9890. By Mr. DOBBINS: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, advocating the early enactment of legislation now under consideration designed to preserve the fertility of the soil and sustain the farmers' purchasing power; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9891. By Mr. FERGUSON: Petition of the patrons of star route no. 53162 from Kenton, Okla., to Edler, Colo.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9892. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Henry Ripley, Bill Martin, Martin Ward, George Jackson, Martin Lowrance, Cap Ponder, Ed Walls, Sam McCluskey, Jess Ward, Jim Simmons, Earl Coody, Warner McBee, Willie Campbell, Luke Curlee, Wallace Clark, Ovie Clark, Arthur Martin, Lace Stanley, Pete James, Quince Taylor, Otto Hicks, and R. Riples, all of Blum, Tex., favoring legislation to take the place of the Agricultural Adjustment Act declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9893. Also, petition of Berry T. Baxter, of Franklin, Tex., favoring legislation to take the place of the Agricultural Adjustment Act declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9894. By Mr. PIERCE: Petition of Weston Grange, No. 670, Weston, Umatilla County, Oreg., January 10, 1936, favoring a program of agricultural control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9895. By Mr. PEYSER: Resolution of the National Guard Association of New York, adopted at the annual convention, Syracuse, January 18, 1936; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9896. By Mr. PIERCE: Resolutions of the Eastern Oregon Wheat League, Pendleton, Oreg., January 16, 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9897. By Mr. POWERS: Resolution of the New Jersey State Planning Board, requesting that the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey give priority to completion in New Jersey of the triangulation and precise level control; to complete the New Jersey geodetic control; and for the Congress to make appropriations for the work in the amount deemed necessary by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9898. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of Mrs. A. Swan Brown and 19 citizens, of Passaic and Clifton, N. J., requesting the passage of House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9899. By Mr. POWERS: Resolution of the City Council of Trenton, N. J., suggesting certain changes to the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9900. By Mr. THOMASON: Resolution of Pass City Lodge 316, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, urging passage of House bill 3263, to amend the provisions of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act, known as the long-and-short-haul clause; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9901. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Federation of Standard Railway Crafts and Auxiliaries of the Toledo Area; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9902. By Mr. EATON: Petition of 15 residents of Dover, Morris County, N. J., urging reenactment of a prohibition law for the District of Columbia by passing House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1936

(Legislative day of Thursday, Jan. 16, 1936)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, January 30, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY] are necessarily detained from the Senate, and that the Senator from Albama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is absent because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] is necessarily absent.

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

MUNITIONS COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a correction in the RECORD.

In my remarks before the Senate on January 17, the second paragraph on page 563 has occasioned an exchange of telegrams which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the request of the Senator, I did not understand what his correction is.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I repeat that on the 17th of January, in an address before the Senate, I made a statement which is incorporated in the second paragraph on page 563, which has occasioned an exchange of telegrams between J. P. Morgan & Co. and myself, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is not asking that the RECORD be changed?

Mr. NYE. I am not asking that the RECORD be changed in any respect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegrams will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegrams are as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 17, 1936.*

Senator GERALD P. NYE,
United States Senate:

The news ticker quotes you as saying on the Senate floor today that members of J. P. Morgan & Co. present at the munitions hearing yesterday passed around notes among themselves announcing that "embarrassing statements would be made on the Senate floor about the work of the committee." If you have been correctly reported, we beg to inform you that the statement is wholly untrue and we shall appreciate your making correction of it. None of us had information of any kind as to Senator CONNALLY's intention until advised through members of the press that he was already making the speech later reported.

J. P. MORGAN & Co.

JANUARY 17, 1936.

J. P. MORGAN & Co.,
New York City:

Glad to make correction if you will say you had no knowledge of Senator POPE's plans as well.

GERALD P. NYE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 17, 1936.*

Senator GERALD P. NYE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

In reply to our telegram to you of this afternoon, in which we denied the incorrect statement made by you about us on the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Senate floor this morning, we have your response reading as follows: "Glad to make correction if you will say you had no knowledge of Senator POPE's plans as well." It is incomprehensible to us why you should make your correction of a misstatement about us conditional upon something else, but for your information, we had not the slightest previous knowledge of Senator POPE's action, and his appearance was complete surprise to us.

J. P. MORGAN & Co.

RUDYARD KIPLING

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, I voice what is the opinion of all when I say that the world recently suffered a great loss by the death of that genius of the literary world, Rudyard Kipling.

It may not be generally known that he lived and wrote in America. In 1892, soon after his marriage to Carolyn Balestier, a Vermont girl, he came to Dummerston, in my home county, built a home, and spent 4 fruitful years, producing the Jungle Books, Captains Courageous, and other works.

The United Press recently covered that period of his life in a brief press dispatch. I ask that it may be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

KIPLING'S NEIGHBORS OF NINETIES RECALL HIS YEARS IN VERMONT—POET-NOVELIST'S HOME IN DUMMERSTON, WHERE HE WROTE THE JUNGLE BOOKS AND CAPTAINS COURAGEOUS, WAS MAGNET FOR LITERARY TITANS

DUMMERSTON, VT., January 17.—Nowhere in America was the passing of Rudyard Kipling mourned more deeply than in this hamlet in the hills, where he wrote some of his most famous works.

For 4 years—1892 to 1896—the poet-novelist and his Vermont bride lived in Dummerston, near Brattleboro town line, in an extraordinary house which they built and named Naulahka, after one of Kipling's books.

The house, still known by its original name, stands on a picturesque hillside whose vista includes the broad sweep of the Connecticut Valley to the southeast and New Hampshire's slate-blue Mount Monadnock far to the east.

MARRIED NOVELIST'S SISTER

It was in 1890 that the late Wolcott Balestier, Vermont novelist, and his sister Caroline went to London. Soon after entering the publishing field Balestier met Kipling, fresh from India. They became fast friends and, collaborating, wrote The Naulahka, a novel, in 6 weeks.

Kipling met Caroline at the Balestier home, fell in love with her, and married her in 1892. Homesick, Mrs. Kipling induced her husband to go to Vermont for their wedding trip.

The writer soon discovered that he shared his wife's love for Vermont. They bought land here and built Naulahka, a two-story wooden building, all rooms of which are on the east side, leading off halls that run the length of the building.

It was in his American home that several masterpieces came from Kipling's pen, including the Jungle Books, many of the poems in Seven Seas, and Captains Courageous, the material for which Kipling gathered at the famed Massachusetts fishing port of Gloucester.

HAD OWN POST OFFICE

Naulahka became a magnet for literary giants of the day, and Kipling's world-wide popularity produced so much fan mail that finally in desperation he arranged with the Federal Government to establish a personal post office for him. This little office, known as the Waite, was situated within a stone's throw of his home.

Two daughters, Elsie and Josephine, were born to the Kiplings while they lived here.

Although 40 years have elapsed since the Kiplings returned to England, Dummerston folk never lost their neighborly interest in them.

In slate-colored Naulahka now live Cabot Holbrook, apple grower, his wife, and three children. Of the many Kipling mementos that the house contains, Holbrook treasures most highly an antique desk at which the author worked. Each summer brings hundreds of tourists to Naulahka, but Holbrook, who inherited the house from his father, bars all visitors.

A brother-in-law of Kipling, Beatty Balestier, elderly retired gentleman farmer, still lives here.

Mr. GIBSON. In this connection I am requested, Mr. President, and I am glad to acquiesce in the request, that a short poem entitled "Rudyard Kipling", written by Horace C. Carlisle, of the Architect's Office of the Capitol, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

RUDYARD KIPLING

R-udyard Kipling, with his pen—
U-ntil three score years and ten
D-rew his efforts to a close—
Y-ielded to the call for men,
A-nd, in poetry and prose,
R-ose to heights among his peers,
D-reamed not in his younger years.

K-ipling, without question, stands,
I-n all English-speaking lands,
P-eerless, as a poet, whose
L-exicon of life expands
I-nto ideas and views,
N-ational—and more—in scope,
G-iving mankind cheer and hope.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

COMMITTEE REPORTS FILED DURING RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
February 3, 1936.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

Under the order of the Senate of the 30th ultimo, reports from the Committee on Appropriations were filed with me as Secretary of the Senate on January 31, 1935, as follows:

By Mr. GLASS, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 9863) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, with an accompanying report (No. 1490); and

By Mr. ADAMS, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 10464) making appropriations to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, with an accompanying report (No. 1491).

Very respectfully,

E. A. HALSEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

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 a bill (H. R. 10630) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 307) authorizing the erection of a memorial to the early settlers whose land grants embrace the site of the Federal City, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—NATIONAL PARK SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 169)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, fiscal year 1936, amounting to $15,000, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF STATISTICAL STUDIES—NONGOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Labor, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to statistical studies performed by the Department of Labor for other than Government activities, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DECEMBER 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 the month of December 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.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of that company, together with a list of the stockholders for the year ended December 31, 1935, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE GEORGETOWN GASLIGHT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Georgetown Gaslight Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the business of that company, together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1935, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of that company for the calendar year 1935, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1935, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BALANCE SHEET, WASHINGTON RAPID TRANSIT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the treasurer of the Washington Rapid Transit Co., transmitting copy of the balance sheet of that company as of December 31, 1935, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON INTERURBAN RAILROAD CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Washington Interurban Railroad Co. for the calendar year 1935, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1935, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1935, which, with accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, which was ordered to lie on the table:

House Joint Resolution 2

Whereas thousands of Illinois citizens are directly and acutely interested in the farm problem; and

Whereas because of the unusual nature of agricultural production, which does not lend itself readily to adjustment policies used by labor or industry, there is a definite need for some permanent legislative plan to preserve the fertility of the soil, and to raise the farmer's purchasing power, thereby promoting all business activity: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, convened in the second special session thereof (the senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to enact as soon as possible constructive farm legislation similar to, and taking the place of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and especially requests Illinois' representatives in the Congress of the United States to use every effort consistent with honorable practices to secure enactment of such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and each Senator and Congressman from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota favoring the enactment of legislation to continue the W. P. A. program until January 1, 1937, on a liberalized basis so as to permit the employment of needy unemployed persons who are no longer capable of self-support without first requiring them to accept public relief, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. BENSON.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate papers transmitted by the Secretary of the American Homestead Protective Association, Inc., Chicago, Ill., submitting a plan and resolution pertaining to the relief of depositors in closed banks, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate papers in the nature of petitions from the Maratime Co., of Boston, Mass., praying for payment of the war debt claims of that company, which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from William F. Verdi, M. D., of New Haven, Conn., enclosing resolutions adopted by the League for American Neutrality, New Haven, Conn., protesting against the enactment of certain sections of pending neutrality legislation, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Federation of Standard Railway Crafts and Auxiliaries of the Toledo, Ohio, area, favoring the repeal of the Transportation Act of 1920, and the enactment of the so-called Black-Crosser 6-hour-day bill, the Brown-Griswold train-limit bill, the Neely-Griswold full-crew bill, the signal and track inspection bill, and other transportation measures, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate the memorial of John K. Turton, of White Plains, N. Y., remonstrating against the validity of the first 12 amendments to the Constitution on the ground that the resolution embodying them was not presented to the President of the United States for his approval, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Augusta, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit advertising intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WAGNER presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the designation as an air-mail service station of the Floyd Bennett Field Airport in Brooklyn, N. Y., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. COPELAND on the 30th ultimo, p. 1193, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. BENSON presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation to provide for the continuation of the WPA program until January 1, 1937, on a liberalized basis which will permit the employment of those needy unemployed who are no longer able to support themselves and their dependents without first requiring them to accept public relief in addition to those who are certified from the public relief rolls

Whereas the legislature of the State of Minnesota, convened in special session, has been requested to make additional appropriations for the care of the unemployed, which appropriations are necessary because of the inability of the local communities in the State to finance the relief bill without outside assistance; and

Whereas statistics have been presented to the legislature by the representatives of the State Emergency Relief Administration and the Works Progress Administration of Minnesota indicating that there are approximately 85,000 persons certified as eligible for employment under the present rules and regulations of the Works Progress Administration while the Works Progress Administration

of Minnesota is authorized to employ a maximum of 65,000, which leaves a residue of 20,000 employable relief cases which must be supported by the State of Minnesota and its political subdivisions; and

Whereas there is a minimum of an additional 10,000 employable relief clients who are not eligible for employment under the present rules and regulations of the Works Progress Administration, which limits employment to those persons who received public relief at some time between May 1 and November 1, 1935; and

Whereas there were, as of January 1, 1936, a total of 71,444 unemployed persons exclusive of those receiving public relief registered as seeking employment in the offices of the National Reemployment Service and the State of Minnesota, which individuals are all potential relief clients unless they are provided with either public or private employment; and

Whereas the Works Progress Administration of the State of Minnesota has received Presidential approval of 4,443 projects, involving a total amount of Federal funds of $102,190,572, of which only approximately $20,000,000 has been made available to the Works Progress Administration of Minnesota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the senate concurring), That we most earnestly request the Congress of the United States to provide for the continuation of the WPA program at least until January 1, 1937, by appropriating additional funds; and be it further

Resolved, That the present regulations of the Works Progress Administration be amended to permit not only the employment of those certified from the public relief rolls, but also for the needy unemployed who, unless they are given employment, will soon be forced to make application for public relief, and that sufficient additional funds be appropriated to provide employment for this group: Be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the State of Minnesota be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to both Houses of Congress and to each Member in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

FAIR TRADE BILL—PETITIONS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I present 84 telegrams in the nature of petitions received from constituents during the last 24 hours favoring the enactment of the so-called Robinson-Patman bill. I ask that the telegrams be noted in the RECORD, with the names of the senders, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

The telegrams in the nature of petitions, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 3154 (House bill 8442) the so-called Robinson-Patman fair-trade bill, presented by Mr. NEELY and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary are from—

The Crescent Grocery, Raleigh Association of Retail Groceries, Raleigh Cash Grocery, and H. D. Irwin, of Beckley; L. A. Poe, proprietor of the Poe Store, Goodykoontz Drug Stores, Inc., by H. A. Goodykoontz, Lamanca Sites Drug Co., by John Lamanca, Gotts Pharmacy, H. H. Wassum, owner Wassum Cash Market, and president, Bluefield Princeton Unit of Quality Service Stores of America, of Bluefield; O. J. Cox Trading Co., Amick Williams Brokerage Co., Thomas J. Straughan Capitol Feed Co., E. D. Martin & Co., C. H. Ross, Busy Bee Grocery, George W. King, president of West Virginia Association of Retail Grocers, of Charleston; The Blair Willison Co., The Hornor Gaylord Co., C. W. Leggett Co., merchandise brokers, B. D. Bailey & Sons, A. & L. Stores, The Retailers Grocers Association of Harrison County; Crimm Store, of Wolf Summit; Barker Stores, of Nutterfort; Lawson Bros., Hyre Bros., P. A. Romano, Colombo Market, Harold Ross, Allman Bros., A. M. Ridenour, Ralph Swiger, of Adamston; D. M. Davis, J. F. Strother, John Parrill, John Stamm, Bert Stamm, B. & R. Grocery, Nicols Store, Wholesale Brokerage Co., Chicago Dairy & Baking Co., D. J. Walters, Ice's Market, Cabell County Retail Druggists Association, Clyde N. Roberts, secretary-treasurer, Lawrence Drug Store, Sam S. Lawrence, Clyde W. Roberts, Robert F. Scott, J. P. Woods & Co., John H. Christian, The Duling Bros. Co., Hagen Ratcliff & Co., Shands, Inc., C. R. Jackson, manager, Gibson Boston Pharmacy, C. E. Gibson, proprietor, Vaughans Red Cross Pharmacy, M. M. Vaughan, Herman R. Wild, Pittmans Drug Store, Highlawn Pharmacy, M. M. Thomas, Jas. Murphy & Son, F. W. Campbell, H. B. Crummett Drugs, of Huntington; Elkhorn Valley Grocery Co., of Keystone; C. G. Meadows, manager, Aracoma Drug Co., Inc., of Logan; James A. Patterson, of Martinsburg; Fayette Wholesale Grocery Co., H. H. Andrews, president, P. H. Kelly, druggist, J. C. Thomas, druggist, of Montgomery; H. S. Harner & Co., Rogers Pharmacy, Moore & Parriott Drug Store, J. C. Raese, of Morgantown; Star Grocer Co., W. C. McConaughey, president, The Shattuck & Jackson Co., Wood County Association of Retail Grocers, G. N. Keenan, president, of Parkersburg; Retail Grocers Association, Irvin Schaffner, president, Gay Force, secretary, Rothers Bros., Inc., H. Kalbitzer & Son Hardware Co., Schenks Meat Market, Inc., Wm. Schaffner & Son Grocery, Chas. Norteman, Miller Bros., W. A. Driehorst Grocery, Community Builders, Inc., Albert J. Mooney, acting secretary, Doepkins Market, Holly Sayre Grocery, Joseph Reinacher, Richard Aubreys Grocery, W. H. Fords Grocery, of Wheeling, all in the State of West Virginia; and Ward K. McNeill, of Lansing, Mich.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT, 1933

Mr. FLETCHER presented a letter from the city manager of St. Petersburg, Fla., together with a resolution adopted by the council of that city, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
January 31, 1936.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLETCHER: I take the liberty of enclosing herewith, for your information, copy of my letter and a resolution passed by our council which has been mailed to the administratives of approximately 150 cities and towns within the State.

Your consideration of and cooperation in the premises will be much appreciated.

Yours cordially,

A. F. THOMASSON,
City Manager.

Whereas the Securities Act of 1933, passed and adopted by the Congress of the United States, provides in substance regulations for the marketing of securities including therein a requirement that a statement must be filed with the Securities Commission giving full information affecting the contemplated issues and that no issue of securities can be made until after the statement containing full information in relation to said securities is accepted by the Securities Commission, created by said act, and further providing that the Commission may restrain the sale of securities in the event information reaches the Commission that any material fact has been omitted in the statement required to be filed. The act also provides penalties for misstatements in any such statements required to be filed or the withholding of any material facts from said statements. The act also provides that dealers, brokers, bond committees, or syndicates must disclose to buyers the material data in such statements under penalties provided by said act; and

Whereas the said act in its present form, under paragraph 77–C, section 2 thereof, exempts from the provisions of said act political subdivisions of any State or Territory; and

Whereas it is the sense of this council that if the class of political subdivisions hereinafter listed came within the purview of this act it will be of lasting benefit to these communities and the investing public, in that it would prevent the issuance of securities based upon a fictitious representation of the community's ability to pay, and would assure the investor that he had received full information as to the community's ability to meet its obligation before the purchase thereof; and

Whereas it has been recommended to the Honorable J. MARK WILCOX, United States Congressman, that the 1933 Securities Act, passed and adopted by the United States Congress, be amended so as to provide that securities of the following political subdivisions come within the purview of said act, to wit:

1. Political subdivisions of any State or Territory having a city charter and a population less than 300,000 people, if—

A. Any political subdivision with a city charter has not been free of default in prompt payment of principal and interest when due to holders of its securities for at least 10 years previous to exemption from provisions of the Securities Act.

B. Any such political subdivision with a city charter that has outstanding a total net debt exceeding 20 percent of the total real and true salable value of the property within its area taxable for debt service.

C. Any such political subdivision with a city charter that has a total net debt including its proportion of overlapping debts of other taxing units for which debt service taxes are levied against property in its area; exceeding $250,000 per capita of the population shown by the last United States census; and

Whereas this council is of the opinion that said suggested amendment is meritorious and will be of lasting benefit to the class of communities heretofore recited and the investing public at large: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Fla., That this body do go on record as endorsing the purpose and in-

tent of the amendment heretofore suggested and to urge Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, United States Senate; Hon. PARK TRAMMELL, United States Senate; Hon. J. MARK WILCOX, House of Representatives; Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, House of Representatives; Hon. W. J. SEARS, House of Representatives; Hon. R. A. GREEN and Hon. MILLARD CALDWELL, House of Representatives, to lend their earnest efforts in the procurement of the suggested amendment for the obtaining of legislation accomplishing the purpose herein set forth; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes and that each of the representatives of the people of the State of Florida in the United States Congress be furnished with a copy hereof.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3709) for the relief of the Norfolk Southern Railroad Co., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1492) thereon.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred to the bill (S. 1123) for the relief of William Sulem, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1493) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2654) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of George B. Marx, Inc., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1494) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3154) making it unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to discriminate in price or terms of sale between purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, to prohibit the payment of brokerage or commission under certain conditions, to suppress pseudo-advertising allowances, to provide a presumptive measure of damages in certain cases and to protect the independent merchant, the public whom he serves, and the manufacturer from whom he buys, from exploitation by unfair competitors, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1502) thereon.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 277) for the relief of the Perkins-Campbell Co., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1495) thereon.

Mr. BENSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

S. 903. A bill for the relief of the Holyoke Ice Co. (Rept. No. 1496);

S. 2042. A bill for the relief of Grace Park (Rept. No. 1497); and

S. 3274. A bill for the relief of Mary Hobart (Rept. No. 1498).

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1828) for the relief of Mrs. Frank G. Sanford, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1499) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3683) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1500) thereon.

Mr. MINTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4858) for the relief of Edward Shippen West, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1501) thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on January 30, 1936, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3328) to provide an official seal for the United States Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

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. AUSTIN:

A bill (S. 3875) granting an increase of pension to May S. King; and

A bill (S. 3876) granting an increase of pension to Florence E. Southwick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 3877) for the relief of Mrs. Stephen Toth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 3878) for the relief of Joseph F. Bolger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY:

A bill (S. 3879) for the relief of James W. Grist; and

A bill (S. 3880) for the relief of Charles E. Molster; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3881) to grant to United States district courts jurisdiction over administration of decedents' estates on Federal reservations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 3882) to amend the act entitled "An act to safeguard the estates of veterans derived from payments of pension, compensation, emergency officers' retirement pay, and insurance, and for other purposes", approved August 12, 1935; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3883) providing for the advancement on the retired list of the Army of A. W. Barry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

A bill (S. 3884) for the relief of Sidney E. Mobley and Lucille E. Mobley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NYE:

A bill (S. 3885) to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS:

A bill (S. 3886) granting a pension to John Vandever; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 3887) granting a pension to Fieldon Adkins;

A bill (S. 3888) granting a pension to Nancy C. Buck;

A bill (S. 3889) granting a pension to George W. Gardner;

A bill (S. 3890) granting a pension to Sam H. Hadley;

A bill (S. 3891) granting a pension to Minnie Harrison;

A bill (S. 3892) granting a pension to Lydia Ann Hollingsworth;

A bill (S. 3893) granting a pension to Juriah Hyden;

A bill (S. 3894) granting a pension to Sarah Jane Lewis Langdon;

A bill (S. 3895) granting a pension to Ella Noe;

A bill (S. 3896) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Runnels;

A bill (S. 3897) granting a pension to Mattie Sebastian;

A bill (S. 3898) granting a pension to Maggie Wilson; and

A bill (S. 3899) granting a pension to Ellanor Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 3900) for the relief of Wilhelm Schaffer; and

A bill (S. 3901) for the relief of George Yusko; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 3902) for the relief of Zion's Cooperative Mercantile Institution; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3903) to provide for a geologic survey of the Tushar Range of mountains in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BENSON:

A bill (S. 3904) to enable consumers and farmers to recover from processors the amounts of processing taxes which were passed on by the processors to such consumers and farmers but which have now been turned over to the processors by the courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

A bill (S. 3905) granting a pension to Viola May Snow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK (by request):

A bill (S. 3906) to provide for the purchase of certain agricultural lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 3907) for the relief of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3908) to amend section 1 of the act of June 7, 1924, entitled "An act for the relief of settlers and townsite occupants of certain lands in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, in Nevada, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

A bill (S. 3909) providing for loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to municipalities in certain cases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 3910) to exempt the real property of the American War Mothers from taxation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 3911) for the relief of Mrs. Earl H. Smith; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. POPE introduced Senate bill No. 3912, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 3913) for the relief of Dr. Charles A. Swanson; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 205) providing for the disposition of certain cotton held by the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 10630) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BYRNES and Mr. RUSSELL each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 3780) to make further provision for the conservation and proper utilization of the soil resources of the Nation, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. WHEELER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8455) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WHEELER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 10630, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill to insert the following new paragraph:

"That portion of section 1 of the act approved August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571–584), known as the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, providing $806,000 for construction, enlargement, or improvement of public-school buildings as authorized by and in conformity with numerous acts of the 74th Congress, approved June 7, 1935, fiscal year 1936, is hereby amended so as to repeal the provisions for recoupment by the United States, on account of expenditures thereunder, and the amounts appropriated for assistance of the said public-school districts are hereby declared to be an outright grant to the various public-school districts mentioned therein."

MYRTLE C. PATTERSON

Mr. PITTMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 226), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Exenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for Miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1935, to Myrtle C. Patterson, widow of C. C. Patterson, late messenger to the Committee on Foreign Relations, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AMERICAN NEUTRALITY—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD a most excellent and enlightening article by Walter Lippmann, one of the keenest and ablest writers on governmental and public questions, whose articles appear in many of the newspapers of the United States. This article is on the question of a neutral policy for the United States. I commend it, may I say in passing, to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who are considering this very important question.

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

TODAY AND TOMORROW

By Walter Lippmann

NEUTRAL POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

Underlying all the proposed neutrality laws there is the optimistic assumption that the United States will never have to fight a great war on its own account. Everyone seems to assume that for us there is only one road to war, namely, by becoming entangled in somebody else's war, and more particularly a general European war.

The notion that the United States might become engaged in a war of its own, that it might be a belligerent and that other nations might be neutral, seems not to have been considered. If it has been considered, it seems to be taken for granted either that the United States could wage a great war without importing large quantities of essential war materials or that nations to whom we propose to refuse necessary supplies if they are at war will sell us all the supplies we need if we are at war.

Let us hope that all these reassuring assumptions are correct. Let us hope that the possibility of a direct conflict with any great power is for us forever impossible. Let us hope that, even if a war of our own is not impossible, we can count upon such assistance from the nations that are then neutral as we propose now to deny them if we are neutral. But is it wise to base a national policy on a hope of this sort, and to legislate on the unexamined assumption that we shall never need help, that we have only to decide how much help we are willing to give?

It is very unwise. For no man can guarantee all these things, and no prudent statesman will take a position without inquiring carefully into the effects on American war power if a neutral policy such as is now proposed were applied to the United States. At the very least, Congress ought, before legislating, to hear not merely the professors of international law and the advocates of peace but those men in the Navy and the Army and elsewhere who can tell it what the United States would need from the outer world if the United States were at war.

Congress will find, if it studies the tables in Mr. Brooks Emeny's The Strategy of Raw Materials, that America's position is about as follows: In respect to what Mr. Emeny calls "the great essentials"—food, power, iron, machinery, chemicals, coal, iron ore, and petroleum—the United States is self-sufficient, but in respect to a list of 19 "critical raw materials" there are 12 of which the United States must import from about half to all its supplies. The principal ones are rubber, manganese, nickel, chromite, tungsten, antimony, and tin. Most of these supplies would have to come from British countries; practically all of them from countries that belong to the League. And this does not take into account the fact that any great American war would be fought at sea and that our shipping is less than one-fifth of the tonnage of the world.

These considerations may not be conclusive, but they should be sufficient to make us hesitate before serving notice on the world that no one may count on our supplies in the event of war. For once that notice is given, the other great powers that may be drawn into war will be compelled to reorganize their commercial relations so as to insure themselves the supplies we propose to deny them. What this will mean in the way of new military alliances no man can clearly foresee. But that it will force a regrouping of the powers both for war and peace is almost certain.

And where does it leave the United States as a neutral? It puts the United States under a self-imposed blockade. To the belligerents this would mean that we had become so pacifist that we would resist no injury and that, having blocked our own trade, we had no power, short of a declaration of war, to injure them. We should be helpless to protect ourselves abroad by reprisals and helpless to protect ourselves at home against the depression we had imposed on ourselves.

It is true enough to say that an abnormal war trade may entangle us in a war, and I am not arguing against measures of credit control to prevent a war boom. But it seems to me perfectly evident that in laying ourselves open to insult and injury by rendering ourselves defenseless abroad and by legislating a depression at home we are insuring the development of a war party in the United States. If anyone thinks that unemployment, unsalable surpluses, financial disorder in the United States, and a series of insults abroad will make the American people like their neutrality, he is mightily deceiving himself. If, as many think,

excessive prosperity made us war-minded in 1917, they may be certain that misery and humiliation will make us even more war-minded.

If we look closely at the reason why there is so much sentiment in favor of rigid legislation, we shall find that it lies in the fear that a President would use discretionary power to entangle America in a war between the League and a European aggressor. I do not myself believe that the United States should take action against the aggressor, and the administration's effort last autumn to put pressure on Italy seems to me to have been a serious mistake.

Yet this fact has to be faced squarely: The League does exist as a European system of international law, and in the event of a grave conflict in Europe the question presented to us would not be: Shall we collaborate with the League? The question would be: Shall we oppose the League and destroy its effectiveness, or shall be permit the League to operate in Europe? The Ethiopian war did not raise this question, because in the affair the League did not blockade Italy. But in a great conflict the League would have to blockade the aggressor, and then we should have to decide whether we would recognize that blockade or whether we would attempt to break through it.

My own view is that if the League applies full sanctions to a European aggressor, and stops trade with him, that it would be dangerous and unwise for us to ally ourselves with the aggressor and try to break down the League's sanctions. Our wisest course will be to let the League function by denying diplomatic protection to our own traders. If, on the other hand, the League does what it has done with Italy—that is to say, applies "mild sanctions"—then we cannot and should not collaborate to make mild sanctions stronger by embargoing our own trade.

For it is one thing to refuse to interfere with the League, to remain passive while the League acts. It is a wholly different thing for us to judge the aggressor and on our own initiative to take positive measures against him. The policy of passive assent to the League's action recognizes the fact that we do not belong to the League, but that we recognize its existence in Europe and do not desire to challenge it in the interest of a European aggressor. It is a realistic policy. For it would be wholly unrealistic for us in a quarrel not our own to challenge the League. It is a policy which accurately, I believe, reflects the prevailing American feeling, which is that though we do not wish to participate in the League we do wish it well in its efforts to keep the peace in Europe.

RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its recent annual convention in Chicago. This great farm organization is representative of the thought of a great body of farmers in almost every State in the Union.

I desire particularly to call attention to the resolutions calling for neutrality legislation which shall include prohibition of loans to belligerents, a national-defense program adequate to the defense of the United States and its insular possessions, general conscription of industrial and financial resources of the country as well as of man power in the event of war.

Also I invite the attention of my colleagues to the long-time agricultural program advocated by the American Farm Bureau Federation, which has in it much merit, and I believe is along the right lines. I intend to discuss the farm problem and a farm program in the near future and will not now further trespass on the time of the Senate. I send the resolutions to the desk and ask that they may be printed as part of my remarks.

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

[From American Farm Bureau Federation Official News Letter, Dec. 10–24, 1935]

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, AT THE CLOSE OF THE 3-DAY SESSION HELD IN CHICAGO, DECEMBER 9, 10, 11

We, the voting delegates of the American Farm Bureau Federation, resolving for its vast membership in 37 States and 1,800 counties, and representing a unified, organized American agriculture, do hereby enunciate the following principles, beliefs, and resolutions as expressing the ideals and objectives toward which our organizations is working, not only in the interest of American agriculture in its entirety, but also in the interest of our great Nation:

We reaffirm our faith in the established order of our Government, and in the ideals upon which that Government is founded, with such modifications and changes in the organic laws as experience and mature judgment show are necessary to preserve our long-established political and economic liberties, and maintain economic balance and social justice as between all groups and classes, so as to guarantee complete freedom of opportunity to each and every citizen to enjoy the fruits of his efforts, to improve his well-being, and to preserve human and property rights.

In pursuance to these great purposes, we do hereby resolve:

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT

We reaffirm our previous pronouncements on the Agricultural Adjustment Act and its amendments, and the necessity for simplifying its administration.

The great farm policy embodied in this act is the culmination of a 12-year fight by organized agriculture to obtain from Government necessary recognition of, and assistance and cooperation in, an economic program by which farmers may obtain fair and equitable prices for their products in terms of relationships with industry and labor.

The administration of this act during the past 2½ years has proved the soundness and justice of the basic principles embodied in this measure. We rededicate our efforts to improve and perfect this measure in every way so as to make it function equitably in the interest of the entire agricultural industry of the Nation.

We serve notice on all individuals and groups, who are opposing agricultural adjustment for political, personal, or other reasons, that this program was formulated by the farmers themselves, acting through their own organizations, and will be protected and defended by the farmers and their friends on the basis of its fairness to agriculture, its beneficial contributions to continued national economic recovery, and in the interest of permanent prosperity for all the economic groups and classes of our Nation.

We reaffirm our position that the processing tax is a tariff for agriculture, and must be continued as the most effective means by which agriculture may work toward parity prices.

We reaffirm that the long-time objectives of agricultural adjustment necessitates a properly balanced and coordinated land-use policy for the Nation, and include the control of soil erosion, maintenance of soil fertility, and withdrawal from production of submarginal farm lands.

We ask that the controlled acreage of basic crops, when withdrawn from production, shall not be planted to other than soil-building crops, except for home and farm use.

We again reaffirm our previous position on the need for adjustment contracts to be so drawn as to apply in terms of individual farm units instead of being applicable to individual farm commodities. The American Farm Bureau Federation endorsed this principle nearly 2 years ago. We commend the President of the United States for having enunciated this very principle in a recent message to the Nation.

We know that great benefits will accrue to producers of non-basic agricultural commodities through the use of marketing agreements permissible under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. We, therefore, urge cooperative marketing associations in all sections of the United States to take advantage of the various provisions of the act for the purpose of stabilizing prices of the respective farm commodities handled by such cooperative marketing associations.

We commend the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and the Congress of the United States for accepting the recommendations of organized agriculture to amend the original law, thereby giving American agriculture a permanent legislative vehicle for continuous adjustment of production in relation to supply and demand domestically and throughout the world.

MONETARY POLICIES

In view of the fact that changing price levels have resulted in a succession of business booms and depressions for more than a century, permitting uncontrolled inflation and devastating deflation, we urge and request the President of the United States to—

1. Extend for 1 year the authority to raise and lower the price of gold as authorized under existing law.

2. Establish a definite policy of currency management to maintain stable price levels in line with fixed costs from generation to generation.

Business depressions, of the character from which we now are emerging, result in the ruination of families, devastation of homes, stagnation of business and industry, and decay of agriculture and labor.

Such depressions automatically take from our people the guaranties under the Constitution of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Depressions are man-made and they can be man-controlled.

We request Congress to set up a joint committee, representative of the House and Senate, to study thoroughly and factually the causes of business depressions.

We ask that the results of such studies be used as a basis upon which the Government of the United State may develop ways and means of preventing recurrence of such depressions. We believe that one of the principal contributing causes of such depressions lies in the inflexibility of a fixed monetary unit.

RURAL CREDIT

The Wheeler amendment to the Farm Credit Act of 1935, which reduced the interest rate on both old and new farm-mortgage loans originating in national farm-loan associations to 3½ percent for 1 year, has been of great value in the present emergency.

It appears that there is ample justification for a continuation of this rate policy for at least 2 more years. We believe that credit to agriculture should be on the basis of the lowest possible interest rates commensurate with sound methods of financing, without resorting to subsidy from the Federal Government.

We favor the amendment of farm-credit laws so that a majority of the directors of farm-credit institutions, owned by farmer-borrowers, may be elected by such borrowers.

We recognize the tremendous importance of home ownership in agriculture. In many districts the large percentage of tenancy is resulting in unwholesome economic and social conditions.

There is a need for making it possible for worthy tenant farmers on good land eventually to become landowners.

We, therefore, recommend that the Federal Government should use its facilities to meet this need, and that the method employed should supplement but not compete with the Federal Land Bank System.

