten about this far through the calendar, when the call has had to be suspended, and there has been no opportunity for the consideration of bills further down the calendar.

Mr. LONG. I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that at the next call of the calendar the clerk shall begin the call of Calendar No. 839, the next bill on the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think that is a very fair request, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, that involves, I presume, the understanding that we are to consider unobjected bills on the calendar?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I said unobjected bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, in compliance with the order made earlier in the day.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of John Galleher to be State director, National Emergency Council, for Virginia.

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

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

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

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alice L. Woolman to be postmaster at Coweta, Okla.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that this nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Emick to be postmaster at Temple City, Calif.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that this nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters in Illinois.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that all the other nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

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

RECESS

Mr. KING. 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, Tuesday, June 25, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of May 13), 1935

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Helmer D. Carlson, Fox Lake.
Mary B. East, Highwood.
Leslie H. Ullrich, Kenilworth.
Joseph A. Masonick, Lake Bluff.
Helen L. Frank, Lake Zurich.
James A. Thomson, Ravinia.
Edna O. Trumbull, River Grove.
Gertrude M. Molidor, Round Lake.
James Fay Carr, Wauconda.
Herbert L. O'Connell, Wilmette.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Infinite God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for all the comforting and loving ministries of life, for the promise of each day, for the happiness of home, for friends whom we trust, whose presence is freshness and a sweet pulse of peace. We are most grateful for the revelation of Thy supreme sacrifice which woos us from our selfishness. At Thy command the mightiest powers of earth rise and fall; yet to Thee no falling tear is missed. O Holy Presence, keep aglow the lamps of devotion on the altars of our hearts. We commend unto Thee our President, our Speaker, and the Congress. Help us all to go forward to the tasks of the day in faith, hope, and the spirit of brotherly love; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 21, 1935, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7652. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the Federal Reserve Board, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 5917. An act to provide for the appointment of 2 additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, 1 additional judge for the circuit court, ninth judicial circuit, and an additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. KING, Mr. McADOO, and Mr. BORAH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be held in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936, and authorizing the President to invite foreign countries and nations to participate therein, and for other purposes.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table for 45 minutes.

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

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, and I think under the circumstances probably I will have to object, I would like to know what the program is for tomorrow and the succeeding 2 or 3 days?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that probably the merchant-marine bill will come up tomorrow under a rule.

Mr. SNELL. And that will take 2 days or such a matter?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot state.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If we bring in a rule for the consideration of the merchant-marine bill and take it up tomorrow, we hope that we will finish it tomorrow.

Mr. SNELL. And what do you expect to follow that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think we have in mind the public-utility holding bill or the T. V. A.

Mr. SNELL. The public-utility holding bill has not been reported yet, and I think we ought to have a reasonable notice before that is taken up.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the business before the House today is the District of Columbia matters, and it will probably not take more than 2 hours. It seems to me that gentlemen who desire to make extra speeches might get in this afternoon rather than interfere with business tomorrow. We have some time on our hands this afternoon, and I do not feel that they should interfere with important business.

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

Mr. SNELL. In view of the statement made by the Chairman of the Rules Committee the other day, I object.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I shall have to object.

Mr. DIES. May I have 1 minute?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas for 1 minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, my beloved friend and distinguished colleague, Hon. O. H. CROSS, has formally announced that he will not be a candidate for reelection and that he intends to retire from public life. This announcement came as a surprise and keen disappointment to his many thousands of devoted and admiring friends throughout the country. At the conclusion of his present term he will have served in Congress 8 years. There is no Member of this distinguished body more highly esteemed or more universally loved than Mr. CROSS. By his kind and gentle ways, his tolerant understanding of the frailties of others, his rugged and honest character, and his keen sense of humor he has endeared himself to everyone of his associates, and his retirement will not only be a distinct loss to his associates in Congress but also to his district and the Nation. Few men have reached his period in life with so many achievements to their credit as our beloved friend. Not only was he successful in private life and in his pursuit of the legal profession but he has the unique distinction of never having been defeated for any public office to which he aspired. This is a tribute to his sterling qualities.

Mr. CROSS is essentially a self-made man. He began the practice of law without any money and he went through the trying experiences which confront every young lawyer who is compelled to rely upon his own resources. I shall always remember the story which he told me of his first experience as a practicing attorney. His first fee was $5, which was paid in advance. After he had accepted the employment and his client had left, he went to the grocery store and bought several loaves of bread and a pound of butter, returned to his office, and, behind locked doors, proceeded to place himself on the outside of the bread and butter. Many young men would have given up in despair under the same circumstances, but with perseverance, honesty, and close application to work our friend climbed the ladder of success.

In recognition of his splendid mind he was elevated to the important Committee on Banking and Currency. As a member of that committee he has devoted himself diligently to the problems of finance and currency until he is now regarded as one of the outstanding authorities in this country on the subject of money and finance. Few men have ever mastered this intricate subject so thoroughly as our friend. Ever since his election to Congress he has been intensely interested in this subject. I recall that he was one of the first Members of the House to advocate the remonetization of silver. He was responsible for getting many interested in the subject and, in fact, taught me much of the little knowledge that I have on the silver question. He introduced the first bill in either branch requiring the purchase of silver and the issuance of certificates to pay for it. While he did not serve on the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee and could not, therefore, be the author of the bill, his original bill was used by all other Members and formed the background of the silver movement in the House which finally culminated in the passage of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, of which I had the honor to be the author. I know of no Member of this House who has contributed more to the understanding of this complicated subject than he. Believing that the money question was of transcendent importance and that it was the major factor in producing the depression, he never ceased to exert himself in season and out of season in an effort to impress upon the Membership of the House and Senate the necessity of solving it in the interest of the people. Many of the proposals which he advocated at a time when they were little understood and, in fact, unpopular have been written upon the statute books. Many other proposals which he has advanced in the committee and on the floor will eventually be enacted into law.

It has been my pleasure to have served with him for 5 years, and during all that time I have never known a man more devoted to the welfare of the common man than he. Unlike many men of substantial means, he has been a consistent progressive in the field of legislation. He has at all times been independent and fearless in the advocacy of measures that were designed to do the greatest good to the greatest number. I have known of instance after instance where my friend CROSS voted against his own financial interest because he thought it was right and for the best interest of the plain people.

His genial and happy disposition and his tolerant understanding of the frailties of others has made him one of the most popular Members that ever served in this body. In the cloakroom, Members like to gather around him and bask under the sunlight of his cheerful smile. While advanced in years, he has the viewpoint of youth, and the younger Members enjoy his association as well as those of his own age. The philosophers of old have said that the highest achievement which any man can reach is the mastery of self. Many men have been able to conquer kingdoms; few to conquer themselves. The highest tribute which I can pay to our beloved friend is to say that he has conquered himself. I have never known a man so temperate in all of his habits as Mr. CROSS. The great philosopher Aristotle preached the doctrine of the happy medium. CROSS is a disciple of that doctrine. He is not given to extremes. Believing that all extremes are probably wrong, my friend CROSS can usually be found in the middle between the extremes. Coming from the ranks of the common people, he has never lost that understanding of their needs and that appreciation of their sturdy qualities which distinguishes a great man from a little one.

Some people measure success by the money that a man has accumulated and the fortunes amassed. Some there are who define success in terms of military fame or literary genius. In terms of material accomplishments, my friend CROSS can certainly be classified as a successful man. But many of us believe that there are higher standards of success than this, and it is in terms of real success that we take pleasure in pronouncing CROSS a successful man. It can certainly be said of him that he has achieved success because he lived well, laughed often, and loved much; that he gained the respect of intelligent men and the love of little children; that he looked for the best in others and always gave the best that he had; that he always appreciated life's values and never failed to express it; that he made it a rule not to prejudge others lest he condemn himself. It is because he deeply and unselfishly loves his fellow man that his fellow man loves him.

It is to be deeply regretted that such a man should retire from public service, for which he is so well adapted and qualified. During these uncertain and perilous times men like CROSS are more needed than ever before. Many of us are still in the hope that his people will persuade him to continue his wonderful work in the Halls of Congress. But we can well understand the motives which actuate his retirement. He has certainly earned such retirement by his splendid services.

Congress will not be the same when he is gone. During the trying times through which we have all gone, CROSS has been a guiding light to many of us, and a source of inspiration and encouragement. And as he goes back to private life to enjoy the fruits of a well-spent life, he will carry with him the richest reward which any man may receive on this earth—the consciousness of duties well done, and the esteem, the love, and gratitude of his fellow Members.

While, like many of us, he will not leave behind him a portrait or sculpture in the Rotunda of the Capitol, nevertheless the memory of his kindly ways and constructive service will be enshrined in our hearts, and upon the tablets of our memory his name will be carved as one who served well and faithfully and who loved his fellow man.

And I bespeak the sentiments of my colleagues of both parties when I wish for him that peace of mind which passes all understanding. May the evening of his life be spent in the midst of his loving family and his grateful friends, for whom he has worked so unselfishly and so successfully.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a letter of tribute and appreciation from some of the leading constituents and friends of Mr. CROSS.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. How long is it?

Mr. DIES. It is not very long.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

BELTON, TEX., *June 20, 1935.*

Hon. O. H. CROSS,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE CROSS: We have just learned that it is not your purpose to be a candidate for reelection to Congress in 1936. We know that we will miss you and the splendid service and fine cooperation which you have always rendered so willingly for 8 long years. We realize that you have been working under a great strain and tension, brought about by the unusual chaotic condition of our economic affairs which has been honeycombed with dissatisfaction, communism, etc., on every hand, resulting in a spectacle the like of which we have never witnessed before! We know, though, that during the nerve-racking stress and strain of it all you have been true to your convictions, courageous and fearless in the discharge of your duties, and fulfilling your promises to the people who honored you with this important trust. Honesty and sincerity of purpose has actuated you in every movement.

Your illustrious record in Congress speaks for itself and there is nothing that we could say which would raise the high standard of statesmanship which you have already established for yourself in the sacred halls of Congress! Your public and private life has been clean, wholesome, and uplifting, ever pulsating with a warm and kindly interest in your friends, and ever willing to listen to those who needed your helpful guidance, advice, and assistance. Your service in Congress has been an inspiration to us and we are convinced that it will, indeed, be difficult to find a man who can take the torch which you soon will pass to your successor and hold it with the same firm and steady grip which has characterized your service at Washington!

Your efficient service, embracing as it did personal and detailed attention to every letter and inquiry of any importance with the promptness and dispatch of an efficient manager of a modern successful business, your attention to the varied and perplexing problems which we have brought to you from time to time, have all been appreciated more than we can tell you; and it is but natural that you have endeared yourself to us; and it is but a natural course of events that your name has been inscribed for all time to come upon our "tablets of love and memory."

We know that you have devoted all your time, thought, talents, and energies in advocating and encouraging the highest and noblest principles of life and aiding in the enactment of just and righteous laws that will aid in making America a better place in which to live. You have not practiced hypocrisy in your politics; you have not played the part of a demagogue; you have been a real statesman in the true sense of the word, dependable, "faithful as a bridge of stars"—true as steel. We know, too, that you have especially enjoyed the friendship and comradeship of your colleagues in Congress. You will miss these pleasant associations. And while you will miss these pleasant and refreshing contacts, we know, yet when you come back to your own Elevent District, back to Waco, back to Belton, and the other towns in your district, you will come back to friends and loved ones who have known you much longer than your associates in the Capital City; and you will be welcomed back in your own home district by hearts that are just as loving and just as faithful as ever welcomed a statesman home. Yes; you will miss your Washington friends, but remember:

There is no friend like an old friend
Who has shared our morning days;
No greeting like his welcome,
No homage like his praise.
Fame is a scentless sunflower
With gaudy crown of gold,
But friendship is a breathing rose
With scents in every fold.

Your friends,

OWEN P. CARPENTER.	E. W. POTTS.
A. G. VICK.	D. C. KEETCH.
ROY C. POTTS.	C. G. PARKER.
R. B. JAMES.	TED WHITLOW.
JESSE S. BLAIR.	V. R. MEANS.
A. ROY MITCHELL.	MARY DEANE CARPENTER.
E. W. CLINE.	A. W. JACKSON.
W. E. CLINE.	NATE CARPENTER.
A. H. POTTS.	

OLD-AGE PENSIONS—CONTRIBUTIONS OF STATES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I object.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I do this to call the attention of the House to the Russell amendment that was adopted to the security bill in the Senate. The House tried several times during the consideration of the security bill to place an amendment on the bill whereby the States could receive Federal aid for pensioners without contribution for a period of time. The Senate amendment allows the $15 a month to be paid for 2 years in those States that are unable to meet the financial requirements. I think the House would be justified in keeping this Russell amendment in the security bill, and if the conferees refuse to accept the amendment, I think it is the duty of the House to vote down the conference report and ask the House conferees to recede from their objections to the Senate amendments.

To further call the attention of the House to the value of this amendment, I have addressed the following letter to my colleagues.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1935.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The following amendment offered by Senator RUSSELL was inserted in the social security bill in the Senate:

"*Provided,* That in order to assist the aged of the several States who have no State system of old-age pensions until an opportunity is afforded the several States to provide for a State plan, including financial participation by the States, and notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State for each quarter until July 1, 1937, to be used exclusively as old-age assistance, in lieu of the amount payable under the provisions of clause (1) of this subsection, an amount sufficient to afford old-age assistance to each individual within the State who at the time of such expenditure is 65 years of age or older, who is declared by such public-welfare agency of the State as may be designated by the Governor thereof, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Social Security Board, to be entitled to receive the same: *Provided further,* That no person who is an inmate of a public institution shall receive such old-age assistance, nor shall any individual receive an amount in excess of $15 per month."

I am informed that a majority of the House conferees, Congressmen DOUGHTON, HILL, CULLEN, TREADWAY, and BACHARACH, are opposed to retaining this amendment.

The retention of the Russell amendment is the only thing that will make the social security bill function in many States, until such time as the States can qualify. I earnestly hope that you will support the Russell amendment by contacting the House conferees either personally or by mail, to induce them to retain this amendment. If this amendment is taken out in conference, I hope a sufficient number of House Members will vote against the acceptance of the conference report and demand that the Russell amendment be put back into the bill.

Sincerely yours,

SURPLUS COMMODITIES PURCHASED

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution of the Florida Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Florida Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 20. It urges the Federal relief organization to purchase from Florida its proportional part of fish, same to be distributed to relief clients; this contention is just and proper, the resolution follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 20

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida in session assembled (the house of representatives concurring):

Whereas under $6,000,000 worth of commodities have been shipped into the State during the last year, principally packing-house products from Chicago and other Midwestern areas, and distributed by officials in charge of rehabilitation of relief classes; and

Whereas the fishermen of the State of Florida had been overlooked, and have been unable to dispose of any of their products to any of the above-mentioned agencies: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the senate and house concurring, respectfully and earnestly request the President of the United States to direct the Federal agencies purchasing commodities for distribution to relief clients within this State and other southeastern parts, a proportionate part of the fish production within this State.

Be it resolved, That a copy of this resolution under the great seal of the State of Florida be forwarded to the President of the United States, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and a copy to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Florida.

Approved June 4, 1935.

Filed in office secretary of state June 5, 1935.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEPPEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes upon the subject of the department racketeers and Treasury raiders in the city of Washington.

Mr. BLANTON. Make it 1 minute.

Mr. HOEPPEL. I cannot tell about the racketeers in 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California to address the House for 5 minutes?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PROPOSED RENT COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a very important bill vitally affecting the people residing in the District of Columbia is scheduled to come before the House this afternoon. I hope Members will stay here and help us keep it off the statute books. I refer to the bill proposing a new rent commission.

We who were here during the war remember the old rent commission, which did not do a scintilla of good, which did not reduce the rents, but raised rents, and cost a lot of money. It took us years to get it off the statute books and to stop expense. It amounted to nothing in the world but placing an army of job seekers on salaries, and they performed no service of any value. It put the Government in the boarding-house business.

We should stop this rent commission bill which is coming up today. We are going to adjourn before very long and go home. In a short time we will be gone from here and our secretaries will be gone from here and thousands of people will be going out of Washington and going to their homes and rents will come down in Washington automatically.

And before we come back in January, if Washington landlords again attempt to hold us up, we will arrange to get quarters over in nearby Virginia or Maryland. We already know too much about rent commissions. We want to stop this bill, that puts another burden on the people here in Washington, and will accomplish nothing worth while, and all of us know that it is unconstitutional. There is no World War on now to create the necessary emergency.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

S. D. McREYNOLDS,
SOL BLOOM,
Managers on the part of the House.

KEY PITTMAN,
JOE T. ROBINSON,
WM. E. BORAH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment:

The House amendment provided that all appointments to the Union Conference shall be made by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. The House recedes.

S. D. McREYNOLDS,
SOL BLOOM,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear what the Clerk read, but I suppose the amendment from which the House recedes is that amendment providing that appointments to the union conference shall be made by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes. We followed the usual custom of letting the President of the local union make the appointments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

THE ASSAULT UPON THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I delivered last Saturday at Worcester, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered last Saturday at Worcester, Mass.:

Some years ago, in Independence Hall at Philadelphia, I first saw the room in which on July 4, 1776, John Hancock affixed his signature to the Declaration of Independence in letters so large that King George would be able to read it without putting on his spectacles, and in which 11 years later the representatives of 13 jealous and suspicious States argued and labored for nearly 4 months "to form a more perfect union." I was invited to sit for a moment in the chair which Washington occupied while he presided over the Constitutional Convention and to sign my name in a visitors' register placed on the table upon which he must have pounded again and again with his gavel when spirits ran high and debate became acrimonious. My attention was called to a design painted on the upper part of the chair—a half-disc of the sun, with extended rays. It was to that symbol Benjamin Franklin pointed when, after the final draft of the Constitution had been accepted, he rose and said, "I have often and often, in the course of these sessions and in the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to their issue, looked at that [sun] behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting, but now at length I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

I feel that it is appropriate on this midsummer day, when we are gathered in conformity with an ancient custom which goes back to the time when our pagan ancestors met on each recurring solstice to rejoice in the return of the sun, to consider again the meaning of the symbol which 148 years ago was the object of Franklin's thought and solicitude. Is the sun of ordered liberty still rising in the American sky?

The American Constitution is today the oldest written constitution in the world. It has served as the model for many other constitutions since adopted. It has been copied both in Europe and in the Americas. At the time of its adoption it was unique; it was based on a new conception of the relationship existing between those who govern and those who are governed.

The framers of the older constitutions had proceeded on the theory that the ultimate power resides in the Government, and that the people have only such rights and privileges as the Government, through the Constitution, is willing to grant or forced to yield.

The men who sat in Philadelphia in 1787 had an entirely different idea. They drew their inspiration from the revolutionary doctrine enunciated in the Declaration of Independence that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Sovereignty, they held, resides in the people, governmental power originates in the people, and a government therefore can have and exercise only such powers as the people yield. Thus, while other constitutions had been grants from the government to the people, ours was a grant from the people to the Government. Consequently, the Government established by the Constitution was one of limited powers.

It should be noted also that the men who framed the Constitution sat in the Convention as representatives of their respective States, and that the Constitution which they wrote had to be adopted by the States as such before it could become effective. Those States were independent; they were in effect nations, and they had governments which, like the Federal Government that was being set up, were clothed only with such powers as the people had given.

We find therefore that after the Constitution of the United States was adopted this situation existed: First, all powers except those which the people had delegated remained in the people; second, those powers which the people had given to the States remained in the States unless and until surrendered to the Federal Government; and, third, the Federal Government had only such powers as had been surrendered to it by the States or delegated to it by the people. The Federal Government was one of definitely limited and specifically enumerated powers. It is important to remember that it was not a national government, but a Federal system of government that the founding fathers established.

In order to safeguard the liberties of the people, the framers of the Constitution set up a system of checks and balances. They distributed the powers of government among three separate departments—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. To Congress, and to Congress alone, they gave the power to pass laws. To the President, and to the President alone, they gave the authority to enforce laws. To the courts, and to the courts alone, they gave the responsibility to interpret and apply laws in cases in which the rights of litigants were in question.

There was a reason for this sharp demarcation between legislative, executive, and judicial functions. The framers of the Constitution knew history. They knew that at one time the king's will was law; they knew that he not only legislated, but in many instances heard and decided cases. They knew that the struggle for liberty had in the main been one to transfer the power to make laws from the king to the representatives of the people, and the power to interpret and apply laws from the king to an independent judiciary. The framers of the Constitution were determined to preserve the gains the people had won by hundreds of years of struggle, and therefore they were careful to enumerate the separate powers of the three departments of the Government.

Furthermore, recognizing that the tyranny of the many may be just as oppressive as the despotism of the few, the fathers wrote into the Constitution a bill of rights. They fixed boundaries beyond which the people themselves could not go in transgressing upon the freedom of the individual.

In his "Republic" Plato had declared that the "chief object in the construction of the state is the greatest happiness of the whole and not that of any part." While the authors of the American Constitution also recognized the importance of promoting the "general welfare", they were wiser than Plato in that they knew that the "greatest happiness of the whole" is best served when every man who is a part of the whole is secure in the possession of certain rights and liberties which a capricious temporary majority cannot take away.

The ideal society is one which recognizes that it exists for men and not men for it; which gives to every person freedom and opportunity to achieve to the full measure of his capacity, and which seeks in the development of the individual character the fulfillment of its highest purpose.

The men who built this Nation did not, like some of their decadent sons, inveigh against "rugged individualism." On the contrary, they gloried in it. They followed no cult of mediocrity, they sought no dead leveling of society. They did not waste their time dreaming of an economic order in which every man should have the same amount of income, live in the same kind of house, wear the same kind of clothes, own the same number of acres, and maintain the same bank balance as every other man. They recognized that nature, which never gives to any two trees the same foliage or even to any two blades of grass the same structure and form, does not invest any two men with the same capacity. They knew that some, by reason of greater foresight, more talents, and better self-control inevitably outstrip their fellows. When the founding fathers said that "all men are created equal", they did not refer to equality of ability or wealth or position, but to equality of right and opportunity.

So today, if we follow the fathers and heed the Constitution which they wrote, we shall seek the answer to our social questions, not in a dead leveling of society, but in the removal of artificial handicaps and the withdrawal of special privileges; we shall find the solution of our economic problem, not in tearing down our neighbor's house, but in building one of our own. There is enough sporting blood in the average American to make him willing to take his chance if he is given a fair field where there are no favors.

Our ideal of America was well expressed by James A. Garfield when he said that "while European society is stratified like the rocks in the earth, ours is stratified like the ocean, where from the sternest deeps any drop may rise to glisten on the highest wave that rolls." Such a society we can have under the Constitution, without confiscation, without regimentation, and without destroying our social and economic order.

Thus far, in developing my subject, I have sought to show that the Constitution adopted by the fathers set up a Governmental system in which all powers not granted to the Government were reserved to the people; in which the States were as essential and important as the Nation; in which the powers of government were divided among three departments, none of which might encroach on either of the other two; and in which the individual had rights which no Government, State or Federal, could take away.

Is that system adequate for today, or should it be either scrapped or so modified as to alter its framework substantially?

This is not a political meeting, and I shall respect the proprieties of the occasion by not making a political speech, admitting that adherence to that pledge will somewhat cramp my style.

Personally, I am not ready to concede that there is any present economic or social problem that cannot be solved without fundamentally changing the Constitution. I say "fundamentally", for I freely admit that amendments may properly be adopted from time to time in the future, as they have been in the past, to meet situations due to changing conditions. The very fact that the Constitution prescribes the manner in which it may be amended shows that it was intended that it would be amended. But what I would especially stress is that while we may find it necessary to make occasional adjustments, we should approach with caution all proposals to abridge individual liberty or to alter the essential framework of the Federal system.

Recently there was introduced in the House of Representatives an amazing resolution. It proposed a constitutional amendment providing that "the Congress shall have power to make all laws which in its judgment shall be necessary to provide for the general welfare of the people."

I prefer to believe, as charity should prompt us to do, that the author of that resolution did not realize the full import of the language which he used: "The Congress shall have power to make all laws which in its judgment shall be necessary to provide for the general welfare of the people."

If that amendment were adopted, Congress could pass any law, howsoever it conflicted with provisions of the Constitution, that in the opinion of a majority of those temporarily sitting in the Senate and the House of Representatives would be for the general welfare.

A mere statute, enacted by representatives of the people, might supersede the fundamental law adopted by the people themselves. Accordingly an act of Congress would have greater validity than the Constitution. The net effect, of course, would be that we would have no Constitution.

Every provision of the Bill of Rights would be subject to abrogation. If Congress decided that it was for the welfare of the people to suspend the right of free speech, it could suspend that right. If Congress decided that it was for the welfare of the people to outlaw newspapers whose editorial policy was in conflict with the policy of the party in power, it could destroy the freedom of the press. If a majority of the Members of Congress held the view that has been officially accepted in one part of the world, that "religion is the opium of the masses", they could give effect to that view by prohibiting the free exercise of religion. If they believed that communism is preferable to individual ownership of property, they could confiscate any farm, any factory, and even any home in America.

Under such a provision Congress could usurp every power of the States; it could tear down State boundaries and destroy the Federal system. It could change the tenure and the manner of the election of its own Members. It could divest the courts of their jurisdiction. By the two-thirds vote required to override a veto, it could pass a law depriving the President of his right of veto. It could strip him of his power, or if it wished, make him a dictator. The adoption of the proposed amendment would make it possible for Congress to do in the United States everything that Mussolini has done in Italy, or Hitler in Germany.

If you think I have found in the language a meaning that is not there, let me read it again: "The Congress shall have power to make all laws that in its judgment shall be necessary to provide for the general welfare of the people."

A second resolution now pending in Congress calls for a constitutional amendment providing that "no court of the United States, or of any State, shall declare unconstitutional or void any law enacted by the Congress of the United States. All laws of the United States shall remain in full force and effect throughout the United States until repealed by the Congress of the United States, or until vetoed or repudiated by the action of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. The tenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed."

What is the tenth amendment which the author of this resolution would repeal? "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

If the tenth amendment were repealed the States would have no rights which the Congress would be bound to respect. The Federal Government, instead of being one of limited powers would become one of absolute power. The States if it suited the whim of a congressional majority, might be made merely geographical units, existing for the sole purpose of electing Congressmen. Such an amendment would not only repeal the last of the 10 articles of the bill of rights, but would place in Congress the power to nullify the other nine. Against the tyranny of any law the citizen could not assert any constitutional right, for no court would have jurisdiction to hear a case in which the constitutionality of any act of Congress was challenged.

It is difficult to believe that even the stress of economic necessity, serious as it is, would ever induce the people even to consider a proposal designed to destroy so completely the American form of Government.

Of late it has become a popular pastime among those who have been frustrated in their effort to reach Utopia by a legislative detour to challenge the right of the Supreme Court to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional. Even the President of the United States, at a press conference that has already become historic, in an unguarded moment gave utterance to some opinions which he may have occasion to regret.

The right and duty of the Supreme Court to consider the validity of the laws it is called upon to interpret and apply arise out

of the very nature of our constitutional system. We have two kinds of law, constitutional and statutory, the one springing from the people themselves, the other from their legislative representatives. The Constitution is, in effect, a power of attorney given by the principal, the American people, to the agent, the Congress of the United States. The acts of an agent, if within the terms of the power, are binding upon his principal; if not within the power, they have no validity. We have a Constitution which is the supreme law of the land, and statutes which are law only insofar as they do not conflict with the supreme law.

A and B are engaged in litigation. A asserts his right under an act of Congress; B asserts his under a provision of the Constitution, with which the statute is in conflict. The case comes to the Supreme Court for a final decision. Shall the Court decide in favor of A, who relies on a mere statute, or in favor of B, who rests his cause on the supreme law of the land? If the Court decides in favor of B it invalidates the statute and sustains the Constitution; if it decides in favor of A it sustains the statute and invalidates the Constitution. When faced with the dilemma of having to invalidate either the statute or the Constitution, what should the court do? To ask the question is to answer it.

There are those who, while chafing under judicial decisions they don't like, do not care to go so far as to deny the Supreme Court the power to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, but demand that the Constitution be so amended that a two-thirds vote would be necessary for a judicial veto. Pointing to occasional 5-to-4 decisions, they decry the fact that it is possible for "one old man" to nullify the action of a majority of both the House and the Senate, and of the President as well. The argument is so plausible that it wins many supporters, but it is wholly specious.

It is important to remember that the issues upon which courts are asked to pass are not moot questions, but questions involving the rights of litigants. If the Constitution were so changed that it would require a 6-to-3 instead of a 5-to-4 decision to invalidate an act of Congress, the rights of litigants who challenge a statute would be impaired. Thus, in the hypothetical case I have cited, B, who rests his claim on the Constitution, would have to convince 6 of the 9 judges that he was right; A, who relies on the statute, would have to win only 4 to his side. In other words, A might win the case although 5 of the 9 judges thought he was wrong. Surely this would be not only a repudiation of the generally accepted principle of the majority rule, but a gross denial of justice.

There is nothing undemocratic in the procedure under which a majority of one may invalidate an act of Congress. One vote frequently decides the fate of a bill, or of an amendment thereto, in the House and the Senate; and a bill passed by both Houses is often killed by one man, the President of the United States. Those who argue that a two-thirds vote should be required to invalidate an act might with equal consistency demand that it should require a two-thirds vote in both Houses of the Congress to pass it.

Whenever it is thought desirable to amend the Constitution, let those who ask for an amendment submit their proposal in the manner provided in the Constitution to the people from whom the Constitution itself issued. Let there be no amendment by indirection, whether through the device of unconstitutional legislation or by tampering with the composition of the Supreme Court.

As the almost precipitate adoption of the twenty-first amendment showed, it is not impossible or even difficult to make any change in the fundamental law that the people want made.

Ratification might conceivably be accomplished by a majority of one, either in the legislature or in a constitutional convention, in each of 36 States. Those States might be the smallest—those which in 1932 supplied in the aggregate only one-third of the total vote. In each of those States the majority members of the legislature or convention might conceivably be elected by a bare majority, or even by a mere plurality, of the electors. Therefore, inasmuch as those voters who constituted a bare majority in one-half of the legislative districts in States casting one-third of the Nation's vote might decide the issue, it is at least theoretically possible for a little more than one-twelfth of the voters in the United States to change its Constitution.

While it is readily admitted that it is quite improbable that 40,000,000 votes would ever be so distributed that three and one-third million would bring about a change in the fundamental law of the land, the figures I have presented show that organizing the electorate toward that end is not an insuperable task.

Men who are influential in the Nation are at the present time advocating a change in the commerce clause of the Constitution.

Although such a change would not have the sweeping consequences of the proposals I have heretofore enumerated, it would, in view of the preponderance of the Nation's economic interest, hold possibilities for disturbing the balance between the State and national jurisdictions that should suggest caution. Any general shifting of responsibility in relation to intrastate commerce from the State capitals to Washington might lead to consequences that would be regretted.

The submission of the child labor amendment now pending represents the right procedure.

If authority is sought for the enactment of a Federal minimum-wage law, or for the enforcement of codes of fair competition, let each proposal be separately stated in restrictive terms, so that the people may know definitely the extent of the powers they are asked to delegate to Congress.

Then, whatever the decision, whether wise or unwise, we shall all abide by the result, recognizing that this is a country in which the will of the people as expressed in the Constitution is the supreme law of the land.

Some there are who have declared that the "horse and buggy" Constitution adopted in 1787 is outmoded and that we should exchange it for a 1935 model. Those who offer the suggestion and thereby inferentially offer themselves for the role of Constitution maker cannot claim the merit of modesty.

They are bold men who would undertake to write a new basic law to take the place of the one framed by that galaxy of statesmen that by the grace of God or by an unusual fortuity was assembled at Philadelphia 148 years ago this summer.

I am free to confess that no such group of men could be recruited from the House, I question whether it could be assembled from the Senate, and I doubt whether it could be constituted even from Felix Frankfurter's class of precocious sophomores. For one, I would not be willing to exchange the Constitution of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison for any brain child of Donald Richberg, Rexford Tugwell, and Hugh Johnson.

It is said that on the night before his departure for the Far East of his career of conquest, Alexander of Macedon had an interview with his tutor, Aristotle, and that the great Athenian said to his pupil: "You are about to embark upon a great enterprise that will take you into many lands and amongst many peoples, some already celebrated in arts and in arms, some savage and unknown. This last counsel I give you, that whithersoever your victories lead you, do not forget that you are a Greek."

America needs the advice of Aristotle today. Whatever the adventures we undertake, the goals we seek to reach, we have an inheritance to safeguard and to transmit—a system of ordered liberty in which statutes must yield to the Constitution, in which the people are governed by law and not by men, and in which human rights are deemed to be sacred and unalienable.

We who live today are trustees for the future of America. In our responsibility we must not fail.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of District business today I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which was dealt with exhaustively by Republicans last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I object.

RULES COMMITTEE—LEAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file reports on various rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ISSUANCE OF BONDS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8270), to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of certain bonds, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Since the distinguished leader on the Republican side is objecting to all requests for time on this side, I believe it is ill-advised to pass important legislation by unanimous consent at this time. Therefore, I object.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Republicans may not be deprived of this wonderful speech I intended to make, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 20, this House was addressed by Hon. DONALD H. MCLEAN, of New Jersey, my colleague, and a fellow member of the Military Affairs Committee. He spoke at length on the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and now I rise to answer the statements that he made that day.

Let me take up the various statements of Mr. MCLEAN, one by one:

First of all, Mr. MCLEAN says that the T. V. A. had no authority to build other than the Norris Dam. The truth of the matter is that its creative act gives the T. V. A. the

broad power to construct dams, reservoirs, power houses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines, and so on. Strangely enough, though Cove Creek Dam is mentioned somewhere in the statute, Norris Dam, which Mr. McLEAN cites, is not mentioned anywhere in it by that name, yet the general power to build dams is unmistakably there. Therefore, the T. V. A. cannot be criticized for building dams.

A great hue and cry is made that Congress needs a report before the work goes ahead. Yet we all know that the T. V. A. has made an annual report. Besides, the President in May 1934 sent up a message transmitting a report on the progress of the work being done there (Doc. 365). This in addition to repeated testimony by the T. V. A. directors before the Military Affairs and Appropriations Committees.

Mr. McLEAN also says that a bond issue of $50,000,000 was to be used as working capital. One of the things that he and the bitter opponents of the T. V. A. oppose is the spending of money for power and the furnishing of power for the public. As a matter of fact, the T. V. A. was launched with an initial appropriation of $50,000,000. But the statute provision for a bond issue not exceeding that amount restricted its use wholly or in part for the generation or transmission of electric power, and so on. Therefore, the general activities were not covered by this bond issue. The T. V. A. has not issued any bonds. As far as the bond feature of the act is concerned, it is a case of the T. V. A. being damned if it does and damned if it does not.

Mr. McLEAN asserts that the T. V. A. organized the Electric Home and Farm Authority. This, of course, is not correct, at least from a technical viewpoint, although the E. H. F. A. was supposed to—and did—help the T. V. A., not to mention manufacturers, dealers, and users of electric appliances, and that means private utilities as well.

As a matter of fact, the Electric Home and Farm Authority has worked out to the benefit of the people of the United States. It does not operate wholly within the Tennessee Valley, but in some cases, operates in portions of Georgia and Mississippi, not within the geographical limits of the valley.

Because the Electric Home and Farm Authority has so far principally boomed the Tennessee Valley is due to the fact that the Tennessee Valley is the only part of the United States that now has the advantage of the T. V. A. Low-cost appliances and "yardstick" electric rates go hand in hand. However, the whole problem of rural electrification will be carried out soon and, as we know, that general subject will be dealt with in a national way. Even if the Electric Home and Farm Authority were a subsidiary of the T. V. A.—which it is not—what of it? I see nothing wrong in it, and if there happens to be another corporation which is doing something for the benefit of the people, so much the better. The T. V. A. is cooperating with the Rural Electrification Authority, of course, and with the power companies, as I presume will be done in the other parts of the United States in connection with rural electrification. On the whole, rural electrification and appliances for farms and homes are so important that no technicality should keep us from having the benefits of this happy combination.

Complaint is made that the C. C. C. men are used in soil-erosion work in the Tennessee Valley. What of it? The C. C. C. men are supposed to be used where they can benefit their country, and if they can benefit their country in Tennessee, or Mississippi, or any other State, can they not be used there the same as they are used in New York, or in the State of New Jersey? There is no reason why they should not be used where they are necessary.

Also, enemies of T. V. A. say it has given no plan to Congress. When I first came to Congress, they were talking about the Tennessee Valley and were holding hearings before the Military Affairs Committee. Day after day, week after week, and month after month we have been hearing plans of the Tennessee Valley Authority until I, for one, am convinced that the T. V. A. is the busiest new-deal agency by a "dam site." I do not know how they could give any more plans than they have. I have before me numerous pamphlets and information releases; also, a particular report with illustrations furnished the Military Affairs Committee, and, I believe, to the Appropriations Committee, and I can hardly see how they can make any fuller or more explicit reports.

Then Mr. McLEAN states that, inasmuch as he has not gotten all the information he needs, he must go to other places to get his facts. So he goes ahead and reads Fortune Magazine and various other magazines to find out what the Tennessee Valley Authority is going to do, when there is no indication that they are doing all the things they are written up as doing. For example, he lists several dams to cost something like $85,000,000, which he lists as immediate expenditures of the T. V. A., although such dams are still only on paper in future planning for the valley. It is true that the T. V. A. has considered a Hiwassee Dam, a French Broad Dam, and an Aurora Dam, and these dams may someday be built, but they are certainly not in the current T. V. A. expenditures.

Then, in this same speech, the T. V. A. is charged with ignoring the matter of national defense, not to mention the Engineer Corps of the Army. Let us talk about this thing in a sensible way. It is true that the T. V. A. started out as a national-defense proposition, because of the "white elephant" nitrate plants wished off on it. Then, if we were to conjure with words, we might say that its big contribution to national defense is to defend the soil of our country; I mean in such things as soil erosion, to prevent dust storms, and to keep our rivers from running away with the soil. It is national defense to improve navigation; it is national defense to keep our rivers from overflowing; and it is national defense to have good rivers properly harnessed, high-power transmission lines in network array for emergency service, nitrate plants ready to make munitions, and manganese and other natural resources ready to be drafted for war purposes. But, brushing aside the technicalities, the truth of the matter is that the Tennessee Valley project is not only one where we spend it on national defense—that is to say, to go to war with or to fight with—but it is one that has peace-time contributions to the public welfare.

The T. V. A. has gone far beyond its original purposes, I must admit, and I hope that it will go still further beyond, and that we will give it the legislative power to do so. If we can save farms from being washed away, why not do it? If the saving of farms is not included in the national defense, should we not save them for our economic defense? My idea is that we should go ahead and do everything we can for the benefit of our country, no matter whether the doing be classed as national defense or regional renovizing.

Mr. McLEAN praises the Army engineers and then he complains that the Wheeler Dam is being built without authority. I cannot understand how these engineers could start to build there a navigation lock, now completed, if Wheeler Dam is in violation of the law. The War Department will operate all locks along the T. V. A. navigation dams, just as it does now at Muscle Shoals, because it retains jurisdiction over all navigable streams. Incidentally, the Corps of Engineers is designing the Pickwick Landing Dam, and the T. V. A. had the cooperation of the Reclamation Bureau in designing the Norris Dam.

Much fuss has been made over the fancied lack of cooperation by T. V. A. with other Government agencies. If this were so, the Authority could not work out its many problems in the manner it is now doing. Most of its activities find precedence in the old-line Federal departments. For example, its forestation, soil-erosion, and flood-control programs are long-familiar pursuits of the Interior and Agriculture Departments. Moreover, methods being developed in the Tennessee Basin tend to produce a large-scale proved pattern which can be applied to the national picture as a whole. I do not have to remind my colleagues that recurring

floods and dust storms are the bitter lessons of national neglect. In this phase alone the T. V. A. should not be too bitter a pill for doctor-hating interests to swallow.

Mr. McLEAN seems to resent deeply that the T. V. A. has not sold any fertilizer. He did not explain, however, that the experimental plant at Muscle Shoals has, under T. V. A. operation, turned out thousands of tons of a much-needed phosphate fertilizer. Nor did he say further that, through the cooperation of State and local agriculture agents, this fertilizer is being shipped to more than 500 farms, from Virginia to Mississippi, for practical demonstration.

To be perfectly frank, the Tennessee Valley Authority does not know exactly what their fertilizer policy will be in the future. What is wrong with that? They are utilizing every resource they can of the rivers and of the lands there, and if there does not happen to be a war where they can use nitrate there is no reason why they should not thoughtfully and carefully work out a policy in the matter of fertilizer. But fertilizer is a strong subject; let us not get too deep in that.

Mr. McLEAN cites the T. V. A. made town of Norris as costing $3,500,000 and gets "statisticritical"—there is a coined word for you—making comparisons with that and other places over the United States where dams have been built and where it has been necessary to have construction camps. In this he has given you the correct amount. He, however, wholly neglects to break down this cost to include a construction camp, two public parks, a forest preserve, a demonstration farm—and the famous cows which I may bring up later in the argument—a school, roads, and lands needed for erosion control—some 2,800 acres all told. I have not all the facts before me, but in addition to this I happen to know that the difference over the original T. V. A. estimates was due to costs of materials and labor being increased by the late lamented N. R. A.—recently slain, mostly by our dear friends, the Republicans.

He mentions likewise that Norris Dam completed would only need 20 or 30 men to operate, but wholly evades the point that Norristown is intended to be a permanent settlement where there will be certain small manufacturers, or big ones for all I know, the development of home industries and home crafts, and so on, to carry it on. There is no reason why a village of that size should not be maintained in almost any fertile and cheap-power center of the United States.

Further, Mr. McLEAN implies that the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives is a poor investment—that Uncle Sam has received poor returns on the $300,000 loaned this locally incorporated group by the F. E. R. A. Well, maybe, in a material way this is true, yet if bringing self-help to some counties where as much as 70 percent of the people were on relief is a poor dividend, I will have to try to tune in again for better tips by that post-depression financial sage of the radio, the "Old Counselor" of Halsey, Stuart & Co. Personally, I think providing people facilities to can what they would ordinarily waste in season and buy back in cans out of season is not an illogical—or an uncanny—phase of the valley's effort to get the people to help themselves.

Last but not least, much ado has been made over the so-called "report" by Comptroller General McCarl on alleged irregularities in T. V. A. accounts and what not. To begin with, this is not a report but is a preliminary bill of exceptions filed by the Comptroller General with the T. V. A. with the understanding that they will get together and try to iron out their differences. The newspapers played the story up big, but the biggest story as I see it, is how certain enemies of the T. V. A. in Congress got hold of it in the first place. However, I do know how this group got it out. No copy of the letter was sent to Congress. It is only by hearsay that I know that the letter covered 400 single-spaced typewritten pages of accounting details. When I further hear that two full pages are devoted to the disappearance and recovery of two typewriters from the Washington T. V. A. office, I do not want to make further inquiry because by so doing I may embarrass some of my colleagues on the Hill who have also misplaced a typewriter or two of late.

The whole incident boils down to the case of an exceptional McCarl believing that the T. V. A. should not be excepted from bureaucratic redtape. Maybe the T. V. A. should be just another Federal bureau, but if we believe the T. V. A., its construction jobs—in which it believes it is setting a criterion in economy and dispatch—would have been seriously crippled by the delays of routine thumbing at McCarl's office. Besides, the details really involve engineering judgment as well as accounting practices. And the stew made over non-low-bid awards! Yet, after all the records are examined, it is found that 95 percent went to the low bidders anyway, and the remainder involved safety and responsibility factors in which the T. V. A. refused to take a chance.

But the point I want to drive home is that the T. V. A. is not supposed to be under the Comptroller General's rule of thumb. It was purposely set up otherwise. This policy was emphasized by the President in his message to Congress proposing the establishment of the T. V. A., and the conference committee of the House again stressed this provision in reporting the bill for its final passage. As the President so ably briefed it, the T. V. A. is "a corporation clothed with limited powers of government, but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of private enterprise."

And that, gentlemen, is one reason why it has been able to set the pace it has.

Even the press is beginning to realize that the McCarl report is not what the T. V. A. enemies tried to puff it up to be. In this connection, I ask permission to introduce three editorials on the subject, one from the Baltimore Evening Sun, which originally assailed T. V. A. on the basis of McCarl's exceptions; another from the Engineering News-Record, a McGraw-Hill publication which speaks for the profession; and the third from the Knoxville News-Sentinel, of the Scripps-Howard group:

[From the Evening Sun, Baltimore, Wednesday, May 22, 1935]

AN ANSWER COMES

Last week Senator AUSTIN offered 26 pages of itemized charges against the management of the T. V. A., claiming these to be excerpts from a much larger report on the management of the T. V. A., which had been made by Comptroller General McCarl. There is not space to go into the charges in detail. Sufficient to say that in general they charged dishonesty and inefficiency in the handling of funds and gross mismanagement. In suggesting at the time that the charges should be met and answered, we did no more than to reflect the opinions of most honest people.

Well, the charges have not been answered in detail. Nevertheless, at the T. V. A. hearing yesterday they received an answer which will be sufficient for most people. We quote from the account of the hearing:

"Mr. McCarl, for whom a hurry call was sent out * * * proceeded to disown not only the Cassidy digest (the one offered by Senator AUSTIN) but also the audit report on which it was based.

"'I don't want to discuss the audit report', he told the committee, 'because to me it isn't official and it is not before you.'

"Chairman McSWAIN told the committee yesterday that Mr. McCarl looked upon the audit report as only 'a bill of exceptions' and believed the T. V. A. directors would be able to explain satisfactorily all the exceptions it raised. * * * Mr. McCarl concurred in this view."

Asked whether he had found any evidence of fraud, Mr. McCarl replied:

"I want to say 'no.' This is a serious thing. You're dealing with a public trust. This is all premature. * * * I certainly have found no fraud."

This is a blanket denial that he had uncovered fraud, made by the man who has been cast unwittingly in the role of chief witness for those who oppose the operation of the T. V. A. Therefore, it is essential that we give as prominent space to the answer as to the original charges.

[From the Engineering News-Record, June 6, 1935]

PROPER ANSWER

Reports of the audit of T. V. A. operations that were presented before the Military Affairs Committee of the House last week by Comptroller General McCarl gave an unbelievable and, as the sequel proved, a scandalously misleading impression that the T. V. A.'s operations lack integrity and efficiency. It is therefore gratifying to learn that Arthur E. Morgan, Chairman of the Authority, answered the Comptroller General's charges point by point and thoroughly. One of the basic charges was that the wartime riot of expenditure for Wilson Dam, the Muscle Shoals nitrate plants, and associated properties was falsely written down on the T. V. A.'s books. This is an old canard. It would have been easy for the Comptroller General to verify the fact that the book value

represents sober, present-day, usable value. computed from the recorded construction quantities and actual present-day unit costs; yet, forgetting the responsible character of his office, he put forward figures implying that the T. V. A. had juggled its books to change an investment of more than $130,000,000 to less than half that value. Engineers are interested also in the exceptions taken by the audit to purchases of construction equipment, where in many instances a bid other than the low bid was found to be best—quite within the law and within good engineering practice, but apparently not to the Comptroller General's taste. If governmental accounting rules stand in the way of considering quality of product and range of performance in comparing bids, then it is time that the rules were modernized.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Sunday, June 2, 1935]

ACCUSING THE T. V. A.

Among other things, Comptroller General McCarl accused the T. V. A. of letting of contracts without competitive bidding, reimbursement of traveling expenses of prospective employees, allowance of overtime to annual employees, allowance of charge for personally-owned motor vehicles without prior authorization, payment of pay rolls without administrative approval.

When President Roosevelt conceived the T. V. A., he said that it would "have the power of the Government and the initiative of a private corporation."

Because it has tried to realize the President's ideal, it has not had as much respect for redtape as the average Government bureau, and, therefore, it has demonstrated an efficiency which has won it success.

The T. V. A. has bought on a merit basis, if it has not always gone through the formality of advertising for bids. When it has wanted to interview a man possibly suited to a particular job, it has paid his expenses on the trip, just as a private business does; that's the way to get competent men, and the T. V. A. has gotten them.

Its submanagers, knowing that their superiors wanted them to get results quickly, didn't always bother their superiors, who they knew had confidence in them, by asking advance approval of everything they wanted to do; again this is the custom of efficient private corporations.

The essential thing is that T. V. A. should get its officials and employees on a merit, rather than a political, basis and that its policies should be sound. This has been true. Given that fundamental basis, T. V. A. should not be bound with unnecessary regulations.

Enemies of T. V. A. will want its hands tied with redtape; its friends will not.

Mr. McCarl's accusations only prove the soundness of T. V. A.'s practices. Here is a case where Government in business has proved businesslike.

We suggest that the watchdog of the Treasury bark up another tree.

Mr. Speaker, I have answered some of the things that have been said, and I hope in a respectful way—at least as respectfully as those who have said them. There is a tremendous amount of propaganda coming before this House and over the Nation to thwart the Tennessee Valley Authority and to defeat the utility holding company bill. I am not now speaking on the holding-company bill, but on the Tennessee Valley Authority.

We read in the anti-new-deal newspapers that it is socialism; we read that it is this and it is that; we read that it is everything in the world. But whatever they call it, let me tell what it is: The purpose of the Tennessee Valley Authority, according to its present possibilities—and this is my opinion, not the interpretation of a law nor the interpretation of some formula that was made during the war time so we could win the war—is that the Tennessee Valley Authority is the greatest social program of this administration or any other administration in the history of the United States. Personally, I believe that it comes nearer meeting our economic questions and our economic problems than any other undertaking of the American people.

How in the world is a private company going to enter into a field and have soil-erosion work? Does it protect the public investment in its dams? If you will look into the hearings you will see where I asked the representatives of the Aluminum Co. of America, who desire to be wholly excluded from this act, what would they do in reference to soil erosion. Of course, they had to answer that they would do nothing whatever. How much reforestation is the Aluminum Co. of America going to do? How much is any private corporation going to do? Of course, none.

Anyone who knows anything at all knows that the only way that this can be accomplished is through governmental enterprise. If we are to save our farms and keep our country from being washed away, we must have a national program, as of course it cannot be done either by private interests or private business, or by treaties of several different States, due to the fact that they would never make a treaty. Moreover, how are we going to preserve our forests? How are we going to make these forests so that we will have lumber in the future? How are we going to conserve our land? How are we going to make it so that they too do not wash away? In all these questions—in soil erosion, in reforestation, and conservation problems of all kinds—comes consideration of the fertility of the land, the ability to produce, the ability to bring forth corn and oats and other things, and if we do not do this our country will be so sterile that we cannot grow anything on it.

Now we will get to the subject of navigation, and when you are on navigation you are on flood control. And the only way you can have flood control and navigation is as a public proposition. You can navigate in the wide-open ocean, the Pacific, or the Gulf of Mexico, or the Atlantic, but you cannot navigate up and down rivers unless you have certain artificial works. These transcend State lines. They are big projects and cannot be done by private industry and, therefore, this navigation must be done by the Government. And in doing this we keep our land from being blown and washed away.

So now we get down to the most controversial subject, the fact that we are using money in order to get money back. It is a crime for the Government to spend money economically and make a good investment. It is all right for the power companies to make investments where they gouge the people out of their money, create a superstructure of holding companies to milk the investor, with salaries from each one of them to "gyp" the general public; but whenever the Government goes out and makes a sound investment, as they are making in the Tennessee Valley, where they will build power plants and sell power cheaper, pay better wages, and then get a return on the money, this, of course, aggravates and absolutely angers the Power Trust because they do not want the people to know that the Government can produce cheaper electricity than the Power Trust can and pay better wages and give better service. It is all in our philosophy of government. It is all an economic policy; an economic policy which the Democratic Party must face.

In speaking of such a great program as this, the enemies of this bill, and the conservation program of the Government, make long speeches about the T. V. A. cows—the foolishness of buying good cows to improve the breed down in those six or seven States. All I can say is, that when such a great, substantial work is considered, which will literally raise the standards of millions of people, that talking about cows is gnat snapping, fly slapping, and flea catching. Let us look at it as a big problem.

We were elected to serve the people. We were not elected for the purpose of getting profits for the power companies. Moreover, the country cannot stand it any longer.

T. V. A. ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority program is a particularly complicated one—due to its multiple and dovetailing phases—I have asked for, and have received from the Washington office of the Authority, a comprehensive word picture of T. V. A. activities to date, which, for the information of my colleagues and the public at large, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD:

In its 2 years of existence the Tennessee Valley development has recorded a progress that is commanding world attention. Yet it is a national job in particular. For, as President Roosevelt told the valley people on the occasion of his November 1934 visit to that area of activity, what is going on here is "an example which will be a benefit not only to yourselves but to the whole 130,000,000 Americans in every part of the land."

OUTSIDE BENEFITS

Preliminary benefits of this development to other areas are already manifest.

At least half of the $45,000,000 spent for materials to date has been spread outside of the valley—profiting business in 35 States, from New England to the Pacific coast. A considerable portion of T. V. A.'s total pay-roll disbursement of $17,000,000 has likewise found its way into national circulation.

By employing 15,000 persons locally the Authority is indirectly relieving unemployment in outside industrial centers which for-

merly drew many valley people unable to eke a livelihood at home. Every individual employed by T. V. A. means income and subsistence for three or more other persons.

Approximately 10,000 T. V. A. employees are engaged in construction and associated work. Norris and Wheeler Dams are now three-quarters and one-half completed, respectively, and a beginning has been made on Pickwick Landing Dam.

Meanwhile Wilson Dam is being operated for the immediate convenience of thousands of households and places of business in three States—Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee—which appreciate the advantages of cheap power. In addition to acquired facilities, about 200 miles of rural transmission lines have been erected and more are projected. More than 300 municipalities—from Oklahoma to Florida—have inquired into the possibilities of T. V. A. service.

At Muscle Shoals Nitrate Plant No. 2 a demonstration plant has gone into experimental production looking to new and better types of fertilizer materials which may ultimately be a direct gain to every farmer in the country. At the same time the Government is assured of a national-defense asset maintained in stand-by condition.

GENERAL

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act was approved May 18, 1933. The three directors of the T. V. A. held their first meeting June 14, 1933, at which time they constituted its sole personnel. Today a definite start has been made in the development and control of the Tennessee River and its tributaries for navigation, flood control, utilization of surplus power, and other purposes.

DAMS

Besides operating Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals and building Norris, Wheeler, and Pickwick Landing Dams, the Authority is conducting surveys looking to the full utilization of the Tennessee River's unified Federal hydroelectric development.

Construction of the Norris Dam (named for Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS) began October 3, 1933. The Wheeler Dam was authorized by President Roosevelt October 13, 1933. The Pickwick Landing Dam was authorized November 21, 1934.

The Norris Dam will cost about $34,000,000, and the Wheeler Dam, without power installation, about $20,000,000. The Norris Dam is on the Clinch River some 25 miles northwest of Knoxville, Tenn., and about 80 miles above the point where the Clinch River joins the Tennessee. The Wheeler barrier is on the Tennessee River, in Alabama, about 15½ miles upstream from the Wilson Dam. The Pickwick Landing Dam, to cost $22,000,000, will rise near Shiloh Battlefield, in Tennessee, about 10 miles north of the Mississippi-Alabama State line. It will require about 3 years to build Pickwick Dam. Norris and Wheeler Dams will be completed in 1936.

These dams will not only help to regulate the flow of water on the upper Tennessee, in the interests of navigation and flood control both, but will serve also to provide additional power when needed.

POWER

In order to find an outlet for this present and potential horsepower, the T. V. A. is embarked on an elaborate electrification program. It has adopted power policies and established rate schedules as a "yardstick" for both public and private operation and has drafted exemplary rules and regulations governing the marketing of its power.

It has purchased or otherwise acquired private lines in certain areas in Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee to take care of the present power output of Wilson Dam. Purchase of approximately $3,000,000 of property from the Alabama Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., and Tennessee Electric Power Co., in January 1934 gave T. V. A. immediate urban and rural markets in that area. On June 1, 1934, the T. V. A., on payment of $850,700, acquired properties of the Mississippi Power Co. in certain counties in northern Mississippi.

In early February 1934 the T. V. A. began serving its first municipal customer—Tupelo, Miss. Today it is serving a total of 36 municipalities as well as rural homes in 14 counties in Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee.

Northeastern Mississippi is the center of T. V. A.'s rural electrification program—the first Federal venture of this nature. Here interested farmers have formed cooperatives to take advantage of T. V. A. power and rates. In one instance farmers in the county of Alcorn, Miss., are collaborating with the residents of the city of Corinth (that State) in making electric rate reductions average approximately 40 percent locally through a cooperative known as the "Alcorn County Electric Power Association."

Fourteen communities of northern Alabama, having attempted, without success, to purchase existing distribution facilities of the Alabama Power Co. in July 1934, formally signified willingness to join in a plan whereby T. V. A. would buy these plants and for a time operate them, pending amortization by the municipalities involved. These communities are: Florence, Sheffield, Tuscumbia, Courtland, Decatur, Falkville, Hartselle, Moulton, Red Bay, Russellville, Town Creek, Cherokee, Leighton, and Austinville. Due to legal and other obstructions which threatened to delay indefinitely the acquisition of the existing properties, the Authority, on December 14, 1934, withdrew its request that the Tri-Cities (Florence, Sheffield, and Tuscumbia) longer defer their original plans to build. But a Federal court restraining order has prevented them from so doing.

After negotiations extending over a period of several months, an agreement was reached in July 1934 between the T. V. A. and the National Power & Light Co. whereby the latter's electric property in eastern Tennessee (Tennessee Public Service Co.) was to be acquired, under certain conditions, by the T. V. A. for $6,000,000, with the idea of ultimately turning the properties over to the various municipalities involved for public operation. This is in line with the Authority's policy to avoid duplication of existing power systems wherever possible. Involved in this deal were Knoxville and 26 other communities. The agreement was approved by the power company stockholders, and by the Knoxville City Council, but litigation caused the deadline for the transaction to expire November 1, 1934, without the same being consummated.

Knoxville, Chattanooga, and Memphis are among the 27 municipalities which have voted on municipal ownership looking toward the use of T. V. A. power. Only five have registered in the negative.

APPLIANCES

In late May 1934 Tupelo saw the initial valley demonstration and sale of low-cost electrical appliances intended to go hand-in-hand with low rates in furthering the use of electricity. This phase of activity is under the Electric Home and Farm Authority. Created by Executive order, the E. H. F. A., with the cooperation of some 40 leading manufacturers of electrical appliances, plus 3 private power companies and 300 independent dealers, is making inexpensive electric ranges, refrigerators, water heaters, and farm pumps (other items to follow) available on long-term credit to the many persons—particularly rural—who, up to the present time, have been unable to afford such labor-saving devices. Prices are 25 to 35 percent lower. Many of these appliances have been placed on the national market, but for the time being E. H. F. A. financing is confined to low-power-rate areas, affecting 375,000 home users of electricity in parts of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and Tennessee. (The E. H. F. A. neither manufactures nor sells appliances.)

SOIL EROSION

The building of dams would be transitory gestures unless coupled with reforestation and other steps to check destructive soil erosion in the contributing basins. The effective storage capacity of dams is prematurely affected by the washing of silt into the reservoirs. This filling-in process, as far as some sections of the Tennessee Valley are concerned, goes on at the rate of as much as 1 percent a year. The T. V. A. land program aims to protect the public investment in its dams, which will play such an important role toward controlling flood waters and adding to the navigation and power possibilities of the river system.

Terracing demonstrations in Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee have made many farmers erosion conscious and have led to the local initiation of cooperatives to promote soil recovery and conservation. Some 13,000 acres have been terraced to date. Such efforts offer an economical method of halting the Tennessee River and its tributaries from "running away with the soil" to the detriment of navigation and efficiency of dams.

Cooperating in the general program are 6,400 C. C. C. boys who have constructed 200,000 brush, log, bag, or stone dams, and have placed matting on 5,000,000 square yards of eroded lands. The latter method has been found less costly and equally efficient, besides requiring one-third the time Tree nurseries have been established and millions of trees planted, including the blight-resistant Asiatic chestnut, to replace the doomed American variety. Also, a start has been made in cultivation of tree crops.

FERTILIZER

In line with land rehabilitation the T. V. A. is specifically authorized to develop new and better types of fertilizer materials. This it is doing, besides formulating better plans for fertilizer distribution In November 1934 a pilot plant at Muscle Shoals went into experimental production of a phosphate product, a substance sorely needed by the soil. Some 20,000 tons of this material has since been made and is now being distributed to more than 500 valley farmers for demonstration work in cooperation with State and local agricultural agents. The objective is to develop processes that will cheapen plant food and increase its application by the farmers of the Nation, to whom dust storms and floods have become a very vital menace.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

A primary responsibility of the Authority is in relation to national defense. Its creative act specifies that nitrate plant no. 2 at Muscle Shoals shall be kept in stand-by condition in event of an emergency. This is being done. Experiments now being made there in connection with phosphate fertilizer will contribute substantially to the national-defense program. Studies also are being made for the development of deposits of manganese, another material valuable in war. The valley is rich in mineral resources of especial military use. It is near the center of population and within short haul of many industrial centers.

NAVIGATION

With the completion of Pickwick Landing Dam, a 7-foot channel will have been created from the mouth of the Tennessee River at Paducah, Ky., to Guntersville, Ala., a distance of 358 miles. Approximately 157 miles of this water highway, from Pickwick Landing Dam to Guntersville, will have a 9-foot channel. The ultimate objective is a 9-foot channel from the Ohio River to Knoxville, Tenn., a river route of 652 miles. These long-needed navigation facilities that will be instrumental in opening the rich mineral and other natural resources of the valley to the mutual advantage of residents and an outside world.

FLOOD CONTROL

Closely allied with navigation and power development is flood control. The energy of Wilson Dam, for example, depends upon

water fluctuation. At the present time low water may mean a decrease to one-seventh of its rated energy. The Norris Dam will tend to correct this by releasing water in dry season and storing it at other times. In doing so it will help reduce the flood menace in the Tennessee Valley, which now does $2,000,000 damage yearly. An integrated system of dams, such as planned by the T. V. A., will, in addition to opening new sources of power when needed, have indirect bearing on the flood hazard on the Miississippi River as well.

TRAINING

Because jobs on the dams go to the local jobless, the Authority employs more workmen than would otherwise be needed. These men, mostly from regions where agriculture yields meager returns, are employed half time with opportunity to benefit themselves by the training—also educational—courses provided for their spare time. They learn how to carry on useful occupations when they return to their homes. Such instruction not only results in more efficient work on the dams but, at the end of the construction period, will provide skilled workers for neighborhoods which heretofore have had none.

NORRIS TOWN

The T. V. A. built town of Norris, near the dam of the same name, comprises a distinctive and practical community. Here are housed families of workers on the dam or allied projects. The 350 dwellings are electrically equipped—more than one-third of them include electric heat—and represent stone, frame, or cinder-block construction. Rents range from $12.50 to $45 a month, with the lower brackets predominating. There is a school and cooperative store. Within the town confines are parks and a forest preserve, also community gardens, a demonstration farm, training center, and the construction camp proper. The latter is planned to fit into the industrial life of the community after the dam is completed.

There is a much smaller community at Wheeler Dam, and another small town is being built at Pickwick Landing Dam. The Muscle Shoals properties include three residential groups built prior to T. V. A. occupation.

COOPERATIVES

On January 24, 1934, there was incorporated in Knox County, Tenn., the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, which is interested in sponsoring cooperatives for the benefit of the valley people. It was allocated $300,000 by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration with which to begin operations. To date it has launched about a dozen cooperatives affecting some 8,000 families. Some of these activities are in mountain communities where as many as 70 percent of the people were on relief. The projects embrace fruit, berry, and vegetable canning; seed-potato cultivation, flour grinding, dairying, and handicraft textiles.

These and other activities in the Tennessee Valley afford visual evidence of a multiphased regional development which gives promise of not only returning national dividends on the war-time $127,000,000 investment at Muscle Shoals but, at the same time, points the way toward America's "planned future." For, as President Roosevelt says, "If we are successful here we can march on, step by step, in a like development of other great natural territorial units within our borders."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION—COMMERCIAL AIRPORT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3806) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the lady from New Jersey?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have some time on this matter.

Mrs. NORTON. I do not think there is anyone on this side who has requested time or who objects to the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is in charge of the time on the other side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3806) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to preface my remarks upon the pending legislation by saying that personally I believe the time has come in America when we, as Members of Congress, should cease to vote huge appropriations of billions of dollars for warships and obsolete fighting equipment at the expense of the aviation of this Nation. We should encourage commercial aviation as a second line of our defense in this Republic. I bring this to the attention of the membership at this time simply to state that America must not lag behind in its appropriations for defense from the air, in view of the huge appropriations which we seem determined to continue to make.

That brings me to a discussion of the aviation needs of the Capital City of this land. Your subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia conducted hearings over a period of weeks upon the Gravelly Point airport measure. This committee heard a great many witnesses who came before it, speaking in favor of the Gravelly Point air site, the Washington-Hoover Airport as it now exists, and a great many other sites for airports in the District of Columbia and adjacent territory. Out of those hearings there came a belief on the part of the committee that what was advisable at this time was for the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would bring the airport situation to the attention of the people of the District of Columbia in a way that definite action might be taken at this session of the Congress.

At this point permit me to say that the committee had no definite idea as to any particular site. I am certain that the members of the subcommittee and the District Committee today do not come here in connection with this legislation in favor of or against any certain airport site which was to be considered.

I should like at this time to turn to page 50 of the hearings on the airport bill and read a few sentences which were expressed by Rex Martin, the Assistant Director of the Bureau of Air Commerce of the Department of Commerce. I asked Mr. Martin this question:

Before you leave the stand, going back to your tour of Europe in the last few months, I would like for you to state for the committee how far, in your opinion, we lag behind, here at the National Capital, in comparison with other capitals of the world, from the standpoint of aviation facilities.

Mr. Martin replied:

It would be like comparing a chicken yard with a Texas range in size, mostly. While Tempelhof and Le Bourget are not extraordinary, they are bigger. They have no airport at The Hague, in Holland. They have a very fine one at Amsterdam, a very good one at Rotterdam, and the airport at Brussels is superior in every way.

Think of it! The airport of little Belgium is superior in every way to ours. He said further:

The airport at Croydon, England, is superior by far. The one that they are presently using at Rio de Janeiro is, I think, better, though it is not well located. The new one that they have there will be extraordinary. The airport in Rome is better. The one in Venice is not better.

Then he goes on to say:

Any number of cities of Europe have better facilities than we have—Munich and Stuttgart; even the little town of Friedrichshafen has a better airport.

Then Mr. Nichols, a member of the subcommittee, asked Mr. Martin:

There are many cities in the United States that have airports superior to Washington's, are there not?

And he said:

Quite a number.

Now, that is the testimony given by Mr. Martin, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Air Commerce, as shown by the hearings.

I now come to the testimony, very briefly, of Edward V. Rickenbacker, who is one of the leading aviation authorities of this Nation. This is what he said upon the stand, speaking of the present facilities at Washington:

It is without doubt one of the most hazardous airports in this country for the number of schedules coming in and out with the type of equipment that is being used, and I think it is truly remarkable that there has not been a serious accident. In fact, it is one of my worries 24 hours of the day every day. It is almost expected all the time. I would not be surprised at any time to hear of a very fatal collision. It would not be news to me.

I bring these two opinions to you from high authority about the need of an airport with adequate facilities for the District of Columbia now. We believe that in this pending legislation we have presented a way whereby we shall not have one group arguing for a certain airport and another group arguing for another site, but that we shall create a commission to choose a site for the establishment and development of a commercial airport for the District of Columbia.

This commission is to consist of seven members, as follows: First, the Director of Aeronautics of the Department of Commerce, Mr. Vidal; the Second Assistant Postmaster General, in this case Mr. Branch; a Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be the chairman, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House; a United States Senator, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; an appointee of the air transport companies serving the city of Washington, and let us remember in this connection that there are nine schedules running in and out of Washington every day and that the number is going to be increased in the very near future; one member from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to be selected by the Board; and Amelia Earhart Putnam, internationally known aviatrix. Some one may ask why we have selected a woman to act on this commission. I may say, because I see the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. O'DAY] and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] in the Chamber at the present time, that we believe that women have taken their place not only in some avenues of endeavor, but in practically all the avenues of worthwhile endeavor in America today, so we felt that this woman should be given an opportunity of serving the District of Columbia and the Nation as well.