In the administration of this financial aid to qualified tenant farmers we recommend that use be made of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Farm Credit Administration.

FEDERAL FISCAL POLICIES

We believe the credit of the Government should be used to its full limit during periods of stress and emergency, both internal and external, and that when such periods of stress and emergency have ended, our Government's credit should be conserved for use when again needed.

A sound fiscal policy for our Government is fundamental. Its financial affairs should not long continue out of balance. The business confidence of the people of our Nation, both agricultural and industrial, is directly related to a well-managed Federal fiscal policy.

We recommended that the fiscal policy of our Government be so modified that its revenues shall be increased and its expenditures decreased, to the end that, within the next few years, a balance shall be attained.

When this balance is attained we believe there should be no reduction in taxation policies until the Federal debt shall have been greatly diminished.

DISTRIBUTION

In many sections of the country marketing facilities, both terminal and regional, and information on methods of marketing functions do not make for maximum efficiency in the distribution of farm products.

Extreme congestion in our larger city markets, many of which are obsolete, is costly both to producers and consumers of farm products.

We request the United States Department of Agriculture to expand its research in marketing, so that a more efficient system of marketing may be developed, with emphasis upon grower control, and also that modernization of regional and terminal marketing facilities may be effected. We urge the Federal Government to take leadership in this important project.

Conditions in livestock marketing differ widely in various sections of the country. Methods of marketing are affected by such conditions. Insofar as possible, marketing practices should be developed which will reflect back to the producer true values of livestock. Competitive conditions for buyers of livestock should be maintained and safeguarded.

We favor broad, discretionary powers to the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, so as to adjust and regulate the handling and marketing of livestock as it moves in interstate commerce to the terminal markets.

We request that the Packers and Stockyards Act should be amended so that such records of processors and packers will be available to the Secretary of Agriculture as are necessary for determining the effects of the several types of marketing methods, now in existence, upon producers of livestock.

In any changes to be made in the regulation of livestock markets, we ask that such changes be made only after all aspects of the problem have been analyzed through governmental studies, and that such changes be put into effect only in cooperation with livestock producers and the organizations which speak for them.

Excessive or unnecessary costs of distribution cause the farmer to pay more for his supplies and receive less for his products.

We commend efficient and economical methods of distribution which reduce distributive costs between producer and consumer.

We believe that modern farmers' cooperative organizations render maximum service in the field of distribution of farm products and farm supplies and urge our membership to support such cooperative organizations.

We oppose the use of agricultural "loss leaders" by retail stores as being inimical to sound methods of distribution and sales.

We request the Federal Government, through properly designated agencies, to expand its studies of the cost of distribution of farm products so as to make available to the public information which may be used in reducing the distributive spread between producers and consumers of farm products. We especially urge an investigation of the costs and selling prices of tin containers.

Meat which moves in interstate commerce should be so marked and labeled by the United States Department of Agriculture as to permit the consumer to identify the different grades and qualities. Imported meats and agricultural food products should be so labeled at the point of importation that the purchaser may know foreign products are being bought.

TRANSPORTATION

For 15 years the Farm Bureau has worked strenuously to have farm-to-market roads included in the general Federal roads system of the country.

During the past year a real beginning has been made in this direction, and we are gratified that large allocations of emergency Federal funds now are being employed for the construction of genuine country roads. In commending the Works Progress Administration for its enthusiastic support of the farm-to-market road project, we urge that this work should be expedited and stressed in every possible way.

We reiterate our previous position on the general problem of transportation as it affects agriculture. We ask that the railroads should be given freer opportunities to meet competition.

We continue our opposition to the water-carrier bill of 1935. We believe that the Federal Government should proceed no further in regulating motor carriers than to protect public safety on the highways and to protect the highways themselves.

We ask that the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 be amended to remove its rate-making features and to include the dimensional regulations omitted in this act.

We request the discontinuance of diversion of revenues obtained from all gasoline taxes for any purposes other than highway building, maintenance, and the payment of outstanding highway obligations. We recommend that States which continue to divert such revenues should be penalized by receiving lesser or no funds for highway building and maintenance from the Federal Government.

We urge the earliest possible completion of the St. Lawrence waterway, of the Lakes to the Gulf waterway, the Inland waterway of the Northwest, and of such other waterway projects which have been declared practicable by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, so as to reduce the Nation's freight bill and equalize transportation advantages to all sections of the Nation.

We urge that the State legislatures and the Congress be requested to protect the farmer-owned trucks from excessive taxation where said trucks are used for the transportation of the farmers' own products to and from markets.

INDUSTRIAL TARIFFS

In the case of many industrial products, excessive tariffs have fostered a monopoly and increased the cost of living to an unreasonable degree. We urge that the consumer be given the same consideration and protection under industrial tariffs that he is now given under the Agricultural Adjustment Act as to agricultural prices through the requirement in that act that processing taxes shall not exceed an amount necessary to maintain parity with other prices.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

We reaffirm our position of last year on reciprocal-trade agreements, as follows:

Historically the United States is an agricultural exporting nation. The prosperity of the producers of basic farm products has during most of our history been dependent on profitable foreign markets for our surplus production. Our policy of high industrial tariffs coupled with our change in status from a debtor to a creditor nation has made it impossible for foreign countries to sell enough industrial goods and services to enable them to buy our agricultural products in normal volume.

We are in accord with the purpose of reciprocal-trade treaties, which is, primarily, to restore agricultural exports by judicious lowering of industrial tariffs, thus admitting more goods into this country and making it possible for us to sell more of our farm products abroad. We insist that this purpose be adhered to in framing reciprocal-trade treaties and that there be no reduction in present agricultural tariffs on any farm product that would have the effect of holding or reducing domestic price levels below parity on such products.

REGULATION OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES

The pending measure to control speculation on commodity exchanges which has passed the House of Representatives and been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, should be enacted into law speedily in the next session of Congress.

LAND-USE PROGRAM

We recognize the need for a national land-use program. We urge the American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors to formulate at an early date the details of such a program.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Economically, socially, and culturally, American farmers would be benefited vastly by a wider use of electricity in their homes and on their farms, provided the rate per kilowatt-hour is reduced so that there is a greater consumption of electrical energy.

We recommend that, where the need exists, cooperative activities by farmers should be organized to manufacture and distribute electricity at the lowest possible cost, and that adequate funds be provided by the Federal Government for this purpose.

We commend the Rural Electrification Administration and the Tennessee Valley Authority for the work these two Federal agencies are doing in the expansion of the use of electricity on our farms, and we urge that this work be expedited in every possible way.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The pending food and drugs act is not yet satisfactory and does not fully comply with long-established Farm Bureau policies which seek to protect the public in the purchase and use of foods and drugs.

We reiterate our former position on this measure with special reference to advertising by mail or radio of foods and drugs; honest labeling to include grade and quality of products, and such other provisions as we have recommended from time to time.

CHILD LABOR

We approve the pending child-labor amendment to the Federal Constitution and request the State Farm Bureau Federations to give it serious and sympathetic consideration.

PROPOSED ARGENTINE TREATY

We oppose the proposed sanitary convention with the Argentine which, if approved by the Senate, will more directly expose our livestock and dairy producers to losses from foot-and-mouth infestations.

SAFETY ON HIGHWAYS

We recommend that the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation give careful consideration to the matter of prevention of highway accidents, including the support of Federal legislation that will tend to reduce the tragic toll in deaths and injury resulting from automobile accidents and to promote safety on our highways.

MEDICAL CARE

Rural people do not have medical care anywhere near commensurate with that given in cities. Therefore the American Farm Bureau Federation should advocate and promote study and research to the end that rural families have the benefit of increased facilities for health services such as clinics, hospitals, and nursing services.

We recommend that the American Farm Bureau Federation set up a committee to work with this objective in view.

WORLD PEACE

We commend President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull for their humanitarian and patriotic efforts to maintain neutrality in the present international situation. The time has come when this Nation must recognize that citizens traveling in war zones or in nations at war, and individuals and corporations doing business in war zones or with nations at war, are liable to draw the United States into wars in which otherwise our Nation need not become involved. The time has come to change international practices and precedents so that citizens who travel and corporations which do business in war zones or in warring nations, do so at their own risk and cannot feel assured that the United States marines and later the entire military strength of our great Nation will come to their personal or financial protection.

As a method to prevent our Nation becoming involved in war, we recommend that legislation be enacted immediately authorizing and directing the Federal Government, in event the United States enters war, at the moment which will best achieve international peace and security, to proclaim:

1. An embargo on the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, including loans, credit, and secondary war materials, to any nation going to war in violation of its international obligations.

2. General conscription of the industrial and financial resources of the Nation as well as citizens, in case the United States goes to war.

3. A national-defense program based on the requirements for defending the continental United States and its insular possessions.

4. Cooperation with other associations of citizens, the objectives of which are to secure and maintain world peace.

OMNIBUS

We favor:

1. An adequate appropriation for the Forest Products Research Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

2. Increasing the acreage eligible for inclusion in grazing areas in the Taylor Grazing Act, to the end that the public lands may be conserved by reducing the number of head of livestock that may be grazed thereon.

3. Pooling by farmers of the underground mineral resources, particularly petroleum, similar to the very successful plan long in operation for the Osage Indians, with an allotment of emergency funds to organize the pools.

4. More equitable loan values on livestock in several farm credit administration districts.

5. The adoption of a system in production credit associations which will permit a borrower to establish his credit rating at the time of the first loan, which rating subsequently may be used as a basis for establishing the amount of the loan instead of adding costs and charges every year in addition to the original interest rate.

6. Longer terms of payment on production credit loans to dairymen.

7. We favor the strengthening of the production credit associations and national farm loan associations as farmer-owned and farmer-controlled credit cooperatives and urge all farmers to attend business meetings and otherwise to help build these local organizations.

8. The elimination or modification of the so-called luxury tax on furs which now has a depressing influence on prices received by farmer-trappers for raw furs.

9. Adequate funds to put into effect the Tobacco Grading Act of 1935.

10. An appropriation of approximately $40,000 by Congress to send official delegates to the Seventh World Poultry Congress to be held in Leipzig, Germany, in the summer of 1936, principally for the purpose of bringing that Congress to the United States in its next meeting, to be held in 1939.

11. The establishment of official Federal grades and standards on cottonseed and price reporting thereon.

12. Expansion of the Federal Crop Reporting Service to include all crops and livestock to be issued more frequently than monthly, with reports issued on daily or weekly schedules during the marketing seasons on certain fruits and vegetables. Special reports should be issued promptly regarding crop damage by freeze, flood, hurricane, drought, or hail. Poultry reports should include commercial and farm flocks in excess of 400 birds. Cotton reports which have been discontinued by law should be resumed.

13. In order that livestock producers using the public domain or forest reserves may be eligible for loans from Farm Credit Administration, we recommend that rules and regulations be adopted which recognize an economic unit in range livestock operations, consisting of privately owned lands and publicly owned range lands operating jointly, with such earning power as will pay fixed charges and provide amortization payments for retirement of the loan.

We urge that the single authority which is given regulatory control over grazing areas guarantee that qualified permittees who are now running livestock on public domain or in the forest reserves, be privileged to operate well-balanced economic units consisting, if necessary, of privately owned lands and publicly owned ranges.

14. The control and elimination of noxious weeds is a proper function of the Federal Government in cooperation with State and local agencies. Individual farmers, or concerted activities in limited areas, cannot be effective in controlling or exterminating noxious weeds which already are spread widely, or by methods of propagation are easily spread over vast areas.

It is advisable that adequate funds be provided from regular or emergency appropriations to extend weed control beyond its present limited scope. Chemicals for use in killing noxious weeds should be manufactured at Muscle Shoals and distributed for use at the lowest possible cost in all parts of the country. The tariff rates on sodium chlorate and other chemicals which may be used in weed control should be reduced.

15. The Federal Government is to be commended for its purchases of surplus hides in 1934 and for its withholding of these hides from the market with the result that prices have now increased materially. The Government hides now should be gradually placed on the market without, however, doing so in quantities sufficient to break the market prices on hides.

16. All imitation leather products which move in interstate commerce should be stamped, labeled, or identified under the authority of the Federal Government.

17. We recommend and favor legislation at the next session of Congress which will impose at least a 5-cent per pound additional tax on all oleomargarine manufactured from domestic products and sold in the United States and which will impose at least a 10-cent per pound additional tax on all oleomargarine manufactured in whole or in part from imported products and sold within the United States.

18. The complete and successful operation of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration requires that competitive products from abroad be not allowed such free entrance to our markets as will permit foreign products to disrupt the adjustment plan of producing more or less, as may be necessary, of a basic and nonbasic crop to supply domestic requirements. Accordingly, excise taxes on tropical starches, eggs and egg products, and blackstrap molasses when imported for distillation purposes, should be imposed so that these products when imported must be sold at least equal to those secured by our own farmers, and that these items be not bound at their present status on the tariff list in any reciprocal-trade agreement.

The forestation and land-utilization policies of the Nation demand that pulp, cord, and block wood be given excise taxes so that our farmers may have profitable sales for forestry and woodlot products.

19. We insist again that no law be enacted and no rule or regulation promulgated which will remove or limit the right of the American farmer to enjoy our domestic markets for their products, both for edible and inedible uses. We will not surrender either the edible or the inedible field of use of any farm product in the home market and will resist any privilege sought by importing interests, to secure free entrance to the American markets of an edible product if such product is made inedible for the purpose of such free importation, because of the price relationships between such products.

HOME CONSTRUCTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. WAGNER] delivered before the Building Congress in New York, January 30, 1936, an illuminating address on the subject of home construction. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

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

My friends of the Building Congress, a few months ago one of the keenest business observers in the world said:

"To my mind, Americans ought to be ashamed to allow an acute home shortage to creep upon them while at the same time millions of men are idle and billions of dollars have no work to do."

This suggestion that the key to complete revival is held by the construction industry is doubly significant in view of its source. Mr. Gordon Selfridge, the famous British merchant, understands our institutions and national phychology because he is a native

American. Moreover, he knows as well as anyone can what the English people have accomplished by a housing program when confronted by economic hardships incomparably greater than our own.

There is another reason why Mr. Selfridge's statement should be read with deference wherever businessmen congregate. It reaffirms the principle that creating new employment opportunities for idle labor and new profitable opportunities for idle private capital are part and parcel of the same problem. Some time ago we might have regarded this as a truism hardly worthy of repetition. But more recently there has developed an unhealthy tendency to consider reemployment as a purely social rather than a business concern and to assume that those interested in reemployment are only secondarily devoted to business recovery. The truth is that employment is a prime index of business. To infer that those who count the number of the jobless are cold to industry's needs is as superficial as to argue that those who gaze upon a barometer are not interested in weather conditions.

The large volume of unemployment today is the most serious obstacle to absolute industrial recovery. This is true because no civilized country will countenance widespread starvation; and the cost of relief must in the final analysis be borne by the business community without receiving labor in return. It is true because enforced idleness saps the health and morale of millions of men and women, thus making them unfit to take their places in industry when better times return. It is true because misery breeds among its victims a resentment against a system which, rightly or wrongly, they blame for their misfortunes. The dole is not good for business.

In our distrust of the dole we have devised a widespread system of public works. These have overcome part of the lull in private construction. They have built permanent improvements at a time when materials and labor could be procured easily. They have eliminated the wholesale waste of opportunities that stagnation means. I am convinced that experience has justified my long advocacy of priming the business pump.

But priming cannot go on forever. The ideal situation exists when unemployed labor and idle private capital are brought together in a mutual enterprise. Our major economic task in the United States is to find that enterprise and set it in motion. The undertaking is made less difficult because all the signposts guide us in the same direction. When we examine the composition of our reserve labor supply we find that at least 50 percent is due to the comparative stagnation in the building trades and its effect upon allied industries. When we seek the causes for idle capital we learn that while the index of industrial production has risen to 103 percent of normal the index of construction still lingers at 25 percent. When labor and capital are united there is still need for a market. The greatest potential market in the country today is the market for homes. Every factor is thus eagerly awaiting the inception of an extensive home-building program.

Let us survey a bit more minutely the need for home construction in the United States. The depression alone cannot account for the shocking living conditions in this country. Millions of homes do not decay in 5 years. Only the amazing neglect of housing even when our technical ingenuity along other lines was startling the world will explain why at least one-third of the population dwell in 10,000,000 homes that imperil their health and shock their sense of decency. Even people with comfortable incomes accept poor living quarters that violate the high standards which they observe in respect to other niceties of life. American housing is not consistent with our standing as the wealthiest of nations.

We have fallen so far behind in housing, that it would be fantastic to contemplate an immediate housing program wholly commensurate with our needs. We cannot tear down 10,000,000 homes overnight. But there is no reason why we cannot build at least 10,000,000 new housing units within 10 years, thus lifting the standards of all sections of our people, and raising even the most underprivileged out of the mire of unhealthful surroundings. This modest estimate makes no allowance for periodic obsolescence, or for a normal population increase of about 450,000 families a year. When we plan for 1,000,000 new family quarters annually, we are not being over generous. We are merely meeting the bare necessities of the situation.

No less important than the existence of a market is the character that it discloses. If a home-building program is not to become an orgy of speculation, awaiting the bursting of an inflationary boom, it must be adapted to the normal purchasing power of the people. At the present time, 93 percent of the families of the United States have incomes of less than $3,000 per year. We may naturally expect their earning power to be augmented in the future. But no legitimate financial venture could contemplate supplying such customers with homes, except those ranging between $2,500 and $6,000 in cost, with emphasis upon an average of $4,000. Successful endeavor must be scaled primarily toward that magnitude.

Before exploring further the field open to private business, we should make the honest confession that there is a portion of the home-building task that private industry alone cannot accomplish at a profit. Private industry acting alone will not, and cannot be expected to, provide better living quarters for those millions of American families who have incomes of less than $1,500 per year. They cannot buy $4,000 homes. Some of them, it is true, will move into vacated dwellings when those in the higher-income group build or buy new ones. But the majority of the poor, particularly in the congested city slums, need a renovating and building program of their own. To provide them with American standards, the Federal Government should extend partial assistance to local authorities, in the form of loans of money at nominal rates of interest, or by some other method. This, indeed, is the special objective of the low-rent housing legislation which I have been sponsoring.

It is a grievous mistake to entertain fears that a low-rent program would encroach upon private industry. In the first place, it would by very definition be confined to that section of the population which individual enterprise alone cannot serve. Its tenants would be limited to those whose incomes would not permit them to seek similar quarters elsewhere. Secondly, the strict decentralization of administration among the various localities would guarantee that all activity would be carried on in close contact with the general business needs of the community, and would be quickly responsive to them.

In fact, a low-rent program would give a decided impetus to private industry. It would create purchasing power by swelling the volume of employment. It would increase the demand for the raw and fabricated materials that business produces. It would open an area for some investment by private capital. It would tone up the residential standards of every element of the population.

But the real benefits of a low-rent housing program must be gaged in broader terms. The disease and crime that are generated in slum areas produce an appalling social waste. They multiply the costs of fire and police protection, of hospitals, reformatories, and prisons. They pyramid taxation and decrease industrial efficiency. They undermine the strength of free institutions. All these evils would be mitigated by the removal of the slums. The British have found, in a low-rent housing program, the most concrete reinforcement for political democracy and individual enterprise in a troubled and unsettled world.

There is no business group that will not bend every effort toward giving all the youth of America a chance—a chance to breathe fresh air, to play in safe places, to be free from the threatening influences of sordid home surroundings.

Now we may revert to our survey of the predominant area open for development by the private construction industry. In my opinion, it is unnecessary to quibble about whether low-rent housing with public assistance should have an upper limit of a $1,000 income or a $1,500 income. In either event purely private housing will have a larger market than it can supply. It seems clear that at least 75 percent in number of the 10,000,000 family units to be built during the next 10 years, or 7,500,000 of them, will be built by private industry alone. This includes, of course, apartments and small homes. At an average capitalized cost of $4,000 for each family, the private building program involves investment opportunities of $30,000,000,000, or about $3,000,000,000 per year.

Despite the accelerated tone of residential construction, the Federal Government should continue to add pace to a lagging development. One of the barriers to home buying today is that the average prospective owner of a $4,000 or $5,000 home cannot afford to make the down payment of about 20 percent that is required before the Government will protect the mortgage loan. The Government might obviate this difficulty by encouraging private mortgage institutions to bear a larger portion of the initial cost of this type of home building. Let me give a concrete example. It is reasonable to believe that the purchaser will be able and willing to make a down payment of approximately 10 percent. Today 80 percent can be supplied by private first-mortgage loans, amortized over a 20-year period, and secured by Government insurance. I think that the wheel of the construction industry would be set in rapid motion if the Government would extend its insurance of mortgages up to 90 percent. Thus, if the Government were willing to increase its protective undertakings by only one-eighth, it would provide the final incentive for private investment of $3,000,000,000 per year and of $30,000,000,000 within a decade. This proposal should be coupled with the British practice of requiring the builder to guarantee the payment of the mortgage down to 75 percent. In this way the British have generated a tremendous home-building program that has put decent quarters within the reach of millions.

In conjunction with this action, the Federal Government should assist in other ways. It should continue the work of the Federal Housing Administration in reducing mortgage costs by eliminating multiple-financing and sharp practices. It should lend its influence toward keeping private first-mortgage interest rates at a level that will not prove enormous to borrowers. The Government might also guide improvements in the relevant laws of the States and municipalities.

In addition, the Government should widen the areas of eligibility for Federal protection. Under the present law, while mortgages issued prior to July 1937 are ultimately guaranteed by the Government itself, those issued subsequently are to be protected only to the extent of the insurance fund. While we all have just confidence in the adequacy of this fund, the more complete security should be afforded in both types of cases. Amendment to the existing law should raise from $1,000,000,000 to two or three times that sum the limitation upon the public protection of mortgages upon new construction.

Another course of action is slightly novel, but eminently desirable. Though there are many institutions eager to make loans upon completed structures, existing conditions make it difficult for a building operator to secure capital for his project. The Government ought therefore to insure small construction loans just as it now protects assistance for modernization and repair.

Yet another change suggests itself. Today, insurance of large-scale mortgages is confined to rental projects. It should be extended to cover the large-scale development of small individual homes.

There is little reason why the powers of the national mortgage associations, which are private institutions, should not be expanded. They ought to be allowed not merely to purchase the insured mortgages of other institutions, as now provided, but also to make mortgage loans on large-scale projects that are insured by the Federal Housing Administration. Their debentures against insured mortgages instead of being limited by law to 12 times the amount of their capital funds should be allowed a margin at least twice as large. With these improvements in law and practice, the full possibilities of the Federal Housing Act will come closer to realization.

In concluding let me stress the central significance that a building revival occupies in our whole economic program. We are now witnessing the most gladdening signs that the depression has been defeated. Industrial output in December stood at 103 percent of normal, reaching the highest level in 5 years. The basic industries, such as steel and automobiles, are marching forward rapidly on a united front. Their production is larger and their employment is greater. Every trade journal is punctuated with increasing reports of higher profits and larger dividends.

Interest must now be focused upon retaining and improving this progress. Everyone is listening intently for any sound of discord in the chorus of improvement. Everyone is fearful of the slightest sign that might indicate a relapse.

It is natural that well-informed persons should regard the construction industry as a weather vane of solid business progress. We may recall that the index of residential activity dropped 33 percent between 1928 and 1929, thus sounding the storm signal of the depression. The complete collapse of building was the vital single factor in prolonging hard times. Taken alone, it accounted for fully one-third of the total unemployment in early 1933.

In days of revival, as in days of recession, we must listen for the ring of the hammer and the buzz of the saw. The first stages of recovery in 1933 and early 1934, caused by increasing the purchasing power of the farmer and factory worker, were abbreviated because the gain was not reflected in the building trades. On the other hand, the surest tokens of permanent improvement today are to be found in the quickening of construction. The whole building industry is now pulsating with life. Residential construction during the second half of 1935 was more than 100 percent greater than during the second half of 1934.

But, while these signs are encouraging, they are not sufficient. Only 70,000 homes were built last year, while the imperative demand was at least 10 times that large. With records being smashed in other fields, the index of construction, as I have indicated, still dallies at 25 percent of normal.

All the materials for consolidating recovery are waiting to be used. Both men and capital are eager. Industry is prepared to assume its responsibilities with the same self-command and intelligence that weathered the storm. The Government is eager to lend a helping hand, profiting by its experience and careful not to encroach upon the field of individual initiative. The vast majority of our people, too long denied the congenial home surroundings that they identify with the American way of life, are pleading for the satisfaction of this basic demand. In this conglomerate of business and social needs are blended everything that in the past has stimulated our Nation to feats unparallelled in history. I am sure that the same response will be forthcoming in the future, and that a well-tempered building drive will preserve the welfare of business along with the health and faith of our people.

PHILLIPPINE INDEPENDENCE—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I present for incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address on Philippine Independence delivered by the Honorable George H. Dern, Secretary of War, at the Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Calif., on December 12, 1935.

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

Philippine independence is a vital subject in the Philippines. Every Filipino is interested in it and knows about it. Every American ought to be interested in it, too, and ought to know about it, for it involves our honor in keeping our promises and our sincerity in professing to believe that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Thirty-five years ago every American who could read, and many who could not, had a fair knowledge of the Philippines, because imperialism was the paramount issue in the Presidential campaign of 1900. Today I doubt that one American in a thousand knows or cares anything about our relations with the Filipinos. This lack of interest does us about as much credit as would be due a parent who had neglected his child. The wonder is that our record in the islands has been so good in spite of it. We have much reason to be proud of what we have done over there.

The Philippine Islands are the only Christian country in the Orient, and are about to become the only true republic in the Far East. How does it happen that a Malay people has this unique distinction of belonging to our western civilization? I must cite a little history to show how the stream of Philippine development has been so profoundly influenced by two contacts with the western world.

In 1521, or more than 4 centuries ago, the first man who ever sailed around the globe—Ferdinand Magellan—by chance brought a Spanish squadron to the Philippines. Sailing across the Atlantic, around South America, which Columbus had discovered only a few years before, through the straits which now bear his name, he struck boldly out across the vast unknown western ocean which he named the Pacific, landed first on Guam, now an American island, and then discovered the Philippine Archipelago. He came to the island of Cebu, with the Bible in one hand and the sword in the other, for he was not only an intrepid explorer but also a fanatical missionary. He claimed the country for Spain, and within a few days he had baptized the King and most of the population of Cebu. A little group of unreasonable men on the small island of Mactan, who had never heard of the great King of Spain, and who objected to having Christianity crammed down their throats, gave battle, and Magellan was killed near the spot where his monument now stands.

Magellan's missionary methods apparently did not have a very deep spiritual effect, for when he was gone all his converts slid back into their old faith, if they had any, and for 40 years more the brown people had to worry along without the white man's guidance. However, Magellan's exploits caused other Spanish expeditions to be sent from Mexico, for the Philippine Islands were colonized and governed through the Viceroy of Mexico until Mexico threw off the Spanish yoke and became an independent nation early in the nineteenth century. Forty-three years before the first permanent English settlement in the United States at Jamestown, Va., Legaspi sailed from Mexico and finally conquered the islands. He named them for the prince who became Spain's great King, Philip II. Gradually Spanish civilization and culture were established among the natives. This was the first contact of the Philippine Islands with western civilization, and it lasted more than 300 years.

Nobody doubts the piety, heroism, and disinterestedness of the early missionary priests who came to the Philippine Islands and won the inhabitants over to the Christian faith, but Spain from the start ruled the colony by brute force. It was the medieval policy of overawing the people and subjugating them with fear. It is true that the Spaniards gave the Filipinos a religious ideal and the beginnings of education and increased knowledge, as well as better buildings and roads, something like uniform laws, and the outline of a coordinated political system. Nevertheless, the Filipinos were never contented under Spanish rule. During the three centuries between 1573 and 1872, it is estimated that there were more than a hundred revolts, large and small, 31 of them being of serious proportions, which in itself is strong evidence of abuses and injustice.

On June 19, 1861, was born the great Filipino patriot, Jose Rizal, whose monument now stands in the plaza of practically every considerable town in the islands. He is revered as the national hero and martyr who brought about the downfall of Spanish misrule. He is an outstanding example of that small, select group of men in human history who have profoundly influenced the destiny of their people, and whose names symbolize their national aims and aspirations.

Rizal exposed the oppressive system that had grown up, and the wrongs that the Filipinos had suffered at the hands of a selfish, greedy ruling class, which had no objective except shamelessly to exploit them. He maintained that the courts were operated for the benefit of the rich, and that there was no justice for the poor man, who could be arrested and imprisoned on the merest suspicion of disloyalty, and perhaps even executed without the semblance of a trial.

Through novels and other writings, Rizal laid bare the whole sorry spectacle, and in so doing he aroused the Filipinos to a keen sense of their wrongs and a passionate longing for relief. He himself never counseled a violent revolution, but hoped to bring about reforms by peaceful means under the Spanish flag. He thought that by holding up Spain to the contempt of the civilized world she could be shamed into giving the people justice and decent government. He felt that the first need was education and enlightenment, and that his people had been kept in a condition of ignorance and inferiority so long that they were not prepared to rule themselves, although he never doubted their natural ability to do so.

The ruling class, instead of granting reforms, became enraged, and began to hunt down this dangerous man, who threatened to take away their special privileges. It was ever thus. Their persecutions only aroused the people to greater resentment and excitement. Since Rizal would not lead them to revolt, other leaders did so, and on August 26, 1896, the Philippine revolution against Spain began. Rizal was arrested and unjustly accused of having incited the revolution. In spite of his denial and his expressed disapproval of the revolution, he was found guilty, and on December 30, 1896, was executed. But his soul goes marching on.

Bear in mind that this was only 39 years ago. Spain had continued her medieval practices right down to our own times.

The revolution gained increasing force, and soon a new leader came to the front. He was a youth of 27 years, only lately out of college, but Emilio Aguinaldo quickly showed great talents of command. Under his direction rapid military progress was made in every Province until he had driven the Spanish troops into Manila and had the city surrounded and besieged, except by way of the sea, the avenue through which the Spanish Army could still get supplies and reinforcements.

Then, on February 15, 1898, the U. S. S. *Maine* was blown up in Habana Harbor, precipitating war between Spain and the United States, which was declared on April 21. On May 1, 1898, occurred the Battle of Manila in which the Spanish fleet was destroyed by the United States Asiatic Squadron under the command of Commodore Dewey.

Six weeks later the independence of the Philippines was proclaimed by General Aguinaldo's so-called dictatorial government. Aguinaldo and his followers first looked upon the Americans, who had closed the Spanish Army's access to the sea, as friends and deliverers, and he claimed that Dewey had encouraged him to believe that the United States would help them achieve their independence. Dewey denied this, and there is nothing in the records to substantiate Aguinaldo's claim. The interview between Dewey and Aguinaldo was conducted through an interpreter, and perhaps this accounts for the misunderstanding.

At any rate, since a fleet alone cannot take and hold territory, American soldiers were sent to Manila, and on August 13 the Spanish authorities surrendered the city to the United States forces. Aguinaldo was not permitted to enter the city with his troops, and friction between him and the Americans developed. On January 21, 1899, General Aguinaldo promulgated the constitution of the Philippine Republic, and 2 weeks later the Philippine Insurrection against the United States commenced.

And so we found ourselves fighting the Filipinos—a people who were struggling for independence.

Our occupation of the Philippines was not premeditated, but had come about entirely through the fortuitous chance of war. Whatever may be said of us, we certainly did not take the islands with any thought of territorial aggrandizement.

The Liberty Bell in Independence Hall at Philadelphia is one of America's most sacred relics. It bears the inscription, "Proclaim liberty through all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." That was the spirit of 1776, and that spirit has been bred in the bone of every American since our country was born. That is why Americans instinctively sympathize with all peoples who aspire to freedom and self-government. The Philippine Insurrection against Spain was such a struggle for freedom. What was then to be the attitude of the United States toward a freedom-loving and freedom-seeking colony which it had so accidentally acquired?

There were some imperialists among us who looked toward a policy of colonial expansion and exploitation and who said, "Where the American flag once goes up it never comes down." Such a departure from our national ideals never commended itself to the American people. The permanent government of one people by another without their consent is not the American system.

Wisely or unwisely, we had taken the Philippines. Wisely or unwisely, we had assumed the burden and responsibility of governing them. And yet we said the Philippines belonged to the Filipino people, that we were merely their trustees, and that when they were competent to take care of themselves we would resign our trust and let them govern themselves.

Colonial exploitation was repugnant to our minds. We declared that the good of the colony, not our own good, must be the first consideration, which was perhaps a brand new idea in a world which had always colonized for quite different reasons. We harked back to the spirit of 1776, and we conceded that the Filipinos had the same rights as we claimed when we were colonists of Great Britain. Moreover, we recognized that we had the same duties toward the Philippines that Great Britain should have had toward us at the time of the American Revolution.

Having declared this unheard-of colonial policy, there arose the practical question of how and when it should be carried out; whether the Philippines should be given their independence forthwith, or whether they should first be given a period of education and training to prepare them for independence. Through no fault of their own the people of the Philippines had not been trained in the difficult art of self-government, and had never been given an opportunity to demonstrate whether they could rule themselves or not, nor whether they would respect the rights and property of others.

How could we tell whether they had been disciplined, as Anglo-Saxons had been disciplined for centuries, to submit to the expressed will of the majority, no matter how wrong the individual might deem that decision to be? Where that principle is not accepted democracy must fail.

Moreover, it was difficult for us to comprehend how popular government could be possible without popular education. We Americans think education is essential to democracy. Rizal himself had complained that Spain had kept the Filipinos in ignorance, and that they must be educated before they could be qualified to rule themselves.

And so we set up a military government and proceeded to put down the insurrection. We soon discovered that we had a first-class war on our hands. At first there was heavy fighting between the two armies, in which the Filipino forces were driven back and broken up into small bands. A period of guerrilla warfare ensued, which lasted more than a year and a half. We had more than 70,000 troops scattered all over the Philippines, and we had a garrison in every town of importance and in many places that were mere villages. But the guerrilla warfare continued, under the direction of General Aguinaldo, who was in a remote hiding place. The Filipinos showed that they had courage, fortitude, and tenacity of purposes, and proved a worthy foe. There is no telling how long the insurrection might have lasted if Gen. Frederick Funston had not accidentally learned the whereabouts of General Aguinaldo, and, by bold stratagem, captured him.

The capture of General Aguinaldo soon terminated the insurrection, and the islands were rapidly pacified. The military government, after having established peace and order, and after having made the beginnings of the American type of administration and jurisprudence, of popular education, of building roads, and of modern sanitation, was superseded by a civil government, and step by step self-government was introduced. The second contact of the Philippines with western civilization had begun, this time according to the American style of liberty, enlightenment, and progress. What has been accomplished in the last 37 years is a marvelous story.

Popular election of municipal and provincial officers was instituted 3 years after American occupation, and so the school for democracy was under way. So apt were the native officials that 5 or 6 years later the popular election of the lower house of the Philippine Legislature went into office. The results were entirely satisfactory, and in 1916, with the encouragement of President Wilson, the Jones Act was passed, making the entire Philippine Legislature elective, and giving the Filipinos an enlarged part in administrative affairs. This was a long step toward self-government.

Let me invite your attention to the preamble of the Jones Act, which was passed by almost the unanimous vote of both parties in Congress.

"Whereas it was never the intention of the people of the United States in the incipiency of the war with Spain to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandizement; and

"Whereas it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein; and

"Whereas for the speedy accomplishment of such purpose it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines as large a control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing the exercise of the rights of sovereignty by the people of the United States in order that by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence."

This preamble can only be construed as a definite promise of eventual independence. The Jones Act gave the Filipinos such a large measure of self-government that one might almost be justified in saying that they remained connected with the United States by but a slender thread, namely, American control of the executive department through the office of Governor General. The Filipinos responded magnificently to their new responsibilities and opportunities, and their record of accomplishment since the Jones Act went into effect reflects the greatest credit on their ability and character.