The members of this commission will receive no salary but provision is made to reimburse them for actual expenses incurred in the discharge of official duties. This commission is to be empowered and instructed to make a survey of the best possible sites in the District of Columbia, keeping in mind always the large amount of testimony from various commissions which have investigated this question over a period perhaps of the last 10 or 12 years. It is further provided that the action of a majority of the members of the commission shall constitute the action of the commission. After a site has been selected the duties of the commission automatically cease. Within 30 days after the first commission has concluded its service by selecting a site, there is to be appointed a second commission, to be known as the "Washington Airport Commission", to provide for the actual administration of the site which has been chosen.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The President of the United States, by and with the consent of the United States Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to create a commission to establish and operate this public airport for the city of Washington and the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think the gentleman omitted one phase of the proceedings, and that is that the second commission, appointed by the President of the United States, will have as its duty the acquisition of the site recommended by the first commission. In other words, the first commission does not acquire a site; it simply selects the site. It is the President's commission, appointed for a term of years, which acquires and purchases the site, and administers it after its acquisition.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma; he is entirely correct. I may say further in this connection that the committee which is to select the site, of course, takes into consideration the prime factors, that is the time of completion, the cost of the enterprise, the safety of the field, and its proximity to the city of Washington.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. Is this airport to be used by private air transportation companies?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is to be for the use of commercial enterprise; every type of air transportation.

Mr. COLDEN. Why should the District of Columbia and the Federal Government furnish an airport for the use of commercial companies? Is it done in any other city?

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. As a matter of fact, airports are furnished in nearly every instance by the cities, towns, or municipalities in which they are located, and in no case do the transport companies build them. The cost of maintaining the airports, however, is taken care of out of revenues derived from charges on transport companies for the use of the field, rentals, and hangar space. Over a period of years they even show a profit.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman. Does that answer the inquiry of the gentleman from California?

Mr. COLDEN. I should like to say to the gentleman that at one time I was a member of the City Council of Los Angeles. We were inveigled into buying an airport on the theory that it would be self-supporting; but it proved to be a failure.

Mr. NICHOLS. That might be true.

Mr. RANDOLPH. How long ago was that?

Mr. COLDEN. That was in 1928 or 1929. It has proved to be a disappointment and a costly item to the city of Los Angeles.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The acquisition of an airport should be looked at also from the standpoint of national defense should it not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. We feel that not only are we serving the District of Columbia but also the Nation's Capital when we provide ample airport facilities.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Which could be used for the protection of the National Capitol if necessary.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is right. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLDEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to add in this respect that the Los Angeles Airport has been a failure. Private companies refused to use it and built their own airport, which they maintain themselves.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There has been, of course, a rapid development of aviation within the period since the city of Los Angeles had its experience. Even in my little city in West Virginia we have a municipal airport. This is true, of course, in all the largest cities of the United States.

To continue with the make-up of this commission: The members are to be selected by the President, three in number. The first commissioners are to be appointed for a term of 2 years, 4 years, and 6 years, respectively, the President having the right, of course, to designate the chairman of the commission.

The said commission, or a majority of them, shall have the power to elect a manager for the airport hereinafter to be acquired and all officers and agents thereof and to make needful rules and regulations, subject to the laws and to the rules of the Department of Commerce regarding aviation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman state to the Members of the House the necessity for these two commissions?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say to the gentleman that the District Committee members felt they wanted a commission

simply to act from the standpoint of the selection of a site, with no entangling alliances connected therewith. This commission would receive, as I previously stated, no salary, and would act only until the selection of the site had been made.

Mr. LUCAS. Following that, under section 4 it is stated within 30 days after the selection of the site by the first commission there shall be a second commission appointed, to be known as the "Washington Airport Commission." There is delegated to the President of the United States authority to create and select this commission. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he believes the second commission would be involved in any entangling alliances in connection with the selection of this airport?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; I do not mean that. The first commission, if and when set up, would only function until the actual site was picked; then that commission's power would automatically cease.

There may be a question in the minds of the Members as to the necessity for these two commissions, but we believe there should be a permanent commission functioning in Washington, D. C., for the control and regulation of airport facilities. Section 8 of the legislation provides that a sum not to exceed $2,500,000 shall be made available for the purchase of the land and improvements.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I introduced this airport bill, and I stand here this morning in the peculiar position of being opposed to a bill which bears my name. If the Members will look at the bill as now presented to the House, they will find that the committee struck out everything after the enacting clause and inserted an entirely new bill.

In this new bill the committee erects a double-headed monster in the form of two commissions to decide, first, where the airport shall be built, and then the other to build and operate the airport. May I say at the outset that I favor a proper, safe airport for the District of Columbia. I have been interested in this matter for several sessions of Congress. It has been investigated by, I would say, at least six committees of the Congress as to where the airport should be placed. The agency in Washington that knows more about where an airport ought to be built than the individual Members of Congress, who can give this matter but little time, is the National Capitol Park and Planning Commission, which has been set up for the purpose of determining just this sort of question.

There are only two sites that have ever been given serious consideration. One is what is known as the "Gravelly Point" site, which is under water. It has to be filled in. This site is favored by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and a large number of other agencies, the names of which I shall give you presently. They have constantly and repeatedly urged the adoption of this site. The other site is the Washington-Hoover Airport, the existing airport across the Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge. Ultimately, when an airport is selected for the District of Columbia, I believe it will be one of these two sites. The committee reports against the Gravelly Point site. I think this Congress should prohibit by proper amendment to this bill the selection of the Washington-Hoover site, and I will tell the Members why. Every time an effort is made to erect an airport in the District of Columbia, a gentleman by the name of Soloman appears and monopolizes the time of the committee. Mr. Soloman is an officer of the Washington-Hoover Airport Co. The Washington-Hoover Airport was sold under deed of trust some years ago for something like $600,000. The airport company state that they had a lot of money in the project prior to that time, which brought their total cost up to $1,600,000. This may be entirely true, and I do not question the statement, because I do not know. However, when it was put under the hammer and knocked down at public auction, it brought six-hundred-and-some-odd thousand dollars. Whenever a question is raised about purchasing the site from this company, the white elephant they have on their hands, the price mentioned is anywhere from $1,600,000 on up.

Mr. EAGLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EAGLE. Yet the plot of ground over there is not big enough to land a good apple cart on?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have not got to that feature as yet.

If we set up an unofficial commission with the power to buy this property, and they will have this power under the present bill unless a limitation is put therein, there is the possibility—and I may say the strong probability—that the present Washington-Hoover Airport will be selected and we will be buying that land for $17,400 per acre.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would the gentleman favor eliminating both Gravelly Point and the Washington-Hoover Airport?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the committee will agree to such an amendment, I will conclude my argument immediately and withdraw my opposition to the bill.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Personally I believe that neither of the places mentioned are suitable for an airport.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Understand that the subcommittee is not favoring the Washington-Hoover Airport. They are giving full power to the commission to make the selection. My fear is not of the subcommittee. My fear is of this unofficial commission that is going to be set up to spend two and a half million dollars of our money. If we are going to spend two and a half million dollars, let us investigate the matter and make our own selection and say where the airport should be located.

I now want to tell you about the size of the Washington-Hoover Airport. The previous hearings on the Washington-Hoover Airport show that it is not large enough, and that it is unsafe and cannot be made safe unless it is enlarged and unless it takes in a part of the Arlington Experimental Farm.

This bill contains a provision making it mandatory upon any department of the Government to turn over to them any part of their land which may be needed to make a sufficiently large airport at this point. If they select the Washington-Hoover Airport they have got to have a large slice out of the Arlington Experimental Farm.

Now, let us see what the Department of Agriculture says about this. Here is a letter written to the committee during a former hearing by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hyde. When they wrote to him and asked whether the Arlington Experimental Farm could spare a portion of its land in order to make this a competent airport, he replied:

> As there is no other portion of Arlington Farm suitable in topography and soil character for much of this type of this experimental work, its abandonment for that purpose on short notice would irreparably damage the plant research programs of the Bureau of Plant Industry and seriously interfere with related work of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils.

Then, in conclusion, he states:

> If Congress should authorize the transfer of this 50-acre portion of Arlington Farm for other uses, the question of relocation and the provision of funds necessary to accomplish this would be immediately precipitated and even if authority and funds for relocation were available, several years would be required for the physical transfer to a new site without serious loss to the public of results of experimental work now under way.
>
> In view of the existing situation, this Department could not look with favor on the transfer of the land in question.

It is absolutely essential that they should have a portion of Arlington Experimental Farm in order to build an adequate airport on this property for which it is proposed to pay $17,400 an acre.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. EAGLE. In the event that 50 acres of the Arlington plat be added to the present little patch there, would not the great concrete highway which runs through there disrupt and interrupt the traffic?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; the heaviest route in the United States, which is U. S. No. 1, runs right along beside the present airport and is a constant menace and will always be a constant menace to those who travel by plane, as well as those who travel otherwise; then the Military Road bisects the field, and traffic lights are maintained to warn of approaching planes.

Mr. EAGLE. I may say to the gentleman that I so completely share his view that in flying up from Texas this week-end I declined to leave at a time that would put our ship down here after dark, because I knew it would be unusually dangerous.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The committee in its report did recommend that Military Road be closed immediately, did it not?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not speaking of Military Road. There is one road just to the side of it and one road that runs right through the middle of it. They will have to close Military Road, which is the road used to get to the Experimental Farm, in order to establish an airport there that will be safe under any conditions.

Now, what I want the committee to do, when we reach the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule, is to put in an amendment that will change the personnel of this commission. I would also like you to put in an amendment that will cut out the clause which would permit this unofficial commission to take away from the Department of Agriculture a part of the Arlington Experimental Farm, far more important to the people of this country than the matter of whether they ever have an airport in the city of Washington or not. I should also like for the committee to put into the bill an amendment limiting this commission to $1,000,000 for the purchase of the land for this airport. You know you can go out here and get plenty of land for an airport for $1,000,000. If you limit it to $1,000,000, then you cut out this Washington-Hoover Airport Co. that is trying to sell its property to the Government for $17,400 an acre.

May I say on behalf of Arlington County, where this property is situated, that I have a resolution which I should like to put in the RECORD, from the county board of that county, which is the governing board of the county, in which they petition the Congress not to permit the Government to purchase this airport and deprive them of a very large chunk of taxes which they get every year from this property. I think the committee will feel that this local community, where this project is being placed, ought to be entitled to some consideration, particularly when you realize that it is a drain upon their taxes of $7,500 per year if you take this property out of taxation by selling it to the Government.

I now want to call attention further, if I have the time, to a matter with respect to the Gravelly Point site, and I am not making an argument for Gravelly Point. As I said in reply to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK], if this committee will agree to an amendment excluding both the Gravelly Point site and the Washington-Hoover Airport site from this bill, I will withdraw my objection to it this minute, but I do not believe the committee is going to pass a bill which leaves it in the power of an unofficial commission to permit this Washington-Hoover Airport Co. to sell their white elephant to the United States Congress for $17,400 an acre.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As I understand, if this bill passes, they will not have to come back to Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; if this bill passes, this unofficial commission selects the site and their say is final. The only thing left for commission no. 2 to do is to build the airport and operate it.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the gentleman give the Members of the House any basic or fundamental reason why two commissions should be set up here to negotiate this matter?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I cannot. I am violently opposed to that and I hope the committee will not adopt the amendment reported by the committee when it is offered to the House.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the selection of a proper site for an air mail terminus. I can recollect very vividly when we initiated the first transcontinental air line that we had great difficulty in setting up landing fields from the Atlantic to the Pacific. At that time the Government sent out high-pressure salesmen to interest parties in the selection and establishment of air fields, and for many years afterward complaints were made that the Government either refused to land on the field or that the company or individual that set up the field was anxious to dispose of it to the Government. This advance selection of airport sites has not always proved advantageous in view of later developments.

If we decide to abandon the present facilities for an airport 20 miles away, we might have a white elephant on our hands 5 years from now, due to the ever-changing transportation service.

The present field is certainly a hazardous one. It is so regarded by the experts of every country. It is particularly hazardous for ships flying into the field, and should be changed and changed at once.

I have no objection to the bill or the details of the bill before us, but I really believe that the proper procedure for Congress to follow would be to establish an airport where it is now located.

From all opinion it is the best located airport of any city in the United States, and I have flown into a number of them. It is the best location because it is just across the river from the city. It is near the post office and within 5 minutes of the business center.

These airplanes carry passengers, express, and mail, and if there is delay in the transportation and delivery after the plane has landed that must be taken into consideration.

The Washington-Hoover Airport is the most convenient location, and its improvement can be brought about without much delay by eliminating the Military Road running through the center, eliminating the temporary bathing beach and filling up the adjacent lagoon, and turning over to the airport a portion of the Government's experimental farm land.

A C. C. C. camp could go into the Washington-Hoover Airport and put it in condition within 60 days for flying under maximum safeguards.

Mr. McFARLANE. Can we not change the name of that airport?

Mr. MEAD. Call it the "new deal" airport. [Laughter.] If we select a site 10, 15, or 20 miles away, we will have to put up with this hazardous situation until the construction of the other airport is completed. If we improve the present airport, we will have the best located airport in the United States and one that is free from hazards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, we have an excellent site, and we will not have to worry about the price because, as I understand it, the commission created by the terms of this legislation has the authority to condemn the land.

I want to make this one closing observation. The size is ideal; it can be improved, and it affords an opportunity for Washington to have a real airport. We talk about airports

in other cities and in other countries; it must be remembered that this is only one of three or four airports that we have in the city of Washington. We have the Army airport, the marine airport, one or two private airports, but the Washington-Hoover Airport improved, as I have suggested, will make a splendid airport, unequaled in many respects by that of any other city in the United States, because of its being so close to the very heart of the city of Washington.

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

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does not the gentleman believe that as long as we have this name attached to this airport, there is going to continue to be a hazard. Its name ought to be changed, and I suggest that this committee change the name of the airport and relieve us from that hazard.

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

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would it make much difference in getting to and from an airport if it took 2 or 3 minutes longer, provided you have better landing facilities?

Mr. MEAD. Two or three minutes would be all right, but I understand the other sites are more than 2 or 3 minutes further away.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We investigated sites here and there was a difference of only 2 or 3 minutes in locating a site that was cheaper and more reasonable.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Permit me to suggest that some 48 sites have been presented to various committees for consideration.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I took this matter up with a number of the men who fly into the airport, who use the airport, and this is what they say: If the Military Road were taken out and part of the experimental farm turned over by the Federal Government to the airport, so that they could clear the ground and move the hangars back, it would be a very excellent field and would probably cost only one-quarter of the maximum included in this bill. [Applause.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of this bill has gone off on the wrong premise. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has injected into this a proposition that would lead you to believe that this is a consideration for the location of a site, as between Gravelly Point and the Washington-Hoover Airport. That is strictly and entirely not the situation. The merits of the two sites are simply two things that will enter into the consideration of this first-named commission. They will consider every site, and the testimony in the hearings shows that there are some 45 in close proximity to the District of Columbia available for airports for the District of Columbia. The gentleman rather impugns the motive of somebody. Let us see what this commission is; let us see if there is any danger from this commission. Who are they? No. 1 is the Director of Aeronautics of the Department of Commerce. Where is the man who is going to rise and say that he has some selfish interest as between one and another airport? He will be a member of the commission. No. 2 is the Assistant Postmaster General. He is in charge of air mail. Who is the man or woman in this House who will say that he has a selfish interest in the selection of a site for an airport? He is to be a member of the commission. No. 3 is a Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be chairman, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. Where is the man who is going to say that he has a selfish motive in the selection of this site, which can be selected from all the world—a Member of your own body, to be picked by the Speaker? No. 4 is a United States Senator, who is appointed by the President of the Senate. Is he going to be a "fixed" member of this commission?

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Will anybody have time to explain to the committee members why it is that the Government is buying and why it is that the District of Columbia is not buying this airport?

Mr. NICHOLS. I shall answer that, but let me finish with this first. The fifth member of the commission is to be an appointee of the air-transport companies serving the city of Washington. Who is more interested in an adequate airport, one which will be located properly, one which will furnish every facility for landing, than the companies who pay for the support and upkeep in rental of this airport?

Do you think they are going to be swayed as between a location in Virginia and one in Maryland, or do you think they are going to protect their business interest, whose interests are identical with the interests to be served by this airport? Another member of the commission is a member of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Who is going to impugn his motives? Where is the man that is going to say that he is a "fixed" member of the commission? Then there is Amelia Earhart Putnam. Certainly she knows how to fly an airplane and she has been in and out of airports. Who is there among the Membership who will assert that she will be a "fixed" member for the selection of an airport?

Let us go on. There will be two more, one a member of the Park and Planning Commission of the District of Columbia. This will be offered as a committee amendment and I trust it will be adopted. A member of the Park and Planning Commission of the District of Columbia. Is he going to be a fixed member of the commission, in favor of some particular site?

Another, a member of the board of trade, who represents the business interests of the District of Columbia. Will he go on the commission, fixed against one site or another? If it is possible to select a fairer commission, a fairer cross-cut of the representatives who are interested in this important matter, I do not know how it can be done. The only interest of the subcommittee in the consideration of this bill was to select a commission of which no one could be suspicious after they had selected a site.

In answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] as to why it was necessary to create two commissions, permit me to say it is necessary to create two commissions so that there will be obviated every chance of someone suggesting graft or frame-up. The first commission is a nonsalaried commission. It selects the site. We do not leave it in their hands to purchase the site and spend the money. We take it out of their consideration. They are discharged. They are no longer in the picture. Then we ask the President of the United States to appoint a commission of three who shall serve for a term of years at a per diem and expenses, not only to purchase a site but to operate and maintain the site. If any Member can think of a fairer plan, let him suggest it.

The gentleman from California asked, "Why should the Government pay anything on this airport?" The Government should pay its proportionate part of the construction and maintenance of this airport principally because it will receive equal benefits from it with the District of Columbia. A further reason why the Government should pay part of it is that this airport will be located in the Capital of the United States, a Capital that is rapidly becoming the Capital of the world, and in this Capital City of this Nation there should be an airport second to none in the entire world.

The Government does not land its air mail down on the Government landing field. You can take a bucket of water and stick an airplane down in that flat across from Gravelly Point. The Government is not going to lose any money. They put up the money, and then after 10 years the District of Columbia pays them back 50 percent of the money with 3-percent interest. Then the District of Columbia and the Government contribute equally, 50 percent each, to the maintenance of the airport. The Government and the District of Columbia share equally, 50 percent each, in the revenues that come from the airport. I know the gentleman from Texas, TOM BLANTON, is going to ask me if there is

going to be any profit. I do not know whether there is going to be any profit or not.

Mr. BLANTON. There will not be any.

Mr. NICHOLS. Very well; probably not.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. In the gentleman's own home town there is an airport.

Mr. NICHOLS. No. I am a country boy. I live in a town of only 3,000 people.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Well, we have one and we support it ourselves and we paid for it. I cannot vote for this bill, because I do not see that the Government's contribution is necessary.

Mr. COLDEN. And the taxpayers pay the bill, too, if it is not self-supporting.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman says his city built an airport and paid the expense of it. I presume that somebody in that city thought they needed an airport. Because they needed it they took the money from the city and paid for it and built it, and they should have done so. Now, does Washington, with the ever-present problem of national defense looking her in the face——

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Oh, she has the Army and the Navy.

Mr. NICHOLS. I did not yield to the gentleman, but when it rains the Army and the Navy land their airplanes at the Washington-Hoover Airport today. The Army and Navy field is down in the flats. It is on made land. The water has never settled out of that land. It is still seepy and boggy. You can land an airplane and take a tub of water and stick it tight to the ground on the Army and Navy field. This airport should be located in a field that is high and dry and not in a spot of made land taken from the bottom of the river, as was the present site of the Army airport.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. What would happen to Gravelly Point, if it was selected, on that score?

Mr. NICHOLS. I do not care to go into that, but the hearings are full of the testimony of experts on the subject. The testimony is that it will take from 1 to 40 years in the first place to complete it; that it will take from 1 to 5 years for it to settle and for the water to seep out of it. I have no interest in where the airport is. I do not care. But we sat for 3 weeks on this subcommittee listening to every available witness, and we have come here to you with a bill giving our best and mature judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is just one real consideration in this bill, as I see it, and that is the question of whether or not the Congress thinks that the District of Columbia should have an adequate airport. No one who testified before our subcommittee even suggested that we had ample commercial landing facilities. No one who has ever landed either on the Washington or the Hoover field under present conditions, with Military Road splitting that field in two, will say that we have adequate landing facilities. Regardless of whether you like it or not, aviation is going forward. This country is rapidly becoming air-minded. The leading cities and communities in these United States are providing facilities with which they can take care of the march of progress, which is now being led by the rapid strides made in aviation.

The most rapid mail transportation today is carried on by means of airplanes. We should furnish the Post Office Department of this Government a place in the city of Washington where commercial ships can land the air mails. Private companies, if you please, have contracts from your Government and from my Government, to carry the mail. The Government does not provide them with landing facilities at the Army and Navy fields. The Government pays the private companies to carry the mail and it is up to the company to put the mail down at its own expense.

Visitors who come to the city of Washington on business, which they think should be expedited to the extent of their flying here, have the right to expect and know that they will be set down in an airplane in the city of Washington at a port where every care has been taken to protect their safety.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is the gentleman's opinion, then, that any airport constructed in the District of Columbia would serve not only the District of Columbia but also the Nation?

Mr. NICHOLS. Certainly, and it would serve every governmental department here.

I want to close with this statement. As I said before, this is a matter that has been before the House for at least two sessions; not this bill, but the question of an airport for Washington. This subcommittee sat for weeks and weeks and heard everybody whom we thought could throw any light on the subject. I sincerely hope the Committee of the Whole will pass this bill. No one has cried a great deal about expense. If you want to impugn the motives of this commission, all right; if you think there is a fairer commission that can be selected, let us try it; but if you want an airport for the city of Washington vote for this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is only one feature of this bill to which I object, and that is the feature requiring the Government of the United States to pay half of the expenses of purchasing this field and of maintaining it, and for it to provide all of the money and then wait 10 years before half of it is paid back. We have two fields of our own here in the District of Columbia, two landing fields owned by the United States Government, bought by the United States Government, and maintained by the United States Government, one for the Army and one for the Navy, and we do not need any interest in this field. This is a District of Columbia city field, just like the city field we have at Abilene, Tex.—and we have one of the finest landing fields in the United States in my home city, a double A-1 field where planes land regularly every day, mail planes, Army planes, passenger planes, private planes, every kind of plane. It is an all-weather field. When the people in the district of my friend from South Carolina want a field they buy and build it. When our friends from New York want fields they build them, they pay for them, and they maintain them.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry not to yield, but I want to use my few minutes myself.

Mr. Chairman, why should our taxpayers back home put up the money for this municipal Washington field? Our distinguished friends on this committee are very generous with the American taxpayers' money. They take it all out of the Public Treasury. None of it is to be paid back for 10 years. For 10 years the people of the District get the benefit of it and then begin paying back so much a year for 4 years.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Not now; I am sorry I haven't the time. When the gentleman goes home I want him to tell his people back home that for 75 years they have been taxed not only for their own civic enterprises at home but they were taxed also to bear 50 percent of the cost of the local civic government here in Washington, respecting all the public improvements in Washington, until in late years we stopped it. During those years the people in the 48 States paid 50 percent of the water system, the light system, the school buildings, the playgrounds, the bridges—the million-dollar bridge out here on Connecticut Avenue and the $3,500,000 Key Bridge. They helped to pay for all these civic improvements here, embracing 1,200 parks in Washington used for the pleasure and benefit of the people of Washington. The people back home do not get any benefit of these things unless they make a trip to Washington and visit here for a

few days. I am getting tired of seeing the taxpayers back home mulcted and almost ruined by overtaxation when they can hardly pay their own expenses, when they are already overburdened with taxes, when they have to pay all of their own civic expenses back home.

We should strike out the provision requiring the Government to pay any part of this expense. I am with our distinguished friend, the gentlewoman from New Jersey in providing Washington with an airport. She wants a nice airplane field here, and so do I; but I want to let the people of Washington pay for their own field.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. If the gentleman will help me get a bill through Congress giving the franchise to the people of Washington I will go along with him in some of his efforts.

Mr. BLANTON. Franchise for what?

Mrs. NORTON. A franchise to vote, of course.

Mr. BLANTON. What, against the Constitution! A bill was passed through Congress in 1871 giving the people of Washington the right to vote, but the Supreme Court held they did not have that right under the Constitution, and in 1874 Congress took it away again; but in the meantime they got into debt so far that it almost bankrupted the Nation to pay them out. We paid them out then but we provided also that if any official of the District of Columbia ever again should borrow another dollar he should be put in the penitentiary for a long term of years.

Why did Congress do that? They did it because they did not want this Nation's Capital to get into debt.

Mrs. NORTON. Does not the gentleman know that the Government has given 30 percent of the vast public-works fund as grants to the people throughout this country?

Mr. BLANTON. And the people of Washington have gotten their full proportion of all P. W. A. grants, and have already received their 30-percent donations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider the substitute committee amendment as an original bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentlewoman from New Jersey means to consider the committee substitute amendment as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. In other words that it shall be read by sections and amendments shall be in order at the end of each section?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. At the conclusion of the reading of this amendment, will it then be in order to vote upon the adoption of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will have to vote upon the committee substitute amendment.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That there is hereby created a commission to choose a site for the establishment and development of a commercial airport for the District of Columbia; said commission to consist of seven persons, as follows: The Director of Aeronautics of the Department of Commerce; the Second Assistant Postmaster General; a Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be chairman, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; a United States Senator, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and an appointee of the air transport companies serving the city of Washington; one member from the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, to be selected by said Board; and Amelia Earhart Putnam, internationally known aviatrix. Said commission shall receive no salary, but shall be reimbursed for actual expenses of travel incurred in the discharge of official duties herein prescribed."

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mrs. NORTON: On page 4, line 18, strike out the word "seven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nine."

On page 5, line 2, after the semicolon, strike out the word "and."

On page 5, line 3, after the word "aviatrix", strike out the period, insert a semicolon and the following language: "an appointee of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and an appointee of the Board of Trade of the District of Columbia."

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the latter amendment is offered in order to give the people of the District of Columbia greater representation on this commission and is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 4, line 18, after the word "persons", strike out down to the period on line 3, page 5, and insert the following: "To be appointed by the President."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the difference between this amendment and the original bill is that instead of naming various and sundry individuals, officials, and others, as is done in the bill, the selection of the committee is left to the appointment of the President of the United States. That is all it does. It strikes out all of that part which says that so-and-so, Amelia Earhart, and somebody else shall be appointed to the commission, and directs the President of the United States to appoint the members of the commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Said commission is hereby instructed and empowered to make a survey of possible and practical sites and to study testimony submitted in the various congressional hearings conducted on this subject. Said commission is further instructed and empowered to choose a site for the establishment and development of a commercial airport, taking into consideration as prime factors, the questions of time of completion, cost of the enterprise, safety, and the proximity to the community to be served.

SEC. 3. After a site has been selected by the said commission (and it is hereby ordered that the action of a majority of the members of the commission shall constitute the action of the commission), the duties and powers of the commission for the selection of said site shall end.

SEC. 4. Within 30 days after the selection of the site by the commission, which shall be known as the "Washington Airport Commission", as above provided for, the President of the United States, by and with the consent of the United States Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to create a commission to establish and operate a public airport at Washington, D. C., to consist of three persons, to be appointed by him, and the first commissioners so appointed shall hold office for the terms of 2 years, 4 years, and 6 years, respectively, and until their successors shall have been appointed and qualified, and thereafter every commissioner appointed to succeed said commissioners shall be appointed for the full term of 6 years, and the President shall designate which one of said commissioners shall be chairman. Any vacancy created by death, resignation, or dismissal, or otherwise, shall be filled for the period of such vacancy only, and all such appointments shall be confirmed by the Senate of the United States. Said commissioners shall receive no salary, but shall be reimbursed for actual expenses of travel incurred in the discharge of official duties, and shall reside within 10 miles of the Capital of the United States.

SEC. 5. Said Commission, or a majority of them, shall have power to elect a manager for the airport hereinafter to be acquired, and all other officers and agents thereof, and to make all needful rules and regulations, subject to the law and to conform to the rules of the Department of Commerce regarding aviation.

SEC. 6. The said Commission is hereby authorized and empowered to acquire the property selected by the Washington Airport Commission first provided for in this act, together with all rights, privileges, and easements incident to same, and if, after private negotiation, a satisfactory price therefor cannot be agreed upon, then the said Commission is hereby authorized and required to give notice that said property is needed for public purposes and that the same will be condemned, and accordingly the same shall be condemned, and the condemnation proceedings shall conform as nearly as may be to the proceedings authorized and set up in the act of Congress approved May 18, 1933, known as "An act to create the Tennessee Valley Authority", and said

provisions of said act are hereby incorporated into and shall become a part of this act.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be misunderstood because of the remarks I made heretofore as being opposed to the District of Columbia getting an airport. I think I realize as fully as any member of the committee that the District of Columbia needs a commercial airport, but I have not been convinced after listening to the arguments made this morning that the United States Government should contribute the amount that it is proposed to contribute by this bill to the erection of this airport, the building of it and its continued maintenance throughout the years. This final commission is authorized to contribute for the Government one-half of the expense of the airport.

Mr. Chairman, it is no argument to tell me that because the city of Sacramento, which is the capital city of my State, desires an airport the State of California should build an airport in the city of Sacramento because that is the city of official business. It is no argument for national defense that this airport should be built or paid for in any way by the Government. The Government is intensely defended here in the city of Washington with its Marine airport, its Army airport, and its Navy airport. So far as that swamp land is concerned, the last time I flew to the city of Washington, the pilot refused to land in this commercial field, but did land at the Army or Navy field across the way.

Mr. Chairman, the United States Government is going to make a sufficient contribution to this airport that it should be selected at the commercial airport. There are a great many acres in this agricultural field that is spoken of, which the United States Government proposes to give. If such a plan is followed there are 14.25 acres available in the experimental farm. If the present airport is worth $16,000 per acre, multiply this 14.25 acres by $16,000 and this agricultural land is probably better than where the airport is at present situated. The area in Military Road amounts to 4.82 acres. The area in the lagoon amounts to 10.67 acres. The property between the lagoon and Military Road amounts to 8.10 acres. I have recited enough acreage here that on the basis of $10,000 an acre would amount to more than $500,000 as the contribution on the part of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, if the District of Columbia wants an airport, which it should have, the United States Government should not be made to contribute just because the Capitol is located here. There is no city from my experience and travels in the last few years during the depression that is so blessed by God as the city of Washington, D. C.; yet the folks here do not seem to know it. If they do not appreciate this fact, they better leave the District of Columbia and ride through the countryside and see the poverty and distress which exists in the country, and I am not speaking for ballyhoo purposes or for the newspapers at home when I make that statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of this bill somebody, it seems to me, has received some advance information. I did not know that the commission, which this bill creates, was going to select the Washington-Hoover Field. I do not think anybody knows it and, of course, it is ridiculous to say that they do, but you continually hear this bill discussed with respect to the merits of the Washington-Hoover Airport. This is beside the question and is ridiculous. They talk about the expense to the Government in taking the Experimental Farm. There was no testimony before the subcommittee by anyone that they would take more than a small corner off of the Experimental Farm, and there was also testimony before the committee that regardless of what happened out there, the Government is now making plans to move the Experimental Farm entirely from its present location and establish it at another point.

As to whether or not Washington needs an airport for national defense, of course, Washington does not need one airport for national defense. I hope I never live to see the time when this country is engaged in war again, but if it is, and it happens that the war is brought to our shores, we will need plenty of airports for national defense purposes around the Nation's Capital. Neither 3 nor 4 nor 5 nor 6 nor 7 will be adequate. You certainly cannot concentrate your flying strength in time of war at one or two air bases. Certainly the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps bases that the gentleman has referred to, plus the present field, would not be ample for national defense purposes in time of an emergency. I say frankly to this Congress that I think before many years have gone by you will have under consideration in this House a proposition to dot several places around the Nation's Capital as auxiliary landing fields for defense purposes, as they do in nearly every other capital in the world for its adequate protection.

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill, please do not be led off by the side arguments as between Gravelly Point and Washington-Hoover Field. They should not enter into the picture at all. One would think they were the only available sites in the country around the District of Columbia. Within a radius of 5 miles of the business district, the country is dotted with adequate sites on which could be placed a landing field that could be purchased right. You do not need to be scared about the $17,400 an acre that the gentleman from Virginia talked about. There are spots all around this city, and this commission not only is directed, but is ordered to consider every available site and, as I have said, unless you can impugn the motives of this commission, you have got to assume that they will consider all the sites.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is there adequate provision made to provide proper safeguards with respect to bidding and publicity in regard to all the sites submitted?

Mr. NICHOLS. No; there is not. They can select the site and then the other commission buys it. The first commission does not do anything but select the site, and the second commission buys it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the other nations of the world, many of which I have mentioned here today, through their capitals and their splendid airport facilities in practically every instance have contributed as governments to such airports at their national capitals, and here in Washington, D. C., we are face to face with the fact today that we need adequate airport facilities, and if there was ever a time when the Federal Government needed to shake hands with the District of Columbia in behalf of a project which is for the interest of both, it is now.

I may say that the Federal Government is helping cities throughout the country in the development of their airports by 30-percent grants in all the States of this Republic to assist such communities and cities in the development of proper aviation facilities.

It would be a wrong move for this House today to say to the country that this Nation has no part in the building of an adequate airport, with proper facilities, in the National Capital for the years that are ahead.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. In the event that the site selected by the Washington Airport Commission first provided for in this act includes in it land or property which now belongs to the Government of the United States, or any department thereof, the Commission appointed by the President is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to enter into negotiations with the department of Government having control over said property, for the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of the property, so that it may be made available for use as an airport, as provided for in this act. Any department of Government which has under its control any property necessary to the successful completion of an airport, as provided

for in this act, is hereby authorized and directed, after satisfactory negotiations have been made with the Commission, to release to said Commission as much of said property as is necessary for the successful completion of said airport.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 23, after the period, strike out the remainder of the section.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, the purpose of this amendment is to foreclose the Airport Commission from taking over other Government property, and I have particular reference to that portion of the Arlington Experimental Farm.