Meanwhile, that great symbol of democracy, the little red schoolhouse of the Unitted States, was transplanted to the Philippines, and universal popular education became and remains as much a Philippine ideal as it is an American ideal. The hunger of the Filipinos, young and old, for education has been remarkable.

At the beginning of American occupation there were practically no decent roads in the Philippines. Today there is an excellent system of highways, those indispensable requisites to agriculture, commerce, industry, and social intercourse. I wish I had time to tell you how the health and well-being of the people has been improved through modern sanitation since American occupation; how public works of various kinds have added to the security, comfort, and self-respect of the people; how the courts have been made temples of justice for rich and poor alike; and how the economy of the islands has been improved by introducing and fostering new industries which increase the national income, furnish employment, and raise the standard of living.

Perhaps the greatest thing that the United States has done for the Philippines is to give them free access to our markets. Since they have been able to ship their sugar, coconut oil, hemp, tobacco, and other products to the United States without paying duty, they have prospered marvelously, and are now enjoying a higher standard of living than any other country in the Orient.

Notwithstanding the tremendous benefits which the Filipinos had received from their connection with the United States, their longing for independence continued, and finally the Tydings-McDuffie Act, which is entitled, "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands", etc., was passed. I have just returned from the Philippines where, on the 15th of November, I participated in the inauguration of the new government which was thereby authorized.

By virtue of the Independence Act there has been created a government called the "Commonwealth of the Philippines", which gives the islands almost complete autonomy in their local affairs, putting not only the legislative but also the executive and judicial departments into the hands of the Filipinos. The Commonwealth government was organized in accordance with the provisions of their own constitution, formulated and drafted by delegates of their own selection and adopted by their own votes. The people elect their own president and vice president, and also the members of their own legislative department, which consists of one house, known as the National Assembly.

The inauguration of the Commonwealth of the Philippines deserves to be rated as an historic event in the annals of both the United States and the Philippines. The ceremonies were excellently planned and were carried out in an impressive, picturesque manner, in the presence of a throng estimated at 200,000

persons. There was a lot of early rising that beautiful day, for the program began at 8 o'clock in the morning, to avoid the midday heat.

After the invocation, Governor General Murphy introduced me as the personal representative of the President of the United States, and I delivered an address, at the conclusion of which I asked the Governor General to read the proclamation of the President of the United States declaring that the persons therein named had, respectively, been elected members of the national assembly. Thereupon the oath of office was administered to them, after which I formally declared the old government at an end and the new Government in effect. President Quezon then delivered his excellent inaugural address, which ended the ceremonies.

It is not often that a new nation is launched with such cordial friendship and mutual good will. Usually new nations are born in the welter of battles and bloodshed. Because this occasion was so unique in human annals I have said that it was of historic significance.

President Manuel L. Quezon and Vice President Sergio Osmena are the two undisputed leaders of the Filipino people and have been intimately connected with the development of self-government and the movement for independence. Their long experience in governmental affairs affords every reason to expect a successful administration of the Commonwealth.

Under the terms of the Tydings-McDuffie Act independence is not yet complete and the islands will remain under American sovereignty for another 10 years, at the end of which period American sovereignty will be withdrawn and the Philippine Republic will supersede the Commonwealth of the Philippines as a completely independent nation.

The 10-year transition period was deemed wise and prudent, principally to enable the Philippines to make the necessary readjustments in their economic life. If they were given the status of an independent nation immediately and suddenly, and were accordingly required to pay full tariff rates on their exports to the United States, it was feared that it would ruin some of their most important industries, thereby throwing a great many people out of employment and causing much hardship and suffering. In that event the Filipinos would probably conclude that independence had been a delusion and a snare. The transition period is therefore intended to benefit the Filipino people and to give the new nation a better chance for success. Moreover, the transition period will give the Filipinos a period of training in the executive branch of the government, which has heretofore remained in the control of the United States.

Inasmuch as the United States still retains sovereignty over the islands, it has important responsibilities there. We reserve certain powers, namely, direct supervision and control over their foreign affairs and, in general, the right to intervene in case of serious disorders or failure of the Commonwealth Government to meet its obligations. In order that the rights, prerogatives, and interests of the United States may be sustained, we keep a United States High Commissioner in the islands as the representative of the sovereignty of the United States. The first High Commissioner is the last Governor General, the Honorable Frank Murphy, who has made such an outstanding record during the past 2½ years that he deserves to be ranked among the greatest Governors General whom we have sent to the Philippines.

The philosophy of the Independence Act is that we are voluntarily surrendering a valuable dependency to its inhabitants and launching a new democratic nation. Who says there is nothing new under the sun? History is replete with stories of conquest and of struggles for freedom, but examples like this are rare, indeed.

Those who have been in a position to observe closely the part the Filipinos have played in the development of their civil government have nothing but admiration for them and have no misgivings about their fitness for self-government and independence. I see no reason why the Commonwealth should not be a success, and why complete independence should not be achieved on schedule time. Certainly, we ought to do everything we can to help them on their way, for this new venture is ours as well as theirs.

The steps whereby the Filipinos have gradually gained self-government bring out three things:

The first is that the United States is keeping its word to give the Philippines independence. And, as President Roosevelt said a few weeks ago, "It is good for a nation to keep its word."

The second is that the American record in the Philippines, despite its mistakes and vicissitudes, has been creditable. As Mr. Root said when he was Secretary of War, "The country which exercises control over a colony is always itself on trial in the public opinion of mankind." We are human enough to hope that the world will say of us that our work has been well done. But especially we hope that the people of the islands may feel that our sojourn there has been a benediction to them, even though it has deferred their independence. The people of the United States may justly feel proud if they have built such an enduring monument in the hearts of the Filipinos.

The third point that is brought out in the evolution of Philippine self-government is more important than the other two. It is that the main credit is due to the Filipinos themselves. They have been tried and not found wanting. They have had a passion for independence for many, many years, and with each new opportunity they have, in the most convincing manner, demonstrated their capacity to perform the varied and intricate tasks of government. We have had good material with which to carry on our work.

As Americans, therefore, we may be pardoned a natural feeling of gratification over having been true to our national ideals and doing a deed worthy of our ancestry. We rejoice at having had this opportunity to "proclaim liberty through all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof", and to give the world an example of the true meaning of American democracy. May we never falter in putting human rights, human liberties, and human welfare above all selfish ambitions, individually or nationally, at home or abroad, and thereby help to make the world safe through democracy, which may, after all, be more to the point than making the world safe for democracy.

If our own cooperation with the Filipinos in a practical way to establish a new democratic republic, fashioned after the American plan, shall renew our devotion to the high principles which gave birth to our own Nation, then our sojourn in the Philippines will have been a blessing to ourselves no less than to the Filipinos. Men always benefit by obeying their noble impulses, and so do nations. The performance of one righteous, unselfish act by America makes it easier and surer for her to be just and upright in all her international relations. It is a proper ambition for her to deserve the esteem and affection not of the Filipinos alone but of all right-thinking nations. To deserve them she must keep on high ground.

TRANSPACIFIC AIR-MAIL FLIGHT—ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an address by Postmaster General James A. Farley at Alameda Airport, Alameda, Calif., in connection with the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of the first scheduled trans-Pacific air-mail flight Friday afternoon, November 22, 1935.

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

Just before leaving Washington I received a letter from the President of the United States. It read:

"MY DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: Please convey to the people of the Pacific coast the deep interest and heartfelt congratulations of an air-minded sailor. Even at this distance I thrill to the wonder of it all.

"They tell me that the inauguration of the trans-Pacific sky mail also celebrates the one hundredth anniversary of the arrival of the first clipper ship in San Francisco. The years between the two events mark a century of progress that is without parallel, and it is our just pride that America and Americans have played no minor part in the blazing of new trails. There can be no higher hope than that this heritage of courage, daring, initiative, and enterprise will be conserved and intensified.

"Very sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

With the inauguration here today of the first scheduled trans-Pacific air-mail flight a new chapter in aviation history is being written. In fact, it records the beginning of the greatest and most significant achievement in the marvelous and fascinating development of air transportation.

More than 8,000 miles of ocean are to be spanned by this new service, which will bring Asia within 5 days of the United States, thus reducing the period of travel between these two continents to less than one-third of the time now required by the fastest steamships, which is 17 days. There will be a corresponding saving in time between the United States, the Hawaiian Islands, Guam, and the Philippines, and all will benefit by this time saving. The Hawaiian Islands, now 5 days away by the fastest steamships, will be overnight from San Francisco.

Very soon the superplanes flying over this route will be transporting passengers and express. A person or letter will arrive in China within 6 days after leaving New York. This is, indeed, an epoch-marking achievement and one which rivals the vivid imagination of a Jules Verne.

It has been the experience of the United States that when better communications and faster transportation have been established between this and other countries better understandings have resulted and an improvement in trade and commerce has followed. Therefore, I anticipate that our friendly relations and our commerce with the countries of the Orient will be strengthened and stimulated by the trans-Pacific air-mail service.

I wish to offer my congratulations to the officials of the Pan-American Airways, whose vision, enterprise and resources have pioneered this great service and brought new laurels to American aviation; to the American aviation engineers and manufacturers, whose research and skill have made possible the superplanes which will fly this route, and to the Congress of the United States for providing the necessary appropriation. I am proud that this history-making service was inaugurated during my administration of the Post Office Department.

The United States easily leads the world with its air-mail services and these services have by no means reached their peak. In the near future it will be advisable to further improve the services in the United States and Alaska and I am confident that within a year or 18 months we will have a trans-Atlantic service from the United States to Europe.

Each year brings new triumphs in American aviation, but it will be a long time before any of them overshadow the achievement which we acclaim here today.

PAYMENT OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES—ADDRESS BY GENERAL HINES

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask consent to have published in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, on January 30, 1936, relative to the payment of the adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans.

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

First of all, I desire to thank the Columbia Broadcasting System for the opportunity presented to me to use their facilities to convey this message to World War veterans and those interested in the payment of the adjusted-service certificate known as the bonus.

I know that many radio listeners would possibly prefer to listen to a program of a more entertaining nature, but I also know that there are three and one-half million veterans who are vitally interested in knowing all about the additional bonus benefits which have just been granted to them and that one of the thoughts uppermost in their minds is, "What will I get?"

The bill which has just become a law provides for veterans who have been issued adjusted-service certificates to receive in exchange for such certificates bonds of the United States in $50 denominations, with a value up to the face amount of their adjusted-service certificate less any loans which have been made thereon; interest on such loans to be charged only up to October 1, 1931, and that which has accrued thereafter is forgiven or canceled. No provision is made, however, for refunding any interest which has been paid. Odd amounts over and above the highest multiple of $50 in the amount due will be paid by check.

As an example: Sergeant Hill had a $1,000 certificate upon which he borrowed $500 on March 30, 1931. There will be deductible from his certificate the $500 which he borrowed, together with interest of $11.25, which is the amount accrued from the date of his loan up to October 1, 1931. All interest charged thereafter is canceled. Sergeant Hill, if he makes application for payment, will receive nine $50 bonds and a check for $38.75.

Now, let me tell you something about the character of the bonds which are to be issued. These bonds are not of the ordinary type but have several unusual features which make them extremely valuable. They may be redeemed at any time during the first year at their face value, and if held 1 year from the date of issue they may be redeemed at any time thereafter not only for the face value but, in addition, 3-percent interest. Thus, holders of these bonds are fully protected against any fluctuation in value. They are nontransferable, nonassignable, not subject to attachment by any legal proceedings, so that the veteran is assured of getting the money himself. No one can take these bonds from him.

All bonds will be dated June 15, 1936, and will run to June 15, 1945. Bonds will be redeemable by the United States Treasury at such places as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and it is quite certain that the necessary arrangements will be made so that redemption of the bonds will be a simple procedure insofar as the veteran is concerned.

My urgent advice to veterans is to hold these bonds so that they may serve as a nest egg, because they represent the safest possible investment and an attractive one. To those veterans whose need is so pressing as to require immediate funds I would strongly advise them to cash only so many of the bonds that may be necessary to meet the actual need.

These bonds have been variously referred to as baby bonds, bonus bonds, and thrift bonds, and the veterans should, by holding them, prove that the latter name is the most suitable. Whether they are thrift bonds or spendthrift bonds will be dependent very much upon what the veteran does with them after they are received.

Application forms for the payment of the bonds are now available throughout the country at regional offices of the Veterans' Administration and at posts or comparable units of the various service organizations so that every veteran may secure one. The final date for applying for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act has not been changed and remains as January 2, 1940. Application for exchanging the adjusted-service certificate for bonds may be filed at any time prior to the date of the maturity of the certificate. Regardless of the date the veteran applies for conversion of the certificate into bonds the bonds issued will be dated June 15, 1936, and will draw interest from that date. Those veterans who have loans outstanding against their certificates should send their applications only to the office from which the outstanding loan was made. I want to repeat and particularly stress this caution, because it is highly important. Those veterans who have loans outstanding against their certificates must send their applications only to the office from which the outstanding loan was made. Veterans who have no outstanding loans upon their certificates should send their applications, together with the certificates, to the Veterans' Administration regional office activity nearest the place of their residence. Veterans who have loans outstanding with banks should send their applications to the central office of the Veterans' Administration at Washington, D. C. As to veterans who are mentally incompetent, application should be made in their behalf by a legally authorized representative.

After filing your application, do not write to the Veterans' Administration, as to do so will only cause delay in handling your case, except where you desire to change the address to which the bonds are to be sent which appeared on your application form. Veterans must expect that a very considerable time will elapse between the filing of the application and the receipt by them of the settlement. This is because of the tremendous amount of administrative work involved and because of its technical nature it is not possible to expand the working operations beyond a certain degree, as only trained personnel acquainted with procedure and the governing law will be valuable in discharging the duties devolving upon the governmental departments.

Comparisons have been cited so often—they sometimes become tiresome—but in this matter I know of no better way of impressing you with the gigantic task confronting us. For instance, if the issuance of bonds had been started at the time of the beginning of the present calendar and 50 a day had been issued thereafter, and the work had been continuous, including holidays and Sundays, we would still have about 2,000,000 more bonds to issue. I know that the next illustration has in its general sense been overworked, but I cannot refrain from asking what your reaction would be if I told you that the bonds to be issued, if laid end to end in the usual manner, would reach from Washington to New York. I am quite certain you would be greatly amazed. Well, I have only told you a small part of the story. Actually, if the bonds to be issued were laid end to end, they would reach from New York to London and then still go on almost to Moscow. The amount of money which will be represented in the settlements would approximate the pay of 500 men receiving $40 a week continuously for the last 1,935 years.

May I again urge that veterans consider these bonds thrift bonds or savings bonds. They are valuable to you and should be retained or at least as many of them as possible for future protection of yourself or yourself and family. These thrift bonds which you will receive in exchange for your adjusted-service certificate are better than cash for this reason: You can always obtain cash for them, and after the first year you receive the cash plus additional cash from interest. You have an attractive investment, and it is to your advantage to hold your bonds. The bonds which will be sent to you in exchange for your adjusted-service certificate will always be worth the face value, and if you hold them they will be worth more than their face value after the first year because they bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum, and the value increases each year to June 15, 1945.

In conclusion let me give three admonitions—first, after filing your application do not write to the Veterans' Administration unless you wish the settlement of your case delayed. Second, be patient and don't expect to receive your bonds for a reasonable time after June 15, 1936. Remember, if you hold your bonds they will draw interest from June 15, 1936, without regard to the date they are delivered to you. Third, after you get your bonds hold on to them. If you think you need the money now—just think a bit harder and realize how much more badly you may need it in the future. Be thrifty—hold your thrift bonds.

Thank you and good night.

THE BRYAN PEACE TREATIES—ARTICLE BY HERBERT WRIGHT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Prof. Herbert Wright, professor of international law, Catholic University of America, dealing with international matters.

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

[From the Washington Star of Feb. 2, 1936]

BRYAN PACT WITH ITALY MAY FOIL EMBARGO PLAN—SUCH PROPOSALS AS OIL SHIPMENT BAN HELD STYMIED BY TREATY THAT CALLS FOR ARBITRATION

(By Herbert Wright, professor of international law, Catholic University of America.)

It would be a strange quirk of fate if the hand of Democratic Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan should reach from the grave to prevent Democratic Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Democratic Secretary of the Interior and Petroleum Administrator Harold L. Ickes from applying a virtual embargo upon shipments of oil and other key products to Italy and thus supporting the supplementary sanctions program of the League of Nations. And yet that such may be the case is not beyond the realm of possibilities. And thereby hangs a tale.

It seems that President Wilson, in the months intervening between the presidential election of 1912 and his inauguration in 1913, was considering the formation of his Cabinet. He requested an interview with Mr. Bryan, the upshot of which was the offer to and the acceptance by Mr. Bryan of the Secretaryship of State. However, Mr. Bryan laid down as a condition of his acceptance that the President should allow him to negotiate a series of treaties in accordance with a draft which he produced. This was a typewritten draft of the so-called treaties for the advancement of peace. Mr. Wilson read the draft and stated that he would have no objection to Mr. Brayn's proposal. But Mr. Bryan was not satisfied with a mere nihil obstat. He desired to make these treaties an integral part of his foreign policy. It was only upon Mr. Wilson's assurance on this point that Mr. Bryan consented to accept the portfolio.

What were these treaties which were destined to have such far-reaching effects then as now? For a long time Mr. Bryan had been interested in labor troubles, and in the course of his experience he had found that the greatest difficulty in the solution of

labor controversies was the ascertainment of the facts at the basis of the controversy. He had observed that, once the facts had been ascertained, very frequently the question would decide itself, or at least the way would be paved for an easy solution. From this he argued, quite reasonably, that if the nations would agree to a procedure by which some impartial body would ascertain the facts at the basis of a controversy, nations might be expected, like labor groups, to reach a satisfactory solution and thus avoid possible bloodshed.

COMPULSION IDEA INCLUDED

It is no discredit to Mr. Bryan, a man of practical affairs and admittedly not an expert in international law and relations, that he was not aware that such a procedure was made available to the nations by convention I on the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes of The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907.

But under the procedure established at these conferences there was no compulsion for the nations to follow this course of action; they were merely recommended to follow it. Mr. Bryan's idea was that the United States should take the lead in making such a procedure compulsory in any international dispute in which the United States was an interested party. And he set about effecting this in a most realistic manner.

He knew that treaties of this nature must receive the advice and consent of the United States Senate. He accordingly waited upon the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and laid before its members his projects, asking them if they would accept treaties of this nature if he were able to negotiate them. Upon assurance of their acceptance he negotiated some 30 treaties, every one of which was advised to in advance and some of which were immediately consented to when they were submitted to the Senate in their negotiated form.

By many people Mr. Bryan has been looked upon as a visionary and it is natural for such people to brush aside Mr. Bryan's treaties for the advancement of peace as the emanations of a pious but misguided mind, or at least as the innocuous efforts of a dreamer. Many, even experts in the field, have cavalierly consigned them long since to the limbo of forgotten things, for certain it is that there is no known instance of any of these treaties coming into active operation. It might be asked, of what use is such an institution as a commision of inquiry to ascertain facts if the nations have not seen fit to make use of the institution. This, on its face, would seem to be a valid argument. And yet it is a strange phenomenon in human affairs that frequently the mere existence of political machinery for a given objective obviates the necessity for its use. Thus, for example, in the entire 146 years of the existence of the United States there have been only an even dozen cases in which the impeachment process has been invoked.

HAD WORLD-WAR BEARING

So it is with the commissions of inquiry provided for by the Bryan treaties for the advancement of peace. The mere availability of them with the attendant compulsion to submit controversies to them obviates the necessity for their use, because the nations, with that possibility in mind, have settled their controversies by direct diplomatic negotiation or in some other peaceful fashion. It would surprise and even startle many individuals to learn that the existence of one of Mr. Bryan's treaties possibly prevented the United States from entering the World War against Great Britain over a year before she actually entered it against Germany and on the side of Great Britain. Yet such is the fact.

In the latter part of 1915, when President Wilson was much disturbed over the fact that Great Britain, through orders in council and other governmental measures, was interfering disastrously with the neutral trade of the United States, he directed Mr. Lansing, then Secretary of State, to lay a request before the Neutrality Board of the United States, of which Dr. James Brown Scott was chairman, for recommendations of forceful measures short of war which the United States might employ to compel Great Britain to perform its international duties toward the United States as a neutral. An individual opinion was requested of each of the members, but the naval members were able to agree upon the reply which they were willing to make as a joint recommendation to the President.

The chairman was temporarily absent from Washington at the time of the request, but upon his return found the request and the proposed joint recommendations of the naval members. Asked if he would join in their report, he felt bound to reply that he was unable to do so because of the fact that the Government of the United States was a party to one of Mr. Bryan's treaties, signed with Great Britain on September 15, 1914, and proclaimed 2 months later, requiring, upon the failure to obtain a settlement of an outstanding dispute by direct negotiation, its submission to a commission of inquiry for investigation and report.

Therefore, he maintained, the United States, by the terms of the treaty, could not resort to any act of force, much less war, to compel Great Britain to recognize the neutral rights of the United States until the commission had made its report. Since the treaty allowed a year for the Commission of Inquiry to make its investigation and formulate its report, that was the last heard of the President's request as to what means should be taken to compel Great Britain to comply with its duties toward neutrals, for within a year the very subject of the controversy might have become purely academic.

NO TREATY WITH GERMANY

As a matter of fact, within a year and a half the ruthless submarine campaign of Germany caused a similar controversy between the United States and Germany. At that time there was no Bryan treaty for the advancement of peace between the United States and Germany, and so it happened that on April 2, 1917, President Wilson, in an address before a joint session of the two Houses of Congress, recommended a declaration of war against Germany, and the Congress formally declared the existence of a state of war on April 6.

Happily the United States now has a conciliation treaty with Germany, signed May 5, 1928, and proclaimed February 25, 1929, which is modeled on the Bryan treaties, so that the situation of 1917 is not apt to be repeated. But suppose no such treaty had existed with Great Britain in 1915, and in a moment of irritation some act of force should have been committed against Great Britain in retaliation for her interference with the neutral rights of the United States, it would have been possible, as indeed it seemed probable to those ignorant of the Bryan treaty, that the very great moral and physical power of the United States would have been alined against the Allied Powers and virtually on the side of Germany. And what a different picture the world would now present!

The above instance was recounted by Dr. Scott to the members of the American Society of International Law, of which he is president, at their annual meeting in Washington in 1929 and was repeated, at the instance of the present writer, to the same group in April 1935. It is a story which bears constant repetition, because its significance is incalculable. It is no wonder, then, that Dr. Scott says of Mr. Bryan, "that he of all the peacemakers is the one who has contributed most to the peaceful settlement of international disputes by holding the hands of war, by staying the sword until such time as nations can resort to the forum of reason in which there is neither great nor small, powerful nor weak, but nations composed of human beings who merit a better fate than that of food for powder and shell to satisfy the ambitions of the wordly great."

But what has all this to do with Italy? Among the first of the Bryan treaties for the advancement of peace was one with Italy, signed at Washington, May 5, 1914, and proclaimed March 24, 1915. Under this treaty (art. 1) the two nations engage to submit for investigation and report to a commission to be constituted as described below "all differences of whatever nature they may be which may occur between them which cannot be composed by diplomatic methods or are not submitted to a tribunal of arbitration." Moreover, "they bind themselves not to declare war nor to open hositlities during the examination of the Commission and before the Commission has presented its report."

Under a supplemental treaty, signed at Washington, September 23, 1931, the members of this Commission of five are appointed in the following manner: One member is appointed from each country by the government of that country, and the remaining three members, who shall not be nationals of or domiciled in either country, are designated by the two governments in common agreement. The members serve indefinitely, but the appointment of any member may be revoked at any time when no case is pending before the Commission. Replacements are made in the same manner as original appointments.

Under the provision of these treaties, the Commission was set up with Mr. Henry P. Fletcher, former Under Secretary of State of the United States, and Prof. Vittorio Scialoja, Senator of the Kingdom of Italy, as the national members, and Dr. Jose Pedro Varela, professor private international law, of Uruguay; M. Paul van Iseghem, honorary president of the Court of Cassation of Belgium, and Mr. Helge Klaestad, of Norway, president of the Anglo-German Mixed Arbitration Tribunal, as joint commissioners. At the present time there are two vacancies on the Commission, due to the death of Prof. Scialoja on November 19, 1933, and the resignation of Mr. Fletcher on September 19, 1935.

ONE PARTY CAN APPEAL

In case the two countries "shall have failed to adjust a dispute by diplomatic methods or by means of a tribunal of arbitration, it shall at once be referred, either by common agreement or by one or the other party, to the International Commission for investigation and report" (art. 3). It will be seen that all that is necessary for the Commission to take jurisdiction of a dispute is that one of the parties shall make a claim that the activities of the other are against international law or against its treaty obligations, and that the other shall deny the alleged claim. Then the injured party appeals to the Commission and the latter is bound to inform the two governments of the date on which it will begin its labors. The two governments by the treaty "engage to furnish all the documents, and to afford all facilities", provided this is not incompatible "with the laws and with the supreme interests of the State" or prejudices "the interests and rights of third States." This does not constitute a limitation on the jurisdiction of the Commission, which, as pointed out above, extends to "all differences of whatever nature", but refers simply to the furnishing of documents and the affording of facilities.

The report of the Commission must be presented within a period of 1 year after the beginning of its labors, unless the term is modified by mutual agreement. The Commission controls its own procedure, and, of course, may use only a small portion of this time, but, on the other hand, it may exhaust the full year, if it deems it necessary. Meanwhile, the two parties are estopped from opening "hostilities." The two governments reserve "the right to act independently on the subject matter of the dispute after the Commission shall have presented its report." But this is only after the report is rendered, and it goes almost without the saying that no self-respecting nation will act counter to the findings of the Commission then.

But how could this treaty and its International Commission be invoked in the present situation? Suppose the United States exerts pressure upon American shipping companies indebted to the Federal Government, as it was reported in the press on November 23, 1935, impliedly threatening that ocean carriers engaged in carrying certain raw materials to Italy (and Ethiopia) might have difficulties in future financial arrangements with the Government, and that Italy objects to this as an unneutral act directed primarily at her, since Ethiopia can secure these materials from other sources closed to Italy by the sanctionist actions of the League of Nations. Suppose Italy claims that the action just mentioned or the action proposed by Secretary Hull a week earlier, when he declared that trade with Italy (or Ethiopia) in such commodities as oil, copper, trucks, tractors, scrap iron, and scrap steel "is directly contrary to the policy of this Government * * * as it is also contrary to the general spirit of the recent neutrality act"—suppose Italy should claim that such trade prohibitions contravened the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between Italy and the United States, signed at Florence September 26, 1871, and still in force. Either of these questions might result in controversies which could properly be submitted to the International Commission created by the treaty of 1914. And, what is more to the point, while the Commission would be considering the validity of Italy's claim, the United States would be obliged by treaty to refrain from hostile acts.

LEGAL GROUNDS NUMEROUS

Upon what legal grounds could Italy base such a claim in the cases just mentioned? The treaty of 1871 provides (art. 1) that "there shall be between the territories of the high contracting parties a reciprocal liberty of commerce and navigation" and that "Italian citizens in the United States and citizens of the United States in Italy, shall mutually have liberty to enter with their ships and cargoes all the ports of the United States and of Italy, respectively, which may be open to foreign commerce."

It provides, moreover (art. 4), that the citizens of neither country shall be liable in the territory of the other "to any embargo, nor shall they be detained with their vessels, cargoes, merchandise, or effects" for any "public or private purpose whatsoever" without indemnification, previously agreed upon when possible. Not only this, but the two nations agree (art. 5) "that whatsoever kind of produce, manufactures or merchandise of any foreign country can be from time to time lawfully imported into Italy in its own vessels, may be also imported in vessels of the United States * * * and they further agree that whatever may be lawfully exported and reexported from one country, in its own vessels, to any foreign country, may in the same manner be exported and reexported in the vessels of the other country * * *."

This is strong language, indeed, and quite comprehensive, but the parties also agree (art. 13) that in case a state of war exists between one of them (read "Italy") and a third power (read "Ethiopia") this "shall not, except in the cases of blockade and contraband of war, affect the neutral commerce of the other" (read "the United States"). Moreover (art. 15), "the liberty of navigation and commerce secured to neutrals by the stipulations of this treaty shall extend to all kinds of merchandise, excepting those only which are distinguished by the name of contraband of war." And what was included under the term "contraband of war"? The treaty makes this quite clear. "And in order to remove all causes of doubt and misunderstanding upon this subject, the contracting parties expressly agree and declare that the following articles, and no others, shall be considered under this denomination." Then follow four categories: (1) Cannon and other arms and their ammunition and all other things "expressly manufactured for the use of these arms"; (2) infantry belts, implements of war, defensive weapons, and clothes for military use; (3) cavalry belts, war saddles, and holsters; (4) "And generally all kinds of arms and instruments of iron, steel, brass, and copper, or of any other materials manufactured, prepared, and formed expressly to make war by sea or land."

CONSULTED UNITED STATES IN 1915

Of course, there has been much advancement in the manufacture of arms and ammunition for war purposes since 1871. The World War showed that there is probably no section of the international law of war in such an unsatisfactory state as that of "contraband of war." And yet, when the Italian Government was preparing its list of contraband during the World War it remembered this treaty of 1871 and its obligations thereunder and refrained from adding to this list mentioned above without consulting the United States. On May 24, 1915, the Italian Embassy in Washington notified the Department of State of the United States that the list which it was preparing would "include goods not enumerated in the list of contraband of war contained in article 15" of the treaty of 1871 because of the "exigencies of modern warfare." While pointing out that the United States had "implicitly admitted the list of 1871 to be obsolete", still, "desiring to follow a scrupulously correct course, the Royal Italian Government have instructed this Embassy to submit the above considerations to the United States Government in order to obtain their previous consent to the issuing of a list more extensive than the one contained in the aforesaid treaty of 1871."

The Department of State, on the following day, replied that, in view of the considerations presented by the Italian Government, "the Government of the United States is inclined to raise no question as to the list of contraband proposed to be issued by the Italian Government on the ground that it does not conform to the list in article 15 of the treaty of 1871 above mentioned."

In view of the "scrupulously correct" treatment of the United States by Italy in the instance mentioned, would not the Italian Government come into court with clean hands, if it should suggest to the International Commission that without Italy's consent oil and other key products could not be added, either by direct or indirect action, to the virtual list of contraband of war contained in the proclamation of the President issued on September 25, 1935, and applied to Italy (and Ethiopia) by the proclamation of October 5, which declares that "a state of war unhappily exists between Ethiopia and the Kingdom of Italy."

Italy's position would be strengthened by the fact that Public Resolution No. 67, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 31, 1935, under the authority of which the President issued these two proclamations, authorized the President to "enumerate the arms, ammunition, or implements of war" prohibited by the act, and oil and the other key products are not ipso facto in that category, certainly not "manufactured, prepared, and formed expressly to make war" in the sense of the treaty of 1871.

It might be alleged that the provisions of the treaty of 1871 refer primarily to the illegality of discriminatory tariffs on the one hand and in the present situation to the neutral rights of the United States against Italy rather than the rights of Italy against the neutral United States. This appears to be without serious merit for the purpose of the present argument, because the fact remains that the treaty of 1871 contains a comprehensive "most-favored-nation" clause (art. 24), and Italy could allege that an embargo on oil and other key products would constitute an act of hostility and a violation of the treaty, unless it were made applicable to all other nations, including the sanctionist members of the League of Nations.

The suggestion has also been made in some quarters that the virtual effect of an embargo on these key products to Italy might be obtained by new legislation applying a quota restriction on the export of these products to all nations, say, an average of the 5-year normal quantity exported to the respective nation. However, if such proposed legislation were not dictated by the domestic needs of the United States, as seems clearly not to be the case, and were obviously intended to support the sanctions policy of the League of Nations against Italy, it would seem that Italy would still have a grievance for controversy with the United States.

At any rate, enough has been adduced above to show that Italy would have a sufficient basis to refer a question of such a character to the International Commission created by Bryan's Treaty of 1914. And this brings us back to the suggestion made in the beginning of this article, namely, that it would be a strange quirk of fate, if the hand of Mr. Bryan would be the one to prevent the United States from becoming embroiled in what the late Frank H. Simonds, in a brilliant article in the Saturday Evening Post, recently referred to with biting sarcasm as "another war to end war", or as Dr. Charles Pergler characterizes it, the system of "collective insecurity."

SUPREME COURT DECISION IN A. A. A. CASE

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of January 7, 1936, relative to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the A. A. A. case.

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

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of Jan. 7, 1936]

A NEW DRED SCOTT DECISION

The opinion of Justice Roberts in the A. A. A. case goes far beyond the destruction of the A. A. A. In its reasoning it closes the door to practically every present or future attempt to attack new national problems through existing national power. It makes the authority of Congress narrower in theory than it has been since the Articles of Confederation.

The fact that three justices dissented from the opinion of Justice Roberts is enough to prove that the A. A. A. is unconstitutional only because there are six conservatives and three liberals on the Supreme Court. If there were five liberals and four conservatives, the A. A. A. would be constitutional. This shows that there is nothing sacred, nothing unchangeable, about the principles relied on to knock out the law. The Constitution means what the Court majority says it means.

This was undoubtedly the narrowest and most restrictive interpretation of the Constitution since the Dred Scott decision of 1857 and remarkably like it in logic. Starting with the premise that in a government of delegated powers all powers not delegated are prohibited, Justice Roberts said:

"None (no power) to regulate agricultural production is given, and therefore legislation for that purpose is forbidden."

In 1857 the Supreme Court used exactly the same reasoning to deny the power of Congress to regulate slavery in the Territories. No power to regulate slavery in the Territories was given in the Constitution, therefore legislation for that purpose was forbidden. Every student of American history agrees today that the Constitution granted implied power to regulate slavery, and that the judicial denial of it was the most calamitous act of the Supreme Court in American history, helping to bring on the Civil War.

Holding that a tax "signifies an exaction for the support of the Government" and "has never been thought to connote the expropriation of money from one group for the benefit of another", Justice Roberts strikes down the processing taxes but cleverly prevents the use of this argument against the protective tariff. The protective tariff is not a tax for the support of the Government, and it takes money from one group for the benefit of another.

This is permissible, says the Justice, when both groups affected by the tax are interested in the matter it is sought to regulate, and when the matter regulated is otherwise within the power of Congress. That means that the protective tariff is constitutional, because everybody affected by it is concerned in the prosperity of industry, and the tariff falls within the power to regulate foreign commerce. Thus, while knocking out the use of taxation to regulate agricultural production, Justice Roberts by inference upholds the use of taxation for the regulation of manufacturing—along lines desired by manufacturers—but holds that farm prosperity benefits nobody but farmers.

The actual test of constitutionality, under this point, is whether the collapse of American agriculture due to overproduction and disordered marketing sufficiently affects interstate commerce to make it subject to regulation under the commerce clause. If it does, there is just as much constitutional warrant for the use of the taxing power to aid agriculture as there is to use the taxing power to aid manufacturing, since in both cases legality is determined by the relationship between taxation and the power to regulate commerce. Six Justices say they can see no connection between agricultural prostration and the flow of interstate commerce.

Besides adopting a dangerously narrow view of what affects interstate commerce, the Supreme Court has narrowed the taxing power to a degree inconceivable in the light of history. And finally, it has suggested a clear intention of wrecking the historic interpretation of the general welfare clause.

True, Justice Roberts subscribes in theory to the broad view of that clause stated by Justice Story and Alexander Hamilton, but at the same time he denounces the processing-tax payments to farmers as money used "for purchasing with Federal funds submission to Federal regulation of a subject reserved to the States." That reasoning would knock out a good share of the Federal-aid appropriations made under the general welfare clause, despite the fact that the justice tries to draw a distinction between mere conditions for the use of Federal funds, and coercive provisions. Every State-aid appropriation is coercive, for it penalizes the States that do not take their share.

Justice Roberts asserted a principle which the Supreme Court has rejected every time it has come up since the Nation was founded—the right of the Supreme Court to judge whether an appropriation is for the general welfare, or whether it may be declared unconstitutional on the ground that it is for local benefit. Always before, the Supreme Court has stated that it rests with Congress alone to decide what use of money is for the general welfare. Reversing that historic policy, Justice Roberts steps boldly ahead and declares that the farmers' problems are unrelated to the general welfare.

"It does not help," he says, "to declare that local conditions throughout the Nation have created a situation of national concern; for this is but to say that whenever there is a widespread similarity of local conditions, Congress may ignore constitutional limitations upon its own powers and usurp those reserved to the States."

Under that reasoning, Noah's flood was of local concern, since at each spot on earth only one spot was under water. The future possibilities of such an argument are unlimited. To deny the right to appropriate money for old-age pensions, it is only necessary to hold that the plight of each victim of insecurity is a local matter, not affecting the general welfare.

What will immediately result from this decision it is impossible to say. Luckily it comes after the A. A. A. has succeeded in building up farm income and has reduced most agricultural surpluses. The cotton problem is most serious, with a year's supply stored up, but a collapse in most farm prices should logically await the building up of new surpluses.

More ominous is the general paralysis of Federal power in dealing with future emergencies, and the suggestion of other nullifications yet to come. Cotton- and tobacco-control acts are sure to be voided, which would be of no concern if the way were left open to more moderate legislation. The Guffey Coal Act seems doomed, with chaos lying ahead. The narrowing of the general welfare clause suggests that the Wagner Social Security Act will be destroyed.

Politically, the most explosive sort of a situation is created. The state of mind of the farmers, as they discover that Government exists for the benefit of the manufacturer but not for them, will vary according to the effect of this decision upon their pocketbooks. The Federal Budget is knocked into a cocked hat—a billion dollars taken away at one clip. If the contracts with farmers are upheld, Congress will have to raise something over $600,000,000 in new taxes, or add that to the deficit.

No doubt the Supreme Court majority feels that it has saved the country from an unwise pampering of the farmers, but, as Justice Stone said in his dissenting opinion, it is part of the function of Congress to correct its own errors. The Federal Government is now in a straitjacket from which it will not escape until two more men like Justice Stone go onto the Supreme bench. There will be renewed agitation for constitutional amendments, which are almost impossible to enact because any 13 States can block them. The real need is what it was when a similar situation existed in the days of Abraham Lincoln—new blood in the Supreme Court.

BENEFICIARIES AS OPPONENTS OF THE NEW DEAL

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by J. F. Beaman published in the Pittsburgh Press on January 31, 1936, relating to attacks on the New Deal by those who have benefited from it.

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

[From the Pittsburgh Press of Jan. 31, 1936]

TODAY'S BUSINESS—THOSE WHO CRY LOUDEST AGAINST NEW DEAL ARE ONES WHO REAP BIGGEST PROFITS

By J. Frank Beaman, Press Financial Editor

Ironically, it seems those who have been in the vanguard against the New Deal, legally and oratorically, are among those who have profited most from the Rooseveltian policies.

Whether the answer is that these big corporation heads are unappreciative of recovery efforts at Washington through which they have benefited, that opposition has become profitable or that they have been ingenious enough to succeed in spite of change, depends upon your individual viewpoint.

But there is no latitude for disagreement with the facts presented in the annual reports of some of these antiadministration corporation executives just being made public.

The increases in earnings in 1935 over the previous year run as high as 679 percent in the instance of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, of which Eugene Grace is president. In others they run up to more than 100-percent increase, while in some cases the best showing since the depression were made by these corporations in 1935.

1935 EARNINGS SET RECORD

The organization headed by Ernest T. Weir, of Pittsburgh, the National Steel Corporation, yesterday reported a net profit nearly twice that of 1934, when he became really energetic against the new order.

For the year 1935 the National Steel Corporation showed a record net profit of $11,136,451, which is equivalent to $5.16 a share, and compares with a net profit of $6,050,721 in 1934, or the equivalent of $2.80 a share. Thus Mr. Weir, while vigorous for the opposition to President Roosevelt, was practically doubling his company's earnings in 1935.

These earnings of $11,136,451 might be compared with a profit of $1,662,919 in 1932, at the depths of the depression, or with $2,812,406 the following year, the first of the Roosevelt administration.

Again, the earnings might be compared with the previous best showing of the corporation, made in its initial full year of operations, in 1930, when earnings totaled $8,415,822.

BETHLEHEM PROFITS SOAR

Such is the improvement in National Steel's earnings during the period when Mr. Weir fought his famous fight on section 7 (a) of the N. R. A., helping to crumble that ambitious structure.

And so it is with Mr. Grace and his Bethlehem Steel Corporation. During the time of his opposition to this and that of the New Deal his corporation's earnings record has progressed and for the year 1935 shows a net profit of $4,291,253, the best since 1930, against a mere $550,571 for the year 1934.

The fourth quarter, being practically a present-day performance, is the more surprising. During the last 3 months of 1935 Bethlehem showed net earnings of $2,396,026, compared with only $411,099 for the same period in 1934. Thus the fourth quarter of 1935 made up more than half of the year's record of profits.

Over in the motor field the records are pretty much the same. Alfred Sloan, head of General Motors Corporation, has been as frank as almost anyone in his criticisms. Recently he capped them all with a demand that the whole New Deal be junked.

While he was preaching against regulation of business and regimentation, his own corporation's earnings in 1935 were doubling those of 1933. The preliminary statement just issued showed profits of this organization totaling $167,226,000. Yet in the first year of the New Deal they were but $83,423,726, and last year they amounted to $94,940,771. That is an increase of $72,286,000 in the past year of the Roosevelt administration.

STOCKHOLDERS BENEFIT

From the standpoint of stockholders, who in many corporations have been whipped into a frenzy of opposition over possibilities of loss of income, the General Motors business means an increase in dividends from $1.73 in 1933 to $2 in 1934 and an estimated $3.40 for the year just closed.

Even the Du Ponts, the founders of the Liberty League, can point to an improved picture in the last 3 years.

The earnings in 1933 were $38,895,330, and then they stepped up to $41,701,465 in 1934; and while the 1935 report is not yet available, the figures for the first 9 months leave no doubt of the situation. For 9 months in 1935 this company's earnings were $40,154,667. And these were 9 months in which the Liberty League was most aggressive.

Another corporation head who has plainly stamped himself as an anti-New Dealer is Sewell Avery, president of U. S. Gypsum as well as Montgomery Ward. The performance of Montgomery Ward is well enough known to everyone. U. S. Gypsum, the firm with which Mr. Avery prefers to be identified, has shown a profit of $2,888,935 for only 9 months of 1935, as against $2,155,369 for all of 1934 and $1,738,927 for the year 1933. The earnings for 1935 are estimated at $2.50 a share, compared with a payment of $1.10 in 1933 and $1.43 in 1934.

On this basis the annual report of General Foods, which until a few months ago was headed by "Gang-up" Hutton and some other big businesses, will be of special interest when published in the near future.

OPEN LETTER TO HON. ALFRED E. SMITH AND OTHERS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an open letter, addressed to Hon. Alfred E. Smith and certain directors of the Empire State Building, signed by James J. Bambrick, president of the Greater New York Council Building Service Employees, International Union, A. F. of L., appearing in the New York Post of Thursday, January 30, 1936.

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

[From the New York Post of Jan. 30, 1936]

(Advertisement)

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE HONORABLE ALFRED E. SMITH AND THE FOLLOWING DIRECTORS: ROBERT C. BROWN, VICE PRESIDENT; JOHN J. RASKOB, VICE PRESIDENT; PIERRE S. DU PONT, VICE PRESIDENT; AUGUST HECKSCHER, DIRECTOR, AND HAROLD G. SEARS, DIRECTOR, OF THE EMPIRE STATE BUILDING

I listened very attentively to every word of your broadcast on Saturday night, realizing very well that I would learn something of value. I was not disappointed. As the president of the Greater New York Council of the Building Service Employees International Union, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, representing many thousands of workers who service New York's buildings, I was looking for a ray of hope from your radio speech—one that would help these workers in their desire to attain better conditions. The following points, I believe, can be listed as the high lights of your speech:

1. You demanded that the "gate" be left open to all.
2. You see "danger" in class being pitted against class.
3. You are against autocracy in any form.
4. You are helping the "great middle class."
5. You admit that the poor cannot pay anything.
6. You say that you favor old-age and unemployment insurance.
7. You stress the advisability of sticking to State laws against Federal statutes.
8. You say that "some brilliant individual has conceived the idea of getting up 48 A. A. A.'s, or what have you, 1 for each State."
9. You mention that your taxi driver asked: "Governor, ain't there any lawyers in Congress any more?"
10. You said: "N. R. A.! A vast octopus set up by Government that wound its arms around all the business of the country, paralyzed big business, and choked little business to death."
11. You spoke of Government subsidies on a large scale.
12. You mentioned that the Democratic platform looked like the Socialist platform.
13. You said: "Speaking for the rank and file of the American people * * *."
14. You seem to be worried about "shots in the dark" at the Constitution.
15. You end by inquiring: "Shall it be Washington or Moscow?"

The above is a summary of what I heard over the radio. In the name of the thousands of building service workers of this city whom I represent, I should like to reply.

1. Having been selected by the building service employees in the Empire State Building as their representative, I wrote you a communication on December 31, 1935, and met you personally on January 3, 1936, presenting for the employees of the building a program which, in effect, would restore the 25-percent wage cut that had been imposed upon them and thereby open the "gate" to better living conditions for them. I was requested by you at that time to see a Mr. Chapin Brown, and did so immediately. Again I repeated the requests of the men for better wages and conditions, and was informed by him that the matter would be presented to the board of directors on the following Tuesday, January 7, and a decision would be forthcoming at that time. Upon telephoning Mr. Brown on January 8, I was informed by him that the board of directors had unanimously turned down the requests of the men and refused to deal with their selected representatives. We did not jump at conclusions, but after much deliberation wrote you the following letter on January 22:

JANUARY 22, 1936.

Hon. ALFRED E. SMITH,
Empire State Building, New York City, N. Y.

HONORABLE DEAR SIR: In our conference of January 3, acting for the building service workers in the Empire State Building, I presented for your consideration the following:

1. A union agreement.
2. Restoration of the 25-percent wage cut that had been applied to all employees who have been receiving over $25 per week.
3. Twenty-five percent increase on all employees receiving less than $25 per week.
4. Forty-hour week.

At your request, I presented the foregoing program to Mr. Chapin Brown with the understanding that it be presented to the board of directors on the following Tuesday, after which time I was to receive a reply. I called Mr. Brown on January 8 and was informed that the Empire State flatly rejected the proposals and would not negotiate with the men under any circumstances. I asked for formal verification of Mr. Brown's statement. However, it has not been forthcoming up to this date.

Would you please advise me as to what action was taken, so that I may inform our members in the Empire State Building.

Very truly yours,

JAMES J. BAMBRICK,
President, Greater New York Council,
Building Service Employees International Union, A. F. of L.

Up to this moment the Union and the men have been ignored. Why shut the gate in the face of your own men in your own building?

2. Speaking about pitting class against class. With 11,000,000 unemployed Americans at the present time and the apparent indifference of the bankers and leading industrialists toward their plight, your fear of danger is justified. Their utter contempt for these 11,000,000 people is bringing on class warfare. You are right about that.

3. On the question of autocracy. Your contempt, and the attitude of the board of directors toward your own men in the Empire State Building appears rather ironical in view of your radio speech.

4. "The great middle class!" For the first time in my life I have been told that a person getting $100 a month and supporting a family is part of the "great middle class." That's one on me. I have before me figures from the Brookings Institute in Washington, D. C., showing that a total of 19,558,000 families are getting less than $2,500 a year—71.2 percent of the total number of families in the country. The next group is that of 5,666,000 families, or 20.6 percent, who get from $2,500 to $5,000 a year. That group, conservatively speaking, has always been considered the lower fringe of the middle class. The next group of 2,256,000 families, constituting 8.2 percent of the population, have an income of $5,000 a year and over. How you arrived at your "middle class" is rather mysterious.

5. You speak of the "poor." Our records show that quite a few men in the Empire State Building, with large families, are getting wages that barely keep body and soul together—$23 a week for a man with a family is hardly a "middle-class" salary—and these people work in the Empire State Building, not in Oshkosh.

6. On the question of old-age and unemployment insurance you say you are in favor of it, but only under State supervision. You know, and everybody does, that there's about as much chance of the 48 States, one by one, putting those laws into effect as there is of the man in the moon dropping down here for a visit. Through one blanket Federal law, the entire country would be on a fair competitive basis instead of each State cutting the heart out of one another.

7. On the matter of State laws against Federal statutes, the greatest evil New York City is facing at the present time is the unfair competition of low-wage centers throughout the country, who are taking work and business away from this city. Only through Federal legislation can fair competition be established.

8. You ridicule the idea of creating 48 A. A. A.'s, and yet that's what a blanket Federal law intended to eliminate. Your own bitter satire on this point conclusively proves the necessity of a Federal statute instead of leaving it up to the individual State.

9. On the question of lawyers in Congress, Governor, the answer is that there are entirely too many of them there now. The American Yearbook of the New York Times for 1933 shows that out of a total of 528 Members in both upper and lower Houses, that there are 244 lawyers in the lower House and 63 in the upper House, making a grand total of 307 lawyers. Entirely too many.

10. N. R. A.! You forgot to mention when you sarcastically disposed of the N. R. A. that it also called for the elimination of child labor, limitation of hours of work, and at least endeavored to establish minimum wages. Even the most cynical have admitted that it eliminated at least some evils, and since its death all the good old "rugged individualist chiselers" are back skyrocketing hours and pushing children into industry.

11. Government subsidies. If ever there was a Government subsidy it was that of the Gunpowder Trust during the late and unlamented World War. The distinguished Du Pont family, I understand, made quite a penny out of that war. If that isn't a Government subsidy, I don't know what is.

12. You are worried about the Democratic platform looking like the Socialist program. That's a new fear for you, because I distinctly recall voting for you when the reactionaries of New York were leveling that accusation against you—and you were proud of it. What brought this change of heart?

13. The great "rank and file of the American people * * *." When I saw the roster of the "rank and file" who attended the American Liberty League dinner it gave me a great laugh. Rank and file. Be yourself!

14. "Shots in the dark at the Constitution." What a joke! Elimination of child labor, the right of workers to bargain collectively, and many other inalienable rights due every one of us by the law of decency and common sense nullified and thrown aside. If you study the record, you will find that the constitutional rights of the poor man and woman of whom you spoke have been kicked all over the lot, and it is time for them to raise a rumpus. The Constitution was designed to serve the people—not to crush them.

15. Then, my dear Governor, you reach a climax by fretting about "Washington or Moscow." Our old red-baiter friends, William Randolph Hearst and J. HAM. FISH, must have been green with envy on Saturday night when you reached such heights. Don't worry about Moscow. The real danger to America is much

closer to home. In fact, it was sitting in the Mayflower Hotel listening to you that night.

You may well wonder, my dear Governor, why the president of a labor union comes out flat-footed in the public press and challenges you on your whole statement of last Saturday. Frankly I have viewed with a certain amount of disgust the propaganda under the guise of "protecting the Constitution" and calling everyone a "red" who speaks of a more equitable distribution of wealth. That feeling prompted me to write this open letter. Again I was motivated by your inconsistency in your public utterances and private actions.

As the President of the Greater New York Council of the Building Service Employees International Union of the American Federation of Labor, I am definitely interested in improving the living conditions of all our members, and very much to my regret I find that your attitude of complete indifference toward the workers in the Empire State Building is at variance with many other realty owners of much smaller buildings who are willing to sit down and work out a fair wage scale for their employees. "Rugged individualism" would seem to be the dominant note in your radio address, and I wish to say that each and every one of the men and women working in the Empire State Building have a full right to express their desires through their chosen representative—a "constitutional" right, by the way. You invoked a 25-percent wage slash without consulting your employees, and you absolutely refuse to consider the restoration of even a part of that 25-percent wage slash.

I was also authorized by the workers in your building not only as members of the union but by a petition which I have in my office to request that a collective bargaining union agreement be negotiated. I was notified that the management absolutely refused to consider this proposal. What about autocracy there?

As part of the demands of your workers, they asked for the 40-hour week and, judging by your flat refusal, you must have thought our demands were "unconstitutional." The head of the Kellogg Co., according to a report over the radio a short time ago, stated that the 30-hour 5-day week which has been in effect in his plants for some years has proven extremely profitable both to himself as well as to his workers. I would respectfully suggest that you find out how he does it instead of turning the men down flat on what is a reasonable request.

Every one of your workers has urged me repeatedly, as their representative, to present their honest and reasonable demands, and you have seen fit to ignore their every request. You surely cannot accuse them or me of being "reds." They ask at least a living wage, which, according to the most conservative authorities in this country, is $1,530 a year for a family of five.

As Governor you championed the cause of the workingman. You were elected time and time again by their votes, including that of the undersigned. Therefore, your attitude at this time is incomprehensible.

The average workingman doesn't ask for much. He is very reasonable. He only asks that he receive at least a living wage. He is patient. He expects to be treated with courtesy by his employer. However, when he is completely ignored, and that goes for the Empire State Building as well as any place else, he resolves to fight for what he considers his rights.

Very truly yours,

JAMES J. BAMBRICK,
President, Greater New York Council of the Building Service Employees International Union, Affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.
570 SEVENTH AVENUE, *New York.*
PEnnsylvania 6-6511.

LEST WE FORGET—EDITORIAL FROM ATLANTA CONSTITUTION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Atlanta Constitution of January 29, 1936.

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

[From the Atlanta Constitution of Jan. 29, 1936]

LEST WE FORGET!

In his recent address in denunciation of the Roosevelt administration and in criticism of the methods adopted to bring about a return to national prosperity former Gov. Al Smith asked the public to make comparison of conditions now with those existing 3 years ago, saying, "We are no better off now than we were then."

In his powerful and convincing answer of last night Senator JOE ROBINSON said: "Governor Smith boldly asserts that our great offensive to overcome the depression and adjust the Nation's economic life had accomplished nothing and brought us nowhere—I challenge the accuracy of that assertion."

Well might he challenge it, since the charge of Governor Smith brings to the front the real issue—whether or not the country has been benefited by the Roosevelt policies.

If what Smith said is true, then the country might well give serious consideration to his criticism. As to the accuracy of his attack on the Democratic administration, it is well enough, lest we forget, that the country take stock of conditions now and, as suggested by Smith, compare them with those existing 3 years ago, when a progressive and virile Democratic administration took over the Government after 12 years of reactionary Republican control.

In February 1933 cotton was selling for 5.95 cents per pound, as against the 11.95 cents it is bringing today; the increase in the price of wheat has been from 47 cents a bushel to $1.02; of corn, from 24 cents to 56 cents; of oats, from 16 cents to 31 cents; of hogs, from $3.25 per hundred to $10.25; of beef, from $5.75 to $11.75.

Three years ago southern farmers were receiving only $2.72 for their cottonseed oil, now they receive $9.48, while the 12 cents a dozen for eggs has increased to 27 cents on the Atlanta market, with hens increasing from 10 cents a pound to 16 cents.

The total income of the farmers of Georgia in 1932 from their products of all kinds was $67,000,000. In 1935 these same products sold for more than $200,000,000, the total being but little less than the largest amount received in any year for the agricultural products of the State.

So it has been with the farmers of all the agricultural States of the Union. Where 3 years ago their homes were being foreclosed and they were in debt to bankers, grocers, and supply men, they now are largely free of debt, have money in the bank, are riding in new automobiles, and have replenished their farm stock and machinery.

Three years ago there were 8,000 closed banks in the country, and the financial outlook was the darkest in the history of the country. Today the banks of Georgia and of practically every other State have more money on deposit than ever in their history and are in sound and prosperous condition.

In other phases of the Nation's economic life equally revolutionary changes have taken place. Unemployment has declined 30 percent, industrial production has gone up 51 percent, stocks have increased 134 percent in value, and bonds 22 percent. There has been a sound and material increase in the value of business and residential real estate and credit has been created where 3 years ago there was practically no credit.

An entire economic structure that had been flattened out by the effect of 3 years of depression has been rebuilt and again stands on a solid foundation.

No wonder Senator ROBINSON reminds the country that "when the Roosevelt administration came into power hungry and abandoned men in the cities were searching the garbage pails for waste scraps and the American farms were halting court foreclosures by physical force, which borders little short of revolution, and Governor Smith says there has been no progress."

The best answer to Governor Smith's unfortunate speech is to be found in the speeches he delivered in 1928, when he was himself a candidate for the Presidency and while he was still in intimate touch with the masses of the people.

But it will at least serve a good purpose in enforcing upon the minds of the American people the strides forward from the depths of devastating depression that have been made under the inspired leadership of President Roosevelt—steps designed for the dual purpose of rescuing the country from its plight and erecting safeguards against a recurrence of such an economic catastrophe in future.

Look at the figures—lest we forget!

THE HORSE AND THE BLUEGRASS—EDITORIAL FROM THE LEXINGTON HERALD

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Lexington Herald of January 30, 1936, the title of which is "The Horse and the Bluegrass."

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

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of Jan. 30, 1936]

THE HORSE AND THE BLUEGRASS

The Herald presents today its twelfth annual horse edition. Every year since 1925 it has been the custom of the Herald to devote an edition at some time during the year chiefly to the horse, the idea being originated by Desha Breckinridge. A review of these editions would give a complete account of the development, not only of thoroughbred racing in America but of the revival of the saddle horse and of harness racing.

Today's edition features, from a local viewpoint, the formation of the Keeneland Association which in the future will carry forward racing in Lexington, with the intention of providing, in the home of the thoroughbred, racing such as Americans naturally expect in such a setting. Before the Keeneland Association was formed there had been continuous racing for 108 years at the old Kentucky Association track, recently sold to the Federal Government for a housing project.

As a horse center, Lexington grows and develops steadily. Its trotting track, with a reorganized Kentucky Trotting Horse Breeders' Association and a new grandstand, and with the active assistance of the Gentlemen's Driving Club, again is a bright spot on the grand circuit; and keeping pace with the expansion of the running-horse sport in 1935 was the enlargement of the circuit to include several tracks in the Far West.

In the show-horse field Kentucky horses in 1935 again dominated the expositions. Further accentuating the superiority of the bluegrass as a breeding center was the purchase of a large estate here by Mrs. M. F. Yount, of Beaumont, Tex., and its remodeling into an up-to-date saddle-horse nursery.

With resumption of thoroughbred racing at Keeneland, Lexington again should become one of the world's leading training spots for thoroughbreds—"the Ascot of America", to use the name suggested in a previous horse edition of the Herald.

Meanwhile the great thoroughbred breeding industry of the State continues to grow, and the figures compiled by Thomas B. Cromwell for the Daily Racing Form and published by permission in this edition will give a good indication of the importance of this industry. And Man o' War continues to be the principal tourist attraction of the bluegrass. About 30,000 persons signed the guest book in a single year, indicating the widespread interest in famous stars of the turf that now are retired on bluegrass farms.

Thoroughbred racing has expanded until it is now being conducted in nearly half of the American States. There are 22 State racing commissions at the present time in contrast to the situation a few years ago, when only Kentucky and Maryland had legalized racing under control of an official board.

Inasmuch as Kentucky furnishes a larger number of horses for this racing than any other State, it has a keener interest in the manner in which racing is conducted than any other. It has always been made clear, however, that Kentucky horsemen have looked toward the perpetuation rather than the expansion of racing. Toward that end such organizations as the Thoroughbred Club of America and the American Thoroughbred Breeders' Association are working.

International racing, as proposed by Herbert Bayard Swope, chairman of the New York State Racing Commission, at the recent meeting of the National Association of State Racing Commissioners in Miami, may be one of the innovations needed to place the emphasis in racing where it ought to be—upon the thrill of the contest and the glamour of the sport.

In recent years the races of Papyrus and Epinard have attracted widespread interest, and the death of Phar Lap, the Australian horse, was a severe blow to racing. Americans are keenly interested in the invasion of England by Omaha, which will carry the silks of William Woodward, American sportsman, in the hope of winning the Ascot Cup. Mr. Woodward, honored by the Thoroughbred Club of America for his outstanding contributions to the turf during the year, on that occasion emphasized the unfairness of the refusal to permit the entry of names of American horses in the English Stud Book.

Despite the virtual elimination of doping, the claiming racket, and other disagreeable features, many turf writers still are not emphasizing the phase of racing that makes it worthy of popular support and lasting public favor. Today's horse edition of the Herald, like its predecessors, shows why the citizens of the bluegrass have been clinging to their racing traditions and "watching them run" for these hundred years and more.

Kentuckians always look forward, as do all who love the horse, to the Kentucky Derby as the big event of the year. An annual feature in the horse edition of the Herald has been the Derby page, outlining the records of the contestants and forecasting the result. This year Neville Dunn, with the amazing and abundant optimism that ever stamps the handicapper, undertakes not only to detail how each horse will finish but by how many lengths.

Others will disagree—which, after all, is what makes horse racing such an interesting sport. But the Kentucky Derby will remain the great show window of the breeding industry and Kentucky's idea of what a race should be.

In this connection attention should be paid to the warning of Joseph E. Widener in Miami this month that the name "Derby" would be cheapened by scheduling too many of them. Very wisely he asked why Americans should borrow English names that mean nothing to them when they have names of their own that are fitting indeed. With that in mind, he intends to change the name of the Hialeah Derby to the Flamingo next year.

The Kentucky Derby also is becoming more than just a glamorous race lasting slightly more than 2 minutes. The Kentucky Derby festival committee, of which Mayor Neville Miller, of Louisville, is the head, and Arnold Strode-Jackson the director, has done excellent work in providing for a Kentucky Derby festival week and for inviting all Kentucky to the derby celebration.

Also featured in today's edition is the race course now being built at Keeneland. This track, located on one of the most picturesque estates in the bluegrass, will be conducted on a nonprofit basis, and the conviction that racing is a sport and a privilege will ever be uppermost in the minds of those whose duty it is to guide its policies.

From the standpoint of physical attractiveness, Keeneland, when completed, will be second to no other racing establishment in the United States. Just as its programs will exemplify the inherited regard and respect of Kentuckians for the horse, so will its architecture and its landscaping be a mirror that will reflect the beauty of the bluegrass section, horse capital of North America.

In addition to the wealth of information on the horse industry, today's edition of the Herald contains a section devoted chiefly to farming in the bluegrass, with particular emphasis on central Kentucky's leading cash crop—tobacco. Certainly too much emphasis cannot be given to this crop, as the sales to date on the Lexington market alone, totaling approxiamtely $10,000,000, will testify. Facts concerning the value of the livestock industry also are contained in an article citing the importance of the livestock auction markets which play so vital a part in central Kentucky agriculture.

Another section is devoted to Lexington itself—the capital of this interesting horse and tobacco country—and the articles and pictures published in this section reveal vividly the contrast between the Lexington of the "gay nineties" and the Lexington of today. The information contained in this section was obtained from the files of the Herald of 1898, that particular year being selected not only because it was a good example of a very interesting period in the progress of Lexington and the United States as a whole, but because it was what newspapermen call "a good news year." The section will bring back to the older readers memories long forgotten, of the Spanish-American War days and the part Lexington played in that war; of the tollgates, the first street cars, the modest business houses that long since have been replaced by modern buildings.

The horse, the farm, and the city of Lexington—all are linked inseparably, in fact as well as in the columns of today's Herald. The future progress of Lexington depends chiefly on the well-being of the horse industry and agriculture; and the Herald, in presenting to its readers a record of the facts concerning horse and farm, expresses Lexington's sincere hope that during the years to come, they will reap the reward of prosperity they so richly deserve.

GAULEY BRIDGE TUNNEL DISCLOSURES

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Tacoma (Wash.) Times of January 24, 1936, relating to the deaths in connection with the construction of the tunnel at Gauley Bridge, W. Va.

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

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) Times of Jan. 24, 1936]

"WALKING DEAD MEN"

When fear rides his shoulders, no man wastes much time picking the road down which he will run.

That explains why the hard-rock men of Gauley Bridge, W. Va., took the jobs in that mountain tunnel in spite of the fact that they knew a painful, long-drawn-out death was waiting for them in its remote corridors.

Fear? The commonest fear in the world these days—fear of unemployment, of hunger, of family suffering. That fear is merciless and inexorable; when it gets astride of a man and digs in with its spurs, its victim has to ignore all other fears and take the first road that opens.

So the hard-rock men went into that tunnel, by the scores and the hundreds; and it is hard to think of them without thinking of a military parallel—a silent, white-lipped infantry company, slipping up a communication trench to take its collective chance on a death which it knows will strike down at least half of its number.

This Gauley Bridge story is a ghastly thing, any way you look at it. Its first effect must be to light in the breasts of its hearers a quick flame of indignation against any industrial system which can use men as the system under which that tunnel was driven used them.

But beyond that there is this other consideration—this illustration of the terrible force which fear of unemployment can be in the lives of working men.

It can be argued, of course, that these West Virginia workers were not compelled to take jobs in that tunnel. This is a free country; they enjoyed the constitutional freedom of contract; if they were afraid of silicosis, why didn't they stay away from that dust-filled hole in the mountain?

And it is that argument which shows how terrible the worker's fear can be.

For the man who is looking for a job in time of economic depression is not a free agent. As far as he is concerned, his country is not a free country.

The force which drives him compels him to take the first job he sees—any job at all, no matter how poorly paid or onerous or downright dangerous it may be, so long as it has a pay check attached to it.

That is why a contractor can ignore safety precautions. That is why greed can inflict lingering death on a community of workers. That is why some authority, be it State or Federal, must step in at times to see that men are protected against the risk of certain types of employment.

This Gauley Bridge affair is unspeakably shocking. But its victims will not have died altogether in vain if their tragedy makes us understand what a merciless and compelling thing the worker's fear of unemployment can be.

UNTOUCHABLE—POEM BY MARLEN PEW

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Marlen Pew entitled "Untouchable."

Mr. Pew is the publisher of Editor and Publisher. He is one of the brilliant journalists of the country. This poem was written by him immediately after leaving Bombay in December. It is a pen picture of conditions in that city.

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

UNTOUCHABLE

Tonight a sight has seared my eyes,
A sight that all God's love denies:
On Bombay's reeking pavement stones,
Sheeted bundles of skin and bones,
Ten thousand homeless wretches lie—
Ten thousand such as you and I.

Born of woman, with soul and heart,
Sent by Heaven to play a part
In the great game of life on earth,
To suffer pain, to yield to mirth,
To feast and fast, to multiply,
To laugh and weep and then to die.

But these outcasts on stony bed
At infancy were of the dead;
A ghastly fate declared their doom,
Marked each unclean in mother's womb—
In serried ranks on every street
These living lie in winding sheet.

Denied to them man's right meed
By all just laws of life decreed:
Some place apart, a modest plot
On which to rear one's castle cot,
Shut out the world. The ecstasy
Of family life in privacy.

The right to dream, the right to play
Shuttered against the shameful day;
The soft embrace of maid and man,
The miracle of love's brave plan
To have and hold, to procreate,
And thus the gods propitiate.

But how can the dead uphold its head,
Ten thousand dead on the Bombay bed?
How can the blind the pale moon see
Or sense the vile atrocity
Worked on them by the white vulture
In the name of his thrift culture?

Pinioned by caste, no jungle cat
More fiercely hates the nether rat;
Insensate worm, he dare not feel
The crushing weight of the iron heel;
Godless are they, no jeweled shrine
Offers to them a faith divine.

Crusted over by customs stale,
Ten thousand creep beyond the pale;
Dragging their rags, staring in fright,
Showing their wounds, wailing their plight,
Scratching their sores, skeleton palms
Wildly outstretched imploring alms.

India's vast wealth, siphoned o'er seas,
Naught but the crumbs are left for these—
These helpless waifs, motherless sons—
Cowed in the dust by guns,
Unasked, they rule! For right is might,
And India's streets are dark by night.

On Bombay's reeking pavement stones,
Sheeted bundles of skin and bones,
Ten thousand ghostly humans lie,
The foulest blot beneath the sky;
A timeless crime, an endless shame,
All Nature's proudest boasts defame.

—*Marlen Pew.*

BOMBAY, *December 16, 1935.*

LOANS FOR CROP PRODUCTION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 3612) to provide loans for farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1936, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee, which will be stated.

The amendment reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, in section 2, paragraph (b), page 2, line 24, after the word "exceed", to insert "$1,000", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. (a) There shall be required as security for any such loan a first lien, or an agreement to give a first lien, upon all crops of which the production or harvesting, or both, is to be financed, in whole or in part, with the proceeds of such loan; or, in case of any loan for the purchase or production of feed for livestock, a first lien upon the livestock to be fed. Fees for recording, filing, and registering shall not exceed 75 cents per loan and may be deducted from the proceeds of the loan. Each loan shall bear interest at the rate of 5½ percent per annum. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act and collecting loans made under other acts of the same general character, including loans made by the Governor with funds appropriated by the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, the Governor may use the facilities and services of the Farm Credit Administration and any institution operating under its supervision, or of any officer or officers thereof, and may pay for such services and the use of such facilities from the funds made available for the payment of necessary administrative expenses; and such institutions are hereby expressly empowered to enter into agreements with the Governor for the accomplishment of such purposes.

(b) The amount which may be loaned to any borrower pursuant to this act shall not exceed $1,000: *Provided, however,* That in any area certified by the President of the United States to the Governor as a distressed emergency area, the Governor may make loans without regard to the foregoing limitations as to amount, under such regulations and with such maturities as he may prescribe therefor.

(c) No loans shall be made under this act to any applicant who shall not have first established to the satisfaction of the proper officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration, under such regulations as the Governor may prescribe that such applicant is unable to procure from other sources a loan in an amount reasonably adequate to meet his needs for the purposes for which loans may be made under this act.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this bill represents the annual appropriations asked of the Congress on behalf of farmers for seed loans and feed loans and fertilizer. I am not very familiar with the bill, as I am sure other Senators are not, and I think the chairman of the committee should make an explanation concerning this bill, its purposes, and the plan that usually has been followed heretofore in bills of this kind.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McNARY. I merely offer the suggestion. Certainly I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to state that this bill is of the same nature as those that have been passed by this body for now this is the eighth year. It differs from any other effort to aid agriculture in that it is designed to benefit those who cannot get credit otherwise. The policy of those who administer the law is to require those who apply for seed loans to make an affidavit that they cannot obtain credit otherwise. In other words, as farmers are considered as being bad risks anyway, these are the worst and lowest of the bad risks, and yet they have, wherever there have been no drought and no seasonal disaster, paid back as great a percentage or a greater percentage than have those who have put up collateral.

I want to state that this, in the opinion of the majority of the committee, and I am sure of the Senate, is the most practical and helpful procedure in which the Government has engaged in aid of tenant and other farmers, for the reason that if they cannot get this credit they will be in the relief line.

Mr. President, there is published, and it is available, the percentage of these loans that has been returned to the Government. In the year 1935 there were collected some loans that were not repaid in 1931. The Government is still collecting as the farmers make crops. The subsequent crop not only pays the immediate loan of the year in which the crop was made, but the Government has collected the delinquent indebtedness that has been incurred in previous years.

In this day of handing out relief to the unemployed I think no one should object to the bill because it would give employment and the Government would get back its money. The plan would help the farmers to maintain their self-respect because no dole would be handed out. The farmers give a lien on their crops and pay back the loan.

We found that the amount any one farmer could get under the previous measures was so small and limited that it really did not adequately meet the purpose for which the legislation was intended. Therefore the committee thought the maximum amount that anyone could borrow should be $1,000 rather than $500 as provided in preceding measures.