I want to call the attention of the committee to the language that I ask to have stricken out.

Any department of Government which has under its control any property necessary to the successful completion of an airport, as provided for in this act, is hereby authorized and directed, after satisfactory negotiations have been made with the Commission, to release to said Commission as much of said property as is necessary for the successful completion of said airport.

I think that is a very dangerous provision. It leaves the possibility there that this commission may say to the Arlington Experimental Farm that we need 50, 75, or 100 acres for an airport, and the language is such that that Department is directed, after negotiations, to turn it over to the Airport Commission.

I read a letter in the general debate on the bill from the Department of Agriculture in which they said that if they had to give up any part of the Experimental Farm adjacent to the airport that is being used for experimental purposes now it would work irreparable injury to the Agriculture Department and disrupt experiments that have been running over several years.

There are plenty of places without taking any part of that farm. Under this language, they could require also other departments of the Government to turn over land for the site of an airport.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman from Virginia has changed his position. You remember that when the original bill was introduced the gentleman from Virginia proposed to acquire as an airport what is known as "Gravelly Point." Within Gravelly Point is land owned by the Government of the United States. If you adopt the gentleman's amendment, it would make it impossible to use any ground that now belongs to the Government.

I will say frankly that one of the finest sites, in my judgment, I saw—in my personal opinion—was a place down on Anacostia Flats, where the whole ground belongs to the Government of the United States. Why not take land that belongs to the Government and use it for an airport and save the Government from the expense of purchasing more land?

Mr. McFARLANE. Then, why not locate it on the land that belongs to the Government and stop all this poppycock?

Mr. NICHOLS. I stated that that was my personal opinion. We had other members on the committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is time for us not to allow any small plat of ground to stand between us and the acquisition of land for an airport. I do not believe that you should adopt an amendment making it impossible to obtain any plat of ground that belongs to the Government or is held by any department of the Government. In addition to that, in nearly every site around here that is close to the District of Columbia you will find a sliver of Government land running into it, and you will have an airport commercially owned with Government land injected into it.

Mr. MILLARD. The gentleman made the statement there was a good deal of discussion that the Hoover Airport was in mind for purchase. Having section 7 in the bill, does not the gentleman feel that whoever prepared that section did have the Washington-Hoover Airport in mind?

Mr. NICHOLS. I expect I had as much to do with writing this bill as anybody. It was written by the subcommittee and it was not written by somebody and sent to us. We wrote the bill and we wrote the report. So far as I am concerned, I did not have the Hoover Airport in mind, but I did have in mind this: We saw a lot of tracts of land, some having Government land in them, and some of them are good, and we ought to fix it so that we could acquire those tracts even though some of them do belong to the Government.

Mr. MILLARD. Does the gentleman know who owns the Hoover Airport now?

Mr. NICHOLS. It is owned by a corporation; I forget the name.

Mr. MILLARD. There is nobody in the commission who has anything to do with it?

Mr. NICHOLS. No.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I believe the Hoover Airport is owned by the Government, is it not?

Mr. NICHOLS. It is not.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. If this amendment is adopted, it takes the heart out of the bill.

Mr. NICHOLS. It does not take the heart out of it. It simply forces you to trade with real-estate men instead of using some of the land belonging to the Government.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. It ought to be defeated.

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. FIESINGER. Why would it not be well to except Government land where operations might be interfered with?

Mr. NICHOLS. I just stated to the gentleman that there was testimony before our subcommittee, if he is interested in protecting the Experimental Farm, that the Experimental Farm is going to be moved, and then that will be vacant land owned by the Government used for no purpose.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum of money as may be necessary to pay the purchase price of said land and for the necessary improvements thereon: *Provided*, That said sum of money shall not be in excess of $2,500,000. One-half of all sums expended from appropriations authorized shall be repaid to the United States, with interest at 3 percent per annum, from any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia, in four equal installments, commencing 10 years after the expenditure of the money above provided for, and the said Commission shall keep strict account of all its accounts and doings, shall fix fair and uniform charges, fees, rentals, and prices for all services and privileges accorded to any person, firm, or corporation using said airport, and shall annually, in December, make report to the President of the United States, and said report shall be by the President transmitted to the Congress for its information.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 8, line 7, after the word "Treasury", insert the words "to the credit of the District of Columbia", and in line 11, after the figures "$2,500,000", strike out the period, insert a colon, and strike out all of the balance of line 11 and all of lines 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and the words "provided for" in line 17.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment in no way interferes with the attempt on the part of the committee to furnish the District of Columbia with a proper airport. It does not change any of their provisions in the bill at all, except that instead of having the Government pay all the money and then waiting 10 years to eventually have a chance of getting half of it back, it provides that the District of Columbia shall do just like the people do back in Tennessee and West Virginia and Texas and Oklahoma—namely, pay for their own airport. What is wrong with that? Is there anything about the District of Columbia that makes its people here sacred, that we have to make them holy, as my friend from South Carolina, Mr. McMILLAN, suggests? Why give them everything on God's earth free?

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. The gentleman's amendment still leaves that portion of the bill permitting the Government to turn over land.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; it leaves every provision in the bill, but provides that the District shall pay for its airport. Why should you not support this amendment? Are your people back home satisfied with the present system of taxation whereby they pay for everything at home and then pay a great big sum here on civic expenses?

Mr. McMILLAN. May I say to the Members of the House that the record shows that $300,000,000 have been expended by municipalities in this country for airports. I do not see why Washington should be excepted.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. And there are not going to be any returns from this airport. So far as the splendid airport that we have in my city is concerned, the taxpayers have to dig down and make up the deficit. My home people paid for it and pay all maintenance charges and are glad to do it. We want airplanes to stop there. We have regular daily airplane mail service there. Do you want to have the Government put up all this money? That is what the Government is doing under this bill. This Government is putting up every dollar of it, $2,500,000 and then it will wait 10 years and get a part of it back on the installment plan.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Do they do that in Graham?

Mr. McFARLANE. No; we had to pay for our own airport. Under the loan and grant of the P. W. A. money the Government grants only 30 percent and the people have to pay 70 percent. Yet here for the city of Washington, under this bill they will receive a 100-percent grant from the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. The District has had its share of the P. W. A. money. It got about $1,700,000 to put in a sewer system and it got a lot of money from the Government to build a splendid tuberculosis hospital, which is being done at the present time.

It has gotten its share of the relief money. This Government spent $11,000,000 here in Washington last year for relief, out of the Public Treasury, and it has not got a dollar of it back. It spent about $1,000,000 a month for relief. If you will check up on the P. W. A. fund and every other fund you will see that Washington has gotten its lion's share of it. It gets the lion's share of all the jobs in Washington. It has gotten many times as many jobs as Texas, a great commonwealth, 900 miles across east and west and 900 miles across north and south. Texas gets a mere hand-out on public jobs compared to Washington. If you will go around Washington you will see "P. W. A. Project No. So-and-so." Go right down the Avenue and look on the left and you will see "P. W. A. Project No. So-and-so." There are hundreds of thousands of dollars spent here in various parts of the city annually out of various bills, no part of which is paid by the District of Columbia. Are you not getting tired of it? What reason is there for it? They are not overtaxed. I will say to my good friend from Oklahoma, Mr. NICHOLS—and I think he is one of the most valuable young Members of this House—I am going to put in here what his people down in Oklahoma spend compared to what the people spend here in Washington for taxes. It is time to stop it. I hope you will vote for my amendment.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. There is also authorized to be appropriated annually, so much as may be necessary for the operation and maintenance of the airport, including compensation of employees, repairs and accessories, purchase or installation, and maintenance of supplies and materials. One-half of said appropriations to be charged to the District of Columbia; one-half of all moneys received from the operation of said airport shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; and one-half credited to the treasury of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this section should go out of the bill because of the amendment we have just adopted. I offer an amendment to strike out section 9.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Beginning on page 9, line 1, strike out all of section 9.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet seeking recognition when the Chairman put the motion on the previous amendment. I wanted to be heard on the amendment, opposing the amendment, as a member of the committee. I was on my feet seeking recognition when the Chair put the question. I am not sure what the parliamentary procedure is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman rise or hear him ask for recognition.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I also was seeking recognition at the same time, and I saw the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] on his feet and asking for recognition.

Mr. McFARLANE. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma to ask unanimous consent to be heard on the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. But, Mr. Chairman, we have voted on that and determined it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Of course, the gentleman from Texas will object to it, I expect, if I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman had risen to question the vote, I would not have objected.

Mr. NICHOLS. I was on my feet. I did rise.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean before the Chair announced the vote.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, regular order.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] was adopted be reconsidered and that I be recognized in opposition to the amendment before it is voted upon again.

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

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. NICHOLS. May we again have the amendment reported?

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Beginning on page 9, line 1, strike out all of section 9.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. It relates to how this money shall be paid back. We have already provided that the District shall pay it, so there is no use having this last section. It does not injure the bill at all.

Mr. NICHOLS. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am sure the gentleman is in perfect good faith in his zeal to save money for the taxpayers of Texas and Oklahoma and the other States, but in this instance the gentleman is wrong. If you are going to force the District of Columbia to pay all the bill—and I do not think you can force them to do so, but if you can do so——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the first part of section 9 should be retained, so I withdraw the amendment; and then I will offer another.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out that portion of section 9 beginning in line 5 on page 9 with the word "one-half" and the balance of the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: On page 9, line 5, after the word "materials", beginning with the word "one-half", strike out the remainder of the section.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in writing.

Mr. BLANTON. This is not a technical amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask permission to put it in writing.

Mr. NICHOLS. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE] is recognized.

Mr. McFARLANE. Speaking to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], it would be foolish to refuse to adopt this amendment, in view of the fact that we have already adopted an amendment requiring the District of Columbia to pay for this airport, just as every other city in the United States pays for its airport if they have one.

If you dance you must pay the fiddler. We know that the District of Columbia is receiving more aid now per capita than any other city in the United States its size.

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

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman explain whether or not this body by legislation can force the District of Columbia to spend money on an airport if the Commissioners of the District of Columbia do not want to spend the money?

Mr. McFARLANE. No; but it might stop this committee from bringing in this kind of legislation if we hang this kind of amendment on it.

Mr. NICHOLS. It will stop the District of Columbia from getting an airport.

Mr. McFARLANE. That is what we want to do, that is what I want to do. In other words, if the District of Columbia wants an airport let them get it the same way every other city gets an airport; let them buy it and pay for it.

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

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. HARLAN. I am not expressing any opinion on this point but the gentleman's city, for instance, has the right to fix its own tax rate. The gentleman's city can borrow money and issue bonds, it has the benefit of inheritance taxes and income taxes, for most States have income tax laws. Not so with the District of Columbia, however, for this body, this Congress, controls the revenue of the District of Columbia absolutely. They are supine, they cannot do anything without our consent, yet we will not let them levy taxes although we hold them responsible for not doing things. What is the gentleman's comment on this situation?

Mr. McFARLANE. Answering the gentleman I will say that the bill which authorizes them to build the airport gives them full powers to build it if they see fit.

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

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the tax rate per $100 or per $1,000 paid on real property in the District of Columbia?

Mr. McFARLANE. I think it is a dollar and a quarter or a dollar and a half.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On the assessed valuation or on the actual valuation?

Mr. McFARLANE. It is supposed to be on actual valuation, although they reduce it about half.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Therefore it would be about $15 per $1,000. I pay $45 per $1,000 on actual valuation.

Mr. McFARLANE. That is true; and we all know that the tax rate here in the District is lower than the tax rate in any other city of comparable size in the United States. There is no argument about that, we know it is true.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman said the rate was $1.50 a thousand.

Mr. McFARLANE. No; it is $1.50 per hundred, $15 per thousand. I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] whether or not I am correct?

Mr. BLANTON. It is $1.50 per hundred, or $15 per thousand, on far less than actual valuation, as compared with $45 per $1,000 the gentleman from Michigan pays there on full valuation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 9, line 5, after the word "materials", strike out the balance of the paragraph and insert the following:

"SEC. 9. There is also authorized to be appropriated annually from the revenues of the District of Columbia so much money as may be necessary for the operation and maintenance of the airport, including compensation of employees, repairs, and accessories, purchase or installation, and maintenance of supplies and materials."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, adopting the amendment leaves the bill exactly as it was except that instead of the people back home having to pay all this money which the bill originally provided, and then waiting 10 years to get half of it back, the District of Columbia pays for its own airport. This is the way it ought to be.

The provision my amendment seeks to strike out provided that one-half of the profit was to be paid the Government. Of course, we know there will be no profit, so it ought to be stricken out.

Now, let me say to my friend about taxes, that the tax rate here now is $1.50 a hundred not on full valuation, because if you will read the hearings on the last District appropriation bill you will see that the Commissioners testified that year before last they arbitrarily reduced the tax assessment here by $80,000,000 at one time, just arbitrarily reduced the assessed valuation by $80,000,000. You will see that last year they made another reduction in valuation of $50,000,000. So last year and the year before the District Commissioners reduced the assessed valuation $130,000,000, and still the tax rate is only $1.50 a hundred, or $15 a thousand. My friend from Michigan says the tax rate in his district is $45 a thousand. Do you know what the tax rate is in some of the large cities of Oklahoma, where our friend JACK NICHOLS lives? Down there some pay $6 on the hundred, or about $60 on the $1,000.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. Does the gentleman know of any municipality in the country where the tax rate is so low?

Mr. BLANTON. There is not one so low as Washington. The people of the District of Columbia pay a lower rate of tax than prevails in any other city of comparable size in the United States.

Mr. MILLARD. Or of any size.

Mr. BLANTON. If you doubt that, check it up. I want to repeat what I said before: Ben Johnson, of Kentucky, a splendid man, who used to be chairman of this committee, once spent 12 months intensely investigating this tax rate in Washington. I will guarantee that every Member of Congress who will read his last report will be astounded at the hundreds of millions of dollars our Government has spent here benefiting Washington people.

We are leaving this bill just as the committee framed it, except as to who is to pay for it. Every provision they wanted in the bill is still there. We have not disturbed a provision except one, and that is we are keeping the Government from paying all of this money and getting half of it back some of these days.

We are letting the District do what we do back home; that is, pay for their own airport. Out in California, they have spent millions of dollars out there for airports, just like we have in Texas, and we have some of the finest in the world down there in Texas. At Forth Worth, Dallas, Abilene, El Paso, and San Antonio we have splendid air-

ports. The Government has two here in Washington, one for the Army and one for the Navy. They say you can take a bucket of water and stick an airplane——

Mr. NICHOLS. I am talking about the Army airport down here.

Mr. BLANTON. We have an Army airport and a Navy airport.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is the one I was talking about sticking with a bucket of water.

Mr. BLANTON. We have an Army and a Navy airport. If they are not good enough we will build better ones. But when we pay for them, we want to own them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if those who are opposing this bill, and who know that the airport will not be built unless Government funds are provided, have ever thought about this feature: That sometime today or tomorrow or some other time one of our colleagues may land in this field and a fatality occur? If such would happen we will be holding memorial service for those Members next year.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is not only a crying shame but an absolute disgrace to the Nation that Washington has not one of the model airports of the world. It is a tribute to the pilots who have been flying the commercial planes to Washington that there have not been tragedies so far. They are doing the best they can with the facilities available. But think of it, Washington of all cities, the finest, most beautiful capital in the world, has one of the worst airports in the country.

We know that the District of Columbia is not going to build an airport, at least not in its initial stage. It has to have help from the Federal Government. Right in the middle of the present airport, which is privately owned, you have a road, and a very much used road. The airport is not usable unless the planes cross that road. There is a stop and go sign there. Can you imagine an airplane stopping in the middle of the air because the sign is red? Not until we invent some air hooks with which to hang them onto the clouds can you do that. We have heard of a number of cases throughout the country of airplanes striking automobiles, killing the people in the automobiles and the plane. Washington is the heart of this country. Do we want that to happen here? Along with our other great transportation systems the air has become very important, and because of the nature of governmental affairs today, it becomes increasingly necessary for people to come to Washington by plane. We have a great increase in our air traffic, yet have provided no facilities. Talk about the Army and Navy field? May I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that the present Army and Navy fields are two of the worst fields in the world.

Mr. BLANTON. I agree with the gentleman. But let us remedy them. But this bill will not remedy them.

Mr. MAAS. That is what we want to do, and we want to remedy the commercial field as well.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. We can raise the local tax rate here in Washington 10 cents and have more than enough money to buy and build the field. Just raise the tax rate from $1.50 to $1.60. I will go along with the gentleman then and help build the finest army field and the finest navy field in the world, because the gentleman says we need them, and I have confidence in the gentleman's judgment on such matters. He is one of our finest flyers, but he is not helping the situation by building a local city field here for the District with Government money, and which will charge the Government for every plane that lands on the field. He is not helping that situation.

Mr. MAAS. We have to have a commercial field. The District of Columbia is not going to build a field at the present time. We have not raised the tax rate, and I do not know that we would be justified in raising it. All I am pleading for is an airport.

Mr. BLANTON. The Commissioners may enter an order tomorrow increasing the tax rate 10 cents.

Mr. MAAS. But they have not done it.

Mr. BLANTON. An act of Congress is not necessary to do that.

Mr. MAAS. But in the meantime there is not a satisfactory airport here.

Mr. Chairman, if people are killed on that field it is our responsibility. The matter is in our hands; nobody else's. I shall hold this House responsible if any deaths result from our failure to provide an adequate field. The gentleman from Texas knows a great deal more than I do about the modus operandi; but I appeal to the House for a satisfactory airport. I do not care what the technicalities are, but I warn you that you are doing a great injustice to the country and to the people who have to come to Washington by air, if a decent airport is not provided.

The Washington-Hoover site offers a very fine opportunity, together with the agricultural farm, if Military Road is closed. Combining those three fields together would give us one of the finest airports in the country and one of the rare instances of having a field so close to the city, which is a big advantage to passengers.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I will go with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] before the Navy Committee or the Army Committee and help build one of the finest fields in the world for this Government, one for the Army and one for the Navy; but we are not getting anywhere with this kind of a bill. This is not a Government bill at all; it is simply a local city bill, but the Government is to pay for it.

Mr. NICHOLS. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that that will not help the commercial situation, and that is where the trouble lies.

Mr. MAAS. That is exactly the point I am making. We need a commercial airport for the city of Washington, entirely aside from the Army and Navy needs, which have no relationship to the commercial needs. I am concerned with the practical and not theoretical situation involved in getting an adequate airport for Washington immediately.

It is not the people of Washington who are so much concerned with the providing of an airport here. It is really a national problem. It is used mostly by people coming here on Government business. Since it is the Nation's Capital, and air transportation here is largely for the convenience of the Nation's citizens, the Federal Government should bear part of the expense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will vote down this amendment, and I will tell you why. Of course, if the former amendment of the gentleman from Texas is to remain in the bill, this amendment, probably, should follow; but this can be taken care of even if we leave the language in the bill, because there will be a separate vote demanded on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] when we go back into the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is what we have done. If there are any among you who appreciate the trying necessity for an adequate airport at Washington and if you are friendly to the proposition that Washington should have an adequate airport, you have defeated your purpose by the adoption of the Blanton amendment, and I will tell you why: We cannot force the District of Columbia to spend any sum of money to build an airport. We can simply make provision for it, but we cannot force them, and if we leave this amendment in the bill, the District of Columbia will not build the airport, and the matter will stay where it is now, with two little plots of ground cut in two by Military Road, where Eddie Rickenbacker testified before our com-

mittee that every time an airplane sat down over that Military Road it endangered the lives of not only the passengers on the ship but the lives of pedestrians along the road.

If you put this provision back in the bill, TOM BLANTON need not be so exercised about the Government's spending 50 percent of the cost and the maintenance of this airport. This Government, under this administration, has gone up and down the length and breadth of the United States granting 30 percent here and 30 percent there to every little town of 3,500 people that would build an airport out of a little pasture field.

Why should the city of Washington be condemned? I have no fight to make for their taxation system. I do not think the citizens here pay enough taxes, but let us not wreak our vengeance out on this piece of legislation. If you leave this amendment in the bill, you will fix it so that the Capital of your Nation cannot have an adequate airport, although, as a nation, we boast of leading the march of progress of the nations of the world, and yet we have an air field out here that looks like a cracker box and is almost as hard to get into.

If you are interested in this bill, I may say the bill will do you no good unless you vote with the committee when we ask a separate vote on the adoption of the Blanton amendment.

I also hope you will kill the amendment now under consideration and then vote for the committee to take out the Blanton amendment when we get back into the House.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if Military Road that passes alongside of the present commercial airport is endangering the lives of some of our constituents who visit here in Washington, why is it that the committee cannot bring in a bill authorizing condemnation proceedings and condemn this road? I am willing to abandon this road and give it to the airport.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is the gentleman willing for me to answer that question?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. The road is absolutely under the control of the War Department and they have refused to close the road. There is now a resolution pending before our committee, which we are attempting to report out, to force the closing of the road and we are getting plenty of opposition from Virginia to the closing of this road.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I will vote for such a bill, and that is our duty.

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

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. My amendment has nothing to do with Military Road. My amendment simply has to do with relieving the Government of paying all this money. If you pass my amendment, Military Road can still be taken care of under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. If the gentleman will leave me 1 minute of my time, let me say that the ninth section of this bill is more abhorrent to me than the donation of the money to build this airport. I would rather give $2,000,000 to build the airport than to have this recurring, annual expense which is more abhorrent to me than anything else.

Mr. NICHOLS. We have got to maintain it.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Let the District of Columbia maintain it.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he has proposed this amendment as an economical measure in behalf of the Treasury?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, it keeps the Government from paying $2,500,000 now and waiting 10 years to get half of it back. That is an economy, is it not?

Mr. HOEPPEL. Mr. Chairman, if economy is the issue, which prompts our concern over such a comparatively small item, it appears that it is a type of economy which "strains at gnats and swallows camels." I sat on the floor here a year ago when we harangued all the afternoon over a matter of $100,000 for the Chicago fair. A day or two after this we came in, closed our eyes, and, without debate and under a strict gag, voted $1,272,000,000 to hand over to the President, without restriction or designation as to how he might spend this huge amount.

In the last session we voted a substantial subsidy to the bankers of America through the enactment of the Federal Housing Act. Under this bill, which the Congress meekly enacted, bankers receive 9.72-percent interest for loans which they make on the renovation of homes, and on mortgage loans which they make, to be repaid over a period of 20 years, they further gouge the public up to as high as 13 percent.

In addition, we take John Taxpayer's money and guarantee the banker up to 20 percent of any loss incurred on these loans, notwithstanding the usurious rates which they are exacting. Not only are we doing this for the bankers but we are spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, employing thousands of individuals in the F. E. R. A. to canvass the homes of America asking the citizens to borrow money from the bankers for renovation or new construction at these extortionate rates. The Federal Housing ballyhoo has invaded every section of the country at great expense to the taxpayers. They have had 29 national radio hook-up ballyhoos in an endeavor to lead the people to the doors of the private bankers to borrow money, where the lowest interest rate is 9.72 percent. Instead of driving the money changers out of the temple, as we were promised by the President in his inaugural address, we are paying millions of the taxpayers' money to bring the distresed home owner to the threshold of the banker to be bled white. This is indeed a new deal for the banker. Never before did he have the Government cooperating with him in the exaction of usury.

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

Mr. HOEPPEL. In a moment, if the gentleman will permit me to proceed. And after these people have borrowed this money, having 20 years to repay it, they will virtually pay for two or three houses while they actually own one. The Congress condones this and yet we quibble over a little matter of one and a half million dollars for a necessary airport which will contribute to commercial progress and which may be utilized also from the standpoint of defense!

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman tell us who was the father of Zebedee's children? That is just as apropos to the bill now before us, which is to relieve officials from giving bonds.

Mr. HOEPPEL. I am not discussing ancient history but the inconsistency of our present situation and the utter absurdity, in the light of our past actions, of injecting the question of economy into the discussion of the pending bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEPPEL. For a question.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to say that regardless of the talk here about the responsibility of the District of Columbia and the Federal Government being involved in the expenditure for an airport, we cannot get away from the proposition, that down in our hearts this will be a truly national utility.

Mr. HOEPPEL. I concur in the views of the gentleman. I want to emphasize further the fact that we are quibbling about small things which would be in the public interest and doing much for the financial group. In my opinion, we are not living up to our obligations as legislators. Speaking editorially this morning, the Washington Herald states:

> There was a time when Congress possessed the intelligence to meet great crises and, in proper cooperation with the other two coordinate branches of the Government, solve them in statesmanlike fashion.
>
> There was a time when the Congress was composed of self-respecting American citizens.
>
> That time has passed.
>
> The Congress of the United States has earned the contempt of the Nation.

I do not agree with the Herald wherein it is implied that Congress is not composed of self-respecting American citizens. This Seventy-fourth Congress, in my opinion, represents the finest and highest type of American citizenship and intelligence, but I must confess that thus far we have failed

to exercise the intelligence which God has given us and we have not faced the issue courageously in the degree which I consider necessary in our present crisis.

As Representatives I believe that we are beginning to wake up to our responsibilities, and I do hope that the criticism which has been directed at our body by the Hearst newspapers may serve to spur us on to act according to the dictates of our own consciences and understanding, and to decide for ourselves the merit of the questions submitted to us by the synthetic economists and Wall Street agents who apparently hold the reins here in the various departments.

I am still hopeful that the Congress of the United States, giving heed to the principles expressed in the President's inaugural address, will do everything possible to drive the money changers out of the temple and to restore to the Congress the right which is vouchsafed to it in the Constitution "to coin money and regulate the value thereof", rather than to permit this function to be usurped by the private international banker.

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

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto now close.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON) there were 58 ayes and 37 noes.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. NORTON. 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. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3806) to establish a commercial airport in the District of Columbia, and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What is the vote on, the Blanton amendment or the committee amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that there is only one amendment and that is the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. There is only one amendment and that is the committee amendment. The question is on the committee amendment as a substitute.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, what is the amendment we are voting on?

The SPEAKER. It is on the committee amendment as a substitute to the bill.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Does the substitute include the Blanton amendment?

The SPEAKER. It does.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And we cannot vote separately on the Blanton amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. There is but one amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia objects on the ground that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 316, nays 20, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—316

Amlie	Eckert	Knutson	Ramsay
Arnold	Edmiston	Kocialkowski	Ramspeck
Ashbrook	Eicher	Kopplemann	Randolph
Ayers	Ekwall	Kramer	Rankin
Bacharach	Ellenbogen	Lambertson	Ransley
Barden	Engel	Lambeth	Rayburn
Beiter	Englebright	Lanham	Reed, Ill.
Bell	Faddis	Lea, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.
Biermann	Farley	Lehlbach	Reilly
Binderup	Fenerty	Lemke	Richards
Blackney	Ferguson	Lesinski	Richardson
Blanton	Fernandez	Lewis, Colo.	Robsion, Ky.
Bloom	Fiesinger	Lloyd	Rogers, Mass.
Boehne	Fish	Lord	Rogers, Okla.
Boileau	Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Romjue
Boland	Fletcher	Luckey	Rudd
Bolton	Focht	Ludlow	Sabath
Boylan	Ford, Calif.	Lundeen	Sadowski
Brennan	Ford, Miss.	McAndrews	Sandlin
Brown, Ga.	Fuller	McCormack	Sauthoff
Brown, Mich.	Fulmer	McFarlane	Schaefer
Brunner	Gasque	McGehee	Schneider
Buck	Gassaway	McGrath	Schuetz
Buckbee	Gavagan	McGroarty	Schulte
Buckler, Minn.	Gearhart	McKeough	Scott
Burdick	Gehrmann	McLaughlin	Scrugham
Cannon, Mo.	Gildea	McLean	Shanley
Cannon, Wis.	Gillette	McLeod	Sirovich
Carlson	Gingery	McMillan	Smith, Wash.
Carmichael	Goldsborough	McReynolds	Snell
Carpenter	Gray, Ind.	McSwain	Somers, N. Y.
Cartwright	Green	Maas	Spence
Cary	Greenway	Mahon	Stack
Casey	Greenwood	Maloney	Starnes
Castellow	Greever	Mansfield	Stefan
Chapman	Gregory	Mapes	Stewart
Christianson	Griswold	Marcantonio	Stubbs
Church	Guyer	Martin, Mass.	Sullivan
Citron	Gwynne	Mason	Sutphin
Claiborne	Halleck	Massingale	Sweeney
Colden	Hancock, N. Y.	Maverick	Tarver
Cole, N. Y.	Harlan	Mead	Taylor, Colo.
Collins	Harter	Meeks	Taylor, S. C.
Colmer	Hess	Merritt, Conn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Cooley	Higgins, Conn.	Merritt, N. Y.	Terry
Cooper, Tenn.	Higgins, Mass.	Michener	Thom
Costello	Hildebrandt	Millard	Thomason
Cox	Hill, Ala.	Mitchell, Ill.	Thurston
Cravens	Hill, Knute	Mitchell, Tenn.	Tinkham
Crawford	Hill, Samuel B.	Monaghan	Tolan
Crosby	Hobbs	Moran	Tonry
Crosser, Ohio	Hoeppel	Mott	Truax
Crowe	Hoffman	Nelson	Turner
Cullen	Holmes	Nichols	Turpin
Cummings	Hook	Norton	Utterback
Daly	Hope	O'Brien	Vinson, Ga.
Darrow	Houston	O'Connell	Vinson, Ky.
Deen	Huddleston	O'Connor	Wadsworth
Delaney	Hull	O'Day	Wallgren
Dempsey	Imhoff	O'Leary	Walter
Dies	Jacobsen	O'Neal	Wearin
Dietrich	Jenckes, Ind.	Owen	Weaver
Dingell	Johnson, Okla.	Palmisano	Welch
Disney	Johnson, Tex.	Parks	Werner
Ditter	Johnson, W. Va.	Parsons	West
Dobbins	Jones	Patman	Whelchel
Dockweiler	Kahn	Patterson	White
Dondero	Kee	Patton	Whittington
Dorsey	Keller	Pearson	Wilcox
Doughton	Kelly	Perkins	Williams
Doxey	Kennedy, Md.	Peterson, Fla.	Wilson, La.
Driscoll	Kennedy, N. Y.	Peterson, Ga.	Withrow
Driver	Kenney	Pettengill	Wolcott
Duffey, Ohio	Kerr	Pfeifer	Wolfenden
Duffy, N. Y.	Kimball	Pierce	Wolverton
Duncan	Kinzer	Plumley	Wood
Dunn, Miss.	Kleberg	Powers	Young
Dunn, Pa.	Kloeb	Quinn	Zimmerman
Eagle	Kniffin	Rabaut	Zioncheck

NAYS—20

Allen	Burnham	Montague	Smith, Va.
Arends	Darden	Pittenger	Steagall
Berlin	Drewry	Robertson	Umstead
Bland	Gilchrist	Secrest	Warren
Burch	Kvale	Sisson	Woodrum

NOT VOTING—93

Adair	Brewster	Cavicchia	Cole, Md.
Andresen	Brooks	Celler	Connery
Andrew, Mass.	Buchanan	Chandler	Cooper, Ohio
Andrews, N. Y.	Buckley, N. Y.	Clark, Idaho	Corning
Bacon	Bulwinkle	Clark, N. C.	Cross, Tex.
Bankhead	Caldwell	Cochran	Crowther
Beam	Carter	Coffee	Culkin

Dear	Hart	Murdock	Smith, Conn.
DeRouen	Hartley	Oliver	Smith, W. Va.
Dickstein	Healey	O'Malley	Snyder
Dirksen	Hennings	Peyser	South
Doutrich	Hollister	Polk	Sumners, Tex.
Eaton	Jenkins, Ohio	Reece	Taber
Evans	Lamneck	Rich	Thomas
Flannagan	Larrabee	Robinson, Utah	Thompson
Frey	Lee, Okla.	Rogers, N. H.	Tobey
Gambrill	Lewis, Md.	Russell	Treadway
Gifford	McClellan	Ryan	Underwood
Goodwin	Marshall	Sanders, La.	Wigglesworth
Granfield	Martin, Colo.	Sanders, Tex.	Wilson, Pa.
Gray, Pa.	May	Sears	Woodruff
Haines	Miller	Seger	
Hamlin	Montet	Shannon	
Hancock, N. C.	Moritz	Short	

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Connery with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Granfield with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Sears with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. May with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Corning with Mr. Bacon.
Mr. Martin of Colorado with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Brewster.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Marshall.
Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Andresen.
Mr. Dear with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Short.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Tobey.
Mr. Montet with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Reece.
Mr. Sanders of Texas with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Haines with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Cross of Texas with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Russell.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Lewis of Maryland with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. McClellan.
Mr. Moritz with Mr. Polk.
Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Murdock.
Mr. O'Malley with Mr. Smith of Connecticut.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Thompson.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. South.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Hamlin.
Mr. Evans with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Hennings with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Caldwell with Mr. Coffee.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Chandler.
Mr. Clark of Idaho with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. WOODRUM changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs upon the engrossment and third reading of the bill, as amended.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BUNKER HILL ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley on the anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address made by the Honorable James A. Farley before the Bunker Hill Council, No. 62, Knights of Columbus, at Charlestown, Mass., in celebration of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill, on Sunday evening, June 16, 1935.

I feel particularly honored that you in Boston have invited me—an outlander, so far as New England is concerned—to address you on this occasion. I have always believed that the anniversary we are celebrating commemorates about the most significant day in our whole history. Yes; I am not even excepting the Fourth of July, for, if I read history correctly, it is very doubtful if there would have been any Fourth of July for this country had it not been for the great happenings on Bunker Hill 160 years ago.

I suppose some of our accurate historians will complain that I do not say Breeds Hill. This is no time for controversy and it is Bunker Hill in every American mind. Tomorrow is Bunker Hill day, regardless of where the fiercest fighting raged when the medley of American soldiers hurled back the onslaught of the British veterans of Minden. The Yankees had neither a supreme commander, nor a national government. They fought under their State commanders, and while the book men are still figuring whether Massachusetts, Connecticut, or New Hampshire supplied the greatest leader, all the country cares about is that the combined effort of that day taught the world that a new Nation was being born.