I think it is unnecessary for me to explain to this body any further than I have the necessity for this kind of legislation.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. Will the Senator state the outstanding delinquent amount for the past several years?

Mr. SMITH. I think there are outstanding several million dollars, but the amount is being cut down every year. The Senator must understand that in some of the western

States no crops at all were raised for several years and therefore practically nothing could be paid on account of the loans. I am sorry I do not have the total outstanding amounts. I shall get the figures and have them incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. I think I can answer the inquiry, although I state the figures from memory. Last year about 63 percent or 63 cents of every dollar loaned was repaid.

Mr. SMITH. I think the Senator is approximately correct.

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

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. KING. In view of the policy inaugurated by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Mordecai Ezekiel, and the other able and practical farmers in the Department of Agriculture, which has resulted in a large decrease in production during the past few years, I am wondering what is the necessity for the measure now before us. The claim is made by the defenders of A. A. A. and other measures formulated by the so-called experts in the Department of Agriculture that great prosperity came to the farmers; that the destruction of livestock and pigs and the limitation placed on crop production greatly increased the profits of all agriculturists. If these claims are valid, it would seem that additional loans are not now needed.

Mr. SMITH. The necessity for the measure is to keep the small, helpless farmer at home, to enable him to make a living for himself and at the same time to pay back to the Government what he has borrowed, and to prevent his being placed on the dole. That is the object.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator whether the farmers who fall within the category which he has mentioned have not been beneficiaries of the policies of the administration to which I have just referred?

Mr. SMITH. I think not. These are farmers who make an affidavit with respect to their condition, and all of us know it is true that they cannot get the wherewith to carry on their farming operations. The Government extends a loan, takes a lien on their crops, and, be it said to the credit of the honesty of these men, they have repaid a larger proportion than have some in the higher brackets of risk.

Mr. KING. Is it the opinion of the Senator that all the crop reduction and other so-called farm measures which have been been so aggressively urged by Mr. Wallace and those associated with him, have not been effective in lessening the difficulties of the agriculturists who are covered by the terms of the bill?

Mr. SMITH. Many of those measures do not even touch the proposed beneficiaries of the pending bill.

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

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

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. We have provided in other laws for production credit corporations and other agencies through which loans are made to farmers to assist them in the making of their crops, the loans being made on reasonably good security. The class of farmers provided for in the bill now before the Senate, as stated by the Senator from South Carolina, are unable to supply the collateral or to furnish security other than liens on their crops, which have not as yet been planted. If the arrangement for this class of loans should be discontinued now and no provision made for that class of farmers, the result would be that large numbers would be unable to go ahead with their production and would be thrown entirely out of employment, and some other provision would have to be made for taking care of many of them.

As stated by the Senator from South Carolina, it is my information that, except in those areas where some such catastrophe as a drought or flood has occurred to prevent the growing of crops, the borrowers have met their obligations with gratifying and astonishing rapidity. In some States they have paid practically the entire amount borrowed for given years, and, as stated by the Senator from South Carolina, they are still paying on the maturities of other years which could not be met by reason of drought or flood or some other condition which prevented the maturing of their crops.

Mr. SMITH. The amount of loans repaid by the borrowers and collected by the Government where there was no security except a lien on the crops compares very favorably with loans repaid by those who borrowed and put up collateral and took 5 percent of the proposed loans in stock, had their notes discounted at 6 percent, which made 11 percent to start with, and then paid 2 percent for investigating the case and recording the papers. In spite of the fact that the Government required, under loans of that character, ample collateral and took a mortgage on all the farmer had, the percentage repaid by those who had nothing but their growing crop is as great as or even greater than the amount repaid by the first class to which I have referred.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator that I believe this measure has greater merit than many of the measures which come from the officials of the Department of Agriculture. I wish to ask the Senator whether the committee reporting the bill took into consideration the condition of the Treasury, the measures to be adopted to meet the enormous appropriations authorized by Congress. Did the committee favor paper inflation or an increase in the burdens of taxation resting upon the people?

May I say to the Senator that if I shall vote for the bill I shall do so with the understanding that there shall be no inflation, but that the Congress of the United States before it adjourns will materially increase taxes in order that the deficit which is daily mounting may be reduced with the objective of balancing the Budget in the near future. There must be increased revenues if the spending policy of the Government is to be continued. The Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, in my opinion, should be giving attention to this important question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that in my judgment no recent activity of the Government has done more good to a needy class of people than this seed-loan proposal has done to those who obtain money from it for making crops. They are a class of persons who cannot make crops in any other way.

Hundreds of thousands of persons in my section of the country, both white and colored, obtain these loans, and they could not make a crop otherwise. When they obtain the loans they go to work and make their own way. They are not on charity. They pay their debts. In my part of the country they pay them up with remarkable promptness. My recollection is that in the district in which I live more than 90 percent of the loans are uniformly paid back.

Wonderful good has been done by previous measures of this kind, and I hope the Senate will unanimously pass this bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina if this proposed loan is in line with seed loans made during prior years.

Mr. SMITH. It is exactly in line with them.

Mr. GEORGE. And the interest rate is still 5½ percent per annum?

Mr. SMITH. It is.

Mr. GEORGE. Do I understand also that the amount which may be advanced to any one farmer is now increased from $500 to $1,000?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. May I also ask if the bill carries a provision that in areas peculiarly affected by drought or otherwise, even that limitation may be raised?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; exactly the same as previous bills

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, while I am on the floor I wish merely to add to what has been said by the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Tennessee, and others, that this form of loan has been of more benefit to a class of farmers who otherwise do not receive any great direct benefit from other activities of the Government than any other class of loans or efforts made by the Government. It has reached and relieved in very great measure a distressing situation among tenant farmers and farm laborers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 2, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I desire to offer what I think may be called a clarifying amendment, simply permitting the cost of crop insurance to be included in the provisions of the bill. The Senator will recall that we took up that matter in the Agricultural Committee, and the committee took a favorable attitude toward it.

After the word "crops" in line 8, page 1, I move to insert "including the cost of crop insurance within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REFUND OF PROCESSING TAXES

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from G. M. Moffett, president of the Corn Industries Research Foundation, relating to the refund of processing taxes.

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

CORN INDUSTRIES RESEARCH FOUNDATION,
New York, N. Y., February 1, 1936.

Hon. MARVEL M. LOGAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LOGAN: I am glad to be able to advise you that the corn refining industry has taken a position of flat refusal to profit by the return of any processing taxes refunded through the action of the Supreme Court in its recent decisions on the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Ten companies which have refunds coming to them will pass these refunds along just as soon as the way is legally clear and the necessary computations and adjustments can be made. These 10 companies feel that the burden of the processing taxes in general was borne by the ultimate consumer and that the industry would consider itself unjustly enriched unless it attempted to the best of its ability to restore the refunded taxes to the people who actually paid them.

We are addressing you directly on this matter in order to put the facts clearly before you so far as this industry is concerned.

Very truly yours,

G. M. MOFFETT, *President.*

CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which has passed the House, and which is emergent in character, concerning the San Diego Exposition.

The bill, as I say, has passed the House. It is favorably reported by the Foreign Relations Committee; and I ask unanimous consent that it may be taken up at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the calendar number of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON. It is Calendar No. 1538.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9871) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the participation of the United States in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936; authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes", approved March 7, 1935, to provide for participation in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1936, to authorize an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States continue its participation in the California-Pacific International Exposition at San Diego, Calif., in 1936.

SEC. 2. For this purpose the act entitled "An act providing for the participation of the United States in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936; authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes", approved March 7, 1935, as hereby amended, is extended and made applicable to the continuance of the participation of the United States in the said exposition in 1936 in the same manner and to the same extent and for the same purposes as originally provided in said act, except insofar as the provisions of that act specify the erection of a building or group of buildings.

SEC. 3. In addition to the sum of $350,000 authorized by the aforesaid act to be appropriated for the participation of the United States in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936, and appropriated under the section entitled "California-Pacific International Exposition" of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes", otherwise known as Public Law No. 21, Seventy-fourth Congress, and approved March 21, 1935, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $75,000.

REGULATION OF SMALL LOANS IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

During the lifetime of the late Senator Schall, of Minnesota, he objected to the consideration of Senate bill 1162, regulating the rate of interest in the District of Columbia. Since his demise the bill passed, about a week ago, under the rule whereby bills were passed which were not objected to. At that time I was not advised of the objection. Subsequently, the late Senator's secretary requested that I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed might be reconsidered and it might be returned to the Senate.

At the time the bill came up I made no objection, because I had no knowledge of the opposition of the late Senator from Minnesota to the bill. I recognize that the rules do not permit a motion to be made, because the time for making a motion to reconsider has elapsed. Therefore, in order to complete the record, I ask unanimous consent that the votes whereby Senate bill 1162 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and passed be reconsidered, and that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, any request of my friend from Oregon is almost equivalent to a command, and it is with the utmost regret that I feel constrained to deny the request.

In explanation of my position I submit a few words. The measure in question is one in connection with which there were hearings conducted, and it received serious consideration, not only by the District Committee of the Senate but by citizens' organizations within the District of Columbia. Representatives of various organizations came before the committee and urged its passage. Full opportunity was afforded to all persons to present their views, either for or against the bill. After full consideration the bill was unanimously reported by the committee.

When the bill was reached on the Unanimous Consent Calendar the late Senator from Minnesota, whose death we regret, objected, and later stated to me—I hope I shall be pardoned for mentioning a conversation where there is no other person who might throw light upon it—that he should not object to the consideration of the bill if he could have opportunity to insert in the RECORD a letter which he had received, and to make such observations as he desired. I stated that of course I should gladly accede to his request. Later the letter was inserted in the RECORD, and my recollection is that the Senator had read from the desk some observations which he desired to make in respect to the bill. I think it would have passed the Senate at that time except for the fact that the able senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] felt constrained to object until he had further

considered the bill. Thereupon it went over, and was not brought up again until the 16th of last month.

Upon the call of the calendar at that time the bill was reached and was passed by the Senate. It has gone to the House and is now being considered by the House Committee on the District of Columbia. I am not advised as to how far the committee has gone in its deliberations, but I assumed that bill will receive the approval of the House committee.

The measure is a meritorious one. As stated, it received the full support of the District Commissioners, and the corporation counsel urged its passage.

I object to the recall of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 10464, being the supplemental deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10464) making appropriations to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with and that the bill may be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will read the bill.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading, "Title I—General appropriations—Legislative—Senate", on page 2, after line 3, to insert:

To pay to Rose M. Long, widow of Hon. Huey P. Long, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 5, to insert:

To pay to Margaret Huntley Schall, widow of Hon. Thomas D. Schall, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 8, to insert:

Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For clerk to the secretary of the minority, at the rate of $1,800 per annum from February 1, to June 30, 1936, both dates inclusive, $750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 12, to insert:

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers of committees, at such rate as may be fixed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, fiscal year 1936, $75,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for services, personal, professional, or otherwise, in excess of the rate of $3,600 per annum: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses except in accordance with the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, approved June 3, 1926, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1936, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 7, to insert:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Legislative reference: For printing the Index and Digests, prepared in the Legislative Reference Service, of bills pending in the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, fiscal year 1936, $3,800.

Care and maintenance, salaries: For an additional sum required for personal services for the fiscal year 1936, $443.55.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent offices—Central Statistical Board", on page 5, line 17, after the name "District of Columbia", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That of the funds hereby appropriated there shall be available from and including January 16, 1936, such sums as may be necessary for the payment of obligations incurred by the Central Statistical Board created by Executive Order No. 6225, dated July 27, 1933.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission", on page 8, line 1, after the figures "1937", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$50,000", so as to read:

For carrying out the provisions of the act approved August 15, 1935, entitled "An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, approved May 23, 1928", fiscal years 1936 and 1937, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 21, to insert:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to transfer $30,000 of the funds of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1936 to the Navy Department, for disbursement by it under the various headings of its applicable appropriations, for 40 beds at the United States Naval Hospital at Portsmouth, N. H., for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, including minor repairs and improvements of existing facilities under their jurisdiction necessary to such care and treatment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 7, to insert:

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to transfer $140,000 of the funds of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1936 to the Treasury Department, for disbursement by it under the various headings of its applicable appropriations, for 90 beds at the United States Marine Hospital at New Orleans, La., for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, including minor repairs and improvements of existing facilities under their jurisdiction necessary to such care and treatment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 17, to insert:

Administrative expenses, Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, Veterans' Administration, 1936 and 1937: For administrative expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; supplies; equipment; traveling expenses; rentals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; communication services; purchase, maintenance, and operation of passenger-carrying motor vehicles; and for other necessary expenses to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to perform such duties as are required by said act, fiscal years 1936 and 1937, $5,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia", at the top of page 16, to insert:

Filtration system, workhouse and reformatory, District of Columbia: For an additional amount for construction of a sand filter for the permanent water supply system, fiscal year 1936, $5,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 4, to insert:

Filtration system, workhouse and reformatory, District of Columbia: For an additional amount for construction of a permanent water supply filtration system (no year), $2,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture", on page 17, after line 10, to insert:

FOREST SERVICE

Fighting forest fires: For an additional amount for fighting and preventing forest fires, including the same objects specified under this head in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1936, $1,276,709.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 15, to insert:

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Sea-food inspectors: For personal services of sea-food inspectors designated to examine and inspect sea food and the production, packing, and labeling thereof upon the application of any packer of any sea food for shipment or sale with the jurisdiction of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to amend section 10A of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended", approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 871), fiscal year 1936, $33,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 3, to insert:

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY

The sum of $12,500 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $6,000,000 provided by title VII of the act entitled "An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, and certain other acts relating to game and other wildlife, administered by the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes", approved June 15, 1935 (49 Stat., pp. 378–384), is hereby made available for the payment, by the Secretary of Agriculture, of expenses in connection with the North American Wildlife Conference called by the President of the United States, to be held in Washington, D. C., February 3–7, 1936, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere by contract or otherwise, printing, binding, and other miscellaneous expenses: *Provided*, That no part thereof shall be available for travel or subsistence expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous", on page 20, line 10, after the name "Secretary of Agriculture", to strike out "to carry out all the purposes of and"; in line 12, after the word "heretofore", to strike out "or hereafter"; in line 17, after the word "sum", to insert "not exceeding $700,000"; in line 25, after the word "include", to strike out the comma and "but shall not be limited to,"; on page 21, line 3, before the word "purchases", to strike out "past"; in line 20, after the word "otherwise", to insert "substantially"; and in line 21, before the words "of the", to strike out "regulations" and insert "requirements", so as to read:

Payments for agricultural adjustment: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet all obligations and commitments (including salaries and administrative expenses) heretofore incurred under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, or regulations heretofore issued thereunder, except refunds pursuant to section 21 (d) of that act, an additional amount of $296,185,000, together with a sum not exceeding $700,000, equal in amount to the unexpended balances of the funds heretofore established by the President under authority of section 15 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and directed by the Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the President, to be spent for the benefit of agriculture in Puerto Rico and Hawaii; said sums to remain available until expended. The expenditures authorized under this appropriation shall include rental and benefit payments, expenditures for rent and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, stenographic reporting services, supplies and equipment, purchases and exchange of law books, books of reference, directories, periodicals, newspapers, traveling expenses, printing and binding in addition to allotments under existing law, and such other expenses as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this appropriation. No part of the sums appropriated herein shall be used for rental or benefit payments in connection with adjustment contracts entered into on or after January 6, 1936, and as to those contracts entered into prior to January 6, 1936, no part of the sums appropriated herein shall be used for rental or benefit payments in connection with adjustment contracts unless there has been partial performance by the farmer: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available for rental and benefit payments in an amount that the Secretary determines to be fair and equitable to farmers who have applied for contracts, and who prior to January 6, 1936, have in good faith made adjustments in acreage and otherwise substantially complied with the requirements of the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with a crop program, regardless of whether contracts have been signed. Funds herein made available for administrative expenses shall be available for allotment to the bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture and for transfer to such other agencies of the Federal or State Governments as the Secretary of Agriculture may request to cooperate with or assist in the administration of the work under this appropriation or of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, including necessary investigative work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 18, after the figures "1935", in the text pertaining to the 1935 cotton price adjustment payment plan, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That in carrying out clause 2 of said section 32, the Secretary of Agriculture may, if he finds that the purposes of said section will be accomplished thereby, purchase without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, agricultural commodities and products thereof, including purchases for donation to the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department on Commerce", on page 25, after line 19, to insert:

BUREAU OF FISHERIES

Fish cultural station in the State of Nevada: For the establishment of a fish cultural station in the State of Nevada, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for a 5-year construction and maintenance program for the United States Bureau of Fisheries", approved May 21, 1930, fiscal year 1936, $60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior", at the top of page 27, to insert:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Ackia National Memorial Commission and Battleground National Monument: To carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Ackia, Miss., and the establishment of the Ackia Battleground National Monument, and for other purposes", approved August 27, 1935, fiscal year 1936, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bituminous Coal Commission", on page 28, line 10, after the name "Commission", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That if the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935 is declared to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, no money herein provided shall thereafter be spent and all money herein appropriated and unexpended shall be immediately covered back into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department", on page 35, line 12, after the figures "297", to insert "and Senate Documents Nos. 150 and 151", and in line 14, to strike out "$120.29" and insert "$2,291.87", so as to read:

Claims for damages by collision with naval vessels: To pay claims for damages adjusted and determined by the Secretary of the Navy under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collision with naval vessels", approved December 28, 1922 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 599), as fully set forth in House Document No. 297, and Senate Documents Nos. 150 and 151, Seventy-fourth Congress, $2,291.87.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department—Office of the Secretary", on page 42, line 12, after the figures "1936", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$851,000", so as to read:

Expenses, Emergency Banking, Gold Reserve, and Silver Purchase Acts: For expenditure under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury for any purpose in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of the Emergency Banking Act, approved March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1), the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 337), the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1178), any Executive orders, proclamations, and regulations issued under the foregoing acts, and section 3653 of the Revised Statutes, including rental at the seat of Government and elsewhere, costs of transportation, insurance, and protection of gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates transferred to Federal Reserve banks and branches, United States mints and assay offices, and the Treasury, after March 9, 1933, losses sustained by Federal Reserve banks due to abrasion of gold coin, and reimbursement to Federal Reserve banks and branches for expenses incurred by them in carrying out instructions issued by the Secretary of the Treasury after March 4, 1933, fiscal year 1936, $851,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 12, to insert:

Administrative expenses, Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, Treasury Department, 1936 and 1937: For expenditure under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury for any purpose in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, in the District of Columbia and

elsewhere, including the employment of necessary personnel, rental of quarters, supplies and materials, equipment, furniture, communication service, stationery, printing and engraving, postage, insurance, travel, and subsistence expenses, and such other services as may be necessary, fiscal years 1936 and 1937, $6,678,375.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 25, after the figures "1936", to increase the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Federal Alcohol Administration from $180,000 to $225,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having charge of the bill the reason for this increase in the item for the Federal Alcohol Bureau.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I take pleasure in giving the reason to the Senator from Utah.

The administrative officers of the Bureau came before our committee and said that, by reason of the previous reduction, they had had to lay off their field force, and that this appropriation was essential in order to put men back to work in the field force, so that they could secure efficient administration of the law. They said that without the appropriation they could not do the field work which they were required to do in order both to protect the tax phases and to protect the label phase. It seems that under the law label registration is required, and this enables them to check as to the label phase. Part of the appropriation will run out after the labels have gone through the registration process. They said it was absolutely essential for successful administration that this appropriation should be made.

Mr. KING. I may say to the Senator that there is too much overlapping and duplication in the operations of the executive agencies of the Federal Government. Departments and bureaus and other Federal organizations overlap each other to a degree which may not be defended and which result in large expenditures. Many persons hoped that the President would exercise the authority conferred upon him under the economy law, and that he would merge or consolidate many of the Federal agencies, thus relieving the American people of a part of the enormous burden of taxation which rests upon them.

I regret to say that instead of there having been consolidations and a reduction in the number of Federal agencies, there have been increases, so that expenditures of the Federal Government for the salaries of employees of the Government are several hundred million dollars more, perhaps four or five hundred million dollars more than they were before the war.

I appreciate, of course, that during this so-called emergency additional Federal organizations were required, but it seems to me that the time has come to abolish some of these agencies, and to reduce the personnel in others. I am advised that there are considerably more than 1,000,000 persons on the Government pay rolls. I repeat, it is time for consolidation of agencies, and for drastic cuts in Federal expenses.

The Federal control of liquor should be under one organization instead of two. There is now before the Committee on Finance, and before a subcommittee of that committee, of which I am chairman, a bill of 50 or more pages dealing with the control of the liquor question, but it does not touch the Federal Alcohol Bureau. It is believed by some that there ought to be a consolidation of the activities of the Treasury Department in dealing with the collection of taxes on various kinds of liquor, wines, and so forth, with the organization for which an increase in the compensation is sought by this amendment.

I shall not object to the consideration of this amendment. Perhaps under the circumstances, and until the consolidation is effected, we must submit to these constant increases in compensation. I do desire to call attention to the fact, however, that with the mounting expenses of the Government reaching more than 20 percent of the entire earnings of all the people of the United States, there must be a halt called sometime and somewhere. The American people cannot indefinitely meet the enormous expenditures of the Federal Government, together with the very large expenditures of the State governments and various municipalities and local subdivisions.

In the United States News of the 3d instant appears a graph showing the national income for a number of years. In 1929 it was nearly $79,000,000,000; in 1932 it was only forty-five billion eight hundred million; in 1933 it was forty-three billion six hundred million; in 1934 it was forty-nine billion nine hundred million; in 1935 it was fifty-three billion seven hundred million. Notwithstanding the increase for the year 1935, the total income is less by more than $24,000,000,000 than it was in 1929. Yet the expenditures of the Government are billions of dollars greater.

I asked the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] a few moments ago, during the consideration of a bill calling for an appropriation of $60,000,000, whether the committee had considered the question as to where the money was to come from. I voiced my opposition to any policy which called for inflation, as that term is employed, and insisted that, with these enormous expenditures which create stupendous deficits, it is imperative that the revenues of the Government be increased. I again emphasize that view and urge that the two committees of the House and Senate which have to do with revenue legislation meet at an early date for the purpose of devising ways and means of increasing the revenues of the Government.

I sincerely hope that the inflationary spirit which seems to be pervading some parts of the United States will find no support in the Congress of the United States, and that Congress will resolutely set its face in favor of legislation that will provide for a balanced Budget within the next year or two. Certainly, the spending mania must end, and a return to realities be achieved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 4, to strike out:

PROCUREMENT DIVISION, PUBLIC WORKS BRANCH

Acquisition of premises designated as 1724 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.: For purchase of premises designated as 1724 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., and described as lot 28 in square 170 on the records of the surveyor of the District of Columbia, comprising a six-story and basement brick office building and approximately 13,200 square feet of land, to provide necessary office space for permanent Government organizations, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II, Judgments and authorized damage claims", on page 47, after line 3, to insert:

(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent establishments under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case", approved December 28, 1922 (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 215–217), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 152, Seventy-fourth Congress, as follows:

Federal Civil Works Administration, $661.05;
Federal Emergency Relief Administration, $488.96;
Works Progress Administration, $334.33;
Veterans' Administration, $21;
Department of Agriculture, $4,735.41;
Department of Commerce, $1,323.59;
Department of Interior, $567.26;
Department of Justice, $240.91;
Department of Labor, $83.66;
Navy Department, $1,073.03;
Post Office Department (out of postal revenues), $380.55;
Treasury Department, $1,494.92;
War Department, $11,676.01;
In all, $23,080.68.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, United States courts", on page 49, line 3, before the word "under", to insert "and Senate Document No. 153"; in line 5, after the name "War Department", to strike out "$335.62" and insert "$905.48"; and in line 7, after the words "In all", to strike out "$835.62" and insert "$1,405.48", so as to read:

(b) For the payment of judgments, including costs of suits, rendered against the Government of the United States by United States district courts under the provisions of an act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damages caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels belonging to the United States, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 781–789), certified to the Seventy-fourth Congress in House Document No. 298 and Senate Document No. 153 under the following departments, namely:

Navy Department, $500;

War Department, $905.48;

In all, $1,405.48, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interests, where specified in such judgments, at the rate provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Judgments, Court of Claims", on page 49, line 21, after the figures "296", to insert "and Senate Documents Nos. 154 and 155"; after line 23, to insert "Federal Trade Commission, $3,043.06"; after line 24, to insert "Veterans' Administration, $5,900"; on page 50, line 1, after the name "Navy Department", to strike out "$34,156.77" and insert "$35,339.64"; in line 3, to insert "War Department" and strike out "$93,439.34" and insert "$696,279.87"; and in line 4, after the words "In all", to strike out "$128,659.40" and insert "$741,625.86", so as to read:

SEC. 3. (a) For payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims and reported to the Seventy-fourth Congress in House Document No. 296 and Senate Documents Nos. 154 and 155, under the following departments and establishments, namely:

Federal Trade Commission, $3,043.06;

Veterans' Administration, $5,900;

Navy Department, $35,339.64;

Treasury Department, $1,063.29;

War Department, $696,279.87;

In all, $741,625.86, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on certain judgments as and when specified therein.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Audited claims", on page 57, after line 18, to insert:

(c) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1933 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 157, Seventy-fourth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

Independent offices: For traveling expenses, Civil Service Commission, $3.60.

For Interstate Commerce Commission, $1.50.

For operations under Mineral Act of October 5, 1918, $40,875.20.

For Army pensions, $47.17.

For investigation of pension cases, Pension Office, $1.25.

For Navy pensions, $10.

For medical and hospital services, Veterans' Bureau, $46.57.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Bureau, $40.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, $4,387.71.

Department of Agriculture: For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Dairy Industry, $7.25.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, $19.51.

For salaries and expenses, Forest Service, $1.50.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, $536.88.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Entomology, $1.50.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, $15.

Department of Commerce: For mineral mining investigations, Bureau of Mines, $1.30.

For air navigation facilities, $1,851.18.

For expenses of the fifteenth census, 1932–December 31, 1932, 29 cents.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Census, 42 cents.

For salaries and expenses, Patent Office, $9.90.

For testing railroad and mine scales, etc., Bureau of Standards, $12.50.

For general expenses, Lighthouse Service, $36.

Department of the Interior: For Geological Survey, $1.06.

For National Park Service, $88.80.

For roads and trails, Office of National Parks, building, and reservations, emergency construction, $2,954.34.

For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, $20.24.

For education, Sioux Nation, $44.20.

For Indian school support, $157.78.

For conservation of health among Indians, $11.66.

For agriculture and stock raising among Indians, $1.86.

For support of Indians and administration of Indian property, $33.15.

For Indian boarding schools, $80.10.

Department of Justice: For fees of commissioners, United States courts, $118.80.

For fees of jurors, United States courts, $21.50.

For fees of witnesses, United States courts, $6.

For detection and prosecution of crimes, $17.85.

For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, $1,319.29.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prohibition, $416.51.

For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, $653.31.

For fees of jurors and witnesses, United States courts, $93.

For prison camps, $43.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons, $1.

For support of United States prisoners, $173.81.

For United States Industrial Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio, maintenance, $14.09.

Department of Labor: For employment service, Department of Labor, $5.43.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Immigration, $1.65.

Navy Department: For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, $17,210.58.

For gunnery and engineering exercises, Bureau of Navigation, $5.

For transportation, Bureau of Navigation, $185.60.

For maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $101.30.

For engineering, Bureau of Engineering, $1.92.

For medical department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, $137.

For pay of the Navy, $2,595.10.

For pay, Marine Corps, $782.66.

For maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, $243.08.

Department of State: For contingent expenses, foreign missions, $3.67.

For transportation of Foreign Service officers, $10.33.

For contingent expenses, United States consulates, $49.70.

Treasury Department: For collecting the revenue from customs, $2.80.

For collecting the internal revenue, $41.95.

For enforcement of Narcotic and National Prohibition Acts, internal revenue, $2.50.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Industrial Alcohol, $2.50.

For stationery, Treasury Department, $7.48.

Fof pay and allowances, Coast Guard, $9,609.29.

For contingent expenses, Coast Guard, $348.38.

For fuel and water, Coast Guard, $190.79.

For outfits, Coast Guard, $155.49.

For pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, $47.89.

For collecting the war revenue, $115.56.

For increase of compensation, Treasury Department, $17.33.

For furniture and repairs of same for public buildings, $103.83.

For operating supplies for public buildings, 36 cents.

For repairs and preservation of public buildings, $11.17.

War Department: For pay, etc., of the Army, $12,792.81.

For pay of the Army, $5,296.

For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, $2,708.91.

For Army transportation, $854.98.

For barracks and quarters, $296.51.

For National Guard, $722.88.

For subsistence of the Army, $1.50.

For extra-duty pay to enlisted men as clerks, etc., at Army division and department headquarters, $21.50.

District of Columbia: For general expenses, public parks, District of Columbia, $152.50.

Post Office Department—Postal Service (out of the postal revenues): For city-delivery carriers, $5,307.36.

For clerks, first- and second-class post offices, $2,642.90.

For clerks, third-class post offices, $257.09.

For compensation to postmasters, $6,287.28.

For freight, express, or mail transportation of equipment, 60 cents.

For foreign mail transportation, $10.

(Sea post service)

For indemnities, domestic mail, $333.47.

For indemnities, international mail, $215.03.

For miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices, $30.72.

For post-office equipment and supplies, $7.25.

For Railway Mail Service, miscellaneous expenses, $629.40.

For railroad transportation and mail messenger service, $230.66.

For rent, light, and fuel, $4,082.01.

For Rural Delivery Service, $141.90.

For separating mail, $36.

For special delivery fees, $110.95.

For temporary clerks, $91.93.

For unusual conditions at post offices, $13.91.

For vehicle service, $2,616.16.

For village delivery service, $123.44.

Total, audited claims, section 4 (c), $132,183.52, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

(d) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1933 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (U. S. C., title

5, sec. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 156, Seventy-fourth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

Independent offices: For Interstate Commerce Commission, $4.35.

For operations under Mineral Act of October 5, 1918, $5,748.87.

For Army pensions, $155.

For investigation of pension cases, Bureau of Pensions, $2.25.

For medical and hospital services, Veterans' Bureau, $3.25.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Bureau, $8.25.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, $1,075.61.

Department of Agriculture: For salaries and expenses, Extension Service, $4.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, $2.

Department of Commerce: For air-navigation facilities, $43.70.

For domestic commerce, Department of Commerce, $1.50.

For general expenses, Lighthouse Service, $5.70.

Department of the Interior: For industrial work and care of timber, $19.

For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, $30.94.

Department of Justice: For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prohibition, $41.

For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, $25.

For fees of jurors and witnesses, United States courts, $52.50.

For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, $465.33.

Navy Department: For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, $1,348.82.

For organizing the Naval Reserve, $34.30.

For pay, Marine Corps, $22.86.

Department of State: For bringing home criminals, $14.87.

Treasury Department: For collecting the revenue from customs, $70.61.

For collecting the internal revenue, $12.31.

For pay and allowances, Coast Guard, $12.75.

For fuel and water, Coast Guard, $10.50.

For suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes, $1.25.

For furniture and repairs of same for public buildings, $5.05.

War Department: For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, $357.61.

For arrears of pay, bounty, etc., $9.62.

For increase of compensation, Military Establishment, $660.02.

For National Guard, $1,099.15.

For pay of National Guard for armory drills, $133.96.

For Reserve Officers' Training Corps, $113.19.

For clothing and equipage, $155.92.

For Army transportation, $172.37.

For pay, etc., of the Army, $4,539.46.

For pay of the Army, $1,907.64.

For ordnance service and supplies, Army, $345.62.

For Air Corps, Army, $12.43.

For Air Service, Army, $33.

For mileage of the Army, $11.20.

For Organized Reserves, $18.05.

For arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, $101.26.

For subsistence of the Army, $99.65.

For supplies, services, and transportation, Quartermaster Corps, $7.11.

For power plant, Fort Mills, Corregidor, P. I., $3,002.

For pay of Military Academy, $182.

For clothing, camp, and garrison equipment, $12.12.

For pay, etc., of the Army, War with Spain, $10.

Post Office Department—Postal Service (out of the postal revenues): For indemnities, domestic mail, $60.75.

Total, audited claims, section 4 (d), $22,265.70, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments involving claims be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 68, line 14, after the figures "285", to insert "and Senate Document No. 158"; in line 18, after the figures "1935", to strike out "$2,862.20" and insert "$17,505.46"; and in line 22, after the words "In all", to strike out "$3,959.20" and insert "$18,602.46", so as to read:

SEC. 5. (a) For payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office pursuant to private acts of the Seventy-fourth Congress and certified to such Congress in House Document No. 285 and Senate Document No. 158, as follows:

Under the War Department: For payment to claimants under the provisions of Private Act No. 38, approved May 15, 1935, $17,505.46;

For payment to the Jay Street Terminal, New York, under the provisions of Private Act No. 39, approved May 15, 1935, $1,097;

In all, $18,602.46.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 11, after the name "Senate", to strike out "Document No. 129" and insert "Documents No. 129, 159, and 160", and in line 13, after the name "Department of Labor", to strike out "$12,598.60" and insert "$30,353.65"; so as to read:

SEC. 6. Judgments against collectors of customs: For the payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office covering judgments rendered by United States District Courts against collectors of customs, where certificates of probable cause have been issued as provided for under section 989, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 842), and certified to the Seventy-fourth Congress in House Document No. 295 and Senate Documents Nos. 129, 159, and 160, under the Department of Labor, $30,353.65.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado, in charge of the pending bill, whether or not at the invitation of the subcommittee, members of the National Labor Relations Board appeared before that committee on the question whether the $275,000 provided for in this deficiency bill was sufficient for their operation for the rest of the fiscal year, and whether or not the committee came to any conclusions on that subject matter.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the members of the board appeared before the committee. There was some uncertainty as to whether the item would carry them through; and it seemed wiser to allow them to go ahead with the money available, and look to a deficiency bill hereafter if the amount should prove insufficient. In other words, we thought they should proceed with the funds available for expenditure, in view of the uncertainty as to the actual amount needed, with the idea that if additional amounts should be needed the appropriation of such amounts would be recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WAGNER. What I wanted to ask the Senator particularly, if he is willing to give his views upon that subject, was whether the Board members persuaded the committee that $275,000 probably would not be sufficient to prosecute their work efficiently between now and the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the Senator from New York that there was an element of doubt because the estimated expenditures were based upon court proceedings. If the Supreme Court of the United States should render a decision at a relatively early date deciding the debatable questions, it might eliminate some of the proceedings in the district courts and circuit courts of appeals, and thereby avoid the expenditures which are now apprehended.

Mr. WAGNER. Exactly. I thank the Senator very much. May I ask the Senator a further question, he being an expert and I not an expert?

In view of the legal questions arising all over the country, if those questions shall multiply, as some apprehend, before the United States Supreme Court shall finally pass upon the question, and the sum provided shall prove insufficient properly to enforce the law or to enable the Board to be represented before the different courts in the prosecution of the law will the Board be absolutely helpless to continue? Will the Board then be paralyzed and unable further to function, or are there some other sources from which it may secure sufficient funds properly to protect those who are entitled to protection from the Government?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the idea of the committee was that Congress will be in session for some months, and that other appropriation bills, both regular and deficiency, will be under way, and the developments can then be met as they may arise. However, I will say for the members of the Appropriations Committee, and not going beyond its membership, that they were desirous of seeing that adequate funds were available for this board.

Mr. WAGNER. That was my understanding, and I wished to have that fact very clearly set forth. I thank the Senator from Colorado very much.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. One of the difficulties confronting the subcommittee with reference to this particular matter was that there was no estimate from the Budget Bureau for the addi-

tional amount, and, as the Senator from New York knows, we are precluded from going into matters when there is no estimate. The committee was greatly impressed by the showing made by the members of the Board, and it was suggested that they endeavor to have an estimate submitted by the Budget. Certainly my thought is—I am not speaking for the other members of the committee—that if the amount available shall prove insufficient to carry on the work of the Board, it will have an opportunity before there is another deficiency bill to present its cause to the Budget Bureau. I am satisfied the Budget Bureau must be impressed as we were impressed with the reasonableness of the request.

Mr. ADAMS. I may add that the members of the Board decided they would not make an appeal to the Budget Bureau at this time.

Mr. BYRNES. I think they went before the Budget Bureau, but the question was whether or not they would insist upon the matter going to the President with a request for another estimate.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, the committee authorized the chairman of the committee to communicate with the Budget Bureau and to ask them to hear the board members. They had stated to the committee that the Budget Bureau would not hear them, and the chairman of the committee communicated with the Budget Bureau, and the Budget Bureau agreed to hear them; but they did not reappear before the committee.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I must say that one member of the Board did communicate with me about the matter simply to state what I have now stated to the Senator—that they recognized that to have an estimate submitted the matter would have to be resubmitted to the President, and they thought it wiser to go ahead without an estimate being made at this time; that there is to be another deficiency bill, and if additional funds shall be necessary in order to maintain their organization they will then present their case to the Budget Bureau in the regular form.

Mr. WAGNER. I think it should be clearly stated also that it was not of its own initiative that the Board appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations seeking this additional appropriation. I requested that an invitation be extended to the Board to appear, which, of course, was readily assented to by the subcommittee, the members of which were extremely courteous in the matter, and I wish to express my appreciation of that courtesy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee or the Senator in charge of the bill if an item or a sum is included in the bill to compensate the ginners for extraordinary services rendered by them under the Cotton Control Act, the so-called Bankhead Act. If the Senator himself is not very familiar with the subject, I am sure some other Senator who is can furnish the information.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I think the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] had the matter of the ginners' appropriation up before the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Was it included in the bill?

Mr. ADAMS. No. The junior Senator from Georgia, I understand, will offer an amendment.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 8, after the figures "1935" and before the period, it is proposed to add the following:

> And shall remain available until expended, whether or not said act of April 21, 1934, as amended, continues in force and effect.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is some question as to whether the Comptroller would approve the expenditures incurred under the compulsory Cotton Control Act, commonly known as the Bankhead Act, if it should be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court or repealed by the Congress. I am advised by the Department of Agriculture that if my amendment is adopted, it will obviate that difficulty and will assure the payment of this just claim against the Government.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. May I ask the Senator from Georgia whether he has received the information which was communicated to the committee with reference to the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I received a copy of a letter written to the committee, and I received a subsequent letter in which it was stated that there was some question whether the Comptroller would approve the expenditures if this legislation should be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court or repealed by the Congress, unless an amendment substantially in the form of the one I have offered should be adopted.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, in a letter dated February 1, 1936, to Mr. Rea, the clerk of the Appropriations Committee, signed by Paul A. Porter, executive assistant to the Administrator, it is stated—

> That out of the $100,000,000 appropriated by section 12 (a) of that act there remains a sum clearly sufficient to carry out present commitments and obligations and to make the payment to ginners contemplated by the bill. The expenses of administering the Bankhead Act have amounted to more than the taxes collected.

If the Senator has any subsequent information, it is information of which I am not aware; but in this letter the committee was advised that the sum was sufficient to pay the ginners. I know the Senator is as interested as I am in knowing that the necessary amount is available.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have the letter referred to by the Senator from South Carolina; and I received a subsequent letter under date of February 1, which reads in part as follows:

> While it may be urged that the provision in the bill constitutes a specific appropriation of a sufficient amount out of the funds available for administering the Bankhead Act to make the payments to the ginners and that this provision accordingly is an appropriation for a special purpose and therefore would not be affected in the event of the Bankhead Act being repealed or being declared invalid by the Supreme Court, it is by no means certain that the Comptroller General would not hold that the appropriation for the ginners lapses in such an event because it merely makes funds set aside for the expenses of administering the Bankhead Act available for this purpose and the entire appropriation would lapse and because section 17 (b) of the Bankhead Act makes it clear that the expenses of ginners which would be reimbursed under the provision in the bill are expenses incurred in connection with the administration of the Bankhead Act, as indicated by the language of section 17 (b).

There is no question that the language contained in the bill is sufficient, if the Bankhead Act is upheld by the Supreme Court or is not repealed by the Congress; but we have run into the difficulty of a possible adverse decision from the Comptroller General in the event the Bankhead Act is declared unconstitutional. The effect of the language of the amendment is clearly to make the appropriation available in the event the Bankhead Act is declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court or repealed by Congress.

Mr. BYRNES. May I ask the Senator from Georgia who wrote the letter he has just read?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Paul A. Porter, executive assistant to the Administrator. I think he signed the other letter to which the Senator from South Carolina referred.

Mr. BYRNES. That is true.

I wish to make a suggestion to the chairman of the subcommittee. I have not seen the letter from which the Senator from Georgia has read, and I do not know whether the Senator from Colorado has seen it; but, in view of the language read, I ask the Senator from Colorado if it might not be wise to accept the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. The House language, in the opinion of the House, was sufficient to authorize the payment of this money; but, if there is any doubt about it, certainly that doubt can be dispelled by ascertaining definitely from the Comptroller at once whether or not the amount is sufficient. If the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is adopted, the differences can be straightened out in conference with the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the amendment I have offered should be adopted, then there would be no question on earth that this fund would be available, without regard to the ultimate fate of the Bankhead Act.

Mr. ADAMS. With the understanding that the matter shall be gone over in order to reconcile the situation, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am authorized by the committee to offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 69, after line 13, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 7. That section 1 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, approved April 8, 1935, be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting at the end of the first proviso of the second paragraph thereof, a new proviso as follows: "*Provided further*, That the apportionment requirements of this paragraph shall not apply to loans or grants, or both, to States under limitation (g) of the first paragraph of this section, for public highways and related projects, including grade crossings."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the object of the amendment is to make clear the intent of Congress in the enactment of the legislation which it seeks to amend. The Senate will remember that in the original appropriation of $3,300,000,000, $400,000,000 was definitely earmarked for highways in a subsection of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933. It was specified in that act that the money appropriated by that subsection should be apportioned among the States according to their area, their population, and their mileage of post roads. When Congress subsequently made the appropriation of $4,000,000,000 in the Emergency Relief Act of 1935, we, in a measure, earmarked $800,000,000 for Federal-aid highways, placing a limitation of not more than that sum for public roads and related projects, but the act did not refer directly to the subsection that specified the $800,000,000. Therefore, the Comptroller General took the position that the only money which could be expended upon the Federal-aid system was money apportioned among the States. It is to correct that situation that I offer this amendment. A complete justification for it will be found in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on this deficiency bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I join with the Senator in the effort to have the amendment adopted in order to remedy the situation brought about by the rulings of the Comptroller General, a situation not contemplated by Congress when the bill was passed. I hope the amendment may be attached to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am going to offer an amendment to the bill. A provision similar to the amendment I offer was included in the bill at the last session, and I do not know that there is any objection to it. For some reason the provision is not now in the bill, but it was in the bill which was defeated as the result of a filibuster. I send the amendment to the desk and ask for its adoption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

PRINTING AND BINDING

For the printing of 1,000 additional copies of each of those numbers of Senate Document 92, Seventieth Congress, first session, which are out of print or the supply of which is about to be exhausted, $50,000; and for the purpose of printing 10,000 additional copies of No. 71-A of Senate Document 92, Seventieth Congress, first session, $2,800.

Mr. NORRIS. The documents referred to are reports made to the Congress by the Federal Trade Commission in connection with its investigation of the water-power question. They have been exhausted, and there is a great demand for them still coming in.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, that item was included in the deficiency bill at the last session?

Mr. NORRIS. It was in that bill, in the identical language, I think, in which I have now offered it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like the attention for a moment of the Senator from Colorado. Early in the present session I introduced a bill to provide for certain benefit payments to farmers who conformed to the A. A. A. Act which was held unconstitutional in the case of the United States against William M. Butler et al. The committee reported the bill favorably, and it is now on the calendar. A similar bill passed the House carrying a different sum than the one contained in the bill which I offered. I observe on page 20 of the pending bill a sum is appropriated which is probably sufficient to meet the situation; but is the language complete in itself without providing for an authorization bill, legislative in character? I ask that question of the Senator who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. ADAMS. All I can say is that was the understanding of the committee in including the item in the bill. It came from the House and was intended to cover that purpose.

Mr. McNARY. The bill that I proposed was general in character. But in line with a letter from Mr. Chester Davis, Agricultural Adjustment Administrator, I was going to propose an amendment as a substitute, but I understand the committee language will take care of certain unexpended balances, and the transfer of certain records. I do not care to pursue that course if the language is sufficiently general and specific in the appropriation bill. That is the reason I have propounded the question to the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. ADAMS. I will state to the Senator that I have stated my judgment about it; but I do not presume to have accurate knowledge concerning it, and I should not like to have the Senator rely on what is an understanding rather than the result of careful study.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question on that point?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would the Senator say that obligations incurred under the Jones-Costigan Sugar Control Act would be included within the language on page 20, to which he has just been referring?

Mr. ADAMS. Does the Senator see any ground of distinction between those payments and the others?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; not in principle, but in definitions there might be. I find that this refers to obligations incurred under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. ADAMS. The Jones-Costigan Act was an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So that the Senator's opinion is that obligations under the Jones-Costigan Act would be included in the general terms?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. By direction of the committee, I offer a further amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, line 15, after the figures "$350,000", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That this appropriation may be expended without the matching requirement by the States cooperating under the existing appropriations of Congress for vocational rehabilitation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado about an item appearing on page 11, dealing with grants to the States for old-age assistance. Our fiscal year begins July 1, and this language is unchanged from that which appeared in the bill that was under debate here when the last session closed. I wish to ask the Senator whether he thinks the money made available by the Congress to States for old-age assistance would be available to those States as of date of July 1, because many States which have State old-age-pension systems, such as my own State of Washington, are desirous of securing this Federal contribution. Both Senators from Washington, at any rate, are very much interested in ascertaining whether or not this money would be made available in a retroactive way to the States, including my own State, that have provided money to make old-age payments.

Mr. ADAMS. I think the answer is rather completely contained in the paragraph. We are dealing with the deficiency bill for the fiscal year which began July 1, 1935, and will end on July 1, 1936. This provision makes the appropriation for that fiscal year to be expended as authorized by the Social Security Act. So that whatever was authorized by the Social Security Act would be included within this appropriation, and, therefore, the only limitation would be the limitation in the Social Security Act.

Mr. BONE. Then, I take it, the Senator's view is that the States such as the State of Washington would have this money made available to them to take up, if possible, some of these back payments?

Mr. ADAMS. I think so, unless the Social Security Act in itself provides a limitation.

Mr. HAYDEN. On page 27, line 19, I move to strike out "$4,500" and insert "$9,000", which is the Budget estimate. I do not know why the House cut that item in half. I should like to have the amendment taken to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McADOO. I offer an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION

For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act providing for the participation of the United States in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936; authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes', approved March 7, 1935, to provide for participation in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1936, to authorize an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes", approved ———, and for each and every object authorized by said act, $75,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the California-Pacific International Exposition held in 1935 as contained in the act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes, to remain available until June 30, 1936.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, earlier in the day the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] had passed a bill relating to this matter. Whether the bill provides authorization for an appropriation I am not advised. Is the Senator familiar with the measure his colleague had passed this morning?

Mr. McADOO. I did not catch the Senator's question.

Mr. McNARY. Is the amendment now offered by the Senator the same as the bill passed earlier in the day on motion of the senior Senator from California?

Mr. McADOO. The senior Senator from California offered a bill, which was unanimously passed by the Senate, authorizing the appropriation that now I am trying to have included in the deficiency bill. A bill authorizing this appropriation has passed the House and has also passed the Senate. I merely want to add to the pending bill a $75,000 item.

Mr. McNARY. Then the bill passed on motion of the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] earlier in the day was an authorization of the amount now proposed to be appropriated by the junior Senator from California?

Mr. McADOO. Yes. This is merely effectuating the appropriation authorized by the bill to which the Senator refers, and which has passed the House previously and passed the Senate today.

Mr. McNARY. What is the amount involved?

Mr. McADOO. Seventy-five thousand dollars.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. McADOO. Certainly.

Mr. KING. My recollection is we made a very liberal appropriation sometime ago for the San Diego Exposition. Why is the Senator asking for additional appropriations?

Mr. McADOO. The original appropriation was to carry the exposition through to the closing date last year, but there has been an insistent demand that the exposition be carried on for another 6 months. The Government's exhibits and the necessary attendance and attention required for them constitute the reason why this additional appropriation is asked. It is all for educational purposes.

Mr. KING. Was not the enterprise self-supporting? Were not the receipts sufficient, as they were at Chicago, to pay all expenses?

Mr. McADOO. I cannot answer the Senator specifically on that point. The purpose is to assist in carrying forward the exposition for another 6 months. The Government has erected a very fine building there out of the $350,000 heretofore appropriated. This was done in accordance with the act of Congress. The amount which has been approved by both Houses is a very modest sum to enable us to continue the Government exhibits to the conclusion of the exposition.

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

Mr. McADOO. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMS. Earlier in the day the Senate unanimously passed a measure authorizing the appropriation. I understand this item is fully in accord with that bill.

Mr. McADOO. It is intended to be, and I believe it is.

Mr. ADAMS. If it is in accord with that bill, it would, of course, meet the approval of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McADOO. The amendment has that distinct object in view.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, lines 7, 8, and 9, to strike out the words, "attorneys of record for the contestant and the memorialists, to wit: Grant T. Hall, George H. Williams, and Thomas H. Barnett" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "attorney of record for the contestant, to wit: Grant T. Hall"; and in lines 12 and 13, to strike out "each; in all, $1,800", so as to make the paragraph read:

For payment to attorney of record for the contestant, to wit: Grant T. Hall, for services rendered and expenses incurred in the contested-election case resulting from the election of a United States Senator from West Virginia on November 6, 1934, fiscal year 1936, $600.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, Williams and Barnett came before the Senate committee representing neither Mr. Hatfield nor myself. They came claiming to be so-called friends of the court. Mr. Barnett presented a petition signed by 97 men whom he and Mr. Williams were supposed to represent. Seven of the men claim their names were forged on the petition, 2 of them are dead, and we could not find out about the other 88.

I am perfectly willing for Mr. Hall to be paid, because he did present Mr. Hatfield's petition legally and rightfully, but the other two men should not be paid because such a payment would create a precedent allowing any lawyer to come before the Senate committee and claim to represent a group of citizens or themselves, and ask to be paid by the Senate for their services. For that reason I am asking that the two names be stricken from the item.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks be authorized to correct the totals and renumber the sections where necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

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.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3780) to make further provision for the conservation and proper utilization of the soil resources of the Nation, being the bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] for the purposes indicated by its title.

I may state that the author of the bill is ill today and not able to be present. It is my thought that the bill may be made the unfinished business and that after an executive session a recess may then be taken until tomorrow when the bill may be proceeded with if the Senator from Alabama is able to be present. It may be desirable to lay aside the unfinished business and take up another appropriation bill in the meantime.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3780) to make further provision for the conservation and proper utilization of the soil resources of the Nation, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

LIMITATION OF POWER OF SUPREME COURT TO DECLARE LAWS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly in behalf of a bill which I am about to introduce.

Mr. President, May 29, 1787, Edmund Randolph laid before the Constitutional Convention a resolution giving the Supreme Court power to pass upon acts of Congress. The power proposed to be granted was the exercise of a suspensive veto by a committee of the Court, and Congress could override the veto by a vote to be determined by the Convention. The Convention rejected the proposal by a vote of 8 to 3 after full debate, believing it "quite foreign from the nature of offices of judges to make them judges of the policy of public measures." I suspect that the Constitutional Convention prophetically anticipated that an inordinately powerful judiciary would some day make the general welfare of the Union subservient to the palsied hand of out-worn tradition and to the letter which killeth.

In the case of the United States of America against Hoosac Mills Corporation, the Supreme Court interpreted the letter of the Constitution as an unyielding bar to any control of agricultural production by the Government of the United States. The majority said:

> From the accepted doctrine that the United States is a Government of delegated powers, it follows that those not expressly granted, or reasonably to be implied from such as are conferred, are reserved to the States or to the people. * * * The same proposition, otherwise stated, is that powers not granted are prohibited. None to regulate agricultural production is given, and therefore legislation by Congress for that purpose is forbidden.

Mr. President, since the United States ceased to have frontiers, since the phrase "Westward Ho" was dropped from our vocabulary, the agricultural industry, representing some 31,000,000 people, has pleaded for legislation which would give to those who produce our food and raiment the same advantages in production and marketing as are enjoyed by their industrial brethren. The Agricultural Adjustment Act gave them those privileges, and they have now been taken away.

The basic truth of Adam Smith's theories of supply and demand has in no wise been weakened; and it is inconceivable to me that agricultural prices can be improved unless through the coordination of tangible supply with effective demand.

In his eighth annual message to Congress, President George Washington had this to say of agriculture:

> It will not be doubted, that, with reference either to individual or national welfare, agriculture is of primary importance. In proportion as nations advance in population and other circumstances of maturity, this truth becomes more apparent, and renders the cultivation of the soil more and more an object of public patronage. Institutions for promoting it grow up, supported by the public purse; and to what object can it be dedicated with greater propriety? Among the means, which have been employed to this end, none have been attended with greater success than the establishment of boards, composed of proper characters, charged with collecting and diffusing information, and enabled by premiums, and small pecuniary aids, to encourage and assist a spirit of discovery and improvement. This species of establishment contributes doubly to the increase of improvement, by stimulating to enterprise and experiment, and by drawing to a common center the results everywhere of individual skill and observation, and spreading them thence over the whole Nation. Experience accordingly has shown, that they are very cheap instruments of immense national benefits.

Nevertheless, the Supreme Court has placed agricultural production beyond the will of Congress. Nature has placed it beyond the power of States. It seems, therefore, appropriate to go to the root of the problem, the judiciary, for a solution.

There are those who would place the halo of sanctity on the pronouncements of the Supreme Court as expositions of basic, fundamental, and eternal truths. If there existed a metaphysical body of eternal law from which decisions could be drawn, I should not for a moment question the decision. The dissent of three able jurists, however, indicates either that no such body of law exists or that our judiciary is not uniformly endowed with psychic power.

I do not for a moment lack in respect for judicial authority, and my knowledge would suffer in comparison with that of the Justices. I am impelled to speak, however, by a statement by Thomas Jefferson in 1820:

> You seem—

Jefferson said—

> to consider the Judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions—a very dangerous doctrine, indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. Our Judges are as honest as other men, and not more so. They have, with others, the same passions for party, for power, and the privilege of their corps. Their maxim is, "Boni judicis est ampliare jurisdictionem"; and their power is the more dangerous as they are in office for life, and not responsible, as the other functionaries are, to the elective control. The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal, knowing that, to whatever hands confided, with the corruption of time and party, its members would become despots. It has more wisely made all the departments coequal and cosovereign within themselves.

Lest my motives be questioned on the ground of party passion, permit me to recall Abraham Lincoln's comment on another famous case, the Dred Scott decision:

> Judicial decisions are of greater or less authority as precedents according to circumstances. That this should be so accords both with common sense and the customary understanding of the legal profession.
>
> If this important decision had been made by the unanimous concurrence of the Judges, and without any apparent partisan bias,

and in accordance with legal public expectation, and with the steady practice of the departments throughout our history, and had been in no part based on assumed historical facts which are not really true; or, if wanting in some of these, it had been before the Court more than once, and had there been affirmed and reaffirmed through a course of years, it then might be, perhaps, would be, factious, nay even revolutionary, not to acquiesce in it as a precedent.

But when, as is true, we find it wanting in all these claims to the public confidence, it is not resistance, it is not factious, it is not even disrespectful, to treat it as not having yet quite established a settled doctrine for the country.

I do not regard a decision apparently barring all governmental assistance to agriculture as the settled doctrine of the country. Neither do I desire to place this Nation under the absolute rule of nine men, however wise, where rules are grounded in nothing more firm than majority opinion. The people of the United States demanded in overwhelming majority just such an agricultural program as was given them. Two years later they approved it, in my opinion, by an even greater majority.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. POPE. I do.

Mr. HATCH. Not having had the benefit of the Senator's entire remarks, I desire to ask him a question. He has just stated that he did not regard as sound the decision which barred all aid and assistance to agriculture, or words to that effect. Does the Senator from Idaho regard the recent decision as barring all aid and assistance to agriculture by Congress?

Mr. POPE. If one follows the strict language of the Supreme Court which I have already quoted, I think he must come to that conclusion. I will say, however, that certain other language was used by the Court indicating that perhaps a distinction would be made in case of grants upon conditions.

Mr. HATCH. It is not the Senator's opinion, then, that all avenues of aid to agriculture are closed by the decision?

Mr. POPE. I expect later to say something with reference to the bill which is now the unfinished business of the Senate. I shall then point out that I believe there is good reason to think the Supreme Court would not follow the strict language which I think is the heart of its decision, and which I have already quoted, but might make a distinction which would permit the pending bill to be held constitutional.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. POPE. I do.

Mr. KING. I regret to interrupt the Senator, and would not do so had not my friend from New Mexico set the example.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield just a moment, the Senator from New Mexico does not wish to be charged with setting the example of interrupting Senators.

Mr. KING. It was a good example in this instance.

The Senator from Idaho referred to Abraham Lincoln's condemnation of the Dred Scott decision.

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator must confess that even Presidents may sometimes permit their views, partisan or nonpartisan, to lead them into criticisms that may not be vindicated. I think time has vindicated the decision of Chief Justice Taney. Everybody, I think, who is familiar with constitutional law, concedes that Chief Justice Taney gave a proper interpretation of the Constitution of the United States in that case.

The Senator also referred to the statement by Thomas Jefferson. I do not know anyone who more greatly reveres Thomas Jefferson than myself; and yet Thomas Jefferson upon occasions made statements quite at variance with the one to which the Senator has referred. The Senator will recall that for many years Mr. Jefferson violently criticized Chief Justice Marshall, and we all know that between those two great men there was a very bitter feeling. Mr. Jefferson, with all his statesmanship, his love of liberty, and his announcement of the principles which find expression in the Declaration of Independence, was not always right in his appraisement of judicial questions; and, as stated, upon occasions he made statements at variance with the one to which the Senator referred.

Mr. POPE. I will say to the Senator I have no doubt that Presidents are human, as Justices of the Supreme Court are human; but I submit this language of these two eminent statesmen as being very well reasoned and applicable to the present situation.

Fundamentally, sovereignty is vested in the people of a democracy. I hope such an investiture shall be made a living force in our national affairs rather than a tradition to which lip service occasionally is paid. The House of Representatives, the Senate, and the President are authorized representatives of the American people, and are held responsible to them. It is incongruous, inappropriate, and out of accord with the spirit of our Constitution that their enactments shall be swept aside on the basis of a majority judicial opinion.

The Constitution itself has given Congress power to deal with this situation, and the Supreme Court recognized the congressional prerogative. In the case of *Ex Parte McCardle* (74 U. S. 513), Chief Justice Chase said:

It is quite true * * * that the appellate jurisdiction of this Court is not derived from acts of Congress. It is, strictly speaking, conferred by the Constitution. But it is conferred "with such exceptions and under such regulations as Congress shall make."

The advances of time and the battles of party have gradually undermined procedural democracy. The people of my State, in my opinion, demand a change, and I endeavor to voice their wishes.

I send to the desk a bill which I introduce, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3912) to amend the Judicial Code was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 215 of the Judicial Code (sec. 321, title 28, U. S. C., 1934 ed.) is hereby amended by adding the following:

"In cases arising under the Constitution or involving the constitutionality of an act of Congress, the concurrence of more than two-thirds of the Justices present shall be required to hold unconstitutional any law enacted by Congress."

PROPOSED REPEAL OF CERTAIN ACTS OF CONGRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

To the Congress:

I recomend to the Congress the prompt repeal of the act of April 21, 1934, as amended, known as the "Bankhead Cotton Act"; of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended, known as the "Kerr-Smith Tobacco Act"; and of title II of the act of August 24, 1935, known as the "Potato Act of 1935." This recommendation is made because of the termination of the programs of agricultural production adjustment under the act of May 12, 1933, as amended, known as the "Agricultural Adjustment Act", to which the three acts mentioned were auxiliary.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1936.*

REPORT OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RAILROADS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Assistant Director General of Railroads for the calendar year 1935.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1936.*

(NOTE.—Report accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.)

CLAIM OF HOMER BRETT, ESQ.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I enclose herewith a report which the Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to a claim of Homer Brett, Esq., American consul at Rotterdam, Netherlands, for the sum of $116.58, such sum representing the unrecovered amount stolen when, on the night of September 27, 1935, burglars entered the consulate with a false key to the front door and with a powerful tool cut open the back of the safe and abstracted therefrom the iron cash box containing such money.

In view of the fact that the funds were in a locked iron cash box enclosed in a safe provided by the Government, it is apparent that no negligence can properly be imputed to Consul Brett, and, since he made good the loss so occasioned, I recommend that an appropriation in the amount suggested by the Secretary of State be authorized in order to relieve this officer of the Government of the burden such loss has occasioned.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1936.*

(Enclosures: Report of Secretary of State, with enclosures.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ASHURST (for Mr. DIETERICH), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the following nominations:

Robert P. Butler, of Connecticut, to be United States attorney, district of Connecticut; and

Mell G. Underwood, of Ohio, to be United States district judge, southern district of Ohio, vice Benson W. Hough, deceased.

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Bernard Fitch, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut.

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

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the nomination of Maj. Gen. Dudley Jackson Hard, Ohio National Guard, to be major general, National Guard of the United States.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the following nominations:

Brig. Gen. Henry Gibbins, assistant to the Quartermaster General, to be Quartermaster General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, with rank from April 1, 1936, vice Maj. Gen. Louis H. Bash, Quartermaster General, to be retired March 31, 1936;

Col. Frederick Wegener Boschen, Finance Department, to be Chief of Finance, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, with rank from April 23, 1936, vice Maj. Gen. Frederick W. Coleman, Chief of Finance, whose term of office expires April 22, 1936; and

Col. Augustus Bennett Warfield, Quartermaster Corps, to be assistant to the Quartermaster General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Brig. Gen. Henry Gibbins, assistant to the Quartermaster General, nominated for appointment as Quartermaster General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reports will be placed on the calendar.

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

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the name of Gustav Peck, of New York, to be a member of the Prisons Industries Reorganization Board.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, on Friday I asked that this nomination and the next one go over. I am very happy to recommend now that the nominations be confirmed. These appointees are splendid men, and I think their nominations should be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination just read is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James P. Davis, of New York, to be a member of the Prisons' Industries Reorganization Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

EUGENE C. JONES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene C. Jones to be postmaster at North, S. C.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at the request of one of the Senators from South Carolina I ask that this nomination go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cornelius Van H. Engert, of California, to act as Minister Resident and consul general of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Earle Russell, of Michigan, to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry S. Villard, of New York, to be secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I understand that Mr. Villard, who is accredited to New York, is a career man, and therefore I shall not interpose objection. I say this because whenever an appointment of a man from New York comes before us I take rather seriously my constitutional obligation that the appointment must be in line with the advice of the Senate, and I take it that as to the appointment of men who come from the State of New York my colleague and I must in some way convey to the Senate our wishes and desires regarding the appointment, because we are theoretically better informed to pass upon them than are other Senators. Having made that statement, I wish to say that, Mr. Villard being a career man, I have no objection to the confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before that request is granted, I should like to see a list of the nominees.

Mr. McKELLAR. There are three from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask that the nomination of the postmaster at Cody, Nebr., be not included in the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I omit that nomination and ask that the others be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask that the appointment of the postmaster at Cody, Nebr., go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination for postmaster at Cody, Nebr., will be passed over, and, without objection, all the other nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

RECESS

The Senate resumed legislative session.

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 4, 1936, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3 (legislative day of Jan. 16), 1936

RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be regional directors of the Resettlement Administration:

Robert W. Hudgens, of South Carolina, vice Philip Weltner.

Lillo H. Hauter, of New Mexico.

Jonathan Garst, of California.

CENTRAL STATISTICAL BOARD

Stuart A. Rice, of Pennsylvania, to be Chairman of the Central Statistical Board.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Matthew T. Abruzzo, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, under authority granted by Public, No. 385, an act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, approved August 28, 1935.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Benigno Fernandez Garcia, of Puerto Rico, to be attorney general of Puerto Rico. (Mr. Garcia is now serving under a recess appointment.)

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be first lieutenant with rank from date of appointment

First Lt. Oscar Samuel Reeder, Medical Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Maj. Joseph William George Stephens, Infantry, with rank from March 22, 1928.

Capt. John Orn Roady, Infantry, with rank from January 22, 1929.

Capt. William Edward Smith, Infantry, with rank from January 11, 1933.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

First Lt. Cyrus Lawrence Peterson, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 1, 1935.

Second Lt. Charles Warren Schnabel, Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1934.

TO CAVALRY

Maj. Edwin Eugene Schwien, Infantry, with rank from March 9, 1929.

TO COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Second Lt. Charles John Bondley, Jr., Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1934, effective June 12, 1936.

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. Andrew Mark Wright, Jr., Signal Corps, with rank from August 1, 1935.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3 (legislative day of Jan. 16), 1936

PRISONS INDUSTRIES REORGANIZATION BOARD

Gustav Peck to be a member of the Prisons Industries Reorganization Board.

James P. Davis to be a member of the Prisons Industries Reorganization Board.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Cornelius Van H. Engert to act as minister resident and consul general of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

E. Earle Russell to be a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

Henry S. Villard to be a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Lloyd W. Failing, Craig.

Mae L. Sharpe, Gilman.

Ira O. Martin, Keenesburg.

MISSOURI

William H. Kendrick, La Belle.

MONTANA

Stephen Nuerenberg, Missoula.

NEBRASKA

Henry C. Paquin, Dakota City.

Edna M. Miner, Ericson.

NEW YORK

Francis D. Lynch, Stony Point.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mary M. Held, Beulah.

Janette O. Gray, Wilton.

RHODE ISLAND

Edgar J. Peloquin, Manville.

UTAH

William L. Sargent, Coalville.

VERMONT

James J. Ransehousen, Bridgewater.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 3 (legislative day of Jan. 16), 1936

POSTMASTER

NORTH DAKOTA

Florence M. Law to be postmaster at Halliday, in the State of North Dakota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Edward Sandrow, of the Ahavai Sholom Congregation, Portland, Oreg., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of all men regardless of race, color, or creed, we invoke Thy blessing upon this assemblage of American leaders, the Representatives of the masses of people of our beloved country. Inspire, we pray Thee, these men and women to the realization that in spite of economic turbulence, in spite of national and international uncertainty, America, if it has faith in its past, if it clings to those lofty principles of liberty, tolerance, and democracy upon which this Nation was founded; if it stands united, wholeheartedly firm and cooperative, as did the fathers of this Nation when they laid down their lives for political liberty and freedom of conscience; if it has hope, if it has

an unflinching divine hope in its future, then all the difficulties, all those depressing moments through which our country has gone in the last few years will vanish from the heart and from the soul of the American people. Give these men and women of the Congress, O Eternal, the strength of character and the sturdiness of will to keep from our free shores the spirit of religious prejudice, of racial animosity, of ill-will and misunderstanding so common in other parts of the world but so alien to America. Make them continue to appreciate America, to admire its hills and its valleys, to love its songs and the beauty of its spirit—not with arrogant chauvinism but with humility and respect—so that all people of this Nation may climb from this time and forever to greater spiritual heights and physical achievement, so that these United States may always be the home of the free, the towering edifice of all that is noble in life, and the people of this country may achieve the happiness and the security which so concerns this Congress. May this be Thy will, O God, and let us say, Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 31, 1936, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

THE MARINE BAND

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at the direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs I present a privileged report on House Resolution 407, which I send to the desk and ask to have read. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, the report, and the letter of The Assistant Secretary of the Navy be read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 407

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the House of Representatives forthwith by whose direction, order, or command, and upon what or whose authority the United States Marine Band canceled its engagement to render a musical program at the meeting of the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense held at the Mayflower Hotel in the city of Washington, January 28, 1936, and to furnish the House of Representatives with a copy of such direction, order, or command.

ADVERSE REPORT (TO ACCOMPANY H. RES. 407)

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 407) that the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the House of Representatives by whose direction, order, or command the United States Marine Band canceled its engagement to render a musical program at the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense held at the Mayflower Hotel in the city of Washington, January 28, 1936, and to furnish the House of Representatives with a copy of such direction, order, or command, having had the same under consideration, report it back to the House and recommend that the resolution do not pass.

The action of the committee is based upon the following letter to the chairman of the committee from the Secretary of the Navy:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 1, 1936.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of January 30, 1936, with which you transmit House Resolution 407, and request the views and recommendations of the Navy Department.

The subject resolution directs the Secretary of the Navy to inform the House of Representatives by whose direction, order, or command the United States Marine Band canceled its engagement to render a musical program at the meeting of the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington on January 28, 1936, and to furnish a copy of such direction, order, or command.

A section of the United States Marine Band canceled its engagement to play at a banquet given by the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense on Tuesday evening January 28, 1936, by direction of The Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who transmitted his directive to the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Little, who further transmitted this order to the leader of the Marine Band, Capt. Taylor Branson, through the commanding officer of the Marine Barracks, Washington, D. C.

All orders were transmitted verbally, and there is no record of any written direction, order, or command.

The above is the full information desired by the resolution, and in order that it may be fully understood the following is submitted: On December 10, 1935, the Navy Department granted the request of Mrs. Mary Logan Tucker for a section of the Marine Band to furnish music at the banquet of the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense to be given on January 28, 1936.

This was done in accordance with the established policy of long standing, by which the band is permitted to play to patriotic gatherings of national import.

On the opening day of the conference, Monday, January 27, 1936, the leading address was made, which was political in character, and on account of the political color given to the conference by this speech it appeared improper that the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps should participate under orders or official sanction. Accordingly the above directive was issued.

There is no objection on the part of the Navy Department to the enactment of the subject resolution.

Sincerely yours,

H. L. ROOSEVELT,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the information has been furnished to the House, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM, AND DEMOCRACY

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal about socialism, communism, and democracy. William Randolph Hearst has found that America has gone communistic and Al Smith thinks that we are nearly there. In the speeches and writings, most of the charges made relative to socialism and communism in the United States have been coupled up with charges against the President of the United States and the New Deal as being an instrument of socialism and communism. In view of these charges, it seems about time we should take a look at the record.

In 1933, on March 4, when President Roosevelt took office, the banks of the United States were bankrupt. Seven thousand banks had closed their doors within a period of 2 years. The President found himself in a position of allowing the banks to continue closing their doors and allowing the depositors to lose their money by the closing, or by closing down the entire banking structure and, with Government assistance, put them in order. This latter action he took. After the Government had investigated the banks, taken their collateral and put them on their feet, he returned them to the private owners. Is this socialism?

The railroads were unable to meet payments of interest on bonds and other indebtedness. Through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation hundreds of millions were loaned to the railroads that they might continue their operations under private ownership. Is this socialism? The insurance companies and savings and loan associations throughout the United States were in a position where under no circumstance could they be liquid. The President of the United States organized the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the farm-loan banks, took up their collateral and mortgages that they held upon homes and farms, many of which were far greater than the value of the properties on which the Government took mortgages. In this manner the insurance companies and savings and loan associations became liquid institutions and were retained not by the Government but by the private ownership that existed prior to the enactment of these laws. Is this socialism?