Up to that time it was the popular impression through Europe that England was combating merely a frontier revolt by an unorganized group over which the British regulars would ride roughshod whenever they pleased. Bunker Hill conveyed to the world that a new principle, the principle of self-government, was being born, and that the whole population of the American Colonies was willing to fight, and if need be die, to establish independence. It took 7 years of hardship and struggle and bloodshed to convince Great Britain that she had lost her Colonies and even then the lesson was not complete, for 20 years later she tested American sentiment again, with the same result.

But why should I attempt to review the history to which you live next door, and of the details of which you are infinitely better informed, and of the importance of which no words of mine can add to your appreciation.

We in this country are not given much to worship at historical shrines, but Bunker Hill monument stands as the more familiar token of our national achievements than any other. Greater battles have been fought, more decisive determinations of important issues have been reached, higher monuments have been built; but from one end of the country to the other—in sentiment—your monument overtops all that have been raised to commemorate the achievements of our country.

Perhaps the example of those New Englanders that showed the world years ago the depth and courage and resource of America, performed a service as great or greater than the immediate encouragement of the Republic by leaving to their descendants, and to those who gathered about their descendants to form your great communities of today, a heritage of duty. Perhaps it was because of them that you have preserved this spirit, that you have ever since been in the forefront of every movement to resist tyranny and to correct the errors and abuses which new conditions brought in their train.

We, who are connected with the administration in Washington, will never forget that it was Massachusetts that blazed the way for New England's getting into the movement to rid this country of the domination of a group that held our people shackled. The group which, because of the blindness of their reactionism, helped us to drift into an abject depression—a group whose leadership, or lack of leadership, sunk the richest Nation in the world into a condition where the Government had to step in with doles to save millions of our people from actual starvation.

It was Massachusetts that revolted against religious intolerance and prohibition fanaticism when it stood forth and voted for liberalism in 1928. In 1932, New England, despite its tradition of conservative solidarity, followed the Bay State in demanding a new deal for America; followed the leader who is now in the White House, and has sustained him ever since. It has sustained him not because of any political strategy or trickery. It is because it recognized in him a determination to give this country prosperity and contentment if it were humanly possible to do this through acts of government. You New England men and women have been faithful to the old tradition. The courage of your ancestors at the birth of the Nation is still with you. Our country realizes that whenever the occasion arises for a patriotic decision it may be sure that you will be found steadfast in the faith. It is in your blood to be true to what your conscience tells you is right.

I am afraid that in my bringing together the memory of the clear-minded men who fought for a new thing 160 years ago and the equally clear-minded men and women of 1935 that I will be accused of injecting politics into a historic occasion. This is far from my purpose. Actually, politics has nothing to do with the efforts to combat depression, threatened starvation, and economic confusion. It would be a vain glorification of my own party to assume that Franklin Delano Roosevelt was put into the White House by Democrats alone, or that the measures he has taken and the results he has accomplished in getting our country out of the mire have been reached through the exclusive efforts of any partisan group. The only political aspect of it is because it suits the purposes and perhaps the necessities of certain men and aggregations of men to make it appear that recovery is anything but the concern of the whole people. The issue of today is bigger than the question of what party has title to Government offices.

I dare say there never was a time in our history when politics did not come into the picture of every important controversy. Even in the days when the British held Boston, and the American forces besieged them, there were those who thought the revolt of the Colonies was a mistake. Time has brought us to that state of tolerance where we may admit that even some of the Tories of those days may have been sincere in their opposition to breaking

the ties with the mother country, but nobody will assume that their sincerity atoned for the sin against their country, once the Colonies had embarked on the great enterprise of freedom.

I cite this extreme example of tolerance to illustrate what is perhaps the finest of all our American characteristics, that in themselves are a consequence of the Revolution ushered in by the battle we are commemorating. Before that struggle the rivalry, amounting almost to enmity comparable to the jealousies of the old Balkan States in some instances, was a prevailing element among the Dominion States. Indeed, it was the thought that their divergent interests and conflicting views would make it impossible for them to take united action against England, and therefore Great Britain reasoned that the task of crushing them would not be difficult. On the contrary, the common cause brought the Colonies into accord—they forgot their prejudices, they sank their aversions, they left their mutual differences to future adjustment, and when the new country swung into general action, Yankee fishermen and tobacco plantation folks, eastern capitalists and western frontiersmen—in fact, people of every creed, from every section fought side by side. They had learned the great lesson that no class, no group has a monopoly of goodness, any more than that some other element of our population has a monopoly of evil.

Perhaps some of my hearers may be inclined to doubt this in political campaign periods, when the violence of partisanship spurs orators to make charges and accusations against the opposition so monstrous that if anyone took them seriously, he would stand aghast at so much villainy. If the opponents of my party believed what they say about us they would not speak to me on the street. And if we on our side arraigned the entire membership of the opposition in similar fashion treason would be the least of the crimes we would prosecute them for. In fact our political campaigns are a sort of truce of tolerance, but when it is over we settle down to our humdrum existence and find that we get along perfectly in every relation of life with each other.

Such a spirit is indeed a worth-while heritage from our struggle for independence, of which this sacred shaft commemorates the beginning. For civil war we have substituted our every 4 years' spasm, and so we have grown and prospered through a century and a half, and 30 or 40 administrations, with a minimum of strife and a maximum of orderly progress. We have not only furnished a pattern of Government that has been followed by nations all over the world, but by the example of our national system we have taught the world that wrongs may be righted and rulers may be changed without fury or civil war.

I realize that in this city have stood the greatest orators our Nation has produced, and each in turn has delivered his message of congratulation to his audience and reverence to the towering figures of our history. I cannot hope to approach the magnificence of their eloquence and I am humbly sensible of the compliment you pay me in listening to the words of a plain American citizen.

We have had many stresses in our national life, and we are but emerging from perhaps the most dangerous crisis of them all. It must be the hope of every one of us that our emergence from the dark situation will not be checked, either by those who would overturn the fabric of our economic welfare, with wild schemes of confiscation of wealth, or those whose crusted reactionism makes them hang back from every movement that seeks to have Government keep pace with progress.

The founding fathers of our country started us off with magnificent equipment for the Nation's long journey. They told us the road would be beset with dangers and pitfalls; they pointed the direction we must take to reach our goal—farther than that they could not go. They could give us no map nor chart for the future beyond the period of their own lives, for it does not lie with any human being to foretell what lies far ahead in an ever-changing world. Every generation must meet its own problems, and hew its own trail when it finds itself beyond the zone of signposts and known landmarks. In such times—and the present is such a time—unity of purpose and faith in our leaders is our only hope. There is no backward path in the eternal journey of civilization. The world in the past has at times sought safety in retreat, and has landed in chaos that endured for centuries. We must go on.

Let me close this brief recital of the thoughts of a simple citizen with words spoken by one whose voice will ever resound down the ages. More than a century ago, Daniel Webster at the laying of the cornerstone of Bunker Hill Monument told the whole story when he said:

"Our proper business is improvement. Let our age be the age of improvement. In a day of peace, let us advance the arts of peace and the works of peace. Let us develop the resources of the land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered. Let us cultivate a true spirit of union and harmony. In pursuing the great objects which our condition points out to us, let us act under a settled conviction and an habitual feeling that these 24 States are one country."

These 24 States he spoke of then are now 48 States; the country of which he spoke ended in the wilderness of what is now Ohio, but his thought is as true today as it was in 1825.

He concluded with these words, which constitutes a perfect code for all Americans:

"Let our object be, our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country. And, by the blessing of God, may that country itself become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror, but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberty, upon which the world may gaze with admiration for ever!"

ALLOTMENT OF TRIBAL FUNDS OF COEUR D'ALENE INDIANS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the Indians of this country there are many problems arising out of the agreements that have been made with the Indians in treaties that have been ratified in the past. History reveals that the Indians of my State of Idaho have been peaceful and have faithfully kept the promises made in the execution of the treaties that have been made by the Government in dealing with their problems. That the Members of the House may have the views of a member of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Indians I insert herewith a copy of a letter from Philip Wildshoe, an allottee on the Coeur d'Alene Reservation.

DE SMET MISSION, IDAHO, *May 16, 1935.*

Hon. COMPTON J. WHITE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I received the Union Calendar No. 61, H. R. 6223, Report No. 249, which you have mailed to me. I am very pleased to receive said bill.

I will explain to you truly, as I am strongly against the use of the Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money, money arising from surplus Coeur d'Alene Indian land sales or Coeur d'Alene Indian funds held by the United States in trust for the respective tribe of Coeur d'Alene Indian wrongly expendituring on Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency administrations to no benefit, creating nothing.

Mr. WHITE, I will give you the clear history of the Government agent and other employees, which is in my knowledge by me, seeing with my own eyes and knew what was going on amongst the Government agent and other employees on the post, operating on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation in Idaho.

Back in the year of 1897, the Coeur d'Alene Indians had no doctor, no medicine; because Coeur d'Alene Indians had no money at that time that would be held by the United States in trust for Coeur d'Alene Indians.

In the year 1909, when the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation was thrown open by action of Congress United States Government. Surplus Coeur d'Alene Indian land sold to homesteaders this accumulate some money Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money. First Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency was established build by Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money, was under guise as said agency was built by United States Government expenses; not true. Second, said Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administration's appointment of superfluous of employees, at extravagant expenditures on monthly salaries. Twenty-five-year period under these extravagant expenditures on Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's superfluous employees created nothing; did not cause to advance the Coeur d'Alene Indians to prosperity; Coeur d'Alene Indians only go broke; going worse.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs and superintendents, Department of the Interior, has to confiscate the prorata shares tribal money from old-aged Coeur d'Alene Indians, minor children, to pay the wasteful expenditures on Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administration. The evidence I have written to you before my two children's prorata share their tribal money taken away from them, $903.

All Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money is disappearing, wasted on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency administrations. Had Congress probed the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, superintendents, administration, constructing building at the Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency at De Smet Mission in Idaho under guise at United States Government expenses, money appropriated by Congress from the United States Treasury, which is not true, said construction of said buildings are at the expenses from Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money; had Congress probed these buildings, would see said buildings of no use, now abandoned, going into dilapidation. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, superintendent, Department of the Interior, are at present seeking new fields for more wastage from Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money or funds held by the United States in trust for the respective tribe, Coeur d'Alene Indians.

The United States Government has no agreement or permanent agreement for expenditure of money out from its United States Treasury; none to Coeur d'Alene Indians.

Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE, consider under your authority the complaints I write you, the wastage of Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money. Introduce a bill in Congress to prohibit the Department of the Interior, Secretary of the Interior, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, superintendent, prohibit not to expenditure Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money or funds held by the United States in trust for the respective tribe, Coeur d'Alene Indian, not to expenditure on Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administrations.

Ignore even if a few Coeur d'Alene Indians agree in the past to use Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal on Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administration's expenditures; it is without due contemplation.

When public money is appropriated and Coeur d'Alene Indian money is grabbed by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, both public money and Coeur d'Alene Indian money are extravagantly expenditured to no results.

Probe the special appointed Government officer guised to suppress the intoxication liquors out from the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation in Idaho, present Special Officer Tom Claggett, salary paid from Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money, said special officer has not performed no officer's duty on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation, said special officer is at Yakima, Wash., with his stool pigeons, or in the city of Spokane, Wash., with his stool pigeons. While on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation is lawless, beastly drunkenness going on amongst the Coeur d'Alene Indians in public. Several lives are lost caused by intoxication liquor.

Mr. Congressman WHITE, probe this intoxication-liquor situation. Twenty-five years period paying said special officer for what is not done. Intoxication liquor was never suppressed from Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation. Twenty-five years period said special officers clever scheme, special officers placing a mark on his own money gave his money to his drunkard Indian stool pigeon, instructing said Indian go to that white man, buy some intoxication liquor to make an arrest. Tnis is the special officers clever device to make an arrest. This act suppress nothing.

If you will introduce a bill in Congress to do away with this Government special officer.

The Coeur d'Alene Indians have no representation to bring the actual wrongs exisiting on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation to the attention of the proper authorities at Washington, D. C., that would probe into the wrong actions on the Supt. A. G. Wilson's administrations at his Moscow, Idaho office, headed by Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John Collier, Department of the Interior. The Congress of the United States Government of American, Senate and House of Representatives, appropriates millions and millions of dollars called "Indian appropriation," otherwise not appropriated, Congress should contemplate where that millions of dollars annually Congress' Indian appropriation goes to, is it to be expended into vapor, and Congress probe the total figures from Congress' original Indian appropriation to 1935, the grand total would be billions of dollars expended on Indians' name only. Congress probe what did that billions of dollars expended do for the Indians. The Coeur d'Alene Indians are Indians on their Indian Reservation. No portion is visible that would be apportioned for the Coeur d'Alene Indians from said annual Congress' Indian appropriations. In the Union Calendar, H. R. 6223, Report No. 249, which Congress had passed I studied it, the Coeur d'Alene Indians not mentioned Congress did not appropriate no money for the Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administration salary wasteful expenditures to no results.

Mr. Congressman WHITE: If some members from the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and some members from the House of Representatives, members on Committee on Indian Affairs probe each individual Coeur d'Alene Indian home you would find it very poor. If you travel the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation slowly examine what every Indian have and his true condition you would find them very poor, you would find no trace of anything created to benefit the Coeur d'Alene Indian. You would see nothing only poverty.

Yes, indeed; the Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administrations and superintendents—Moscow, Idaho, office—are to many some duplicates.

Only United States Government Congress can stop these wasteful expenditures existing on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation.

The United States American citizens has a damned will against the Coeur d'Alene Indians because they think the Coeur d'Alene Indians are donated showered upon from public money, American citizen tax money what the Congress United States Government, Senate, and House of Representatives appropriates annually called Indian appropriation. In truth Coeur d'Alene Indians not getting it. All I have is land granted to Coeur d'Alene Indians in the year 1877. From when it was pure American United States Government, Senate, and House of Representatives.

Yours respectfully,

PHILIP WILDSHOE.

BLEEDING THE STATES TO DEATH

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THEIR EVENTUAL ANNIHILATION THROUGH FEDERAL USURPATION OF SOURCES OF REVENUE PECULIARLY BELONGING TO THE STATES

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I trust that my colleagues will bear with me for a few minutes while I rethresh old straw and talk about a matter in which I was very much interested and about which at one time I thought I knew something, namely, the subject of taxation. I recognize the fact that men much abler and better informed than I am have discussed this matter in your hearing, and I do not labor under the hallucination that I shall contribute anything new. However, my statements are made as a result of my own practical experience. As an attorney at law I specialized in the study of this matter, for years administered the corporate, general, and inheritance tax laws of the State of Vermont, and later as general counsel and tax attorney handled excise, income, and all other forms of taxation incident to the transaction of corporate business.

All this was some years ago, and I put it all behind me, and to be perfectly honest with you, I know I have forgotten—and am rather glad of it—many of the rules, regulations, and details which enmesh the general subject. Out of my experience, however, came the conviction, grown stronger through the years, that the Federal Government has no moral right and no business to enter the so-called "field of inheritance or Federal estate taxation."

What I have to say is inspired by the recommendations of the President that in addition to the present estate taxes there should be levied an inheritance succession and legacy tax, and the further recommendation that gift taxes should be imposed. Under the Constitution I suppose it is to be construed that the Federal Government has a legal right, under what is known as the "excise tax", and the power to levy the so-called "estate tax." I insist that there is no logical basis or justification, at least there is not the same logical basis or justification, for such imposition by the Federal Government of such tax, as exists and is inherent in the States themselves.

I have always been opposed to the usurpation of this source of revenue to the States by the Federal Government. The imposition of this tax and the right of the Federal Government to impose it on inheritances rests upon the theory, which probably is correct, in fact the only basis on which it may rest, that it is an excise tax—a tax which the Federal Government has the power to levy, but has no moral right so to do, since the Federal Government has no power over the law of descent and distribution. It is not based on any correct principle. It invades the domain more properly relegated to and reserved to the States. Since property passes by virtue of State laws, not by virtue of any Federal law, such revenue as may be derived from an inheritance tax, which is a tax on the right to inherit property, belongs primarily to the States. It is a foregone conclusion that the several States of this Union are gradually and insidiously being deprived of their rights and prerogatives.

It should not be forgotten that property derives its principal value from the protection it receives from the individual States and from the laws of the several States by which its acquisition, enjoyment, and transfer are made possible and are controlled.

This no man can truthfully deny. Those of you who are interested in conserving whatever rights the States still have left, in perserving the integrity and insuring the perpetuity of the States, constituting this Union, must be on your guard, must consider well what action you shall take. You should not forget that the theory of an excise tax is that it should be based upon a privilege granted by the Government. It has been held that the Federal estate tax is an excise tax and may be imposed; nevertheless, I call your attention to the fact that the privilege of transmitting property at the time of death is exclusively a right of the States, and that no privilege is granted by the Federal Government with or in respect thereto.

The Federal Government should not seek to accomplish social regulation by and through taxation.

The idea of a Federal estate tax was wrong in its inception; is still and always will be wrong. The old maxim that the remedy for wrongs is to forget them is inapplicable in this case for no question "is ever settled until it is settled right."

Although the Government may have the right under the Constitution to impose excise taxes, that alone does not justify the reckless exercise of the power to take from the States revenue which if left to them relieves to some extent, at least, the farmer, the small business man, the real-estate owner, and the average citizen of the State from the burden of already unbearable taxation.

The divine right of kings may have been the plea for feeble tyrants, but the divine right of government is the keystone of human progress and its foundation is found in local government. Without it government sinks into the exercise

of police power and the "Nation becomes a degraded mob." The proposition to superimpose additional Federal estate, inheritance, succession, and gift taxes, means just one thing, and that is the further diminution of revenue for the States, and that heavier tax burdens must be borne by real estate and other tangible property now almost taxed out of existence. The States need every available source of revenue. To destroy values from which the States receive income is to force them to resort to higher taxes and to include the wage earner of limited income in the list of those whose income must be taxed. This law of action and reaction is immutable and incontrovertible. The end may be seen from the beginning.

It is interesting to observe that James Madison in seeking to allay the fears of the people who dreaded the possible aggression of a strong centralized Federal Government, and who apprehended the possibility of some such usurpation of the rights and prerogatives of the several States as is contemplated by the so-called "Federal estate tax", and those now recommended by the President, it is interesting to observe, I say, what James Madison says in no. XVI of the Federalist, viz:

> The Federal and State Governments are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people, constituted with different powers, and designed for different purposes. * * *
>
> But ambitious encroachments of the Federal Government, on the authority of the State governments, would not excite the opposition of a single State, or of a few States only. They would be signals of general alarm. Every government would espouse the common cause. A correspondence would be opened. Plans of resistance would be concerted. One spirit would animate and conduct the whole. The same combinations, in short, would result from an apprehension of the Federal, as was produced by the dread of a foreign yoke; and unless the projected innovations should be voluntarily renounced, the same appeal to trial by force would be made in one case as was made in the other. But what degree of madness could ever drive the Federal Government to such an extremity.
>
> That the people of the States should, for a sufficient period of time, elect an uninterrupted succession of men all ready to betray both; * * * that the governments and the peoples of the States should silently and patiently behold the gathering storm, and continue to supply the materials, until it should be prepared to burst upon their own heads, must appear to everyone more like the incoherent dreams of a delirious jealousy, or the misjudged exaggerations of a counterfeit zeal, than like the sober apprehensions of genuine patriotism. * * *
>
> Let us not insult the free and gallant citizens of America * * * with the supposition that they can ever reduce themselves to the necessity of making the experiment by a blind and tame submission to the long train of insidious measures which must precede and produce it. * * *

Patrick Henry, in voicing opposition to the adoption of the Federal Constitution in the Virginia convention, exclaimed:

> Where are the purse and sword of Virginia? They must go to Congress. What has become of your country? The Virginian government is but a name. (Elliott's Debates, III, pp. 366–410.)

Fear of excessive power in the proposed new Government excited wide-spread opposition to the adoption of the Constitution by the colonists. Justification for such fear was found in the long struggle of the people in the mother country to preserve their rights and liberties. The colonists, with knowledge of the contest between the Parliament and the Stuart kings which lasted nearly all of the seventeenth century, mistrusted usurpation of powers and centralization in government beyond all things else. Their kin across the seas had been participants in this almost interminable struggle. Furthermore, they had just concluded successfully the Revolutionary War, which was brought about by the exercise of centralized powers wielded from a great distance and from beyond the borders of the continent.

To them, all of the serious experiences of mankind, immediate and centuries old, seemed to justify the extraordinary reluctance with which they yielded to the necessity of forming the more perfect union which was proposed. But the necessity for the establishment of such new union with carefully guarded and more centralized powers than previously were thought necessary was apparent to the ablest and most far-seeing statesmen of those times. The Constitution framers, observing the dangers of excessive centralization of powers on one hand and anarchy arising from excessive localization of powers on the other hand, succeeded in writing into the Constitution that perfect balance of powers on which has rested the security of this governmental structure during the whole period of its existence.

Lord Bryce, with whose writings respecting our system of government there is none to compare, visualized our plan of government and tersely described it in the following language:

> Under the plan of the Constitution makers, an American, through a long life, may never be reminded of the Federal Government, except when he votes at a Presidential election, buys a package of tobacco bearing the Federal stamp, lodges a complaint against the post office and opens his trunk for a customhouse officer on a pier when he comes from a European tour. His direct taxes are paid to officials acting under State laws. The State, or local authority constituted by State statute, registers his birth, appoints his guardian, pays for his schooling, gives him a share in his father's estate, licenses him when he marries or enters a trade, divorces him, enters civil action against him, declares him a bankrupt, and hangs him for murder. The police that guards his home, the local boards which look after the poor, control the highways, impose water rates, manage schools—all these derive their powers from State laws. In comparison with such a number of functions, the Federal Government is but a department of foreign affairs.

But Lord Bryce would report a far different situation were he empowered to revisit us in our present day. He would find the very antithesis to obtain. He would find a scene similar to that visualized by another who warned us against that which he must have seen materializing.

In The Critical Period in American History, written by the historian John Fiske, may be found this language:

> If the day should ever arrive when the people from the different parts of our country should allow their local affairs to be administered by prefects sent from Washington, and when the self-government of the States shall have been so far lost as that of the Departments of France, or even so far as the counties of England, on that day the progressive political career of the American people will have come to an end, and the hopes that may have been built upon it for the future happiness and prosperity of mankind will be wrecked forever.

In the early days the proponents of the Constitution took the view that dangers of State encroachments upon Federal powers were greater than the danger of encroachments of the Federal Government upon the powers of the States. Few, if any, tendencies have been witnessed to indicate that there was justification for such fear. History shows that, where the greatest power in government is lodged, greater power is sought, and, except for the prudence and firmness of the people, which Hamilton saw was necessary to the maintenance of this Government, ancient rights, however firmly established, will be lost. There is nothing new in this observation. Human nature has not changed perceptibly in this respect. Power in government affairs begets more power. It has been so always. Vigilance remains as the price of liberty.

Why is it necessary to use the device of a Federal inheritance tax? The present situation, with two Federal estate taxes, is already almost intolerably complicated. Fiduciaries are at their wit's end to know how to close and distribute their estates, in view of the delays and litigation incident to the administration of the two present Federal estate taxes. If to this curious structure is added a Federal inheritance tax, confusion will become worse confounded. I do not understand why if the Government needs more money from this source, it does not either cut out the 80-percent credit provision now existing in the 1926 Federal Estate Tax Act or else increase the rates of the 1934 Federal estate tax. That seems the obvious and simple thing to do. If instead of that a Federal inheritance tax is added, administrative delays will increase very greatly and fiduciaries will be in an even worse hole than they now are. This is because an inheritance tax is much more complicated to administer than is an estate tax. Practically all questions relating to such an inheritance tax must be referred to the Bureau at Washington. Doubtless that Bureau can avail itself of the services of plenty of legally trained men, but such procedure will result, in my judgment, in almost intolerable centralization. I have observed the administration of the Federal estate tax from the outside for a good many years and, in my opinion, its chief difficulty is in bureaucracy and centralization. If this is to be increased it will result in an

unwarrantable increase in the burdens laid upon fiduciaries and in an unwarrantable delay in the rights of heirs, devisees, and legatees. Surely such people have some rights left even though the Government proposes to take away most of the property that they inherit. Even though comparatively little be left to them after the imposition of death taxes, yet as to what little is left they are entitled to know certainly what it will be and to receive it as promptly as possible.

From the point of view of the burdens laid upon fiduciaries, heirs, legatees, and devisees and because I apprehend that the imposition of the proposed Federal inheritance tax will enormously complicate and delay matters. From the point of view of a State official administering a State inheritance tax a proposed Federal inheritance tax will diminish the revenue of the State unless the State chooses to enact rather unfair legislation denying the deductibility of Federal death taxes, whether estate or inheritance, from the gross estate subject to State inheritance tax.

Now, as to the validity of any Federal death tax, whether estate or inheritance. This is generally believed to have been conclusively settled in favor of validity by the decision of *Knowlton* v. *Moore* (178 U. S. 41 (1900)). I am perhaps imprudent in venturing to doubt that decision and the soundness of the reasoning of the opinion. Chief Justice White wrote a 67-page opinion in which he discussed the matter of death taxation from every conceivable angle. When, however, he came to the main point, namely, whether the Federal Government had any power, under the Constitution, to levy any sort of a death tax, I venture to doubt the soundness of his reasoning. He seems to base his decision upon the fact that the Federal inheritance tax of 1797 was passed at a time when Congress was full of men who had participated in the formation of the National Government and of the Constitutional Convention which preceded it. His argument is that these men presumably knew what was within and what was without the power of Congress, and that if they enacted a Federal inheritance tax it must have been within the power of Congress; and that consequently it was not up to the Supreme Court, a century later, to doubt the validity of that action. (See p. 56 in vol. 178, U. S. Reports.)

It seems to me that this is a rather tenuous argument. At bottom it depends on the theory that the subject of inheritance or estate taxation is not the right or privilege granted by the sovereignty to transmit or inherit but is the transmission or receipt. This seems to me, with the greatest respect to Mr. Chief Justice White, a metaphysical distinction without any real difference. Indeed, I believe that it can be demonstrated to be wrong. It is universally admitted that it is the States and not the Federal Government which grant the right to inherit property from the estates of deceased persons. I think no one will doubt this proposition. If so, it is within the power of any State to defeat any Federal death tax as applied to its own citizens.

All that such State needs to do is to provide, by statute or by amendment to its own constitution, that thereafter the property of all decedents domiciled in such State shall escheat to the State; that such escheated property shall be taken in charge by State officers called "executors" or "administrators" and shall be administered by them and the debts and other expenses paid and the balance—less an amount varying from 1 to 10 percent, being equivalent to present State inheritance taxes—be distributed to the heirs, legatees, or devisees of the decedent. It seems to me fairly certain that the Federal Government could not levy any tax upon property escheating to a State; and if all the property of all decedents escheats to a State, the Federal Government cannot levy any death tax whatever.

If my line of reasoning is correct, it seems to me that any Federal death tax, whether estate or inheritance, has no solid foundation. A death tax is a privilege tax; and a sovereignty which does not afford the privilege cannot impose the tax.

When all is said and done, notwithstanding the legality of the course that has been pursued and is proposed, it is wrong. The Federal Government as such has no moral right to levy an inheritance tax, call it excise or otherwise, which indirectly puts an additional tax on the property of every citizen of each and all of the several States under the guise of redistributing wealth. If redistribution of wealth is to be accomplished by any such means, certainly let it be done firsthand by the States under whose law the wealth represented by the property is permitted to be transferred. I do not object to the proposition that great fortunes should be broken up, and at their devolution a generous share should be contributed to the State which has made possible the accumulation, and permits the devolution thereof, but I am not in favor of the plans advocated by President Roosevelt and Senator Long. The President's message has been characterized as a demagogic appeal designed to steal the thunder of share-the-wealth spellbinders, and is further evidence of the fact that he is still following the suggestions of the schizophrenic fringe of councilors who surround him, or with whom he has surrounded himself. It is time to stop further centralization of power in the Federal Government; time to stop these poorly disguised attempts by circumlocution to deprive the States of their lifeblood in violation of their reserved powers and rights; time as in the days of William Prynne and King Charles "to rescue the King from his evil councilors" and reestablish before it is everlastingly too late the sovereignty of the States.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that under the Constitution the Federal Government cannot through taxation, or otherwise, sap the sovereignty of the States. The history and the experience of other nations should teach us that only when normal prosperity, based upon confidence and credit, puts the stream of wealth into its natural activity and it is made free from governmental interference can all the people participate in its benefits, and that out of that economic law, and from that law alone, will come those measures which are the objectives sought to be attained under the President's proposed program.

On February 1, 1925, President Coolidge realized that the temper and spirit of Congress disclosed a disposition to sacrifice sound principles of taxation on the altar of expediency, or to enter upon a program of social legislation under the guise and use of the taxing power of the Government, and he said:

> I do not believe that the Government should seek social legislation in the guise of taxation. We should approach the question directly, where the arguments for and against the proposed legislation may be clearly presented and universally understood. If we are to adopt socialism it should be presented to the people of this country as socialism and not under the guise of a law to collect revenue. The people are quite able to determine for themselves the desirability of a particular public policy and do not ask to have such policies forced upon them by indirection.

I do insist, again, it is not the function of the Federal Government, through the instrumentality of an excise tax, to attempt to accomplish such social reform, since the right to transfer the property by inheritance is a State right and not one held or had by virtue of any Federal statute.

The suggestion that a super-Federal estate tax and the others enumerated should be imposed is a serious threat against the continued financial stability of the States. It affects the welfare of every single citizen. It concerns every Congressman who has at heart the welfare of those whom he undertakes to represent. It involves the continuation of and the very political life of every State in this Union, for it strikes at the very root, viz, the revenue-producing and yielding power of the State itself, for in the power to tax lies hidden that insidious, destructive, devastating power to destroy.

This, moreover, is not all that should give us pause as patriots, not partisans. The average citizen may not realize that he is paying or will pay his share of the proposed taxes, but the day of reckoning will soon be at hand. Nearly 40 cents of every dollar we earn is paid out in taxes of one kind or another. A continuation of this policy can but result in individual and even national financial ruin. When the people wake up and realize the facts, they will demand relief.

Further, and with respect to a collateral matter, may I suggest that we should not overlook the facts so forcibly brought to the attention of the people of New York by

William C. Breed, chairman of the board of economic council of that State. Without attempting to quote him exactly, he said in substance:

The Government also is favoring the passage of many acts which require readjustment of capitalization, dissolutions, or other corporate action, without consideration of the burden such actions impose under the existing income-tax laws. For example, the proposed Public Utilities Act is designed to force holding companies out of business. If this law is passed, it necessarily means the dissolution or consolidation of many companies. On the other hand, we find certain sections of the income-tax law imposing heavy penalties as the result of dissolutions or consolidations. The public is so concerned with the provisions of the Public Utilities Act itself that it fails even to consider what would be the effect of the passage of such a law on the companies themselves under the provisions of existing tax laws.

It might also be mentioned that under another section of the income-tax law passed last year the dissolution of a corporation whose stock has been held by an individual for over 10 years will precipitate upon that individual a tax penalty of 100 percent of the profits arising from such dissolution, while if the same individual had sold his 10-year stock he would be taxed only 30 percent of the profit therefrom. * * *

This amendment of 1934 was undoubtedly passed to catch the profits retained in holding companies or private investment companies the dissolution of which the Government sought to effect, and yet we find that it has also penalized the stockholders for doing the very act which the Government would apparently like to have brought about. The effect of this provision on dissolutions undertaken for ordinary business reasons and not relating to private holding companies is exceedingly serious, and clearly this provision should be amended.

In studying the conflicting income-tax laws which have been passed, one comes to the conclusion that many of the evils of tax avoidance are in reality created by the very terms of the laws themselves. There is no doubt that our income-tax laws should be studied and broadly revised; there also is no doubt that they can be vastly improved, simplified, and made understandable to the average individual. The chief impediment to any revision of these tax laws, however, is the present-day idea behind all legislation, which is:

Tax everything on every possible theory, so that those who have will have nothing left.

It is certainly true that if this principle of government continues there will be nothing left, not even incentive. * * *

If the Government's present program continues, moreover, the United States bids fair to sink into the condition of Australia of 20 years ago—a great country without hope, a country without hope because of its attempt to socialize everything and everybody, forgetting that the happiness of the average citizen depends upon the business prosperity of the country itself.

But the game of trying to make 2 and 2 equal 6 is about played out, and the average citizen is awakening to the fact that experiments do not produce prosperity or recovery.

Excessive and abusive taxes have caused wide social disturbances and have led to great historical events.

President Coolidge in an address delivered at the National Conference on Inheritance and Estate Taxation in this city in 1925 said:

The position has been taken that the Federal Government should withdraw from the field of estate taxation. This view has much to commend it. The right to inherit property owes its existence, not to any Federal law, but to the laws of the States. Federal estate taxation, therefore, has not the natural excuse which is conceded to State inheritance taxation. The Federal Government being in the field, however, primarily with rates as excessive as those recently adopted, results in a very material decrease in the amount and value of the property upon which the States will have their inheritance tax. If the States are to suffer diminution in revenue from this source, they can make up their losses only by higher tax in other fields. Already the taxes levied by the States upon land are so high as to menace the prosperity of the farmer. For the sake of the revenue which the Federal Government receives from these sources the Federal Government should be careful to see that indirectly it is not taxing the very persons whom it most wishes to relieve.

The Honorable William H. Blodgett, former Commissioner of Taxes of the State of Connecticut, in addressing the National Council of State Legislatures in 1927, most forcibly stated the situation with respect to Federal estate taxation, and I desire in closing to leave with you for your consideration his analysis of the then existing situation, the same in principle as now obtains, only emphasized by the magnified threat against State rights inherent in the recommendations made. Hear him when he says:

The present Federal estate tax anomaly places the States in a strait-jacket. It is based on the doctrine that the citizen, in whichever State he lives, must pay taxes locally and for State purposes in accordance with the congressional will. The strait-jacket is a presumption of authority and works an injustice to every State in which the citizens have thoughtfully attended to public business. The device accomplishes by indirection that which could not be considered as possible by directly imposing on any State the obligation to enact any kind of tax laws. No one would stand for such direct action by the Congress; such a proposal would not be considered. By the indirection found in the Federal law the same purpose is accomplished. Prior to 1924 the determination of whether the State would or would not have death tax laws was regarded as a matter exclusively of its own concern. Since the passage of this law, while free to make such determination, each State is subjected to penalty for failure to make the determination in accordance with the Federal plan.