The heavy industries of the Nation were unable to pay dividends upon their stocks or bonds and were unable to maintain employment or keep the industries operating for the lack of business. The building industry had dropped to approximately 16 percent of the 1926 level. All of these industries were strictly up against it and crying for Government interference. Our President and Congress, at the urgent request of the National Chamber of Commerce, created the N. R. A. and the A. A. A. The N. R. A. allowed them to set their prices and practically nullify the antitrust laws, so that they might receive greater profits. He added to this the Public Works Administration and the spending of billions of dollars, most of which went into the purchase of the

goods produced by the heavy industries. These industries are still in the hands of private owners and not bankrupt only because of this help of our President and the Congress. Is this socialism?

Seven million farmers of the United States, the producers of the most valuable commodities for the good of mankind, were in poverty and despair. Millions of acres of land had been foreclosed upon by the insurance companies. Many more were on the verge of bankruptcy. Our President and Congress instituted the A. A. A., an act subsidizing the farmers and raising the price levels of the farmers' goods by bringing about a restricted crop production program, this to insure profits to the farmers and to maintain the private ownership of farms and farm goods, even though 20,000,000 people were on relief and in need of the things which were destroyed—or, rather, not produced—under this program. Is this socialism?

The public power program of the President has been often referred to as one of his most socialistic attempts. Hundreds of cities and towns in the United States today own and operate power and light systems. More and more of them are going into the business of public ownership and operation of power and light each year. This program has been instituted by officials of cities and towns throughout the United States over a period of years, and the President is only following the lead of other officials in recognizing the right of the public ownership of power, light, and water.

The charges made by Al Smith in his speech in Washington a few days ago that the Democratic Party and the New Deal had taken over the Socialist Party platform substantiate the statement of Al Smith that he never reads anything. Somebody must have told him that the New Deal had accepted the Socialist Party platform. Had he read it, he would have found that there was no comparison whatever between the New Deal and Socialist platform.

Now, let us compare the Socialist platform of 1932 with the Democratic platform of 1932, then with the enactments since March 4, 1933. What do we find. The Socialist platform of 1932 advocated the socialization of mines, forests, oil, power, transportation, and all basic industries. These resources and industries are still in the hands of private owners.

The Socialist platform demanded Government ownership and operation of the credit currency system. The banks are still in private hands.

The Socialist platform demanded the immediate expenditure of $5,000,000,000 for public works, especially for rehousing. This administration has done very little in the rehousing program.

The Socialist platform demanded the 6-hour day and the 5-day week, without wage reductions. The Black bill is still in the hands of a committee of the House.

The Socialist platform demanded drastic reduction of armaments. This administration is spending a billion dollars or more a year on armaments.

The Socialist platform demanded that the Government put the unemployed to work producing their own homes, fuel, food, and clothing on a basis of production for use. The F. E. R. A. timidly started such a program and stopped it shortly thereafter.

There are several other planks of the Socialist Party in which the New Deal has in no way taken any part. This is definite proof that these reactionary hirelings of the Liberty League not only are telling nontruths, but have no understanding of the things about which they talk.

Going through Al Smith's speech and reading Mr. William Randolph Hearst's newspapers, we find only two things that either one has ever suggested to bring about a decent economic and social order from the position of chaos in which we find ourselves. Communism in this country amounts to simply nothing. The Communist Party itself admits a membership of less than 30,000. So, the only thing in their opinion then to bring about the necessary recovery to the American people must be the balancing of the Budget.

I don't know but what it might be a very good idea if we did attempt to balance the Budget for these gentlemen. Perhaps they would want to do it in a different manner from what we might suggest. First of all, in balancing the Budget we should call in all Government bonds, issue currency against them, and stop the interest of approximately one billion dollars a year. This would be a step toward the balancing of the Budget.

The best step would be to call in all the loans due the Government by 6,000 banks, sell back to the banks $1,000,000,000 in preferred stock, which the Government now holds; demand immediate payment in full of the debt of over four hundred million owing the United States Government by the railroads of this Nation; demand that the mortgage companies repay the $131,000,000 they owe the Government; $8,000,000 to be repaid immediately by the building-and-loan associations; $11,000,000 owing this Government by insurance companies; sell back to the insurance companies their $31,000,000 worth of preferred stock which the Government now holds. By recalling these loans the Government would realize over $2,000,000,000. Stop the C. C. C.'s and return to the streets of America 550,000 youths; stop the public-works projects, especially those in which 60 percent of the funds expended are expended in the purchase of materials from the heavy industries; stop the Federal Government emergency relief program and throw 22,000,000 American people onto the streets without homes, food, or clothing. Reduce the expenditure of the armed forces of the United States to $25,000,000 a year, saving the Government of the United States approximately $975,000,000 each year.

If this were done tomorrow these gentlemen who are now formed into the united front of reaction, opposing the President of the United States would within 30 days again be on their knees before the Treasury of the United States begging for assistance, providing the pauperized and destitute people would allow themselves to be starved for 30 days.

Those people, whom President Roosevelt has tried to save—this system which President Roosevelt has and is trying to patch up and save—has in it, in my opinion, the greatest number of backbiters ever known in political history. They should be reminded of a song popular during the World War known as "Don't Bite the Hand That's Feeding You."

The American Liberty League, the Manufacturers' Association, the American Bankers' Association, the Economy League, and those reactionary Democratic puppets of the wealthy, with William Randolph Hearst as their newspaper spokesman, will find that every attack made upon the President of the United States in charging him with communism and socialism will only strengthen him and weaken them. In my State the people have felt that the President has not gone far enough to the left; that he had lost some ground in that State, I believe to be true, but at the present time with the present line-up, with these forces of reaction opposed to the President, I am absolutely positive that he will carry the State of Washington in 1936.

For myself, I hope these attacks will continue, for if they do, in 1936 the line of demarcation between the candidates sponsored by these "gentlemen" and "gentlemen's" organizations and the candidacy of President Roosevelt, be so definite that on the side of this group we will have a pronounced program of reaction. Our President will then have a platform drawn by the Democratic Party, a platform of liberalization that we may fight the battle out on that ground.

They will be doing a favor to the Democratic Party by compelling the reactionary Democrats to take a "walk" right into the party of special interests and privileges, the Republican Party, and at the same time give a real inducement to the progressive and forward-looking of the Republican Party to "walk" out and join the revised party of the people, the Democratic Party of 1936. Incidentally, they are rendering a real service to our President, who asked the reactionary Democrats to leave the Democratic Party and join the Republican Party and for all the progressives of the Republican Party and other parties to join the

Democratic Party. This was in his speech accepting his nomination in 1932.

Of all the newspapers in the United States that should be chosen to represent the policies of this reactionary group—the united front of reaction—William Randolph Hearst certainly should have been their choice, because of the fact that this gentleman, through his newpapers, will print anything, regardless of the truth.

As an example of this, in a recent article printed in the Washington Herald (Thursday, Jan. 30, 1936) I was quoted as having said:

ZIONCHECK "DISGUSTED"

Democratic Senators, of course, praised it. Republican Members remained silent, watching the widening rift between New Deal and Constitutional Democrats. Some of the comment:

Representative ZIONCHECK (D.), of Washington:

"I was disgusted with his apologies about the Roosevelt administration. We who believe in true socialism don't want Roosevelt ranked with us."

This statement I did not make and would not make.

In the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, a Hearst newspaper, an article was published on the vote of overriding the President's veto on the bonus. The article was headlined "All Washington Senators and Congressmen Voted for the Bonus, Except ZIONCHECK." This is a distortion of the facts, because I did vote for the bonus every time it has come before the Congress of the United States. I have twice signed a petition to take it away from the committees. I only state this to show how Mr. Hearst and his newspapers will put into print those things so that they may cause prejudice against the people to whom he is opposed.

Before closing, I may say that I believe in the last few weeks these attacks by these reactionary groups upon the President of the United States and Congress with the assistance of William Randolph Hearst, have assured the reelection of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor considering the Ellenbogen bill, the textile bill, be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House during this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISNEY OIL IMPORT BILL—H. R. 10483—DIRECTLY AFFECTS KANSAS AS WELL AS THE INDUSTRIAL STATES

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, Kansas will profit by millions of dollars if Congress passes the bill proposed by Congressman DISNEY, of Oklahoma, whose intent is to open to the domestic petroleum industry some of the most valuable markets in this country which are now held by the foreign branch of that industry.

Kansas last year received over $50,000,000 for the crude oil produced in the State. In addition to this is the amount paid to farmers for leases and royalties, making petroleum one of the most important crops on Kansas farms. These receipts by Kansans will be greatly increased if the importers of cheap foreign oil are compelled to pay a proper excise tax, and if the amount of this oil which enters into such direct competition with the domestic product were limited to some definite proportion of the national consumptive demand as is done in the new Disney oil import bill.

The oil industry is the second largest in Kansas, according to data compiled by Charles W. Steiger, attorney for the State corporation commission. Agriculture alone surpasses the oil industry in its annual contribution to the wealth of the State. There are over 100 recognized pools in 35 counties in Kansas. Nearly 20 new pools were discovered last year in areas which had not previously been productive. Old wells which were yielding small quantities of petroleum have recently been deepened to a new and lower sand and suggests the possibility of discovery of large production beneath the present depths of other old fields. So many important oil discoveries were made during the past year in Kansas that newspapers have commented upon these as ceasing to be sensational news. The increase in wildcatting and field development suggests that this State may expect to see its petroleum industry make enormous contributions to the future prosperity of the State.

If foreign oil is permitted to control our domestic markets, the development of the petroleum industry in this State cannot advance. There would be no point in drilling deeper wells or opening new fields and pools unless there is a market for the petroleum and the petroleum products produced.

The biggest single crop, with the possible exception of wheat, that Kansas farms can produce is oil. The only steady and reliable source of income which many Kansas farmers possess has been the money for oil leases and for oil royalties. These have paid the taxes and furnished ready cash on countless numbers of Kansas farms. Many of these leases have not been developed. The untapped oil resources of the State will become reservoirs of wealth when the petroleum industry in Kansas can have what it has never possessed in the past, assurance that the market for its oil products will not be ruined by imported oil and that the Kansas oil industry will not be forced to sell this valuable product at less than its value because of the competition offered by the cheap imported product.

Kansas relies, to a large degree, upon the public revenue received from the various State taxes levied upon the petroleum industry. None of these taxes apply to the products of the foreign oil with the single exception of the sales tax paid by the consumer at the filling stations. Even more than the State, however, the business interests of Kansas are dependent upon the millions of dollars received from the production of crude oil and from the sale of the refined products of that oil.

As the millions of barrels of Kansas oil are shipped from this State into another State, millions of dollars worth of products are brought back into Kansas from the industrial States of the Union. Our purchasing power is derived from the oil industry more than from any other source with the sole exception of agriculture.

We can increase our purchasing power only as our markets are increased. If foreign petroleum is permitted to take the markets which might otherwise be supplied by domestic oil, including that from Kansas, then our industry and our employment are decreased by just that amount. On the other hand, if we place upon the importation of foreign oil the same character of restrictions which we in Kansas are placing upon the production of our own petroleum, and thus stabilize the markets and balance supply with demand, then the oil industry in Kansas will have a larger opportunity, the people of Kansas will have a greater consuming power, and a strong stimulus will be given to the general recovery program throughout the Nation. Kansas, therefore, considers this Disney bill as one of the most important measures pending before Congress which so directly affects the well-being of the entire State.

As the domestic market for Kansas oil is enlarged, the market in Kansas for the goods of the industrial States is also enlarged, and the prosperity of Kansas increases the prosperity of the whole Nation.

HEALTH OF QUEENS COUNTY, NEW YORK STATE

Mr. MERRITT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think it is about time that we cast aside partisanship and proceed to think about our health. In that respect I call the attention of the House to the fact that the county in which I reside, Queens County, in the State of New York, was again adjudged the healthiest county in the United States, the second year in succession.

The United States Public Health Service has announced that New York's Queens County, the borough of homes and apartment houses, had the lowest death rate in the Nation.

In 1935 the death rate was 6.4 per 1,000 estimated population; the rate is even better than in 1934, when Queens County had the same distinction of being the healthiest place in the United States, when it was 6.5 per 1,000 estimated population.

Doctors pointed out that my county had all the requirements for good health, such as sanitation, garbage disposal, milk inspection, numerous hospitals, and a great many eminent physicians.

I recommend to those seeking a long healthful life a residence within the confines of this great and fastest growing county, the garden spot of the Nation, Queens County, N. Y.

WORK ON WORK-RELIEF PROJECTS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, just how much longer is the Congress of the United States going to stand for an un-American, inexcusable, intolerable situation? I refer to the ruling of Harry Hopkins, Works Progress Administrator, that no man may be given work by the Government who was not on relief November 1, 1935. That ruling is ridiculous. That ruling is inexcusable. That ruling is un-American. It is intolerable. And this Congress should change it.

Many Americans, Mr. Speaker, through no fault of their own, were compelled to accept relief from the Government. For them every American had deep sympathy and understanding.

But at the same time there were thousands of splendid Americans everywhere in dire distress, who in order to keep off of relief, sacrificed and stinted and denied themselves and even starved. They and their wives and children wore shabby clothes. They denied themselves the ordinary pleasures of life. They ate cheap food and not enough of that. They even went hungry. They kept off of relief, but now they have their backs to the wall, and must have work. And when they ask for work, they are denied it because Harry Hopkins says their Government cannot give them work unless they were on relief November 1, 1935. Is Harry Hopkins running this Government? Is he bigger than this Congress? Is he supreme?

When this Congress appropriated $4,800,000,000 and gave it to the President to provide work for the unemployed, not one of the 435 Members of this House ever dreamed that a cruel, unjust, inexcusable discrimination would be made against worthy, deserving Americans. Every Member here thought that all needy Americans would be treated alike. We never dreamed of injustice. We never dreamed that proud, worthy Americans would be penalized because they had sacrificed everything to avoid accepting support from their Government. If Congress had known that Harry Hopkins would make unjust discriminations, it would never have furnished this stupendous sum of money.

Our worthy needy constituents not on relief are just as important to us, and are just as much entitled to be employed on this Government work, as are those who have been on relief. There should be no distinction. This Congress should direct Harry Hopkins to stop penalizing them unjustly.

I realize full well that after Congress appropriates the money the President then administers it through Harry Hopkins and his other agents, whom the President himself selects, and to keep the matter out of politics the President handles the matters of relief and public works through county officials, and that Congressmen have nothing whatever to do with such administration. But when Harry Hopkins and the county officials are showing unfair discrimination, and our worthy constituents are not all treated justly and alike, this Congress should stop it, and force fair and just treatment to all alike. I insist that this Congress should order Harry Hopkins to immediately rescind this intolerable ruling. It is outrageous. [Applause.]

I have protested and protested. Now, we are providing for a manufacturers' census. Thousands of employees are to be given jobs all over the United States. I have numerous requests from good men and women who are deserving, who are honest, who are worthy, who need them and want these jobs. Yet Mr. Hopkins sits down here in his office in Washington and says that no person shall be employed to take that census unless he has been on the dole.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent also to incorporate a statement made by my colleague, Mr. MARTIN DIES, appearing in yesterday's press.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, much of the distress now suffered by our unemployed American citizens is due to the fact that there are millions of aliens from foreign countries within our borders holding American jobs that only American citizens should hold. For years I have been fighting for proper restriction laws to have them registered, to keep them out, and to deport all aliens. The United States is the only country in the world that will allow aliens to be employed when its own citizens are without jobs and cannot get work.

The article I referred to, so ably written by my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES], expresses the sentiments I have many times expressed from this floor, and I am glad to have consent to now quote it, to wit:

[From the Washington Herald of Feb. 2, 1936]

SIX MILLION ALIENS THRIVE IN NATION AT EXPENSE OF UNITED STATES JOBLESS, SAYS DIES—NONCITIZENS SEND 100 MILLION DOLLARS YEARLY TO HOMELANDS, CONGRESSMAN CHARGES, URGING DEPORTATION

By MARTIN DIES, Congressman from Texas

Eight million employable Americans now are out of work. Meanwhile there are 8,000,000 aliens in the United States. As a people we are supporting—in jobs or on the dole—8,000,000 foreign citizens, while furnishing relief to a like number of our own citizens and their dependents.

Of this gigantic alien population—meaning foreigners resident here, who are not citizens—it is estimated that approximately three and one-half million are in this country illegally.

Of our 8,000,000 alien residents, it is estimated further, one and a half million are on relief.

We pay out $50,000,000 a year to provide medical attention alone for these aliens on relief. We pay $25,000,000 annually to educate their children.

As a whole, these 1,500,000 aliens actually on relief are costing our Government about half a billion dollars a year. This sum is equivalent to a weekly contribution of 25 cents by every wage-earner in the United States.

They have not given up their native citizenship. They recognize no allegiance to this Nation and when they have enriched themselves sufficiently in jobs which should be reserved for our own citizens, they plan to live a life of comfort—on our dollars—in their native lands.

SENDING MILLIONS TO HOMELANDS

While millions of Americans have been forced to accept the dole and other millions have been taxed to pay it, aliens holding jobs here have been sending $100,000,000 annually in savings to various homelands.

There you have epitomized briefly some main essentials of a grave problem which confronts us all. And it is a problem which is little understood.

Indeed, it is seldom discussed; primarily because the basic facts of this situation are not generally recognized or even known.

For 6 years I have been studying the effect of this group of 8,000,000 aliens upon America. I have read everything available, searched out facts in all competent sources, and I have traveled thousands of miles, studying the effect of these aliens upon our economic, social, and political life.

My files on the subject are the most complete in the country. I am opening them for the first time in the preparation of this series of articles in order that Americans may understand a condition which no other nation would countenance for a moment.

As a prelude it should be made clear that "alien" does not mean foreign born. In this country there are 16,000,000 persons who were born abroad. Alien means those of that number who were born abroad of foreign parents and who reside in this country but have not been naturalized.

If we thought that an invading army of 8,000,000 alien persons was about to invade our shores we would resist to the last gasp.

But such an invasion has occurred in the last quarter century. And we did nothing about it. We knew relatively nothing about it. Even now we do not take the trouble to find out just how big this army is. Research in many places was necessary before it was possible to arrive at the figures given, and which I believe to be absolute minimum figures.

One section of this study shows that some 6,000,000 citizens of other countries today are holding American jobs.

"Brain trusters" and other experts are spending billions of American dollars trying to solve the problem of unemployment. This large alien population is the basic cause of unemployment.

An act of Congress forbidding aliens to work while American citizens are unemployed would do more toward putting our citizens back at work than most of the money being spent upon experiments.

A second act providing for deportation of destitute aliens, instead of giving them relief, then would very largely solve our unemployment troubles.

Some other phases of this alien problem which stand out stark and clear from my studies are:

1. The crime rate among aliens is double that of the rest of the population.

And yet our laws are so lax and their administration so liberal that relatively very few of these foreign criminals are deported, while the influx of alien criminals continues.

2. To say that 6,000,000 aliens have taken Americans' jobs tells but a part of the story, possibly the smaller part. They have "imported" the pauper labor conditions of their homelands into this country. Their competition beats down prevailing wage rates, thus tending generally to lower the American workers' standards of living. In the mass, the effect of this is literally incalculable; but every area in which there are large alien groups proves this point.

3. Aliens form the backbone of communism and fascism in this country.

Yet aliens still are pouring into the United States; and the policies of the Department of Labor make the situation worse, rather than better.

Communism, fascism, Hitlerism, and many other "isms" which are un-American both in conception and principle have been "imported" also, along with the hordes we admit through our open door.

WOULD DEPORT ALIEN DESTITUTE

The underlying political principle of all these "isms", regardless of their viewpoint regarding private property, was expressed by Mussolini when he said:

"Everything for the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state."

This political philosophy is diametrically opposed to the principles of the American system of government, and the two cannot survive side by side.

Nevertheless, these "isms" are being forced upon us by these same alien groups which are so largely responsible for our unemployment problem. For proof you have but to look at the persons attending Communist parades and meetings, or consider those advocating radicalism and pacifism in our schools. Wherever these foreign concepts are found there you find aliens.

4. These alien-minded groups want to bring Europe to America—in alien standards and alien ideas. They also want to send America to Europe.

It is from such as these that there arises a considerable proportion of the propaganda and pressure for our entrance into entangling alliances which would involve us in European affairs, at a time when Europe is gathering itself for another suicidal war. Each group wants us to champion the cause of its particular nationality, in Europe's age-old quarrels. It means nothing to them that the founding fathers came to these shores to escape that very thing.

The last war proved almost disastrous to us, and brought about many of the evils from which we are now suffering.

But many of these alien groups are convinced that if they can bring about our participation in another world war, that may bring about the end of free government in the United States.

Thus, they believe, the way would be cleared for their type of "ism", of whatever kind; but in any event, some form of political or economic dictatorship.

These are facts which challenge every American citizen.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], I ask unanimous consent that he may have 15 minutes in which to address the House immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

THE RASH OF TOWNSENDITIS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert in the RECORD an address which I delivered over the National Broadcasting System in opposition to the Townsend plan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address in opposition to Mr. Gomer Smith, vice chairman of the Townsend movement, Thursday evening, January 23, 1936, in the Town Hall Meeting of the Air over station WJZ and the National Broadcasting Co. chain, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, you have listened attentively to Mr. Gomer Smith. He deplores the "pension" of $10,000 a year Congressmen get. What an outrageous statement to make. A salary is not a pension. Even so, my adversary wanted that $10,000 a year. He ran for the Senate and was defeated. I suppose it is a case of sour grapes. After hearing him I am more than ever opposed to the so-called old-age pension revolving plan.

He, like Townsend, apparently does not believe in the principles of economics. That is readily discernible from his remarks tonight. In fact, not a single economist supports him. In his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House (p. 751 of the Hearings, Jan. 21 to Feb. 12, 1935), the good doctor in part said: "* * * What are economists? On what do they base their conclusions? On precedent, do they not? Gentlemen, we have arrived at an unprecedented age. * * * This new age is presenting new problems. Economists do not know anything more about that than you or I; not in the least, * * *."

However, I warn the good doctor, whether he will it or no, his nostrum will have to be tested in the crucible of economics to determine its soundness before it be taken into the body politic. All economists agree that it is a pseudo remedy, filled with poisons that would increase the maladies of unemployment and distress.

Doubtlessly were we not subject to such national economic suffering the mere suggestion of a Townsend plan could make no headway; but in times of stress, we have and always will have a "technocracy", a Huey Long share-the-wealth plan, a Sinclair E. P. I. C.—now it is the rash of Townsenditis. It is, as it were, what the storm blew in.

Dr. Townsend has the edge on all the other so-called redeemers. They offer usually an abstract, complicated program. Dr. Townsend goes them one better. He offers something concrete—$200 per month. Any simpleton can understand that. Who would refuse $200 per month? He and his followers keep hammering that idea on the anvil of the Nation's suffering. Only the so-called benefits of the plan are stressed. Little or nothing is said of the method of raising yearly the vast sum of twenty billions required.

The Townsendite already has visions of buying automobiles, radios and new houses, and all the medical care he may need. The Townsend Weekly is filled with ads recommending cures for rheumatism, neuritis,, deafness. He will travel—Daytona Beach Townsendites already were on the job handing out leaflets, ready to cash in on the pension to come. The $200 per month is no longer a vision; it is a fact.

In San Diego I am informed, when a Townsend pension bill was before the California Legislature, hosts of elderly people tried to buy automobiles and radios on the credit basis of $200 they daily expected to find in their mail. (For shame, Dr. Townsend, is it not cruel thus to deceive these poor hapless souls!) These old people should and must be disillusionized. It is heartless to continue the deception.

Very cleverly there has been injected a note of religion. The National Townsend Weekly speaks of the plan as "religious in action." The leaders cannot address meetings without previous arrangements for "amens" and "hymns", frequent references to "God and the Creator", and quotations from the Sermon on the Mount. The speakers very artfully proclaim that the Townsend plan is just as much inspired by God Almighty as was the emancipation proclamation of Abraham Lincoln.

The harsh realities of the plan are never touched upon. Usually at meetings it is with a sort of religious hysteria that the adherents revel in the gifts to come. It is this very spiritual enthusiasm that makes the plan doubly dangerous, and mayhap more difficult to scotch.

Furthermore, there is a very deceitful appeal to the passions and prejudices of the unthinking. An examination of the arguments advanced discloses the following: "We must provide security for the people over 60, and jobs for the people under 60. When that is accomplished the Townsend Clubs won't disband. Oh, no. We will tackle the problem of aliens in this country. We'll fix J. P. Morgan."

WHAT IS THIS PLAN?

Frankly, your plan is "too good to be true." Each citizen 60 years of age and over is to receive a pension of $200 a month for life provided he gives up all gainful pursuits and spends the $200 each month. To pay these pensions there is to be a 2-percent tax laid on the gross dollar value of every business and financial transaction. This so-called transaction tax, which is really a sales tax, is to be supplemented by a 2-percent tax on all inheritances and gifts in excess of $500 and a 10 percent increase on all present income taxes. To insure payment of these taxes all sellers of all commodities of things of value are to be licensed, the fee of the license to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

This scheme, aside from giving pensions to the aged, is supposed to create new purchasing power, provide jobs, and give us ripsnorting prosperity!

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE COULD NOT AND WOULD NOT PAY THE BILL

According to the census of 1930 there were 10,479,028 persons in the United States 60 years of age or beyond. Thus the cost, if all over 60 would be pensioned, would be $2,096,000,000 a month, or over $25,000,000,000 a year.

According to the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1934 this is about eight times the present normal revenue of the Federal Government received from taxation and miscellaneous receipts.

Most Townsendites claim that about 8,000,000 persons would be eligible for the pension, and that therefore the total cost, with the expense of administration, would be about $20,000,000,000 per annum. This is two-thirds of our national debt. What does it mean? That yearly cost would place a burden upon us equal to about seven times the revenue received by the Federal Government in 1934. We would have to tax ourselves about seven times our present rates.

According to the August 1935 Survey of Current Business of the Department of Commerce the national income for 1934 amounted to $49,440,000,000. Let us say fifty billions. Thus, to pay the Townsend pension of $20,000,000,000 would require 40 percent of our national income. In other words, it is proposed to give to 6 percent of the population 40 percent of the national income and leave for the 94 percent of the population the other 60 percent.

According to Dr. Walter E. Spahr, chairman, department of economics, school of commerce, New York University, "if the national income of $50,000,000,000 were distributed evenly among the 127,000,000 population, each person would receive $394. Since the Townsend plan proposes to take 40 percent of it, each person would have left $236. Thus 94 percent of the citizens of this country would have their incomes cut to an average of $236 per year so that 6 percent of the citizens may enjoy net incomes of $1,440 per year ($2,400 less the 40-percent tax), or more than six times as much."

Prof. Willford I. King, of the National Bureau of Economics Research, estimates $900 per annum as the income per average laborer in the United States. To pay each individual pensioner would absorb the complete annual income of more than 2½ laborers. To pay 8,000,000 aged persons would require the entire annual income of over 22,000,000 average laborers.

Let us view this stupendous cost from another angle. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates 37,200,000 wage and salary earners of average income. The Townsend pension cost, according to Professor Spahr, would require the entire annual income of 14,900,000 of these wage and salary earners. It would require two-thirds of the entire annual income of 22,300,000 such persons; or it would require one-half of the entire income of nearly 30,000,000 such persons.

The best estimates indicate that about 67 percent of our national income is paid to laborers in the form of wages and salaries—that is, 67 percent of our annual income of $50,000,000,000 goes to 37,200,000 wage and salary earners at work earning an average annual income of $900. If each such person pays his 40 percent of taxes, then each such person has left only $540 per year out of his $900 average salary to support himself and his children. The net income per Townsend pensioner—$2,400 per annum less 40 percent—would be $1,440, or $2,880 per family, where father and mother are living. Therefore, such husband and wife pensioners over 60 years of age would receive a sum over five times as great as would be left to the average wage and salary earner who also has a family to support.

Let the workers beware. Let the white-collar worker beware. Let the machinist, the bookkeeper, the clerk, the farm hand, the stenographer, the plumber, the mechanic, the teacher, the miner—let them all beware. Do you think the masses of our people, who have to pay this bill, would remain supine and indifferent? They will rise in righteous wrath and indignation. Put this Townsend plan into effect and our whole social system would collapse.

THE SO-CALLED TRANSACTION TAX WOULD FALL MOST HEAVILY ON THE POOR

The wage and salary earner would pay more than his proportionate amount, because the poor spend most for the necessities of life. This transaction or sales tax of 2 percent on every transaction "from the cradle to the grave" would raise prices to an astonishing degree. Let us take a suit of clothes: One would have to pay a 2-percent tax on the retail cost, 2-percent tax on the wholesale cost of the material, on the raw fiber, thread, lining, buttons, wages at every stage, transportation, and distribution. The pyramiding of the tax and the cost would give us inflation with a vengeance. Townsendites admit that prices would go up 100 percent. They would go up much further. As a consequence, the laborer's income would buy fewer commodities and the proportion of his income taken by taxation would increase. This high cost of living would affect most seriously those who have fixed incomes, like widows, orphans, and veterans. And what about those on relief? See how hard they would be hit.

While this plan could not be carried into effect without spreading ruin throughout the land, and while the tax itself could never be effectuated, and therefore the pensions never be paid, nevertheless, let us assume for the sake of this argument that it could be put into effect. Then this "transaction tax" would increase geometrically. It would drive American production costs so high that in order to protect manufacturers against floods of foreign importations we would have to apply extortionately high tariffs. Otherwise there would be a complete surrender of the domestic markets to foreign imports. Such unbelievably high tariff walls on our part would encourage retaliatory tariffs on the part of all other countries. Our international trade would become frozen.

THE TRANSACTION TAX WOULD TURN US INTO LIARS AND CHEATS

There would be made necessary the most gigantic policing bureaucracy in the history of the country—at what a prohibitive cost for the army of spies and snoopers. Townsend, in his testimony, stated that neighbors would be expected to spy on pensioners and to report if they think pension funds are being misspent. Thus all pensioners would be policed. They must spend the $200 each month. If they fail to do so and obtain the next month's quota, they are guilty of a new crime, the crime of failure to spend money.

POWERS NEVER BEFORE EXERCISED BY A SULTAN OR A CZAR WOULD BE GIVEN THE GOVERNMENT

Every seller of goods would have to apply for and receive a license from the Secretary of the Treasury, who would have the right to fix the license fee. In every county or ward there would be organized administrative boards with powers beyond the wildest dream of avarice. Every businessman, farmer, and seller of goods, therefore, would be under governmental surveillance by Government agents and inspectors, who would have the power of life and death over these businessmen, and over any farmer, for if a farmer sells milk or butter or eggs, and produce of any sort, he must be licensed.

THE PLAN IS PALPABLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Its sponsors, however, dismiss, in cavalier fashion, the question of constitutionality. That is a detail that does not concern them. In the light of the A. A. A. decision, and in view of the occupational tax provided for in the plan, I assure you it cannot possibly square with the Constitution.

An amendment to the Constitution would be necessary. A little thing like that does not concern Dr. Townsend. An amendment would take years to bring about, but in all likelihood it could never be brought about. Townsend Weekly fails to mention this difficulty and continues to deceive its readers.

WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT OF A TRANSACTION TAX ON WEALTH AND INCOME?

The Townsendites' glib argument is that the dollar value of all transactions in 1 year is about one thousand billion dollars, or $1,000,000,000,000, and that 2 percent of $1,000,000,000,000 is $20,000,000,000 per annum, the amount needed to pay the pension.

They little realize that taxes must be paid out of income and many times may have to be paid out of the capital which produces the income. The good doctor and his cohorts confuse the tax on these transactions with the effect of taxation on wealth and income.

Let us see how wrong they are. Take, for example, an automobile manufacturer with a capital of $1,000,000. It normally has a net income of 10 percent, or $100,000. In order to make this profit the manufacturer turns over his capital 10 times, and therefore does a business of $10,000,000. According to this good doctor and his followers, $10,000,000 of transactions pass through his hands during the year. They would impress upon that business (upon those transactions) a 2-percent tax, which would amount to $200,000. But the business has only earned a net income of $100,000. There would be a deficit of $100,000. That business would be wrecked, because taxes can only be paid out of income. They cannot be paid on "turnover" or "transactions." Every other manufacturer, every other businessman would also be wrecked. Ruin would be visited upon millions of employees.

Thus the argument that new jobs would be created must go by the board.

THE TOWNSEND CIRCULATION-OF-MONEY THEORY PUTS THE CART BEFORE THE HORSE

Townsendites say that the spending of money is all that is necessary to bring about recovery; that because money does not circulate, business is in the doldrums. It is the other way around. Business is bad and therefore money does not circulate. They do not understand that money is merely a medium of exchange and goes into circulation automatically only as business expands. In other words, circulation cannot make business. It is business that makes circulation.

If this were not true, then there should have been great prosperity among the German people in 1923, when they had trillions of money in circulation. If circulation of money makes prosperity, then there should have been great prosperity during our colonial days when we issued continental dollars; during our Civil War when we issued greenbacks; in 1790 when the National Assembly flooded France with assignates. However, during all these periods the people suffered with increased circulation of money. Business folded up. Savings were destroyed. Poverty stalked the land.

TOWNSENDITES CONFUSE MONEY WITH WEALTH

Money of itself is not wealth, nor is it income. It is merely a medium of exchange, or a claim or title to real wealth and real income. Artificially increase that supply of currency or money, and you do not increase wealth. You simply cut the pie of wealth, as it were, into more pieces, but the pie does not increase in size. Artificially increase currency, and you raise prices for the bare necessities of life far beyond the reach of the poor and lowly.

WHY NOT EXTEND THE TOWNSEND PLAN?

If the Townsend argument is sound, why stop with pensions of $2,400 for persons over 60? Why not $5,000 pensions for persons over 40? Or $10,000 pensions for persons over 30?

As Walter Lippmann says, "What can be said against these proposals that must not also be said against the Townsend plan? Dr. Townsend's error lies in forgetting the simple truth that someone must produce the wealth which is consumed by the nonproducers, be they infants, old people, sick people, the unem-

ployed, the idle rich, or the criminal classes. If Dr. Townsend's medicine were a good remedy, the more people the country could find to support in idleness the better off it would be."

THE VIRTUES OF THRIFT, SAVING, AND INSURANCE WOULD GO GLIMMERING

If the plan were put into effect, why should the young live prudently and usefully, save, invest, or take out insurance? Policyholders would convert their policies into cash. There would be no need to insure against old age. Insurance companies would have to dump their securities on the market to meet the demands of all these policyholders.

Why save for old age? Savings banks would consequently have to dump their securities to meet withdrawals.

Who would buy all these securities? The markets would collapse. The exchanges could not remain open a day. Insurance companies and banks would crumble.

Somebody argued that the pensioners themselves would buy all these securities. In the first place, they could not do this, because by so doing they would be getting an income and thus would not be eligible for the pension. And, furthermore, even if they would be permitted to buy these securities, before they could do so these huge taxes would have to be collected. But as a Frankenstein they would be so ruinous as to destroy the very source from which the revenue springs.

HOW WOULD THE AGED SPEND THEIR MONEY?

Townsend would offer no restrictions. Each couple would have $4,800 a year less the "transaction tax." Grandma and grandpa could readily keep in the household without work many sons and daughters and in-laws. In fact, Townsend would put no restrictions on any expenditures. Testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee, he said (p. 687 of the hearings of Jan. 21 to Feb. 12, 1935: "* * * We shall not restrict that expenditure at all * * *." And of the pensioner he said (ibid.): "* * * Let him have carte blanche. Let him buy whisky with it if he wants to kill himself off as quickly as he chooses. That is immaterial * * *." He was questioned, "Would it be permissible for those children to live with them and be supported from the provisions supplied with this pension money in the home?" He replied, "* * * Why not? Why not let the elders buy commodities and give to their children if they like? That is immaterial * * *."

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AFFORDS THE BEGINNING OF A REMEDY

Personally, I am heartily in favor of sensible and adequate pensions for old people. This is embodied in the social-security bill of last year which provides upward of $30 per month for the aged; that is, the Federal Government will match the States dollar for dollar up to $15 per month, providing free pensions for all old people without other means of support. In addition, it provides for compulsory old-age insurance for employees.