The States in the Constitutional Convention yielded the right to the Federal Government to impose taxes only in reliance upon the constitutional limitations as to apportionment and uniformity. It was intended that the Constitution should forbid discrimination by the levying of duties, imposts, or excises upon a particular subject in one State and a different duty, impost, or excise on the same subject in another State. The burden was to be uniform in all States.

The necessity for uniform death taxes is no greater than the necessity for imposing uniform personal income taxes or uniform corporation net-income taxes. No reason exists for uniformity in the several States with respect to such taxes. Indeed, uniformity in this regard is undesirable except as there may exist uniform sentiment in the States imposing such taxes and other uniform conditions too varied in character to be enumerated. If the strait-jacket principle is sound, other strait-jackets, possibly and probably less comfortably fitting, may be devised in course of time to fit other States which refuse to obey the congressional will. By application of Federal power of the purse, the discomfort of three States now may be slight in comparison with that which other States may feel in a decade or two.

If it were necessary for the Federal Government to establish such principle as underlies this tax, no good citizen would inveigh against it. Whether constitutional or unconstitutional, this law not only is in conflict with the spirit of the fundamental law but it destroys that equilibrium essential to the progressive political career of the American people. As the historian Fiske pointed out:

"The hopes that may have been built upon it (the Constitution of the United States) for the future happiness and prosperity of mankind will be wrecked forever."

A large majority of Americans feel as does President Frank, of the University of Wisconsin, as we watch the relentless encroachment of the state, in one European nation after another, upon private enterprise and political liberty, that we want more than ever to will to our sons an America in which a great economic leadership has made possible the preservation of the inspiring advantages of private enterprise and political liberty by boldly recasting its economic policies for the distribution of wealth in the light of its technical processes for the production of wealth.

After swallowing whole a program for the control of production he says:

The creation of scarcity, and the boosting of prices, which has always been the dream of reactionary economic leadership, a radical politics sets the stage for heavier and heavier taxation of the results of successful enterprise in order that Government may execute lavish public works, on the theory that this will effect the spread of buying power necessary to stabilize our economic order.

This, it seems to me, is missing the point. I do not suggest that industrial enterprise, incomes, and inheritances cannot stand heavier impacts of taxation. I insist only that we cannot build a great civilization by lavish expenditures on even the most desirable public works unless concurrently we solve the problem of clothing the bodies, feeding the stomachs, and freeing from fear the hearts of the masses in and through the Nation's business, industry, and agriculture. The place to solve the economic problem is at the source where policies respecting wages, hours, prices, and profits are formulated. It is no answer to permit an economic system to play havoc with the lives of millions and then step into the picture with stringent taxes to take care of these millions with the munificence of a political Santa Claus. In the end such procedure will wreck the system that must produce the wealth and sap the self-respect of the millions who learn to lean on the bounty of Government.

I direct your attention to the undeniable fact that never were those in favor of centralization of power in the Federal Government more active than in these very days. The lifeblood of the States is being insidiously sapped by leechlike

governmental agencies whose number is legion. The eventful disintegration of the body politic and the loss of the identity of the several States is most seriously threatened.

But the States will not submit if they be but aroused to a realizing sense of what confronts them. The sentiment of the country has not been better expressed than by learned Senator GEORGE when he recently said:

The ultimate preservation of the Union depends upon the retention, unimpaired, of the dual system of government set up by the Constitution. The liberty of the citizen rests at last upon local self-government; upon local institutions administered by local authority responsive and responsible to local opinion. The decision of the Supreme Court does not call for amending the Constitution or for the surrender of the reserved powers of the States over the intimate personal business and social affairs of the people.

The decision of the Court calls for the full assumption by Congress of its constitutional responsibility in the consideration of legislative proposals. Nothing but disaster lies ahead if those who know well the political theories of history and are yet lacking in the vital sense of the realities of life are permitted to shatter the American system of government and to attempt to remold it in accordance with their desires. It is yet our hope that these theorists, many of whom have encamped in Washington, will have their day and pass away.

In a recent editorial the Constitution called attention to the warning of Daniel Webster of the dangers of tampering with the Constitution. He said in an address on the hundredth anniversary of Washington's birth:

"Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhausts our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolates and lays waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government; who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty; who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again."

I agree fundamentally with those who contend that there should be a more equable distribution of wealth and that concentration of it in the hands of a few is to be deprecated; but I am opposed to attempts to redistribute it by imposing the Federal super estate and inheritance taxes in the manner proposed. If redistribution is to be effected in any such way or manner, it can and should be attempted and accomplished through and by the States along the lines I have suggested.

There can be no question that the extraordinary governmental expenditures which have now reached proportions for which there is no peace-time parallel in the history of this or any other country must be met by taxation. The manner in which it is done and the methods used, however, should not strike at the heart of the body politic. The spending program must be checked. Its continuation threatens the financial stability of the Government, so do also the plans and policies defined in the message of the President. Our form and system of government are imperiled, for in the sapping of the lifeblood of the several States lies the evident threat of their eventual annihilation.

The further growth of the hydra-headed centralization monster must be stopped, and now.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S TAX PROGRAM WHICH WOULD GRADUALLY REDISTRIBUTE THE WEALTH OF THE COUNTRY, AS WELL AS THE BURDENS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a radio address which I delivered today on the President's tax program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address which I delivered today over a national radio broadcast.

My friends, on last Wednesday, June 19, President Roosevelt delivered to Congress one of the most important messages that has ever come from a Chief Executive of the United States, in which he advocated a policy that would not only tend to redistribute the wealth of this Nation, but it would also redistribute the burdens of government, through the taxing power.

That message constitutes one of the brightest rays of hope that has dawned for the overburdened taxpayers of America since the close of the Civil War.

He is not advocating a radical or a destructive policy, but a safe, sane, and constructive constitutional method of raising the necessary revenues to meet our obligations and to gradually redistribute the wealth of the Nation in such a way as to give the children of this and coming generations an opportunity in this world.

In recent years we have found ourselves in the midst of a paradoxical depression that is without a parallel in all history. We live in the richest country in all the world. With a gentle climate, a fertile soil, and an abundant rainfall, our lands produce every agricultural commodity necessary for the maintenance and comforts of mankind.

We produce more wheat, more corn, more hogs, more cotton, more dairy products, in fact, more of all agricultural as well as manufactured commodities of every kind than the American people can possibly use.

Our natural resources are unlimited. In fact, we have the world's reserve supplies of raw materials and they are well distributed throughout the length and breadth of the land.

The inventive genius of America has given us an ascendancy and a control over the forces of nature never before attained in all the history of the human race.

And yet, we have seen millions of our people hungry and other millions insufficiently clothed. We have seen bread lines stretching down the streets of our cities, while farmers were losing their homes, seeing them sold for debts or confiscated for taxes.

Practically every individual who owned a home, or tried to own a home, has been loaded with debts and burdened with taxes that he found himself unable to pay. Almost every county, municipality, school district, or road district, and practically every State in the Union, and even the Federal Government itself is burdened with debts and bonded obligations that it seems almost impossible to pay.

Yet, we scarcely owe a single dollar beyond the confines of the United States. On the other hand, foreign countries owe this Nation billions of dollars, and at the same time, they and their citizens owe private individuals and private enterprises in America billions of dollars more.

What is the trouble? Why all this financial distress in the richest land in all the world, practically the only country that does not owe any debts beyond its own borders?

It is maldistribution of wealth. We are cursed with a system of economic feudalism that has overawed, browbeaten, or controlled by insidious methods or continuous pressure, the forces of democracy and so dominated the legislative programs of this country during the last 60 years that it has concentrated the wealth of this Nation into the hands of a few families.

We are told that less than 10 percent of our population now own more than 90 percent of our wealth. They are pyramiding their fortunes and passing them on down from generation to generation, ever increasing them by the natural accretion of interest accumulations, while the rest of the 120,000,000 Americans are literally grinding their lives out to even meet the interest they have to pay.

They began by accumulating vast fortunes out of the Civil War. They accumulated more through a high protective tariff, which levied an annual tribute upon every human being in America. Through this method, they sapped the economic vitality of the agricultural States, using the powers of Government through Federal pension and political patronage to hold enough of those States in line to guarantee them supreme control.

While governments were instituted and developed among men primarily to keep the strong from oppressing the weak, the powers of this Government have been used in the past to help the strong oppress the weak.

More fortunes were accumulated, and therefore more wealth was concentrated through a manipulation of public utilities, overcapitalization, sale of watered stocks, and exorbitant service charges. They even manipulated the currency by expanding through the Federal Reserve System and contracting in the same way—raising prices for a period until people adjusted themselves to higher price levels, incurred debts, fixed their tax rates, and floated bonds for necessary improvements—then contracted that currency, drove down prices, and are now demanding that those debts be paid with high dollars, and on deflated commodity values.

The people have about reached the limit of their endurance. They know there is something wrong with our present system, and they are beginning to realize what it is. They are demanding, and they are going to continue to demand, that there be a redistribution of the wealth of this country, and that the burdens of taxation be placed where they belong.

The President has pointed the way.

This is a sane and orderly method of solving this question. We do not need any amendments to the Constitution to give Congress this power. Congress already has that power under the Constitution as it now stands.

If you will let me write the tax bills, I will balance the Budget, pay a reasonable old-age pension, pay off the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates, and pay off the national debt in 25 years. I would place the same burden of taxes on the rich and opulent, in proportion to their wealth, that we are now placing upon the poor, the man of moderate means.

Today, the man most heavily burdened with taxes is the farmer and the home owner and the small business man, whose entire profits and invariably the equity in whose property is taken to pay his taxes. The one element that has grown richer as a result of

the World War has been the ones into whose hands the wealth of the Nation has been concentrated.

The reports of the Bureau of Internal Revenue show that in 1921 there were 21 individuals in the United States with incomes of a million dollars a year. In 1929, there were 513 individuals with incomes of a million dollars a year. Their number had multiplied 25 times, while the man of moderate means had gone down in the economic scale. The rich had grown richer by leaps and bounds, while the poor had grown poorer.

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade—
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroy'd, can never be supplied."

But gentlemen who have always represented the predatory interests of the country in the House and Senate, and who now vociferously proclaim their desire to prevent the further issuance of tax-exempt securities, studiously refrain from advocating the real remedy, and that is the raising of inheritance taxes and making the ones who own tax-exempt securities now bear their part of the burdens of government.

Our inheritance taxes are ridiculous. They are infinitesimal compared with the taxes which the average American has to bear.

Just before the passage of the last tax bill, I secured copies of the inheritance-tax rates for both France and Great Britain, and compared them with the inheritance-tax rates in the United States.

Here is a sample of the comparison: If a man died in the United States and left $100,000, his estate would pay a tax of $1,500. In England, it would pay $9,000; and in France $36,997.78.

In this country, an estate of $300,000 would pay a tax of $19,500; in England it would pay $28,000; while in France it would pay $130,789.78. In this country an estate of $500,000 would pay a tax of $42,500; in England, $105,000; and in France, $234,373.78.

In this country, an estate of $1,000,000 would pay $117,500; in England, it would pay $270,000; and in France $504,373.78.

I have long advocated the French rates for this country.

Men talk about taxing the profits of the next war. I want to adequately tax the profits of the last war. Then there will not be any next war, at least in your day and mine.

The people of large fortunes, as a rule, are the ones who invest their money in tax-exempt securities. They are the ones who seek and find that storm cellar. They are the ones who made fortunes out of the war, coining their millions out of the blood and tears of the suffering men, women, and children of the world. They are the ones who made their millions out of the tariff, by levying tribute upon everything the average American buys, from the swaddling clothes of infancy to the lining of the coffin in which old age is laid away.

They are the ones that we must reach if we ever expect to balance the Budget and meet the responsibilities of this Government and redistribute the wealth of the Nation so as to give the rising generation a chance in this world. Let's make American money serve the American people, instead of being used to buy titled husbands for rich heiresses of concentrated wealth.

This measure should be passed now, and I, for one, shall insist on Congress staying in session until it is put through. We ought not to think of adjourning until this measure becomes a law.

Then we can repeal some or all of our present nuisance taxes.

This will be Democracy's answer to socialism, communism, and all the other radical and dangerous influences to American institutions. It will assure equal opportunities to the children of the future, and, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, it will inspire us with renewed hope that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report for printing under the rule on the bill (H. R. 7160) to provide for research into the basic laws and principles relating to agriculture, and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work, and a more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges.

BONDS OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 7765, to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey calls up the bill H. R. 7765, and asks unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill seeks to relieve certain officials of the District of Columbia from giving official bonds. What officials does it embrace, I ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mrs. NORTON. The Commissioners of the District and surveyor and other officials.

Mr. BLANTON. What others?

Mrs. NORTON. The bill merely repeals the act which provided for the giving of bonds by certain District officials. There is no reason now why these officials should be required to give bonds, as they have nothing whatever to do with the funds of the District.

Mr. BLANTON. How many officials besides the Commissioners are relieved from giving official bonds?

Mrs. NORTON. About 30, and none of them has anything to do with the handling or disbursing of money. Therefore, they should not be required to give bond.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there is now in effect a wise law which has been in force since 1878 that these thirty-odd officials of the District should give bond. Why should we now repeal it? It is no disgrace for an honest official to give a bond.

Mrs. NORTON. Why should they be compelled to do so, since they are not acting in a fiduciary relationship?

Mr. BLANTON. Once in a while there is a dishonest official. This bill does away with the necessity for giving a bond and relieves them of that, when the law has required it continuously since 1878.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mrs. NORTON. They have nothing whatever to do with the spending of money, so why should they be compelled to give a bond?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, they handle business here running into millions of dollars on contracts. We have given them $41,000,000 for the next fiscal year beginning July 1, and they have control of every official who will spend it.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentlewoman will not call this bill up at this time.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I object to the request limiting debate. We want some time to discuss this bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7765; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that debate be confined to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and 15 minutes by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to debate a bill of this importance in 15 minutes if we had all the time of the opposition. This bill is too important to be rushed through the Congress.

Mrs. NORTON. May I say to the gentleman he may have all the time allotted to the opposition?

Mr. BLANTON. I should like to have 30 minutes of the time to yield some to my colleagues who are opposing this bill.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, that is irregular. I object to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the lady from New Jersey?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7765) to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate

the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Mr. SCRUGHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 103, ch. 180), entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia" be, and the same hereby is, amended by repealing the provision "and shall, before entering upon the duties of the office, each give bond in the sum of $50,000, with surety as is required by existing law", and said section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The said Commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered, any statute to the contrary notwithstanding, to determine which officers and employees of the District of Columbia shall hereafter be required to give, or renew, bond for the faithful discharge of their duties and to fix the penalty of any such bond.

SEC. 2. That section 1578, chapter LV, of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1424), entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia", is hereby amended so as to read:

"The surveyor shall take and subscribe an oath or affirmation before the Commissioners that he will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of his office, which oath shall be deposited with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 3. That section 1592 of said Code of Law for the District of Columbia is amended so as to read:

"The assistant surveyor shall take the same oath his principal is required to take, and may, during the continuance of his office, discharge and perform any of the official duties of his principal."

SEC. 4. That said Code of Law for the District of Columbia is further amended by repealing in its entirety section 1597 thereof.

SEC. 5. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. The lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] is recognized.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that this bill merely repeals the act of June 20, 1874. At that time the Commissioners of the District of Columbia did handle the funds of the District. Today they do not. It does not seem necessary to compel them to give a bond for $50,000 when they do not handle any funds. There are perhaps 30 people who come under the provisions of this act. None of the 30 people handle any money of the District.

The second paragraph of the first section is prompted by the belief that in a list of thirty-odd officers and employees who are now required to give bond there are perhaps more than a few whose duties do not reasonably require the giving of a bond or whose responsibilities do not justify a bond in the amount now required.

As I have said, the whole matter hinges on the law of 1874, and the present conditions in the District of Columbia are now changed and there is no necessity for putting those men to the trouble and expense of getting bonds, when they positively do not handle any funds in the District of Columbia.

I do not think there is any other salient fact concerned with the bill, and I do not think there is anything more to be said about it. It is simply a question of having the Commissioners and other officials go to the trouble and expense of procuring a bond when they do not handle any funds of the District, and they should not be required to do so. There is no justification for this requirement.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in 1878 the Congress wisely provided that the high officials of the District of Columbia should give a bond. That has been the law of the District since 1878. The District Commissioners and those officials handle just as much authority in money now as they did in 1878. There is no difference at all. Their responsibility has not changed one iota since 1878.

Is this doing away with official bonds something that Congress wants done? Is this something that the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia wants? Did this bill come from her? No. Did it come from her committee? No. Did it come from any committee of the Congress? No. I will show you where it came from. It came from the officers who are now required to give bonds. They are trying to get out from under. Why? No honest official should object to giving a bond. A bond it not for the protection of the official. It is for the protection of the people he serves. This bill does not come from the people whom those officers serve. It is not from the people of the District of Columbia. They are not asking that their officials be relieved from giving bonds. This bill comes from the officials themselves. I want to read what those officials say, and I read it from the committee report. This is what started this bill. It was prepared down in the District Building by the Commissioners. It was not prepared up here by any Congressional committee. They prepared this bill down in the District Building and they sent it up here to be passed. They prepared it only recently.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to read this first, and then I will yield.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment, yes; not now. I read from the report:

COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, April 24, 1935.

Hon. MARY T. NORTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MADAM: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to transmit herewith draft of a proposed bill to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—

which repeals the laws requiring them to give bonds.

Now I yield to the lady from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Is it not true the Commissioners send up nearly all the bills that come before the District Committee and before the Appropriations Committee as well?

Mr. BLANTON. No. It is true they send up many of the bills to the lady's legislative committee, but they do not send up any bills to the Committee on Appropriations. The estimates that come to the Committee on Appropriations are estimates that come from the President's Budget, and before they can get anything to our committee they must go to the President's Budget and submit their estimates and let the Director of the Budget pass upon them. Then, if they can get by the Budget Bureau, the estimates come to the Congressional Committee on Appropriations from the Budget.

Mrs. NORTON. May I say to the gentleman that it seems a pity that they do not send their recommendations to the committee of which the gentleman is a member, because if they did perhaps we would not have the disgraceful conditions we now have in the District with inadequate hospital facilities, inadequate schools, and everything else for which appropriations are necessary. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Let us see whom the gentlewoman is criticizing. On the Committee on Appropriations are the following: Mr. BUCHANAN, of Texas; Mr. TAYLOR, of Colorado; Mr. OLIVER, of Alabama; Mr. SANDLIN, of Louisiana; Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; Mr. WOODRUM, of Virginia, Mr. ARNOLD, of Illinois; Mr. BOYLAN, of New York; Mr. PARKS, of Arkansas; Mr. LUDLOW, of Indiana, and many other good Democrats. Then, on the Republican side, she is criticizing one of the finest legislators in Washington, the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. TABER, one of the finest gentlemen I ever knew, a man of eminent legislative qualifications. [Applause.] He is the leader of the other side on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Just one minute. My distinguished colleague from New Jersey is criticizing also our beloved friend the gentlewoman from California, who is a prominent member of the Committee on Appropriations. [Applause.] She exerts a wonderful influence over the Committee on Appropriations. We listen to her carefully when she has anything to say on that Committee on Appropriations. Whatever she wants done, she asks of us with a smile, and we grant her request almost even before she asks it.

Our distinguished friend from New Jersey is criticizing my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], one of the most conscientious men I have ever seen serve in Congress—a man who is sympathetic to every single thing that could appeal to humanitarian motives, who never turns down anything that ought not to be turned down.

Mrs. NORTON. I want to say to the gentleman that I thought he was the entire Appropriations Committee for the District of Columbia. From what we hear on the floor one would not know that anybody else was on the committee.

I want to state further that I am not criticizing the gentleman from New York nor any other member of that committee.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the distinguished lady will not cut that out of her remarks, because I deem it a great compliment.

Mrs. NORTON. I am not in the habit of taking my remarks out of the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the best campaign speech that ever was made for me.

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman is welcome to it.

Mr. BLANTON. Coming from such a distinguished Democrat as the leader of the Democracy of New Jersey, I would not take the world for what my friend has said about my standing on that committee.

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman is very welcome to what I have said if he can derive any satisfaction or consolation from it.

Mr. BLANTON. Getting back to this bill, my good friends on this committee should look more carefully, I am afraid, into some of these bills the Commissioners prepare and send up here to be O. K.'d. without due consideration.

Mrs. NORTON. Can the gentleman explain why the Surveyor of the District should be compelled to give a $20,000 bond, unless the gentleman likes these bonding companies in the District? That may be so, of course.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know a single bonding company, and do not know any person representing any of them. My only interest is to see the people protected by proper bonds. In view of the fact that the gentlewoman from New Jersey, the chairman of the committee, has an hour's time, she can answer me after I get through. She might disturb my train of thought, because I must listen whenever she interrupts. I hope she will not interrupt me any further until I get through and then I will not take up so much time, and I think I have something of importance to tell my colleagues.

I am not here just to oppose a bill because it can be opposed. I do not oppose many of the bills this committee brings in here. Why, I sat here the other day and let them pass about 10 bills without opposing any of them. Whenever they have a good bill I never raise my voice against it but help them to pass it, but when the District Commissioners who, since 1878, by act of Congress have been required to give bonds for the faithful performance of their duties to the 500,000 people living in Washington, whenever they try to get out from under that responsibility and try to repeal the law, and quit giving bonds, I must rise on this floor and raise my voice against it.

Now let us get the facts which nobody in this House denies. It has been the law since 1878 that these bonds should be given. If there is a Member here who denies that, I yield for the purpose. No one says a word in protest, so that is admitted to be a fact.

Mr. McFARLANE. Since 1874.

Mr. BLANTON. No; since 1878. The organic act of the District of Columbia which is in force right now and has been in force ever since 1878 was passed in 1878, and it required that these bonds be given. It has not been changed since that time. They have given bonds since 1878. It was in vogue when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] and his splendid committee made its investigation of District affairs; and I take my hat off to him for the splendid work he did a few years ago.

Why should this bond requirement now be changed? Are these officers any better than the high officials of your States? Are they any better than the State officers in Baltimore, Md.? Every single one of those high officials of Maryland, whose capital is at Annapolis, but who spend most of their time in Baltimore City, have to give bonds.

They all give bonds. It is no reflection on them. It is simply for the protection of the people of Maryland.

Let us take the great Commonwealth of Virginia, whose capital is Richmond. Every single high official of the Commonwealth of Virginia gives an official bond. It is for faithful performance. It does not militate against their service but is simply for the interests of the people that they give the bond. My distinguished colleague from New Jersey says that because they do not actually handle with their own hands the $41,000,000 that we gave them for next year they should not give a bond.

Mr. Chairman, they make contracts involving hundreds of thousands of dollars. I sat at one time on a committee that investigated some of these contracts. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], who is now in the United States Senate was the chairman of the committee, and I sat with him on the committee that investigated affairs in the District of Columbia.

We found a former Commissioner who was in the hardware business making contracts involving thousands of dollars with his own firm. He was not giving out competitive bids to other people in the same business. When we brought him before us and confronted him with the situation, it was not long before he resigned his position. We found lots of that going on here in the District of Columbia. They are on the inside and control action on big Government contracts. This bond is for faithful performance and prevents them from doing things of that kind, things that smack of dishonesty.

May I say it has been the greatest safeguard for the people of Washington that this Congress has had control of the business affairs of the District of Columbia. It is this Congress that has kept the District honest. It is this Congress that has kept the District business affairs free of taint, free of fraud, and free of dishonor.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Does not the gentleman think that we should apply our time for effectively legislating for thousands and thousands of inhabitants of other cities where there is so much distress and allow the District of Columbia to legislate for itself? There is too much distress in the country, and we are worrying about one little city, when, as a matter of fact, we should be worrying about all of them.

Mr. BLANTON. When the gentleman from California has been here a few more years and has properly adapted himself to legislative duties, and has had a kind of perspective taking in the whole of the United States, he will not make a remark like that. That is the remark of a newcomer. It is the remark of somebody who is uninformed of Washington and the people of the District of Columbia. And I do not reflect on new Members. Some here are among our most valuable colleagues, and are some of the brightest, ablest men in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this 10-mile square, known as the "District of Columbia", known as "Washington, D. C.", is the Nation's seat of government. Back yonder when they framed the Constitution of the United States they put a provision in there, years before we moved to Washington, that there should be acquired and established in this vicinity a seat of government 10 miles square that should be absolutely controlled by the Congress of the United States. Do you know why they put that in the Constitution? It was because for years previous to that the legislators representing the country had been deviled and harassed to death. We had the Nation's Capital at Baltimore at one time. We had it at York, Pa., at one time. We had it in New York. We had it in Princeton, N. J. We had it at Annapolis. We had it in Philadelphia. But on June 15, 1800, the Capital was

moved to our Government's own seat of affairs here in Washington, where we owned that seat of government and where the framers of the Constitution wisely provided that Congress should forever control the affairs of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman from California to take this home with him to think about this summer. When we moved the Capital down here, do you know that they did not dare to raise the prices on the Government of the United States? Did you know that all the lots here that the Government sold back to the people were sold for less than a total of $1,000,000? There are lots right here in Washington that when we moved here were not worth $50 and by reason of our plant here in Washington some are today worth $500,000. Did you know that?

Mr. Chairman, that is why the people of Washington cannot vote. It is because the framers of the Constitution wanted the absolute control of this 10-mile square, and therefore they put in the Constitution that the people who saw fit to live here could not vote. When we moved our Government here from Philadelphia on June 15, 1800—135 years ago—did you know that every person who lived in Washington then knew if he stayed here he could not vote? Did you know that every person who has moved here since did so with the knowledge that if he wanted to stay in Washington he could never vote? They stayed here and came here with a full knowledge of their rights, and they have seen fit to live here in the Nation's Capital and enjoy all of the benefits that we have given them during this 135 years, knowing that they could not vote. And there is a good logical reason why the good people of Washington do not want a vote here.

There never will be a vote in Washington, because it is against the Constitution, and the people of the United States are never going to change this provision of the Constitution. This is one 10-mile square that we are going to keep for the people of the United States. We are going to keep it free from domination of voters. It is our Nation's Capital; it is where the Congress sits; it is where the laws are passed; it is where the Government, through its Constitution, wisely provided a place that should be controlled absolutely by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much pleasure to the wonderful oration of my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], but I disagree with his view of this proposed legislation.

I can see no more reason why the District Commissioners should be bonded, or the surveyor of the District, than to bond Members of Congress. A District Commissioner does not collect or expend any money. The surveyor does not collect or disburse any money—not one penny—but it is necessary for the District to pay for bonds of $120,000 for these three officials. This is very nice business for the bonding companies, but it is not very good business for the District of Columbia or for the people here who are paying the cost of running the District government. There is not any reason why we should bond Members of Congress. We take an oath of office to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the country. The District Commissioners take an oath of office, as does the surveyor, and in view of the fact they handle no finances, why should we give this lucrative business to the bonding companies when there is no danger of the District Commissioner or the surveyor absconding with any money?

Mr. BLANTON. If I yield the gentleman 5 minutes of my time, will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; just a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. WOOD. Just ask the question, I do not need any more time.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose the surveyor, who does not handle any money, should be bribed by someoody to run a crooked line and someone is injured in the sum of thousands of dollars, his bond would cover malfeasance in office and would be a protection to the people injured against any such fraud or dishonesty.

Mr. WOOD. I beg to differ from the gentleman. The bond does not cover a mistake in a survey.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not say a mistake but fraud, and it covers malfeasance in office.

Mr. WOOD. The bond given by a Commissioner or by the surveyor refers to nothing except misappropriation of money.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman a lawyer?

Mr. WOOD. I know what these bonds cover.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman a copy of the bond there—he will see it covers malfeasance in office.

Mr. WOOD. I know these bonds do not protect either the District or the people from a mistake by the surveyor. There is a right of action at law.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman a lawyer?

Mr. WOOD. No; I am not.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman a copy of the bond there?

Mr. WOOD. I do not have to be a lawyer to know the general rules with respect to bonding companies. I think I know as much about bonding companies as the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I suspect the gentleman knows more about that than I do, although I am a lawyer.

Mr. WOOD. I decline to yield further. The gentleman has taken up about all of my time now.

There is not anything further I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, but I can see no reason why the District Commissioners should be bonded any more than the officers of any other municipality in the United States who do not handle any finances of a municipality. This is simply fine business for the bonding company and brings no benefit to the District or the Government.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know how much the Commissioners are compelled to pay for these bonds?

Mr. WOOD. I do not know the regular bonding rates here.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. They have to pay it out of their own pockets, do they not?

Mr. WOOD. No; the District pays it, I understand. Of course, a Commissioner could not very well pay the fee on a $50,000 bond per annum, as it would amount to several hundred dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time and also the 5 minutes that the gentleman from Texas yielded me.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO].

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, it is amusing on District day to listen to the gentleman from Texas—always ready and willing to take the floor, and oftentimes taking advantage of not having a quorum, and then ridiculing, as he calls them, the "new Members."

The gentleman from Texas has told us everything except on this occasion why he does not want to save some money for the Treasury. He has always taken the floor as the watchdog of the Treasury. When the District comes into the House and makes a recommendation to save money for the District, because of money paid out as premiums for bonds, which has nothing to do with the District because the men who are bonded handle no funds, and therefore are unable to misappropriate anything, and if there is any misfeasance in office we have the courts open, he objects.

The gentleman from Texas has told us when the Capital was in Pennsylvania, when it was in Maryland, and then when it was brought back here as a Capital, where it owns the land, but he failed to tell us what price the Government paid for this valuable piece of land. He did not tell us that it was the colonial estates that had given the land to the Government.

He emphasized the fact that the land was worth nothing. Of course it was worth nothing, the same as every piece of land in the country at some time was worth nothing.

So in order to kill time he talks about everything under the sun except the real issue. I would like to have him tell the Members of the House why he is always picking on the District. Since he has been on the Appropriations Committee he has constantly been cutting down the appropriations for the District. He is constantly helping to take away assessable property, and now when the District wants to save a few dollars in order that it may benefit, he comes in here and complains when we are asking to cut down appropriations that they say are very extravagant. We are not asking to cut down any extravagant appropriations. We are simply asking to save a few dollars that are paid for bonds by officials who handle no funds and cannot misappropriate funds. I hope the House will support the committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman tell us whether these officials are covered by a blanket bond or individual bonds?

Mr. PALMISANO. Individual bonds.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has any attempt been made to cover these officials by a blanket bond?

Mr. PALMISANO. No. This law was enacted years ago when the Commissioners had charge of the funds. Since that time they have been made merely budget directors, or commissioners, and they handle no funds. When the question was brought up in the committee I asked whether the Commissioners had control over contracts.

I was then informed that they had not even the last word on contracts. Realizing who the people were who were required to give a bond, the Commissioners of the District, and wondering whether they could do some sort of trickery work in reference to contracts, I asked the question, and they said "No"; that they have not the last say on contract. So there is no need to require a bond of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do these individuals carry the expense of the bond personally, or is it a District expense?

Mr. PALMISANO. I think it is a District expense, because their income would not justify paying for a $50,000 bond.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can any member of the committee tell us what would be saved in bond premiums if this bill were enacted into law?

Mr. PALMISANO. I do not know, but it might be about $1,500.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do the Commissioners have the power to initiate or partly confirm a contract pertaining to any kind of property?

Mr. PALMISANO. No; the Budget Director has control of that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Have the Commissioners any power over any kind of property, not just cash?

Mr. PALMISANO. I do not think so. The thing I had in mind at the time was contracts, and I asked whether it would be dangerous to permit them to officiate without bonds, in view of their power over contracts, and I was informed that they had not the say on contracts.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The total annual saving which this bill would bring about is about $1,500?

Mr. PALMISANO. One thousand five hundred dollars to two thousand dollars.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes in which to reply to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO].

Over in his State every little justice of peace is under bond. Do you know why he is under bond? For faithful performance of duty.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. PALMISANO. Does the gentleman realize that those justices of the peace collect fines which are to be returned to the State?

Mr. BLANTON. They may do that, but not in large amounts.

Mr. PALMISANO. Very well; they should be bonded.

Mr. BLANTON. These District Commissioners control the expenditure of $40,000,000 annually. How about the county attorneys? Do they handle money? Some county attorneys and some district attorneys in some States are required to give bond.

Mr. WOOD. What kind of attorneys are under bond?

Mr. BLANTON. All of them in some States.

Mr. WOOD. Not in my State.

Mr. BLANTON. They are in some States.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman knows that the county attorneys handle funds in claims of any consequence or property.

Mr. BLANTON. How about county surveyors? The surveyors do not handle any funds. Practically all county surveyors in the various States are under bond. This bill would relieve the surveyor in Washington from being under bond.

Mr. BEITER. There are no county surveyors. County engineers do the surveying.

Mr. BLANTON. In some States like Texas we have county surveyors. They have county surveyors in many of the States. They have them in your State, and your State, and your State [nodding to several Members]. Every one of them is under bond.

Mr. MILLARD. Does anyone know the form of this bond? I have been listening to argument here for 20 minutes and nobody seems to know whether it covers misappropriation of funds or malfeasance or misfeasance.

Mr. BLANTON. Every lawyer in the House knows that every official bond covers not only misappropriation of funds but also it covers faithful performance of duty and provides against malfeasance in office. It makes that official responsible for every malfeasance in office. If he purposely enters into some fraud against the people he serves, those people who are damaged by it can go into court and make him pay for it on his bond. Many notaries have been sued for damages for making false certificates.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Does not the gentleman think that the moral influence alone exercised by the bond is worth the price of it?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly, that is correct. It is worth everything. Very few officials default and the reason for it is because most of them are honest, and they are all under bond, and the moral effect deters the dishonest in many cases. It is an unwise procedure for Congress to relieve high officials of the District of Columbia from the necessity of giving bonds. It has worked well here since 1878.

Let me call your attention to something funny that my friend from Maryland, Mr. PALMISANO, said. He said it was not necessary to require bonds, because if they were guilty of malfeasance in office you could prosecute them in a criminal court. What good would that do? It would not get any money back. If a surveyor deliberately accepted a bribe and ran a crooked line and defrauded somebody out of $10,000 and he did not have anything that you could attach by law, what good would it do to prosecute him criminally? It would not get the money back. It is the bond that stands between him and unfaithful service to the people. The bond makes whole the fraud and dishonesty.

This is nothing to me, personally. If you want to relieve all of these Washington officials of bonds, do so, but what kind of explanation are you going to make to all of your local officials when you go back home, who were forced to give bond? They will come to you and say, "Congressman, I want you to help me to get a law passed in the State legislature relieving me of a bond. I notice up in Washington where the District Commissioners got tired of being under bond, and wanted to evade responsibility, sat down and drew up a law to relieve them of giving bonds and sent it to the District Committee and the District Committee reported it and while BLANTON made a fight against the bill, you voted to relieve them and I want you to help relieve me." What will you say to that? I have done my full duty when

I have finished my speech against this bill, and when I vote against it. I cannot do more.

Mr. PALMISANO. Will the gentleman tell the Members if there are any officers in the State of Texas who do not handle money who give bonds to the extent of $50,000? It may be true they are under a nominal bond.

Mr. BLANTON. If I tell the gentleman of about 5,000 unimportant officers in Maryland who do not handle any money at all who are under bond, will he withdraw this bill, and not pass it?

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

Mr. BLANTON. I yield myself 5 minutes more. I am going to accept the gentleman's challenge. I will name 5,000 officers in Maryland who do not handle any money at all for the State or for the people and who are under bond. They are notaries public, and everyone of them you have in Maryland is under bond, is he not? What is it for? It is for faithful performance of service. It is to keep him from making a false certificate. When some crook comes to him and represents himself to be Mr. Goldsborough and says he is making a deed to somebody for Mr. Goldsborough's property, if that notary does not ascertain who that man is and find out that he is not Goldsborough, he is guilty of malfeasance in office, and he can be sued on his bond for damages. That is what the bonds are for. It is to protect the people from dishonest practices.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not yield now, as I do not want to take up too much time.

Mr. PALMISANO. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. Very well. I yield to the gentleman, since he is on the committee handling the bill.

Mr. PALMISANO. It is true notaries do give bond.

Mr. BLANTON. Why do you not relieve them?

Mr. PALMISANO. But it is a nominal bond; not a $50,000 bond.

Mr. BLANTON. They are about $1,500 bonds in most States. They range from $1,000 to about $2,500.

Mr. PALMISANO. Very well. They can do an injustice, such as the gentleman spoke of, of $100,000 in one real-estate transaction. That is something that cannot be done here.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, more than that damage could be done here by a dishonest Commissioner. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] gave you the crux of it a while ago when he said it was the moral influence of that bond over officials that counted most. You put them under bond and keep them under bond. I hope I will never vote, as long as I am in the House, to relieve a public official from giving bond to require faithful and honest performance of service to the people of the country whom he represents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What reason is there for not having these bonds covered by a blanket bond instead of individual bonds?

Mr. BLANTON. Not a bit. They could do it and save much on premiums.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And would it not save a lot of money?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. They would save a lot of money by having a blanket bond.

I want to call attention to one other thing and then I will have finished.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I regret I have not the time. I do not want to be interrupted for a moment. I am sorry.

Some of you older Members will remember some 12 years ago I made an investigation, when I was a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of the insurance department of the District of Columbia, when Insurance Commissioner Miller was in charge there. You will remember the report I then filed with Congress, which is published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, wherein I showed that that man was accepting bribes from insurance companies all over the land. He was collecting annual bonuses from them in order to allow them to do business in the District of Columbia. I showed instance after instance where he had collected those bonuses. The very next day after I filed my report the Commissioners fired him and kicked him out of office. Suppose he had not been under bond? Suppose you had relieved him of bond? When you relieve the Commissioners of bond you take all the responsibility off of their shoulders, if there should ever be one who is dishonest.

And once in a while a commissioner is dishonest. I will remind you of former Commissioner Col. Frederic A. Fenning. There are men in this House who some years ago saw me take this floor and on my responsibility as a Member of Congress, impeach a Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Col. Frederic A. Fenning, of high crimes and misdemeanors. I presented evidence against him before the Gibson committee for several weeks. It condemned Fenning. He had three of the leading lawyers of Washington to defend him. Frank Hogan, the great criminal lawyer, was one of his attorneys. After I impeached him from this floor, I prosecuted him before our Judiciary Committee for several weeks, and I piled up the evidence on him so strong, I showed where he had had many scores of shell-shocked soldiers of the World War declared insane and had put them in insane asylums, and he had himself appointed their committee, or guardian, and he had robbed them out of nearly $200,000. I forced him to resign and I forced him to pay back some of that money to those shell-shocked soldiers.

It pays to have high commissioners under bond. Once in a while you get a black sheep among them. Once in a while you may again get another black sheep among some of the officials of the District of Columbia. There is no reason why they should not give bond. They have done it since 1878. It is no reflection on their honesty. Let us keep them under bond.

When the proper time comes I shall move to strike out the enacting clause of this bill, and if you want to keep them under bond, which they have been under since 1878, you will vote for my motion. Why have they not asked to be relieved in all that time?

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

Mr. BLANTON. I yield myself 1 more minute and that is all I want. Why did they not ask to be relieved 10 years ago, or 20 years ago? Why did they not ask to be relieved 30 years ago? Why did they not ask to be relieved 40 years ago? They have waited all these years since 1878, and been under bond since 1878, and this is the first time they have ever prepared a bill and brought it up here asking to be relieved from giving a bond.

I am going to vote to make them give a bond. I am not going to vote to relieve them. You can do it if you want to, but the responsibility will be upon your shoulders. [Applause.]

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

Mrs. NORTON. That concludes the general debate, Mr. Chairman, and the Clerk may read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 103, ch. 180), entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia", be, and the same hereby is, amended by repealing the provision "and shall, before entering upon the duties of the office, each give bond in the sum of $50,000, with surety as is required by existing law", and said section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The said Commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered, any statute to the contrary notwithstanding, to determine which officers and employees of the District of Columbia shall hereafter be required to give or renew bond for the faithful discharge of their duties and to fix the penalty of any such bond."

With the following committee amendments——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk reads the committee amendments, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. Chairman, I have debated this bill. I am not going to take up any further time. If you vote to strike out the enacting clause, you will leave the law as it has been since

1878, and will not relieve high officials from giving bonds. If you vote down my motion you will pass this bill relieving the Commissioners and 31 high officials from giving bond, and will leave the people they serve without this protection.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. Considering the millions of dollars that are handled every year by these Commissioners, their many official acts, contracts, and so forth they pass upon, and the men appointed under them who will be relieved from bond under this bill, it seems to me as though to pass this bill would be nothing short of a tragedy.

Mr. BLANTON. We have turned over to them for the next fiscal year $41,000,000. They can make contracts involving every penny of it. It is a ridiculous proposition to relieve them of such bonds, for they control every person who will pay out this $41,000,000 and every person who makes contracts respecting it.

It is nothing to me personally. I have done my duty. I have called the matter to your attention, and when I vote against this bill, that is all I can do.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] a few moments ago propounded a question as to how much saving there would be to the Government if this bill were enacted into law. Under the assumption that each commissioner was bonded for $10,000, it has been stated the saving would be approximately $1,500. Since that time I have learned that each person is bonded for $50,000. So the saving instead of being $1,500 would be approximately $6,000. I wanted to make this correction and also to have the members of the committee know that the saving to the Government will be $6,000 rather than $1,500 as heretofore stated.

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

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has any calculation been made as to what the saving would be on a blanket bond instead of individual bonds?

Mr. BLANTON. They could have a blanket bond covering all of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the committee would find that a very staggering saving could be made by the use of a blanket bond instead of individual bonds.

Mr. BEITER. I understand the saving in premiums would be about 40 percent.

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

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The bonding companies realize the extent of the liability or the premium would not amount to $6,000.

Mr. BEITER. That is their minimum charge, as I understand it.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. They can charge what they please.

Mr. BEITER. Bonding companies generally have a minimum charge, and in this instance I am advised the charge is $5 per thousand.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. No; they do not. I have represented them 25 years.

Mr. BEITER. I do not doubt the gentleman's statement. However, I know the laws governing bonding companies vary in nearly every State in the Union, and in all probability there is a vast difference between the laws governing bonding companies in the District of Columbia and those in the State of Maryland. I am sure the opponents of this bill are as anxious to effect a saving to the Government as are the members of the District Committee and the District Commissioners who have recommended that this proposed legislation be enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON) there were—ayes 48, noes 26.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman cannot get an automatic vote in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. BLANTON. 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. SCRUGHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7765, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division on my motion.

The SPEAKER. There is no such question pending before the House.

Mrs. NORTON. I objected to the vote on the ground there was not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. That question has not been raised in the House.

Mr. BLANTON. The Committee rose before the Committee found it had no quorum.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PALMISANO. As I understood, the gentlewoman from New Jersey objected to the vote on the ground there was not a quorum present, and while that was being considered the gentleman from Texas moved that the Committee rise.

My inquiry is, Does the motion of the gentleman from Texas take precedence over the objection of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

The SPEAKER. The proceedings to which the gentleman refers took place, of course, in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The gentleman from Texas moved that the Committee rise; and the Committee has risen, and we are now in the House. There is nothing pending before the House so far as this bill is concerned.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7765.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my motion to permit the gentleman from New York to submit a unanimous-consent request.

HOLDING-COMPANY BILL

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a majority report and minority views on the holding-company bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the announcement of the Chair with respect to my objection to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present.

The SPEAKER. The question is not pending before the House.

NATIONAL PARK TRUST FUND BOARD

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas further withhold his motion to adjourn?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my motion for the time being.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 2074, to create a National Park Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my objection to permit the gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I would inform the gentleman that by unanimous consent a similar House bill (H. R. 6734) was passed and no Member on the minority of the committee objected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman can take it up in the morning. For the present, Mr. Speaker, I object.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 44, noes 46.

So the motion was rejected.

BONDS OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 7765, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7765) to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. No.

The SPEAKER. The House has already decided to go into Committee for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7765, and the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7765, with Mr. SCRUGHAM in the chair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, as soon as the Clerk reports the bill I have a preferential motion to offer.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Committee of the Whole having moved to strike out the enacting clause and there having been further business transacted, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON) there were—ayes 48, noes 49.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum, and pending that I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and six Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, what does the Chair understand tellers are demanded on?

Mr. BLANTON. On the vote to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Following that there was a point of no quorum made.

Mr. BLANTON. No. I made a point of no quorum, and pending that demanded tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. All of those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I understand it, this teller vote is being taken on the question of the Committee rising and reporting the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Those in favor of striking out the enacting clause would pass through the tellers first?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And those opposing would pass through later?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that is not a parliamentary inquiry. That is telling the Members how to vote.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 45, noes 56.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 2, line 5, strike out the words "any statute to the contrary notwithstanding."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "bond", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That this power of the Commissioners shall not apply to officers and employees who receive, disburse, account for, or otherwise are responsible for the handling of money, and whose bonds are now fixed by law. The provisions of the act of Congress entitled 'An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1909, and for other purposes', approved August 5, 1909 (36 Stat. 118, 125), relating to rates of premiums for bonds for officers and employees of the United States shall be, and are hereby, made applicable to the rates of premiums for bonds of officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 1578, chapter LV, of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1424), entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia", is hereby amended so as to read:

"The surveyor shall take and subscribe an oath or affirmation before the Commissioners that he will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of his office, which oath shall be deposited with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 3. That section 1592 of said Code of Law for the District of Columbia is amended so as to read:

"The assistant surveyor shall take the same oath his principal is required to take, and may, during the continuance of his office, discharge and perform any of the official duties of his principal."

SEC. 4. That said Code of Law for the District of Columbia is further amended by repealing in its entirety section 1597 thereof.

SEC. 5. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7765, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recom-

mendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON) there were—ayes 52, noes 48.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 115, not voting 143, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—171

Arends	Faddis	McCormack	Reilly
Ayers	Fernandez	McGrath	Robertson
Bacharach	Focht	McKeough	Robinson, Utah
Bland	Gildea	McLaughlin	Robsion, Ky.
Boland	Gray, Pa.	McLean	Rogers, Mass.
Bolton	Greenway	McSwain	Rudd
Boylan	Greenwood	Maas	Sadowski
Brennan	Gregory	Maloney	Schneider
Brown, Ga.	Griswold	Marcantonio	Schuetz
Brown, Mich.	Gwynne	Marshall	Schulte
Brunner	Halleck	Martin, Mass.	Scott
Buck	Hancock, N. Y.	Maverick	Secrest
Burch	Harter	May	Shanley
Burnham	Hess	Mead	Sirovich
Carmichael	Higgins, Mass.	Merritt, Conn.	Smith, Va.
Casey	Hill, Ala.	Merritt, N. Y.	Snell
Chapman	Hobbs	Michener	Snyder
Citron	Hoeppel	Monaghan	South
Claiborne	Holmes	Montague	Stack
Cole, N. Y.	Imhoff	Nichols	Starnes
Collins	Jacobsen	Norton	Steagall
Costello	Jenckes, Ind.	O'Brien	Stewart
Crosby	Jenkins, Ohio	O'Connell	Sutphin
Cullen	Johnson, W. Va.	O'Connor	Taylor, Colo.
Daly	Jones	O'Day	Terry
Darrow	Kahn	O'Leary	Thomas
Delaney	Kee	O'Neal	Tinkham
Dempsey	Keller	Palmisano	Tolan
Disney	Kelly	Patterson	Tonry
Ditter	Kennedy, Md.	Perkins	Turpin
Dobbins	Kennedy, N. Y.	Pettengill	Vinson, Ga.
Dockweiler	Kenney	Pittenger	Vinson, Ky.
Dorsey	Kerr	Plumley	Walter
Doughton	Kloeb	Powers	Weaver
Drewry	Kvale	Quinn	Welch
Driscoll	Lambeth	Rabaut	Williams
Driver	Lea, Calif.	Ramsay	Wilson, La.
Duffy, N. Y.	Lesinski	Ramspeck	Wolfenden
Duncan	Lewis, Colo.	Randolph	Wolverton
Eckert	Lewis, Md.	Ransley	Wood
Eicher	Lord	Reece	Young
Ekwall	Lundeen	Reed, Ill.	Zioncheck
Ellenbogen	McAndrews	Reed, N. Y.	

NAYS—115

Amlie	Crosser, Ohio	Guyer	McLeod
Ashbrook	Crowe	Hamlin	McReynolds
Biermann	Deen	Harlan	Mapes
Binderup	Dies	Hildebrandt	Massingale
Blackney	Dondero	Hill, Knute	Meeks
Blanton	Duffey, Ohio	Hoffman	Millard
Boileau	Dunn, Miss.	Hook	Mitchell, Ill.
Buckbee	Dunn, Pa.	Hope	Mitchell, Tenn.
Buckler, Minn.	Edmiston	Houston	Mott
Caldwell	Engel	Huddleston	Nelson
Cannon, Mo.	Farley	Hull	Parks
Carlson	Fiesinger	Johnson, Okla.	Parsons
Carpenter	Fletcher	Johnson, Tex.	Patton
Cartwright	Ford, Miss.	Kimball	Pearson
Castellow	Fulmer	Kinzer	Peterson, Fla.
Christianson	Gassaway	Kniffin	Peterson, Ga.
Church	Gearhart	Kocialkowski	Pierce
Colden	Gehrmann	Kramer	Rankin
Colmer	Gilchrist	Lanham	Richards
Cooley	Gillette	Lemke	Richardson
Cooper, Tenn.	Gingery	Lloyd	Rogers, Okla.
Cravens	Goldsborough	Luckey	Romjue
Crawford	Gray, Ind.	Ludlow	Sauthoff
Cross, Tex.	Green	McFarlane	Schaefer
Scrugham	Thomason	Utterback	Wilcox
Spence	Thurston	Warren	Withrow
Stefan	Truax	Wearin	Wolcott
Tarver	Turner	Whelchel	Zimmerman
Taylor, S. C.	Umstead	Whittington	

NOT VOTING—143

Adair	Crowther	Hennings	Russell
Allen	Culkin	Higgins, Conn.	Ryan
Andresen	Cummings	Hill, Samuel B.	Sabath
Andrew, Mass.	Darden	Hollister	Sanders, La.
Andrews, N. Y.	Dear	Kleberg	Sanders, Tex.
Arnold	DeRouen	Knutson	Sandlin
Bacon	Dickstein	Kopplemann	Sears
Bankhead	Dietrich	Lambertson	Seger
Barden	Dingell	Lamneck	Shannon
Beam	Dirksen	Larrabee	Short
Beiter	Doutrich	Lee, Okla.	Sisson
Bell	Doxey	Lehlbach	Smith, Conn.
Berlin	Eagle	Lucas	Smith, Wash.
Bloom	Eaton	McClellan	Smith, W. Va.
Boehne	Englebright	McGehee	Somers, N. Y.
Brewster	Evans	McGroarty	Stubbs
Brooks	Fenerty	McMillan	Sullivan
Buchanan	Ferguson	Mahon	Sumners, Tex.
Buckley, N. Y.	Fish	Mansfield	Sweeney
Bulwinkle	Fitzpatrick	Martin, Colo.	Taber
Burdick	Flannagan	Mason	Taylor, Tenn.
Cannon, Wis.	Ford, Calif.	Miller	Thom
Carter	Frey	Montet	Thompson
Cary	Fuller	Moran	Tobey
Cavicchia	Gambrill	Moritz	Treadway
Celler	Gasque	Murdock	Underwood
Chandler	Gavagan	Oliver	Wadsworth
Clark, Idaho	Gifford	O'Malley	Wallgren
Clark, N. C.	Goodwin	Owen	Werner
Cochran	Granfield	Patman	West
Coffee	Greever	Peyser	White
Cole, Md.	Haines	Pfeifer	Wigglesworth
Connery	Hancock, N. C.	Polk	Wilson, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Hart	Rayburn	Woodruff
Corning	Hartley	Rich	Woodrum
Cox	Healey	Rogers, N. H.	

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

On the vote:

Mr. Woodrum (for) with Mr. Mahon (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Granfield with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Arnold with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Eagle with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Doxey with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Sandlin with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Coffee.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma.
Mr. Thompson with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Berlin.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Dietrich.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Samuel B. Hill with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. West with Mr. Greever.
Mr. Thom with Mr. Beiter.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Ford of California.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Owen.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Lucas.
Mr. Werner with Mr. Gavagan.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr Stubbs.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Sisson.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Cummings.
Mr. Darden with Mr. Bell.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. KVALE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I object.

THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter which I have written to the president of the United States group in reference to the Interparliamentary Union.

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

There was no objection.

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

JUNE 18, 1935.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President United States of America
Group the Interparliamentary Union,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: As a Member of the Congress I wish to protest to you, as president of the United States of America Group of the Interparliamentary Union, against any action or any participation of the United States of America group in relation to international economic or international political questions to be taken up at the next meeting of the Interparliamentary Union.

I wish to protest particularly against any action or participation by the American group in relation to the "Harmonization of the Briand-Kellogg Pact with the Covenant of the League of Nations", which topic I note is upon the official agenda for the next meeting.

With regard to my protest, I wish to bring to your attention a statement of Dr. Charles L. Lange, formerly secretary general of the Interparliamentary Union, which appears on page 14 of the Interparliamentary Union, handbook of the American group, 1914. This statement reads:

"But up to the present time the interparliamentarians have always limited themselves to the discussion of questions relating to international law; they have never discussed economic questions, and they have always expressly refused to pronounce themselves on problems of a political nature, in which the interests of different States might be opposed.

"The latter principle is one inevitably bound up with the character of the institution itself. Because the Union is composed of responsible statesmen, belonging to nations whose legitimate interests may from time to time be in conflict, it would inevitably compromise its own authority if it raised its voice for or against this or the other practical solution of international conflicts. The interparliamentary gatherings have, without exception, always restricted themselves to the advocacy of peaceful and judicial methods for the settlement of conflicts."

I desire specifically to bring to your attention that the act authorizing the appropriation for the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union provides as follows: "That an appropriation of $20,000 annually is hereby authorized, $10,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration; and $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made."

It would seem from this language that the United States of America group has authority to participate only in discussions or actions "for the promotion of international arbitration."

Very truly yours,

GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM.

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH—PATRIOT, PIONEER, STATESMAN, LAWYER, WRITER, COURAGEOUS CHAMPION FOR THE PEOPLE

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, in 80 years of Minnesota history many Congressmen and Senators have come to Washington from the North Star State. The most able and distinguished of them all was Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, of Little Falls, who was destined to reach a place in the hall of fame of this country because of his progressive, forward-looking, common-sense economic views. He was known as a "radical", a term often applied to the great men of the Nation. I predict that Lindbergh will grow in the estimation of the American public, and as he recedes from our day and age his figure will loom larger in our political life.

His books, reproduced by large publishing houses, are now often quoted in the foremost and best-read magazines in the country. It was a strange turn of fate that the stellar accomplishments of his brilliant son should aid in bringing to the attention of the American people the achievements of the father, Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh.

Lindbergh was modest, quiet, and unassuming, a keen student, and his reputation in Washington was that of ability, diligence, and persistence. He was first to arrive at his offices, sometimes coming when the bugles sounded reveille for the troops about Washington. Often at sunrise he would be at work, and whenever I visited his offices I always found him buried in his papers and his writings and his work. He served five consecutive terms, from March 4, 1907, to March 4, 1917, having served prior to that time as county attorney of Morrison County, Minn., 1891–93.

MINNESOTA PIONEER

He was able to do this tremendous amount of work because of his early training as a woodsman, hunter, and man of work in a frontier country. He was tall, dignified, and slender in appearance. He knew his district thoroughly and was greatly beloved by its people. During his campaigns for Governor of the State of Minnesota he suffered the fires of war time persecution. This persecution now serves to set off his lofty character and makes him outstanding in Minnesota and American history.

We cannot honor Congressman Lindbergh too much. He is not fully appreciated even today, but as the years pass we will know him better for his great accomplishments. The Money Trust investigation, which he sponsored, was the most important investigation of the twentieth century in Congress. Nothing like it before or since has ever been published by any congressional committee, and anything that has happened since, such as the recent Senate investigation, is a mere copy and repetition of the first Pujo Money Trust investigation, for years advocated by Lindbergh. His every prediction concerning the Federal Reserve System has come true.

He was in every sense of the word a real, true, genuine American. He was born in Stockholm, Sweden, January 20, 1859, and was brought by his parents to the homestead near Melrose, Minn., before he reached the age of 1 year. He received an American training in the United States and thoroughly understood our people and our institutions. I have met hundreds of nationally great men in the various Congresses and in my public life; but I have never met a man, no matter what position he held, who made a deeper or more profound impression upon his close personal friends than Charles A. Lindbergh.

LINDBERGH'S POLITICAL BATTLES

Lindbergh always had a plan and a program—a well-thought-out platform. He gave most freely of his time to bring his ideas before the public, often when he must have known how forlorn was the hope of victory. He found, as many others before and since have learned, that the best forum is the public platform in campaign times, primary and election, in campaign years. And always he carried his message to the people in the off years in between elections.

Out there in the hot summer sun on hayracks and wagon platforms he spoke, and he used the early automobile as a forum long before the days of the loudspeaker system. He canoed up and down streams of the north woods and walked over hills and western prairies. He labored hard with his fellow citizens to instruct and convince and urge them to political action.

I remember one winter night, many years ago, when we drove through Shakopee, Minn., and, weary and hungry, Mrs. Lundeen and our little family stopped off at a little country hotel for dinner. A sound of many voices came through the main-room door. Men came and went. Our curiosity was aroused, especially when we learned that the discussion centered around farm problems.

LINDBERGH AND THE FARMERS

Here was "C. A.", as we often called him, in the center of an extremely earnest group of men of the soil, men who that very day struggled hurriedly through their many chores that they might be on hand to confer with their friend—the farmers' friend, the people's friend—Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh. And how late they stayed, and when the group broke up, others lingered on, but "C. A." was there when the last man left, and then he would think and write and ponder and plan. That was Charles A. Lindbergh.

It is well known that the Pujo investigation of 1913, ordered by House Resolutions 429 and 504, before a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, was sponsored by Congressman Lindbergh; his resolutions and speeches resulted in this monumental work. There had been much talk in the country about interlocking directorates, but the Pujo investigation proved their existence. It gave the facts, statistics,

and data. It called Morgan, Carnegie, and Rockefeller, and all the rest of the financial powers in America to Washington, and placed them on the witness stand.

The recent Senate Banking and Currency Committee investigation and other investigations are merely repetitions and only confirm the facts uncovered in the original Money Trust investigation by Lindbergh of Minnesota.

LINDBERGH STATE PARK, LITTLE FALLS, MINNESOTA

In honor of Colonel Lindbergh and his famous father, mother, and home, we of Minnesota have dedicated the Lindbergh State Park at Little Falls, appropriation being made by the State for its maintenance, and the land being deeded to the State by the heirs. There are magnificent pines and a beautiful rural setting above the Mississippi which sweeps on past Little Falls. The location of the park is about 2 miles from the center of Little Falls, Minn., easily accessible from the main highway, running through the Twin Cities, St. Cloud, Little Falls, and Brainerd.

I remember distinctly in 1924, urging the erection of a monument, preferably a great boulder, to be inscribed to the honor and memory of Congressman Lindbergh. I could interest only one man in the matter, Mr. G. A. Raymond, of Minneapolis, a close friend and political supporter of Lindbergh in all his campaigns. Finances were lacking to put the project across. A number of letters were written to granite companies at Little Falls and St. Cloud. We talked of State parks, and I frequently urged upon my Farmer-Labor associates the introduction of a bill into the State legislature to carry out this project.

COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH, WORLD FAMOUS AIR HERO, ONLY SON OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

However, nothing came of it until our world famous Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, only son of Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, conquered the ocean from New York to Paris; even then the matter lagged for some time until Senator Rosenmeier, of Little Falls, introduced a bill which passed the legislature and was signed by our Farmer-Labor Governor, Floyd B. Olson, making possible forever the Lindbergh State Park.

The original Lindbergh home was destroyed by fire many years ago and a new house was built, which still stands. However, this present house was rather badly handled by the crowd which rushed in after the colonel's flight across the ocean. Tens of thousands wrote their names upon every nook and corner; every book and pamphlet and piece of movable furniture disappeared, and even stoves and other articles and utensils were taken apart and carried away, to the great loss of future generations, especially students who would like to examine the volumes, pamphlets, and writings collected by Lindbergh during his long public service. All was carried away and disappeared forever.

AUGUST LINDBERGH OLD FARM HOMESTEAD PROPOSED STATE PARK

For years I have proposed a Melrose-Lindbergh Park near Melrose, Minn., on the original homestead established by Congressman Lindbergh's father, August Lindbergh, in 1860 and where the Congressman grew to manhood. I have conducted much correspondence on this matter. I have urged our State officials and many others to no avail. Some day the original homestead will become a State park in honor of the three Lindberghs—all courageous, undaunted, immortal pioneers.

UNDYING DETERMINATION

A strain of undying determination runs through three generations of the Lindbergh family. Discouragement, persecution, and calamity were met and conquered by grandfather, father, and son. Seldom is such unconquerable spirit found in the successive generations of one family. The whole world knows the odds against which young Colonel Lindbergh staked his life in the first trans-Atlantic flight; his undaunted courage has won for him world-wide admiration. His father, Congressman Lindbergh, displayed the same courageous spirit in facing the bitter persecution of political enemies. In future years his heroism will be more widely known. Both father and son inherited a fighting determination that knew no defeat from the grandfather, August, the Swedish statesman and American pioneer who emerged from the jaws of death a cripple, and yet lived to build his log house, rear his family, manage his farm, and educate a future Congressman.

COURAGE IN THE FACE OF DEATH

In 1861 a terrible accident befell August Lindbergh. He had hauled a giant log to the mill to be sawed into lumber for his house. At the mill he slipped and fell into a circular saw, losing his left arm to the shoulder and cutting through four ribs. The wagon was hitched to the oxen and August was carried back to his farm—a 4-hour journey—lying prostrate on the wagon floor, his remaining hand gripping his left shoulder to check the flow of blood. It was 3 days and 3 nights before the nearest doctor could be brought to the dying man. His courageous young wife, Louise—30 years his junior—and his son Charles made innumerable trips to the spring during that time, bringing cold water and keeping the bleeding and fever under control. When the doctor arrived amputation was performed without anesthetic, and after 2 years as an invalid, August Lindbergh returned to his work as if nothing had happened, and carried on as before.

FOUNDER OF FARMER-LABOR PARTY

Among all the splendid work of this fine Minnesotan none was more important than his aiding in the building of a Farmer-Labor Party in the State of Minnesota.

He stood by when the going was hard. He was there at its birth. He was the first Farmer-Labor Nonpartisan League candidate for Governor, and was the main support of Dave Evans, who was the first to carry the Farmer-Labor banner for Governor. Throughout the years and to the very end he was a loyal courageous fighter for the principles of right and justice.

I DEFEND ONLY THE RIGHT

Colonel Lindbergh at a recent Washington aircraft hearing said, "I defend only the right." Golden words, taught a Minnesota boy by a wonderful father, who never fought for anything but the right.

We have listed here his many battles—for office, his enemies would say; for principles and country, we reply; for, irrespective of victory or defeat, he drove on with all his power of thought and great physical strength until he fell upon the political battlefield, as he would have chosen, in the midst of a fight where the battle was hottest for Governor, and glory, and his beloved people.

ELECTION HISTORY OF CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

1891–93: County attorney, Morrison County, Minn. (Preceded and followed by Frank W. Lyon, and not a candidate for reelection.)

1906: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota. Primary election, September 1906. The Minneapolis Journal of September 27, 1906, carried the primary election statistics, showing the following totals:

Lindbergh	9,917
Buckman	8,606

[From the Minneapolis Journal, Thursday evening, Sept. 27, 1906]

LINDBERGH'S LEAD 1,311—COMPLETE RETURNS INCREASE WINNER'S VOTE IN THE SIXTH DISTRICT

C. A. Lindbergh's majority over C. B. Buckman in the Sixth Congressional District was 1,311, or several hundred more than supposed from the early returns. Returns from every county have been received by the State canvassing board. The official result is as follows:

Counties:	*Lindbergh*	*Buckman*
Benton	398	333
Cass	421	740
Crow Wing	848	806
Douglas	849	804
Hubbard	828	482
Meeker	921	390
Morrison	815	823
Sherburne	537	727
Stearns	657	430
Todd	1,328	1,038
Wadena	467	424
Wright	1,848	1,609
Totals	9,917	8,606

Lindbergh carried 9 of the 12 counties. Buckman carried Cass by 319 and Sherburne by 190. In Morrison County, the home of both candidates, Buckman led by 8 votes, and carried Little Falls.

Lindbergh's majorities ran as follows: Benton, 65; Crow Wing, 42; Douglas, 45; Hubbard, 346; Meeker, 527; Stearns, 227; Todd, 290; Wadena, 43; Wright, 239.

1906: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota.

General election, November 1906:

Lindbergh (Republican)	16,752
Tift (Democrat)	13,115

1908: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota.

Primary election, September 1908:

Lindbergh (Republican)	11,152
Gilkinson (Democrat)	3,893
(Cass County vote missing.)	

General election, November 1908:

Lindbergh (Republican)	22,574
Gilkinson (Democrat)	13,174

1910: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota.

Primary election, September 1910:

Lindbergh (Republican)	13,415
McGarry (Republican)	4,923

General election, November 1910:

Lindbergh (Republican)	25,272
(No opponents listed.)	

1912: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota:

Primary election, September 1912:

Lindbergh (Republican)	12,019
Gilkinson (Democrat)	4,167
Uhl (Public Ownership)	603

General election, November 1912:

Lindbergh (Republican)	21,286
Gilkinson (Democrat)	9,920
Uhl (Public Ownership)	2,839

1914: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota:

Primary election, June 1914:

Lindbergh	10,398
Maxfield	6,988

General election, November 1914:

Lindbergh	15,364
Du Bois	11,409
Thomason	3,769
Sharkey	1,836

1916: United States Senator in Congress, Minnesota:

Primary election, June 1916:

Frank B. Kellogg	73,818
Adolph O. Eberhart	54,890
Moses E. Clapp	27,668
Charles A. Lindbergh	26,094

1918: Governor of Minnesota, Republican primary, June 1918:

J. A. A. Burnquist	199,325
Charles A. Lindbergh	150,626

1920: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, general election (no Farmer-Labor primary shown):

General election:

Knutson (Republican)	47,954
Lindbergh (Farmer-Labor)	21,587

1923: United States Senator, special election, June 18, 1923:

Farmer-Labor primary:

Magnus Johnson	57,570
L. A. Fritsche	38,393
Charles A. Lindbergh	21,811

1924: Governor of Minnesota, Farmer-Labor primary, June 1924. Candidate, but did not live to participate in election. Died May 24, 1924.

These election statistics are taken from the Legislative Manuals of Minnesota.

PERSISTENT MEN OF VISION

It is common to abuse persistent men of vision, like Lindbergh, for their frequent candidacies. The conservative press delights in that, forgetting that their own conservative candidates are inveterate and incurable office seekers.

Suppose we give the record of a great liberal and a great progressive and a great radical—the candidacies of Abraham Lincoln for office, as furnished us by the Congressional Library at Washington, D. C.

Lincoln had a plan and a platform. He always had a well-thought-out program. Why not fight for it, in victory or defeat? And he did. He surely did. That is the life story of Abraham Lincoln. Here we may read and learn.

ELECTION HISTORY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

1832, March 9: Lincoln announced himself as candidate for the Illinois Legislature.

1832, May 27: Lincoln elected captain of his company in the Black Hawk War.

1832, summer: Lincoln defeated for the legislature. The successful candidates had votes running from 1,127 to 815. Lincoln had 657.

1833: Lincoln appointed postmaster of New Salem. Held office 3 years.

1833: Lincoln appointed deputy county surveyor by John Calhoun, surveyor of Sangamon County. Reappointed by T. N. Neale in 1835.

1834: Lincoln elected to Illinois Legislature by the following vote: Lincoln, 1,376; Dawson, 1,370; Carpenter, 1,170; Stuart, 1,164. Lincoln was reelected in 1836, 1838, and 1840. Received the Whig vote for speaker in 1838 and 1840. Twice defeated for speaker.

1840: Lincoln Presidential elector for William Henry Harrison. Lincoln defeated. Illinois went for Van Buren.

1841: Lincoln declined to be candidate for Governor.

1843: Lincoln sought nomination by Whigs for Congress. Defeated.

1844: Lincoln Presidential elector for Henry Clay. Lincoln defeated. Illinois went for James K. Polk.

1846: Lincoln elected to Congress by the Whigs, majority 1,511.

1848: Lincoln voted against Mexican War. Popular indignation ran high. Refused to stand for renomination.

1849: Lincoln applied for Commissioner of the General Land Office. Failed.

1849: Lincoln offered governorship of Oregon Territory. Declined. Desired to accept, unable to persuade Mrs. Lincoln to go to that far western country.

1850: Lincoln said to have refused a nomination for Congress.

1854: Lincoln elected to the legislature by some 650 majority. Later he resigned because a member could not be candidate for United States Senator.

1855. Lincoln Whig candidate for Senate. Defeated.

1856: Lincoln received 110 votes for Republican candidate for Vice President. Defeated.

1856: Lincoln Presidential elector for Fremont. Defeated. Illinois went for James Buchanan.

1858: Lincoln nominated for the Senate by the Republicans.

1859: Douglas, the Democratic candidate, chosen by the legislature, 54 to 46. Lincoln defeated.

1860: Lincoln nominated and elected President.

1864: Lincoln renominated and reelected President.

CONGRESSMAN LINDBERGH AND THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY

Among the founders of a Labor Party in America we find foremost the name of Lindbergh, who battled it out with his Republican conservative reactionary opponent, J. A. A. Burnquist, in the cruel and vicious war years of 1917–18. The shame of that campaign can never be erased by those who heaped abuse and violence upon a great man. The mere memory of it ought to bring the crimson blush of shame were they not too callous in mind and body. Yes; thank God, they are almost forgotten, but he lives on in glory without end.

What was the result of his work? What accomplishments at Washington? Who were the Farmer-Labor Representatives in House and Senate? We list them here, and may we say, always on the side of liberalism and progress. Had America followed our advice we would have kept out of European entanglements, we would have escaped the destruction of the World War and its inevitable panic and depression. Here is the true American party—loyal to the traditions of the great Republic and building for a better and happier America. Ours is the program for social security, and Lindbergh was our first great teacher. Here is the hope of America—a great national Farmer-Labor Party.

Length of service of Farmer-Labor Senators and Representatives in Congress

Rank	Name	Dates of service	Length of service
	SENATORS		
1	Shipstead, Henrik	Mar. 4, 1923	17 years 10 months, when present term expires.
2	Johnson, Magnus	July 16, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1925	1 year 7 months 16 days.
	REPRESENTATIVES		
1	Kvale, Paul John	Oct. 16, 1929	7 years 2 months 18 days, when present term expires.
2	Kvale, O. J	Mar. 4, 1923, to Sept. 11, 1929 ("Independent" for 2 years, Mar. 4, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1925).	6 years 6 months 7 days.
3	Carss, William L	Mar. 4, 1925, to Mar. 4, 1929 (plus "Independent" for 2 years; Mar. 4, 1919, to Mar. 4, 1921).	6 years.
4	Lundeen, Ernest	Mar. 4, 1933 (plus 2 years as Republican, Mar. 4, 1917, to Mar. 4, 1919)	5 years 10 months, when present term expires.
5	Wefald, Knud	Mar. 4, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1927	4 years.
6	Buckler, R. T	Jan. 3, 1935	2 years, when present term expires.
7	Arens, Henry	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
	Johnson, Magnus	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
	Shoemaker, F. H	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.

In order to show the rank of Charles A. Lindbergh among his colleagues, and for general information, we list the Senators and Congressmen of all parties in Minnesota, Territory and State, in order of their rank and service:

Minnesota Congressmen who served in both House and Senate

Rank	Name	Dates of service	Total length of service
1	Nelson, Knute	House, Mar. 4, 1883, to Mar. 4, 1889 (6 years); Senate, Mar. 4, 1895, to Apr. 28, 1923 (28 years 1 month 24 days).	34 years 1 month 24 days.
2	Schall, Thomas D	House, Mar. 4, 1915, to Mar. 4, 1925; (10 years), Senate, Mar. 4, 1925 (11 years 10 months when present term expires).	21 years 10 months, when present term expires (consecutive service).
3	Windom, William	House, Mar. 4, 1859, to Mar. 4, 1869 (10 years); Senate, July 16, 1870, to Jan. 18, 1871, Mar. 4, 1871, to Mar. 12, 1881, Oct. 26, 1881, to Mar. 4, 1883 (11 years 10 months 16 days).	21 years 10 months 16 days (not consecutive).
4	Washburn, William D	House, Mar. 4, 1879, to Mar. 4, 1885 (6 years); Senate, Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1895 (6 years).	12 years.
5	Wilkinson, Morton S	Senate, Mar. 4, 1859, to Mar. 4, 1865 (6 years); House, Mar. 4, 1869, to Mar. 4, 1871 (2 years).	8 years.
6	Johnson, Magnus	Senate, July 16, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1925 (1 year 7 months 16 days); House, Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935 (1 year 10 months).	3 years 5 months 16 days.
7	Towne, Charles A	House, Mar. 4, 1895, to Mar. 4, 1897 (2 years); Senate, Dec. 5, 1900, to Jan. 23, 1901 (1 month 18 days).	2 years 1 month 18 days.

Length of service of United States Senators from Minnesota

Rank	Name	Dates of service	Length of service
1	Nelson, Knute	Mar. 4, 1895, to Apr. 28, 1923 (died)	28 years 1 month 24 days.
2	Shipstead, Henrik	Mar. 4, 1923	17 years 10 months, when present term expires.
3	Clapp, Moses E	Jan. 23, 1901, to Mar. 4, 1917	16 years 1 month 9 days.
4	Davis, C. K	Mar. 4, 1887, to Nov. 27, 1900	13 years 8 months 23 days.
5	McMillan, S. J. R	Mar. 6, 1875, to Mar. 4, 1887	12 years.
	Ramsey, Alexander	Mar. 4, 1863, to Mar. 4, 1875	12 years.
6	Schall, Thomas D	Mar. 4, 1925	11 years 10 months, when present term expires (consecutive service).
7	Windom, William	July 16, 1870, to Jan. 18, 1871; Mar. 4, 1871, to Mar. 12, 1881; Oct. 26, 1881, to Mar. 4, 1883.	11 years 10 months 16 days (not consecutive).
8	Kellogg, Frank B	Mar. 4, 1917, to Mar. 4, 1923	6 years.
	Sabin, D. M	Mar. 4, 1883, to Mar. 4, 1889	6 years.
	Washburn, William D	Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1895	6 years.
	Wilkinson, Morton S	Mar. 4, 1859, to Mar. 4, 1865	6 years.
9	Norton, Daniel S	Mar. 4, 1865, to July 13, 1870 (died)	5 years 4 months 9 days.
10	Rice, Henry M	May 12, 1858, to Mar. 4, 1863	4 years 9 months 20 days.
11	Johnson, Magnus	July 16, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1925	1 year 7 months 16 days.
12	Shields, James	May 12, 1858, to Mar. 4, 1859	9 months 20 days.
13	Edgerton, A. J	Mar. 14 to Oct. 26, 1881	7 months 12 days.
14	Towne, Charles A	Dec. 5, 1900, to Jan. 23, 1901	1 month 18 days.
15	Stearns, O. P	Jan. 18 to Mar. 4, 1871	1 month 14 days.

Length of service of Minnesota Representatives in Congress

Name	Dates of service	Length of service
11 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Davis, Charles R	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1925	22 years.
10 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Steenerson, Halvor	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1923	20 years.
Volstead, Andrew J	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1923	20 years.
Knutson, Harold	Mar. 4, 1917	19 years 10 months when present term expires.
9 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Stevens, Frederick C	Mar. 4, 1897, to Mar. 4, 1915	18 years.
Tawney, James A	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1911	18 years.
7 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Anderson, Sydney	Mar. 4, 1911, to Mar. 4, 1925	14 years.
McCleary, James T	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1907	14 years.
7 TERMS NOT CONSECUTIVE		
Dunnell, Mark H	Mar. 4, 1871, to Mar. 4, 1883	14 years.
Do	Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1891	

Length of service of Minnesota Representatives in Congress—Continued

Name	Dates of service	Length of service
6 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Clague, Frank	Mar. 4, 1921, to Mar. 4, 1933	12 years.
Newton, Walter H	Mar. 4, 1919, to June 30, 1929	10 years 3 months 26 days (resigned).
6 TERMS NOT CONSECUTIVE		
Fletcher, Loren	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1903	12 years.
Do	Mar. 4, 1905, to Mar. 4, 1907	
Strait, H. B	Mar. 4, 1873, to Mar. 4, 1879	12 years.
Do	Mar. 4, 1881, to Mar. 4, 1887	
5 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Lindbergh, Charles A	Mar. 4, 1907, to Mar. 4, 1917	10 years.
Miller, Clarence B	Mar. 4, 1909, to Mar. 4, 1919	10 years.
Schall, Thomas D	Mar. 4, 1915, to Mar. 4, 1925	10 years.
Windom, William	Mar. 4, 1859, to Mar. 4, 1869	10 years.
5 TERMS NOT CONSECUTIVE		
Andresen, August H	Mar. 4, 1925, to Mar. 4, 1933	10 years, when present term expires
Do	Jan. 3, 1935	
4 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Eddy, Frank M	Mar. 4, 1895, to Mar. 4, 1903	8 years.
Goodwin, Godfrey G	Mar. 4, 1925, to Mar. 4, 1933	8 years.
Hammond, W. S	Mar. 4, 1907, to Mar. 4, 1915	8 years.
Heatwole, Joel P	Mar. 4, 1895, to Mar. 4, 1903	8 years.
Keller, Oscar E	July 10, 1919, to Mar. 4, 1927	7 years 7 months 22 days.
Kvale, Paul John	Oct. 16, 1929	7 years 2 months 18 days, when present term expires.
Kvale, O. J	Mar. 4, 1923, to Sept. 11, 1929	6 years 6 months 7 days.
4 TERMS NOT CONSECUTIVE		
Lind, John	Mar. 4, 1887, to Mar. 4, 1893	8 years.
Do	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1905	
Maas, Melvin J	Mar. 4, 1927, to Mar. 4, 1933	8 years, when present term expires.
Do	Jan. 3, 1935	
3 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Bede, J. Adam	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1909	6 years.
Donnelly, Ignatius	Mar. 4, 1863, to Mar. 4, 1869	6 years.
Ellsworth, Franklin F	Mar. 4, 1915, to Mar. 4, 1921	6 years.
Morris, Page	Mar. 4, 1897, to Mar. 4, 1903	6 years.
Nelson, Knute	Mar. 4, 1883, to Mar. 4, 1889	6 years.
Nye, Frank M	Mar. 4, 1907, to Mar. 4, 1913	6 years.
Selvig, Conrad G	Mar. 4, 1927, to Mar. 4, 1933	6 years.
Washburn, William D	Mar. 4, 1879, to Mar. 4, 1885	6 years.
Van Dyke, Carl C	Mar. 4, 1915, to May 20, 1919	4 years 2 months 16 days.
3 TERMS NOT CONSECUTIVE		
Carss, W. L	Mar. 4, 1919, to Mar. 4, 1921	6 years.
Do	Mar. 4, 1925, to Mar. 4, 1929	
Pittenger, William A	Mar. 4, 1929, to Mar. 4, 1933	6 years, when present term expires.
Do	Jan. 3, 1935	
Lundeen, Ernest	Mar. 4, 1917, to Mar. 4, 1919	5 years 10 months, when present term expires.
Do	Mar. 4, 1933	
2 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Aldrich, Cyrus	Mar. 4, 1859, to Mar. 4, 1863	4 years.
Averill, John T	Mar. 4, 1871, to Mar. 4, 1875	4 years.
Buckman, C. B	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1907	4 years.
Christgau, Victor	Mar. 4, 1929, to Mar. 4, 1933	4 years.
Furlow, Allen J	Mar. 4, 1925, to Mar. 4, 1929	4 years.
Hall, O. M	Mar. 4, 1891, to Mar. 4, 1895	4 years.
Kiefer, Andrew R	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1897	4 years.
Larson, Oscar J	Mar. 4, 1921, to Mar. 4, 1925	4 years.
Smith, George R	Mar. 4, 1913, to Mar. 4, 1917	4 years.
Wakefield, J. B	Mar. 4, 1883, to Mar. 4, 1887	4 years.
Wefald, Knud	Mar. 4, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1927	4 years.
White, Milo	Mar. 4, 1883, to Mar. 4, 1887	4 years.
Christianson, Theodore	Mar. 4, 1933	3 years 10 months, when present term expires.
Nolan, W. I	July 1, 1929, to Mar. 4, 1933	3 years 8 months 3 days.
1 TERM		
Baldwin, M. R	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1895	2 years.
Boen, Haldor E	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1895	2 years.
Buckler, R. T	Jan. 3, 1935	2 years, when present term expires.
Castle, J. N	Mar. 4, 1891, to Mar. 4, 1893	2 years.
Comstock, S. G	Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1891	2 years.
Gilfillan, J. B	Mar. 4, 1885, to Mar. 4, 1887	2 years.
Hall, Darwin S	Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1891	2 years.
Halvorson, Kittel	Mar. 4, 1891, to Mar. 4, 1893	2 years.
Harries, W. H	Mar. 4, 1891, to Mar. 4, 1893	2 years.
King, William S	Mar. 4, 1875, to Mar. 4, 1877	2 years.
McDonald, John L	Mar. 4, 1887, to Mar. 4, 1889	2 years.
Manahan, James	Mar. 4, 1913, to Mar. 4, 1915	2 years.
Poehler, Henry	Mar. 4, 1879, to Mar. 4, 1881	2 years.
Rice, Edmund	Mar. 4, 1887, to Mar. 4, 1889	2 years.
Ryan, Elmer J	Jan. 3, 1935	2 years, when present term expires.
Snider, S. P	Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1891	2 years.
Stewart, Jacob H	Mar. 4, 1877, to Mar. 4, 1879	2 years.
Towne, Charles A	Mar. 4, 1895, to Mar. 4, 1897	2 years.
Wilkinson, Morton S	Mar. 4, 1869, to Mar. 4, 1871	2 years.
Wilson, Eugene M	Mar. 4, 1869, to Mar. 4, 1871	2 years.
Wilson, Thomas	Mar. 4, 1887, to Mar. 4, 1889	2 years.
Arens, Henry	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
Chase, Ray P	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
Hoidale, Einar	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
Johnson, Magnus	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
Shoemaker, F. H	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
Cavanaugh, J. M	May 12, 1858, to Mar. 4, 1859	9 months 20 days.
Phelps, W. W	May 12, 1858, to Mar. 4, 1859	9 months 20 days.

These dates of service are taken from the Minnesota Legislative Manual, 1935, pages 89–90.

MINNESOTA TERRITORIAL DELEGATES TO CONGRESS

Minnesota was made a State in 1858. From 1849 to 1858 there were three Territorial Delegates sent to Congress from Minnesota. These Delegates were:

Henry H. Sibley, January 15, 1849, to March 4, 1853; 4 years 1 month 17 days.

Henry M. Rice, December 5, 1853, to March 4, 1857; 3 years 2 months 27 days.

W. W. Kingsbury, December 7, 1857, to May 11, 1858; 5 months 4 days.

Errors may be discovered by those versed in Minnesota political lore. If so, we will be pleased to stand corrected.

CONGRESSMAN LINDBERGH'S BUST PLACED IN JOHN MORTON MEMORIAL MUSEUM, PHILADELPHIA

I have spoken of Lindbergh's writings, and I here list Lindbergh's books and pamphlets, chronologically furnished me by the John Morton Memorial Museum, of Philadelphia, where recently a bust of Congressman Lindbergh was placed, on Sunday, June 23, 1935, at which ceremony I had the honor to deliver some remarks on the life of Lindbergh. Dr. Amandus Johnson, director of the museum, deserves great credit for his loyal work in remembrance of great Swedish-American immortals honored here—John Morton, John Hanson, John Ericsson, Jenny Lind, and numerous others.

We also wish to call attention to Lindbergh's many speeches delivered between March 4, 1907 and March 4, 1917, during his five consecutive terms—10 years—in Congress. These speeches contain a wealth of information. They are full of prophecies of the future. They are the result of clear thinking and deep study. All of these speeches should be compiled into a set of books containing all of Lindbergh's congressional speeches and writings. This will be done some day.

It was my pleasure to present to the Morton Museum the Rules and Manual of the United States House of Representatives used by Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh. This well-worn volume came into my possession from my friend, G. A. Raymond, now in Portland, Oreg.

LINDBERGH'S BOOKS

1. The Law of Rights. A magazine, I–III. 1905.
2. Banking and Currency and the Money Trust. 1913.
3. Why Is Your Country at War, and What Happens to You After the War, and Related Subjects? 1917. Reprinted, 1934.
4. The Economic Pinch. 1923.
5. Who and What Caused the Panic. (Pamphlet) 1923.

SOCIAL-INSURANCE LEGISLATION

The Lindberghs of Sweden came to America sturdy, independent, thoughtful men. They were always unafraid and smiled through tempests of hatred and opposition. Sweden leads in social legislation. It is a progressive, liberal country. After coming to America, Congressman August Lindbergh, grandfather of the colonel and father of Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, continued his efforts to improve conditions among his fellow men. He was a great Liberal leader in Sweden and, in spite of his language handicap, continued to lead in the American community where he pioneered.

His great son, the American Congressman, followed in the footsteps of his father, who served as congressman in the Swedish Congress; and the world hero of the air, Colonel Lindbergh pioneered and continues to pioneer. Whether in new territories or in new fields of thought, always searching for the truth, each one of these pioneers met the sneers and scoffs of his fellow men calmly. They were men—

In conscious virtue bold
Who dared their secret purpose hold
Unshaken heard the crowds' tumultous cries
And the impetuous tyrant's angry brow defied.
Let the loud winds, that rule the seas
Tempestuous their wild horrors raise,
Let Jove's dread arm with thunder rend the spheres
Beneath the crash of worlds undaunted they appear.

[Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SEARS for 1 week, on account of important business.

A MILLION RAILROAD MEN FOR WAR REFERENDUM

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by the 21 railroad brotherhoods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in one of the most significant and dramatic labor movements of modern times the support of a million men has been placed back of House Joint Resolution No. 167, the constitutional war-referendum resolution, which is designed as a preventive of war. As the author of the resolution I am very grateful for their support.

The Railway Labor Executives' Association, which speaks directly for the 1,000,000 organized workingmen who are members of the 21 standard railroad brotherhoods and indirectly reflects the thought of millions of other workingmen, at a meeting in Washington decided to throw its united support back of House Joint Resolution No. 167 as a measure deemed urgently necessary to prevent America from being dragged into war at an early date through the machinations of propagandists of special interests, munition manufacturers, and professional war promoters.

In a communication which scathingly reviews the activities of the war promoters, and which is addressed to the Judiciary subcommittee which has been conducting hearings on the Ludlow resolution, the Railway Labor Executives' Association emphasizes the need of haste, and says:

> We urge that every effort be made to speed the final adoption of this resolution. This legislation is racing against the danger of war, and there is no time to spare.

The so-called "Ludlow amendment" provides that, except in the case of invasion or attack, war cannot be declared until the question is submitted to a Nation-wide referendum and a majority of the people of the country vote for war; also that in the event of war all war properties, munitions plants, and so forth, shall be taken over for use of the Government during the period of the emergency, thus removing the profit incentive to war.

In this crisis—for a world situation that reflects such obvious threats of an impending war is truly a crisis—labor of America is fortunate in having to represent it such an influential spokesman as the Railway Labor Executives' Association. This organization of railway employees, sometimes known as the "21 brotherhoods", is the most vital force in the labor movement today. It has initiative, courage, and fighting qualities that make it a tremendous force, not only for the advancement of the labor movement but for good citizenship in America. To it is due a large share of the credit for bringing about a betterment of social and living conditions among all workers, both union and nonunion. It has been unerring in its discernment of intolerable conditions affecting workers and quick and effective in finding the means of correction.

Its plans and purposes are made articulate through the most virile labor publication in the Western Hemisphere, the publication called "Labor", which is issued from the building owned by the Railway Labor Executives' Association at Delaware Avenue and B Streets SW., this city. Edward Keating, who directs that publication, is a forceful editor, a close student of public questions, a former liberal Member of Congress who has the commoner's viewpoint, and whose philosophy is fashioned on the Jeffersonian idea of equality among men.

AN ORGANIZATION THAT IS 100 PERCENT AMERICAN

The American Railway Labor Executives' Association is 100 percent American and it is for protecting the good, solid, honest American manhood from the tricks and schemes of the war promoters who stand convicted at the bar of public opinion of encouraging and promoting strife for the sake of filthy dollars.

The association believes that those who have to pay the awful costs of war and to do the suffering and dying should have something to say as to whether or not war shall be declared, and it is not willing that any American shall be ripped from his family and thrown into the hell of war just to protect somebody's investments, or to enable somebody to pile up fabulous profits. Seventeen years ago the association saw workingmen conscripted and thrust into the horrors of the trenches and battlefields of a foreign war at a dollar a day, while 23,000 swivel-chair patriots were being elevated into the class of millionaires at home. While it stands firmly for adequate defense, it does not propose that at any time hereafter, with its consent, the fine young manhood of America shall be sacrificed to fight a foreign war until the question has first been submitted to the people of America and approved by them by a majority vote. That is the sum and substance of the resolution I have introduced.

It goes the entire limit in permitting national defense, but it is opposed to foreign wars unless such wars have the sanction of a majority of Americans in a vote taken in the privacy of the ballot booths where the citizen can record the verdict of his conscience with no one to dictate or swerve him from his honest judgment. To that just and reasonable program the Railway Labor Executives' Association stands pledged with absolute unanimity.

TEXT OF RAILROAD MEN'S APPEAL

The statement adopted by the Railway Labor Executives' Association and presented to the Judiciary Committee by W. D. Johnson, vice president of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, one of the leaders of organized labor, is as follows:

The Railway Labor Executives' Association, representing the 1,000,000 railway workers of the United States, desires to place itself on record with your committee as being unqualifiedly in favor of the immediate passage by Congress, and the ratification by the several States, of the constitutional amendment proposed in House Joint Resolution No. 167.

Every thoughtful American who is at all informed on international affairs must feel that there is very grave danger of another war among European and Asiatic nations within the next few years. Ancient rivalries have been revived and hatreds have been heated again to the point where a minor incident may be enough to precipitate a conflict even more destructive than that of 1914–18. Political adventurers, military leaders, and those industrial interests which profit from wars and preparation for wars have stirred international animosities and brought about a situation which can be compared only to that preceding the Great War. The outbreak of hostilities may occur without warning.

We believe in preparedness, but of a kind directly the opposite of that which our own militarists advocate. We believe that our Government must be prepared to keep America out of the next war; we believe that the people of the United States must be prepared to resist those propagandists who will not hesitate to urge our participation in the holocaust toward which the world is moving. We believe that such preparations, if they are to be effective, must be made now before new warfare has created the atmosphere of panic and hysteria which permits professional patriots to drum up war sentiment. We believe that the constitutional amendment proposed in this resolution is patriotic preparation against European war. We believe that its adoption will keep America out of the general destruction threatening modern civilization.

The workers we represent, in common with all decent citizens of our country, have been sickened and disgusted by the revelations recently made of the activities and the profits of the peddlers of war munitions. Efforts sincerely made by governments desiring to limit armaments, and thereby to lessen the international suspicion which breeds wars, have been defeated by the incredibly brutal and vicious practices of these munition makers. Professional propagandists have collaborated in producing the state of mind among the peoples of the world which assures the widest sale of the implements of war. These munitions makers and their agents are creating their markets and selling their goods with no other thought in mind than securing for themselves the greatest possible profit.

The greed for profits was not lacking from American manufacturers before and during the World War. While American soldiers fought in the trenches to decide a European war whose issues were of no real concern to us, billions of dollars were being paid by our Government directly and through the financial agents of foreign governments to the manufacturers of munitions in the United States. The appalling sacrifices demanded of our soldiers and their families should have brought voluntary surrendering by our munitions manufacturers of all profits; they should have been eager to supply us and our Allies all possible munitions at actual cost. We know now that to the eternal disgrace of these interests they reaped profits which were far beyond any possible justification, which were possible only because of the desperate need of the Government and the people of the United States.

If European war comes again, there will be no lack of the same kind of destructive and unpatriotic action by our munitions manufacturers. Nothing has happened to make us believe they have changed their spots. There will be no lack of newspapers to give space to false reports of atrocities or to imaginary insults to our national honor. There will be plenty of skilled propagandists who will, for money, use all their arts to confuse and to mislead our people into believing that we should take up arms against some other nation. No sensible American whose memory runs back to the last war and who has followed the disclosures of the munitions investigation, can doubt that the munitions manufacturers will try to force this country into whatever war they can promote in Europe or Asia. No sensible American can fail to realize that war psychology can be created out of the lies and the oratory of the propagandists. No sensible American wants to see us in that next war.

The constitutional amendment that is proposed will prevent the sudden and ill-considered sort of action which might plunge us into war. The referendum will give time for thought and for countering the propaganda of those whose selfish interests would be served by war. More than that, the limitation of munitions profits would not only force upon munitions makers a decent restriction during war—it would also greatly reduce their interest in promoting American belligerency. This amendment, however, still permits speedy congressional action to defend the Nation against actual invasion.

We urge upon your committee that it report out favorably the resolution under consideration and that every effort be made to speed its final adoption. This legislation is racing against the danger of war and there is no time to spare.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Constitution of June 24, 1935.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I should very much like to hear what the gentleman has to say, but under the conditions I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow morning after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. SNELL] may have 1 hour to address the House and get in good humor.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

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

S. 2917. An act authorizing an appropriation to the American Legion for its use in effecting a settlement of the remainder due on, and the reorganization of, Pershing Hall, a memorial already erected in Paris, France, to the commander in chief, officers, and men of the expeditionary forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7205. An act to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, otherwise known as "section 30" of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, approved June 5, 1920, to allow the benefits of said act to be enjoyed by owners of certain vessels of the United States of less than 200 gross tons; and

H. R. 7652. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the Federal Reserve Board, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on June 22, 1935, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7672. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), in compliance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 25, 1935, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

393. A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of its activities and expenditures for May 1935, including statements of authorizations made during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case (H. Doc. No. 231); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

394. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 22, 1935, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to the prevention and control of its floods, authorized by act approved February 27, 1931; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 275. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 8555; without amendment (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2796. An act to provide for the control and elimination of public-utility holding companies operating, or marketing securities, in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, to regulate the transmission and sale of electric energy in interstate commerce, to amend the Federal Water Power Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 820. A bill for the relief of James A. Henderson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1363. A bill for the relief of Petra M. Benavides; with amendment (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Commitee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1435. A bill for the relief of Sarah L. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2115. A bill for the relief of First Lt. R. G. Cuno; with amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2435. A bill for the relief of the Citizens State Bank of Marianna, Fla.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2526. A bill for the relief of Powell & Goldstein, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2617. A bill for the relief of the Nacional Destilerias Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2620. A bill for the relief of Sadie Wilkinson; with amendment (Rept No. 1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2621. A bill for the relief of Tom L. Griffith; with amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2702. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Lieberman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3408. A bill for the relief of R. W. Jones; with amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3673. A bill for the relief of Bernard V. Wolfe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3777. A bill for the relief of the Herald Publishing Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4148. A bill for the relief of the Thomas Marine Railway Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4655. A bill for the relief of the Sachs Mercantile Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4770. A bill for the relief of Elinora Fareira; with amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4784. A bill for the relief of J. T. Slayback; with amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5245. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Leiding; with amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5634. A bill for the relief of the Baltimore Renovating Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5867. A bill for the relief of E. C. Willis, father of the late Charles R. Willis, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5905. A bill for the relief of Cal Settles; with amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6057. A bill for the relief of Joe Brumit; with amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6394. A bill for the relief of William K. Caley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6889. A bill for the relief of A. Zappone and W. R. Fuchs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6892. A bill for the relief of certain Indians on the Cheyenne River Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7393. A bill for the relief of Ralph P. Kellogg; with amendment (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7520. A bill for the relief of David A. Trousdale; with amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7616. A bill for the relief of the estate of W. W. McPeters; with amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7819. A bill for the relief of William C. Price and Joseph C. Lesage; with

amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7962. A bill for the relief of Grier-Lowrance Construction Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8020. A bill for the relief of Jose R. Redlhammer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8089. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Baylin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1315.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8618) to repeal section 3345, Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the removal of malt liquors from brewery premises without stamps, to enact a new section in lieu thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 8619) authorizing the Secretary of War to purchase lands for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions for national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGLESIAS: A bill (H. R. 8620) to provide for the commemoration of the landing of American troops in the island of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 8621) to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8622) to authorize the purchase of the *Winnie Mae* by the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 8623) to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8624) to provide for the disposal of smuggled merchandise, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to require imported articles to be marked in order that smuggled merchandise may be identified, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEAL: A bill (H. R. 8625) to exempt publicly owned interstate highway bridges from State, municipal, and local taxation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 8626) authorizing a preliminary examination of Middle Fabius River in Scotland and Knox Counties, Mo., with a view to the controlling of floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. STUBBS: A bill (H. R. 8627) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 8628) to provide for the relief of public-school districts and other public-school authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 8629) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Government of Norway in settlement of all claims for reimbursement on account of losses sustained by the owner and crew of the Norwegian steamer *Tampen;* to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ECKERT: A bill (H. R. 8630) to amend section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 8631) to provide for the use of net weights in interstate- and foreign-commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 8632) to amend an act entitled "An act to improve the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley; to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes", approved May 18, 1933; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 335) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be admitted without payment of tariff and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing Congress to recognize the claim of the widow of "Bill" Tilghman; to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 8633) granting a pension to James D. Shelters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 8634) for the relief of Samuel B. Schweitzer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GINGERY: A bill (H. R. 8635) granting an increase of pension to Miriam E. Hogue; to the committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALLECK: A bill (H. R. 8636) granting a pension to Viola Shively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 8637) granting an increase of pension to Harry Kraft; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUCKEY: A bill (H. R. 8638) for the relief of the Franklin Ice Cream Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8639), granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Bross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE: A bill (H. R. 8640) for the relief of L. S. Pitts; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8641) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of L. S. Pitts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 8642) for the relief of Mrs. John Deisher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONAGHAN: A bill (H. R. 8643) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Daley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 8644) granting the consent of Congress to J. L. Jones, Tyre W. Burton, and H. R. Turley, trustees, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 8645) for the relief of St. Vincent's Catholic Church, of Berkeley Springs, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8646) granting a pension to Ella M. Rickert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 8647) granting a pension to Bettie Lee Lomax; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 8648) for the relief of Sadie Mitchell Elmore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEFAN: A bill (H. R. 8649) to provide for the appointment of Ira E. Porter as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 8650) for the relief of Joseph Hovey; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8966. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolutions adopted by the board of managers of the New York Produce Exchange, New York City, urging the enactment of an amendment to section 557 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8967. By Mr. BUCK: Memorial of the California Legislature, memorializing the Federal Relief Administrator to make available funds for the extension of Highway Route No. 163 through the Venice and Santa Monica Bay areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8968. Also, memorial of the California Legislature, memorializing the President of the United States to make ample provisions for the encouragement of the artistic, cultural, humane, patriotic, and sentimental phases of our American national life in the Federal works plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8969. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the textile employees and citizens of the city of Lawrence, Mass., requesting that the processing tax on cotton be abolished, that foreign importations of textiles be limited, and that the President recommend, and Congress adopt, legislation which will preserve and protect the textile industry of New England; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8970. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Senate and Assembly of California Legislature, relative to memorializing the Federal Relief Administrator to make available funds for the extension of Highway Route No. 163 through the Venice and Santa Monica Bay areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8971. By Mr. COLDEN: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 63, adopted by the Assembly and the Senate of the California State Legislature, and submitted by the Honorable Frank F. Merriam, Governor of California, relative to memorializing the President of the United States to make ample provision for the encouragement of the artistic, cultural, humane, patriotic, and sentimental phases of our American national life in the Federal works plan; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8972. By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Petition of citizens of Easton, Md., opposing the reenactment of the Federal tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8973. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the New York State Legislature, favoring the repeal of the charter of the North River Bridge Co. in Public Act 350, Sixty-seventh Congress, 1922; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8974. Also, petition of the New York State Legislature, favoring necessary legislation and cooperation of Public Works Administration for construction of freight tunnel between the States of New York and New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8975. Also, petition of the New York State Legislature, urging legislation to make Columbus Day a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8976. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging legislation for the benefit of the milk and dairy industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8977. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging passage of the Rudd bill (H. R. 6); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8978. By Mr. KEE: Petition of M. T. Jones and other citizens of McDowell County, W. Va., urging the Congress of the United States of America to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8979. Also, petition of J. D. Scyphers and other citizens of McDowell County, W. Va., urging the Congress of the United States of America to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8980. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Joseph T. Schwartz, Fremont, Ohio, a stockholder of one of Ohio's leading oil-producing, manufacturing, and distributing companies, endorsing the views expressed by the American Petroleum Institute, in a petition to the Congress of the United States, in reference to legislation affecting the industry, as contained in Senate bill 2445 or similar proposals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8981. Also, petition of the United Textile Workers of America, Providence, R. I., by their vice president, Horace A. Riviere, urging support of the Wagner-Connery labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8982. Also, petition of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Columbus, Ohio, by their president, Perry L. Green, urging that large amounts of the funds appropriated from the emergency relief funds for use on public highways be assigned to the development of the secondary or farm-to-market highways; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8983. Also, petition of the Alameda County Club of Adult Blind, Berkeley, Calif., by their president, Henry M. Bindt, urging support of House bill 6628, which provides employment for the blind; to the Committee on Labor.

8984. Also, petition of Frazier-Lemke Moratorium Club of Seneca County, Ohio, by their president, David C. Hilsinger, and secretary, E. G. Brosius, urging immediate passage of the Frazier-Lemke farm refinance bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8985. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Slovak League of America, urging the enactment of House bill 8163; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, May 13, 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 Monday, June 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 had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3806. An act to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 7765. An act to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES—LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT (S. DOC. NO. 82)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, Capitol firemen, for the fiscal year 1936, amounting to $31,150, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 83)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, requiring an appropriation for their payment, amounting to $770,661.39, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.