In New York State we provide pensions for our aged and many other States do likewise. In the course of time, national and State legislation will be greatly improved and more sensible benefits will be granted to the aged, the helpless, and the needy.

The Townsend scheme would destroy at one fell swoop all progress made in old-age-pension laws. It should be consigned to the place where it belongs—limbo.

The pity of it all is the false promise that the Townsend plan holds out to the old, feeble, and helpless. It is hard to tell the poor aged that the scheme is merely a mirage. Everywhere they dream of riches to come. Nothing could be more tragic than their eventual disillusionment.

TITLE I—F. H. A.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, title I of the National Housing Act, covering modernization and repairs, expires April 1 of this year. I understand that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DUFFEY] has introduced H. R. 10501, extending this title for 2 years. The date of the expiration is now only 60 days in the future. I hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will do everything in its power to speed the passage of this legislation.

I am certain that every Member of the House has been receiving requests from people in his or her district asking for this extension.

During the month of August 1934, which was the beginning of the Federal Housing Administration's program of insuring modernization loans for the purpose of repairing and improving domestic and commercial properties, $251,595 in loans were reported for insurance. During the month of August 1935, 1 year later, $24,240,034 in loans were insured. As of January 11, 1936, a total of over 739,715 loans had been insured, amounting to $264,214,444. There has been a monthly increase in the insurance of modernization loans, November having reached the peak with a total of $31,051,673.

From reports submitted to the Federal Housing Administration from every State, it has been conservatively estimated the amount spent for modernization and repairs since August 1, 1934, has amounted to over $1,266,481,000. This estimate indicates the amount of repair and modernization work being done which is paid for either by loans (insured or uninsured) or by cash outlay.

MODERNIZATION CREDIT—TITLE I

At the close of business on Saturday, February 1, there were 6,184 financial institutions throughout the country that had reported insured notes; that is, notes representing loans made for the purpose of modernization and repair of homes. The total of these notes on the date mentioned was 794,177, representing $281,417,238 in loans.

Evidence of the amount of weekly business is shown by the fact that the weekly average is $6,400,000 since October 1.

A further analysis of loans insured disclosed that single family dwellings more than equaled the combined total of all other properties improved or modernized.

Type of property improved	Percent of total	
	Number	Amount
Single family	60.7	57.1
Multiple residential	31.6	25.7
Retail store	3.9	7.8
Commercial	1.1	3.4
Industrial	.3	2.5
Institutional	.4	.7
Miscellaneous	2.0	2.8
Total, all types	100.0	100.0

With a record of having insured $55,341,520 in modernization and repair notes, the State of New York led the Nation in which there was a total of $264,214,444 at the close of business January 11, 1936.

New York had made 127,529 insured loans out of a total of 739,715 for the Nation.

California was second, with a total of $39,516,179 for 123,527 loans, and New Jersey third with $15,924,726 for 39,484 loans.

Contractors, real-estate operators, dealers, carpenters, painters, home builders, salesmen, floor layers, merchants, brokers, millmen, engineers, and so forth, are unanimous in their acclaim of the benefits that have been derived from this legislation.

A company in Chicago writes:

DEAR SIR: The Federal Housing Administration, through its insured modernization loans, has been most beneficial in many ways to our corporation, the 300 families directly connected with it, our numerous customers, those indirectly affected, and, in our opinion, the entire Nation.

It has enabled us to absorb many unemployed by considerably enlarging our factory and office force.

It has enabled us to increase the earnings of our factory and office force by substantial bonuses based upon salaries or wages received. It has also made it possible for our salesmen to earn a great deal more money in the form of commissions on account of the increased volume of sales they have enjoyed.

It has enabled the users of our equipment—those engaged in the relief of human suffering—to purchase necessary modern, result-producing equipment at substantially lower finance or carrying charges than have heretofore been available, on terms more commensurate with their ability to pay and on a basis which largely enabled them to make their payments out of their increased income. This has brought about much expressed appreciation from our customers of the opportunity not only to serve their patients more effectively but to increase their own earnings.

It will result in this corporation being able to remit to the Government a much larger amount in the form of income taxes.

A large number of banks and other sources of modernization credit cooperating with us have benefited on account of the profitable nature of loans made by them under the insured modernization credit plan. These institutions have expressed entire satisfaction with the way the loans are being repaid to them and are, in the great majority of instances, ready and anxious to extend additional loans where it can be done with safety.

A report recently received from the Federal Housing Administration stated that their losses on all insured loans had been about thirteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of the amount of the insured loans. This almost unbelievably small loss can, in our opinion, be attributed to the fact that these loans have, insofar as our knowledge goes, been extended in the main with discretion and caution and to a class of purchasers deserving of

credit and able to repay. There is a most wholesome impression with reference to these loans, by those securing them, that they must be paid.

The increased business that has been created by this worthy effort, amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, of which our share has been a small part, has, in our opinion, afforded employment directly and indirectly to such a large number of people as to have caused other necessary National and State expenditures to be decreased. This has brought about the net result that the insured modernization loans of the Federal Housing Administration have in the final analysis not cost the taxpayer anything, but have actually been a means of saving him large sums.

We deem the insured modernization loans of the Federal Housing Administration of great value to the Nation in order that business may be further sustained, employment may be more general throughout the country, and the benefits that have accrued to the country be continued. For these reasons we desire to petition all representatives of the people, regardless of party, to lend their influence and support to the continuance of this most worthy and profitable legislation.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

An employee writes that title I has enabled the company by whom he is employed—

To absorb many unemployed.
To increase our purchases.
To increase the salaries of our employees.
To increase our profits, permitting us to pay increased profits tax.
To pay substantial bonuses to both factory and office employees over and above their increased salaries.
To increase the earnings of our salesmen on the road.

Another reports:

The customers of our firm have expressed much appreciation of the benefits they derive by way of lower carrying charges and better terms possible under F. H. A. Institutions granting this credit report satisfaction and desire to extend it further.

In view of the standing of California in second place for the United States, it is to be expected that the retail lumber dealers of the State of California are very anxious to have title I of the National Housing Act extended.

I urge the committee to report and the House to adopt H. R. 10501 to continue one of the brightest spots of the New Deal.

NATIONAL PARKS AND MONUMENTS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the membership of the House today to the fact that we are going to consider the Consent Calendar. On that calendar are many requests from Members of the House of Representatives for parks or national monuments. Under the Maverick bills passed last year, Public Laws Nos. 201 and 292, we set up a General Advisory Board of the Historical Park Commission. That Advisory Board will pass on all parks and monuments in this country. We appropriated the money for this set-up. I think it is the duty of every Member of the House to permit his park bill or his monument bill to go before that committee before it is brought on the floor of the House. There are a number of them on the Consent Calendar today, and I am going to object to them. So you might as well make requests to carry them over without prejudice, because we have not the money, and you nor anybody else will tell us where we are going to get the money to continue indefinitely setting up these objects that are going to require additional funds in the future to maintain.

I hope the membership will request, before they are objected to, that their bills be carried over until the Historical Park Commission can pass on them. I make that request of you in order that you will not have your park bills objected to today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SOIL EROSION

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, as well as the whole country, is now concerned with the problem of providing a substitute for the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which the Supreme Court recently made inoperative. Regardless of its fate at the hands of the Court, that act saved American agriculture. We are hearing much discussion of the question of soil erosion, and I want to give you a picture of the situation as I see it; just what has been happening to our agricultural lands as a result of erosion and just how little we have realized its destructive force. Our country is comparatively new, and we have been able to take from the soil what we have needed, without realizing just how expensive it has been or what effect it has had on the value of the land for future productive purposes, or how those who are to come after us are to carry on. In other words, we are taking all and leaving nothing for those to whom we owe at least a moral responsibility.

The older parts of the country, of course, experienced the destructive effects of erosion a long time ago, but I doubt if they gave any serious thought as to just what it meant to them or how to prevent it. It was like a horse or a wagon; in the course of time it just wore out. The old farm was not producing like it used to, but aside from placing fertilizer on the soil there was nothing to do about it. They did not realize how serious their problem was or what they should do to prevent its continuance until it was too late.

The topsoil, or productive part of land, washed away cannot be restored. It is forever gone. True, with extensive and expensive fertilization, it may continue to produce, in a measure, a living, but its real fertility is gone, and the efforts to make a living from it will have to be doubled. A little thought and effort directed to preventing the cause will be far better than a futile effort to effect a cure.

Not always have those most affected been willing to accept advice on the subject, and they were reluctant to see the situation as it really was. It is human nature to do things in the usual and accepted manner, and we sometimes are inclined to resent new things even when they are designed for our protection and our prosperity. We have felt that so long as we were able to grow a reasonably good crop there was nothing to worry about. Probably the owner of the land felt unable to stand the expense of putting back into the soil that which he was, year after year, taking out. Most folks who buy a farm are so sorely pressed to meet the interest obligations, pay the taxes, a little on principal, and live, that nothing is left with which to rebuild the soil. In other words, we must farm it so intensively to live, and pay what we must, that we lose sight of just what it is costing us in destroyed value and lessened fertility of soil every year.

Unquestionably, it is a national problem, and it calls for the cooperation of the Government and the owners of the soil everywhere to solve it. It is a national problem, because it is the duty of the Government to protect national resources and plan for the future as well as to meet the problems of the present. When the natural resources of a country are destroyed and no effort made to restore them, that country is beginning to decline.

You may say that so long as our country is engaged in an effort to curtail production for the purpose of reducing surpluses, surely we are not concerned seriously with the question of making our land more productive. We will not always have a surplus; when our millions reach their full consuming power that surplus will vanish. For the purpose of this discussion, I am not concerned with producing more; I am concerned with the protection of the soil.

I can see no good reason for farming 160 acres of land if as much can be produced on 80 acres with half the effort and expense.

I do not desire to discuss here the question of taking lands out of cultivation or use for the purposes of crop reduction or controlling surpluses. That is another economic question that has little to do with the actual question of soil erosion as a destructive agency of wealth and value, and will occupy our attention soon.

For 5 years there has been a soil-erosion experimental station located at Bethany, in my district in Missouri, and

the information gained from the experiments have thrown a great deal of light on the subject. The experiments have been carried on under such conditions as to make the information indisputable.

If it requires the results of a lifetime of labor to pay for 160 acres of land when that land is reasonably productive, what will be required when the productive capacity of that same land is reduced one-half or more, through the washing away of the fertile topsoil?

During our lives we have witnessed the destruction of the trees and shrubbery and vegetation of almost all kinds, and there has followed drought, the blowing away of the soil, and its rapid washing away. The rain that falls upon the ground rapidly rushes to the low places and carries with it the best part of the soil, and the moisture does the ground but little good because it only touches it in its mad rush to the river or other places of escape. Water falling upon a paved street rushes into the sewer and leaves the street clean and shiny. So it does when it falls upon the land, unless there is something to hold it back in its mad rush to the sea. The land is washed clean of the very part that is necessary to make it productive.

If moisture does not remain in the soil how may we expect to have moisture coming from the skies? Moisture, of course, draws moisture. In addition to preventing the washing away of the soil, we must see that sufficient moisture remains in the soil to support growing plant life.

Let us look at the picture: I can best describe the condition in my own State, and that condition is common to most other States. It is estimated that only about 10,000,000 acres of land in Missouri, or slightly more than one-fourth the area, are not subject to erosion, and approximately two to three million acres of such land are affected for agriculture purposes, because of stream cutting and deposits of eroded material from uplands adjacent to the stream bottoms. Slightly more than one-fourth of the area of the States is affected by moderate to serious erosion, having lost one-fourth to one-half of the original surface soil. Slightly less than one-half of the State, or probably 20,000,000 acres is affected by serious erosion, have lost one-half to three-fourths of the original surface soil. Another million acres are affected by severe erosion, and of course, the longer such erosion is permitted to continue, the greater the damage.

An acre of soil to a depth of 1 inch weighs approximately 143 tons. The result of a survey indicates that 20,850,000,000 tons of soil have left Missouri farms since they have been cultivated. It is estimated that the average Missouri soil contains 2,500 pounds of nitrogen, 1,250 pounds of phosphorus, and 2,800 pounds of potassium to the acre, to a depth of 7 inches. This means that Missouri, as a result of soil washing, has lost 26,090,000 tons of nitrogen, 13,030,000 tons of phosphorus, and 300,240,000 tons of potassium. If this lost soil could be magically replaced to a depth of 7 inches on the eroded acres of the State, it would make an area in size almost equal to one-half of the present land area of the State. The restored fertility would probably be sufficient to increase the corn yield from 10 to 20 bushels per acre over this area. Once this nitrogen and humus is lost it can never be completely replaced, even though heavy applications of manure are added, and green manure crops are turned under.

If it is assumed that commercial nitrogen sells for 10 cents a pound, the loss of nitrogen fertility alone from Missouri soils has been approximately $5,000,000,000, since the land was first farmed—and Missouri is comparatively a new State.

These figures may readily show one of the causes of depressed land values, delinquent taxes, and foreclosures, in areas where erosion is particularly destructive. If it is to be permitted to continue unchecked, I do not see how we may expect to make farm loans in the future. The collateral is rapidly being destroyed.

Erosion has been far more serious since the war. When prices of farm commodities became very high and land values in accordance, farmers everywhere plowed up pasture lands and planted grain which brought much more income to them. The result was that such lands immediately began to wash away. Then farm commodities slumped tremendously in value, and it became necessary for every farmer to produce all he possibly could with the facilities available to live and meet his obligations. That meant no rotation of crops, and the erosion that had started increased each year in startling degrees.

In the United States, 100,000,000 acres of formerly cultivated land has already been ruined and abandoned. That is the equivalent of 625,000 farms of 160 acres each, and approximately the combined extent of the States of Ohio, Illinois, Virginia, and South Carolina; 125,000,000 more acres now in production are practically stripped of the topsoil and still another 100,000,000 acres of cultivated land is rapidly approaching the point of bankrupt farming. The cost to the farmers of the United States amounts to $400,000,000 annually.

According to measurements made at the erosion service station in north Missouri, erosion is removing the surface soil 7 inches, or plow depth of soil, in slightly less than 15 years where corn is planted up and down an 8-percent slope. The average loss of soil amounted to 60 tons per acre per year.

Results indicate that under unprotected cultivated conditions the rate of erosion increases rapidly as the length of the slope increases. Doubling the length of slope increases the average erosion 1.66 times, and trebling the length increases the rate of erosion 2.59 times.

Another test showed soil losses from a 3.68-percent slope, over a 6-year period, of 41.2 tons per acre annually, where the ground had been plowed to a depth of 4 inches, and that approximately 68 percent of the annual rainfall was held back; the balance was cutting and tearing and taking away the soil. From a grass-covered area of the same slope and soil type less than 0.03 ton of solid matter was removed each year, or a total of 1.7 tons in 6 years, while 88.45 percent of the rainfall was retained and soaked into the soil. At this rate of erosion, 7 inches of the topsoil would have washed away in 24 years from the area tilled 4 inches deep. Whereas it would have taken 3,547 years to remove the same amount from the grassed area.

Slightly more than three-fourths of the soils of Missouri have lost over one-fourth of their original fertile surface soil and one-half of the soils have lost one-half or more of their original soil according to recent surveys made by the State agricultural college.

What is the remedy? First, there must be a thorough understanding and appreciation of the seriousness of the situation, and just what it means to the future of our country and to our own prosperity. The farmers must realize the seriousness from their own point of view and wholeheartedly enter into the cooperative plan the Government has worked out for crop rotation, proper planting, terracing of fields to shorten slopes, stopping washes in cultivated fields, and fertilization. Experiments seem to show that crops may be divided into three general classes in regard to erosion control. (1) Sod crops which are erosion resistant. Among them are bluegrass, timothy, red clover, lespedeza, alfalfa, and sweetclover. (2) Small-grain crops (wheat, oats, barley, and rye), which are partly resistant. (3) Cultivated crops such as corn or soybeans, which are highly erosive.

In connection with the erosion station I mentioned heretofore, for the past 3 years there have been more than 600 members of C. C. C. camps engaged in soil-erosion work in one county, and such work has covered a large area. The results have been far reaching and those who have observed the results of the work and the ones who have benefited by it are most enthusiastic. The farmers have readily entered into contracts to continue the work the Government has started. Large and small dams have been constructed in places where necessary to do the most good.

It is a comparatively easy task to stop washes in fields if proper methods are employed; the expense is practically nothing and the result surprising.

Their experiments have shown the effect of properly laying out a field for planting and cultivation; the proper locating of different kinds of crops in the same field, to prevent erosion; terraces constructed to shorten the slopes, thus retarding the progress of the water; the effect of rotating crops and the consequent saving of the soil as well as its enrichment and the necessity for fertilization, even on sodded eroded soil, to prevent further erosion and to restore, in a measure, the productive qualities. May I say here that I believe the C. C. C. camps have been the most effective agency the Government has created to combat the ravages of soil erosion.

The result of one demonstration that comes to my mind seems to me to demonstrate very clearly the effectiveness of the character of work I have been describing. In the district where the demonstration was made, there are two streams alike in size and draining approximately the same size area each, and the area drained by each is of the same topographical formation. The soil erosion prevention methods were carried out in the area drained by only one of these streams. Measurements were made of a rain, general over the whole area. The stream in the area where no work had been done rose 3 feet higher than the stream in the area where the work had been done, and the stream in the area where the work had been done stayed up 3 hours longer than the other stream. This, of course, was conclusive evidence of effectiveness of the methods used in the area; the water was being held back and soaking into the soil and creating a reservoir for future use in the growing of crops; it was not rushing off the soil and carrying with it tons and tons of the topsoil necessary to fertility.

The Government cannot, of course, do all the work necessary to protect the vast areas that are affected. It can, however, show the way.

Experiment stations are located at various places in the country, and I should like to see every farmer avail himself of the opportunity of visiting one of them and seeing for himself just what they are proving—seeing how much of the value of his land is being washed away every year.

In every community where erosion is at work, I should like to see the farmers form cooperative organizations for the development of conservation projects; to acquire, on a cooperative basis, machinery necessary to do the work, and to have the benefit of the knowledge of a trained expert on the subject, the latter, of course, without cost to them. If this plan were followed, I believe thousands and thousands of now fertile lands would be saved from the ravages of erosion. The value of the land would be maintained, loans would be better secured, and for that reason more easily obtained. A living would come with less effort, obligations would be more easily met, and there would be some value in the heritage of those who are to follow.

PROGRESS IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a radio address delivered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by Representative JAMES M. MEAD, chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, on January 30, 1936, over the National Broadcasting System:

The Postal Service has always played an active part in the growth of our Republic. It is not surprising, therefore, that when our country is seeking a way to spread employment, the world's biggest business, the Postal Service, should take the initiative and set the example for industry to follow.

We are proud of the law enacted in the last session of Congress, shortening the hours of service of our postal workers, giving them a 5-day week. This is in line with the economic trend of our day in every industry, due to the increased productivity of the machine.

Not one of us would be willing to discard the modern inventions which lighten labor, which turn out work so efficiently and so speedily; but the truth is brought home to us daily that these mechanical contrivances are revolutionizing the world—they are taking the bread from the mouths of our workingmen in so dangerously reducing the number of jobs.

The machines are here to stay. It is our job to find a way to use these inventions wisely. In giving the world the benefit of the speedier method of production, we must, at the same time, protect our workers. They, too, must benefit from these labor-saving devices.

We must find new avenues of employment, and we must accompany this program by a division of the available jobs among all willing to work.

What is more logical right now than a fair division of labor opportunities by shortening the work periods?

We are now operating under that plan in the Postal Service, and it is proving successful. By reducing the workweek from 44 hours to 40 hours, regular employees have been given long-merited promotions, relief has been provided for more than 18,000 substitutes; and with all this remarkable progress the Department paid its way. Additional help has been taken on, and the Service is expanding to meet present-day needs of increased mail volume with faster and more frequent deliveries of mail to our farmers, our business houses, and our homes.

When private industry follows the example of the Postal Service, America's problem of unemployment will be well-nigh solved.

Another achievement of the Department is the spanning of the Pacific by the air mail. On November 22 last the *China Clipper* spread its wings at Alameda, Calif., soared into the sky, and then headed for the Philippines. That was the first scheduled trans-Pacific air-mail flight in history. Just 100 years earlier the first clipper ship sailed into San Francisco Harbor; and now in our day we have seen the blazing of new trails, the linking of America with Asia, the spanning of 8,000 miles of ocean in 5 days. It is almost unbelievable.

And this is but the forerunner of another amazing development—the development of trans-Atlantic commercial service by air.

Our Postmaster General is so confident that the bridging of the Atlantic by air is sure to follow that he is inviting the attention of Congress to the desirability of preparing for such service. Mr. Farley declares: "It has been the experience of the United States that when better communications and faster transportation have been established between this and other countries better understandings have resulted, and an improvement in trade and commerce has followed."

Another growth of the Postal Service is to the north. In the last session we passed a bill authorizing contract air-mail service in Alaska, and, on a wider scale than was previously the case, it is now supplementing the slower dog-sled service. The air mail is speeding up communication between the States and the Territory of Alaska, and it is rendering a humane service in rushing food and medical supplies to the starving and the sick in the isolated regions of the north.

Air-mail service now links the islands of Hawaii, giving daily instead of of semiweekly service. The islands' first letter carriers were the missionaries, who carried the mail in making their pilgrimages from one island to another.

This is a progressive age in which we are living. We are witnessing changes which were merely dreams a few years back. Not long ago the 40-hour week for labor was unheard of, the bridging of the Pacific by airplane was out of the question. But both have come to pass. Even greater things lie in store for us; and we can feel confident that, whatever they may be, the Postal Service is sure to play a prominent role in all such stupendous undertakings.

TEXAS CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on House Joint Resolution 459, to amend the joint resolution entitled "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", and ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 459) 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 disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same.

S. D. McREYNOLDS,
SOL BLOOM,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the House.

TOM CONNALLY,
PETER NORBECK,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
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 Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 459) to amend the joint resolution entitled "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", submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out the last sentence of the first section of the House joint resolution, which provided that funds allocated for Bexar County under the resolution should be expended in connection with historic purposes only. The House recedes.

S. D. McREYNOLDS,
SOL BLOOM,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MEAD

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks relative to the late Dr. Mead and to include therein an article which appeared in the Portland Journal, of Portland, Oreg., after Dr. Mead's death.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Oreg., in its issue of Tuesday, January 28, 1936, eulogistic of the late Dr. Elwood Mead, Commissioner of the United States Reclamation Service.

This encomium pays Dr. Mead a well-deserved tribute. Here was a man of great vision, who translated his concepts into realities and his prophecies into fulfillment. No idle dreamer was he. That which he had envisioned in youth and middle age was vouchsafed to him in the winter of life to accomplish. It would not be too much to say of Dr. Mead that he was an empire builder, for his was "a pioneer idea instinct with genius." In this respect he can justly take his place in history alongside the immortal George Washington. The parallel is striking. Washington as an engineer solved stupendous and vexatious problems for the benefit of mankind. His vision embraced a wide terrain. He opened up vast tracts of land fitted to become the home of millions of American farmers. He spoke of his plan of waterways to the West as the "channel of commerce to the extensive and valuable trade of a rising empire." The horizon of this empire, however, scarcely extended beyond the Alleghenies. Many decades thereafter it fell to the lot of another great American, Dr. Elwood Mead, to see, with prophetic ken, the potentialities of the vast western country beyond the Rockies for development by the ingenuity of man, aided by "the most powerful machines yet devised." This public benefactor, self-abnegating, gave his knowledge, gave his science, gave his spirit, and gave his very life that future generations might benefit by his work and his self-sacrificing devotion to duty.

As a member of the standing Committee of the House on Irrigation and Reclamation, I came in close contact with the work of Dr. Mead, and I feel sure that all of my colleagues on this committee join with me in agreeing that he, like Saint Paul, might well say:

I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith.

The editorial tribute to him is as follows:

[From the Oregon Daily Journal of Jan. 28, 1936]

DR. MEAD

Dr. Elwood Mead built his own monument. He built it of earth and concrete and with water. He built it of the desert turned into farms and flowers and homes.

Dr. Mead, at 78, and after only a week's illness, is dead in Washington, D. C. He had been United States Commissioner of Reclamation since 1924. To him was given the building of Boulder Dam on the Colorado, of Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia, of Owyhee and Vale irrigation projects in Oregon, of Casper-Alcova in Wyoming, and of other great enterprises of reclamation throughout the West. He was a benefactor to the Oregon country.

The greatest work of his life he did after he had passed three score and ten. And after he was 75 he directed the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars allotted to reclamation in the recovery program. When he passed, 35 reclamation dams were under construction; $170,000,000 was being spent, and $30,000,000 of this amount in Portland's trade territory.

While Dr. Mead built he prophesied. He predicted on the Pacific coast as great cities as have been built in the world. He prophesied a great and widespread population in the West and activities that shall be titantic. He pointed to the West as the new opportunity for the drought-stricken people of the Midwest. He found profound significance for the future in the fact that the Columbia River has the greatest water supply in the arid districts of this Nation.

He found the basis of his prophecy in the plains and valleys of volcanic ash made miraculously fruitful and beautiful by water scientifically led from nature's inverted reservoirs, the mountains. He had used in construction some of the most powerful machines yet devised. He had shown that every man employed on a reclamation project employs two elsewhere. He had given proof to Congress that every dollar invested in a reclamation project produced $4 of additional value. He had shown eastern industries that reclamation projects were drawing upon them for $100,000,000 of manufactured products a year. And in one accounting, below present totals, he revealed that upon 3,000,000 acres of land reclaimed in Federal projects, 41,000 country homes had been provided, cities and towns had been built, and a revolving fund investment of $280,000,000 had been turned into $2,000,000,000 of property values.

Isaiah, another prophet, wrote the epitaph to which Dr. Mead is entitled:

"And they that shall be of thee shall build the old waste places; thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in.

"I give waters in the wilderness and rivers in the desert."

Some months ago Dr. Mead confronted Mrs. Mead's proposal for retirement, for ease, and for a trip around the world. He elected to stay on the job. Thus he was happiest, for when he had passed he left in full vigor the work that produces life.

CONQUESTS IN THE ORIENT

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in the light of the great changes that have taken place in the Orient in recent times, the subjugation of Manchuria and the establishment of a government dominated by the Japanese, and the monetary changes that have been effected in China and their effect on the business and financial relations of the people of this country and those of China and Japan, it will be interesting to review some of the statements that appear in the memorial of Premier Tanaka, an ambitious plan for the conquest of China and the rest of Asia and world dominance, with the following quotations from the Memoirs of Tanaka that appeared in a contribution made by myself in 1932, before the conquest of Manchuria, the bombardment of Shanghai, or the nationalization of silver in China. I quote from the memorial:

Iron and steel are closely connected with national development. Every country attaches great importance to it. But because of the lack of ores we have found no solution of this problem. Hitherto we have had to import steel from the Yangtse Valley and the Malay Peninsula. But, according to a secret survey of our general staff, a wealth of iron mines are found in many places in Manchuria and Mongolia. A conservative estimate of the reserve is 10,000,000,000 tons.

The term Manchuria and Mongolia includes the Provinces of Fengtien, Kirin, Heilungkiang, and outer and inner Mongolia. It extends on area of 74,000 square miles, having a population of 28,000,000 people. The territory is more than three times as large as our own empire, not counting Korea and Formosa, but is inhabited by only a third as many people. The attractiveness of the land does not arise from the scarcity of population alone; its wealth of forestry, minerals, and agricultural products is also unrivaled elsewhere in the world.

After studying the present possibilities of our country, our best policy lies in the direction of taking positive steps to secure rights and privileges in Manchuria and Mongolia. Armed by the rights already secured, we shall seize the resources all over the country. Having China's entire resources at our disposal, we shall proceed to conquer India, the archipelago, Asia Minor, Central Asia, and even Europe.

It will be recalled that when the nine-power treaty which restricted our movements in Manuchuria and Mongolia was signed, public opinion was greatly aroused. All agreed that the nine-

power treaty was initiated by the United States. Unfortunately, just as we were ready to carry out our policy and "void the nine-power treaty, the Seiyukai cabinet suddenly fell and our policy failed of fruition."

MONEY MANIPULATION UNDER THE GOLD STANDARD NECESSARY FOR THE SUCCESS OF JAPANESE SCHEMES

Although Manchuria and Mongolia are within our field of activities, yet the legal tender is still silver. The Chinese businessmen use silver money throughout and are free from the effects of exchange fluctuations. (It might be observed right here that the "effects of exchange" constitute a toll profit to the banking interest on every transaction between the citizens of different nations.)

Therefore their junk (water-borne) trade is prosperous although they have no scientific knowledge of exchange value of gold and silver, they always gain in the transaction. It (the silver standard) often conflicts with our gold basis and works to our disadvantage. That our people have failed to prosper as they should in these places is due to the existence of silver monetary system there. The Chinese have persistently upheld the silver basis, and therefore made it impossible for us firmly to establish our colonization plans on firm economic foundation.

The money that we bring into Manchuria is of gold standard. When we use it either for daily livelihood or for industry and trade, it has to be exchanged into Chinese silver dollars. The fluctuation of exchange is not infrequently as much as 20 percent, resulting in serious loss to our people.

With the silver standard in existence the Chinese Government can increase their notes to counteract our gold notes, consequently our banks will fail to carry out the mission of extending our country's influence.

If the gold standard is adopted, we can issue gold notes freely. With the credit of the gold notes, we can acquire rights in real property and natural resources and defeat the credit of the Chinese silver notes. The Chinese will be unable to compete with us; the currency of the whole of Manchuria and Mongolia will be in our control.

Until we have entirely discredited the Chinese silver notes, we will never place our gold notes in their proper place in Manchuria and Mongolia, much less obtain the monopoly in currency and finance of the two countries.

In view of the above-mentioned considerations, we must overthrow Manchuria's incontrovertible silver notes and divest the Government of its purchasing power. Then we can extend the use of our gold notes in hope of dominating the economic and financial activities of Manchuria and Mongolia. Furthermore, we can compel the authorities of the three eastern Provinces to employ Japanese advisers to help us gain supremacy in financial matters.

We must have the rights of monopoly for the sale of Manchurian and Mongolian products before we can carry out our continental policy and prevent the invasion of American capital as well as the influence of the Chinese traders. (Reprinted and distributed by World Peace Movement, 108 Park Row, New York.)

There is food for thought in the above paragraphs.

Is there a parallel between the scheme outlined by the Japanese Premier by the manipulation of money based on the gold standard for the subjugation and control of the Chinese people and the schemes, recently exposed, of our international bankers for the subjugation and control of the masses of the American people? Is the money system of this country under its present management being allowed to function freely for the advancement and general welfare of the masses, or is it being manipulated to deprive them of the fruits of their thrift and industry?

While the Japanese Government has repudiated and disavowed the authenticity of the memorial, subsequent events point to the adoption of a preconceived plan that closely follows the proposal contained in the memorial text of the pronouncement. It is apparent that outside influence, with the connivance of Chinese financiers, has successfully brought about the nationalization of silver by China, placing an interest burden on the business of the Chinese people, as has been done in this and other countries, by retiring gold and silver and replacing the coinage with paper money, loaned into circulation when secured by such interest-bearing obligations as may be eligible. It will be interesting to watch the results of the efforts of financiers to retain control of money and credit in the several nations and at the same time restore business conditions by these experiments.

TOWNSEND PLAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point, to insert a short statement showing where a very small portion of the Townsend money has gone.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object; I have never objected to a colleague extending his remarks—but I think this ought to be pointed out to our colleagues on both sides: That very recently for the first time in years in the House a practice has grown up of Members asking permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD "at this point", and then inserting long speeches. I think it is a very bad practice. I do not think our colleagues should indulge in it. Those responsible for the RECORD ought to see that it is not pursued.

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

There was no objection.

The statement submitted by Mr. HOFFMAN follows:

IS THERE A PROFIT IN THE TOWNSEND PLAN; IS THAT PROFIT HONESTLY OBTAINED?

Beyond question there is a profit in the Townsend plan. Who gets the profit? Does it go to Dr. Townsend or to those who are paying their dimes, quarters, and dollars to support the plan? Who will profit from the plan if it becomes a law, and what will that profit be?

In the beginning the plan was an old-age pension plan—a pension to the aged, to those over 60. The plan is now a plan to restore prosperity. The appeal in the beginning was to justice and to sympathy to relieve want and suffering. The object now being to increase business, let us treat the proposition in a businesslike way. Dr. Townsend testified at a hearing before a congressional committee that his salary was but $50 per week; that he received nothing else. Let us have the facts:

As long ago as May 18, 1935, the doctor signed and swore to a complaint in the district court of the United States for the district of Colorado, in which, among other things, he said that the membership of the clubs of the State of Colorado was approximately 200,000; "that each new member has heretofore paid, and will hereafter pay, the sum of 25 cents initiation fee; and that each member has heretofore, and will hereafter, pay the sum of 10 cents per month as a voluntary contribution; and that said contribution is now regularly made by more than one-half of the membership in the State of Colorado, and will hereafter continue to be so made; that said membership makes further additional contributions which average 1 cent per member per week, and will so continue hereafter * * *."

So, for initiation fees in Colorado alone the members have, up to May 18, 1935, paid $50,000; that each member has heretofore, and will hereafter, pay the sum of 10 cents per month as a voluntary contribution, which means $20,000 per month from the State of Colorado alone. And that is not all. There are, as the good doctor says, other contributions.

If he is correct in his statement that his members the country over number 21,000,000, if but one-quarter of them pay the 10-cents-per-month dues, someone is getting $525,000 per month from that source alone. And do not forget this is just the 10 cent dues. There are many other sources of revenue; one, the Townsend Weekly. There is also the Townsend Legion, with dues of $1 a head per month.

A partial statement would look something like this:

21,000,000 members, dues 10 cents per month; if one-half pay—let's make it one-quarter, or 5,000,000—that gives us per month $500,000 or per year	$6,000,000
Membership fees a year for the doctor—for easy figuring let's lose a million, and say that one-half of a 20,000,000 membership pay 25 cents; another	2,500,000
The profit from newspaper weekly per year, $200,000 (one-half to Dr. Townsend)	100,000
Total to Townsend organization, per year	8,600,000

Here is a little total of $8,600,000, to say nothing about the dues from the legionnaires, the profits from the sales of badges, pictures, etc. Perhaps the doctor's motive is just pure, unadulterated charity, but with his plan incidentally goes an income that would make some of these international bankers and Wall Street bankers decidedly envious.

The foregoing is a very brief statement, but from it you can get the big idea.

HOW DOES THE DOCTOR GET THE MONEY?—WHAT DOES HE TELL THE PEOPLE TO MAKE THEM SHELL OUT?

Let me quote from the Townsend plan victory chart (based on Townsend plan becoming the law of the land):

"THE MIRACLE OF 10 CENTS (IN ACTION FOR ANNUITANTS)

"Quota investment on monthly basis: Original investment 10 cents. Returns on investment (after first few months), $199.90. Life returns on investment (after first few months), $200.

"Quota investment on yearly basis: Original investment, $1.20. Returns on investment (after first year), $2,398.80. Life returns on investment (after first year), $2,400.

"THE MIRACLE OF 10 CENTS (IN ACTION FOR NONANNUITANTS)

"A permanent well-paid job or position until 60, then $200 monthly, $2,400 yearly, for life.

"The formula: Congress will vote for the Townsend plan when the Townsend Clubs control the vote in the 435 congressional districts of the 48 States."

Is it not strange that people reading this, believing, as so many of them do, that by investing 10 cents they will receive $199.90, and

so on, as outlined in the plan, join the club, and pay their dues? Is it not strange that even those under 60, promised a "permanent well-paid job or position until 60", should bite on a bait of this kind? You who are paying your membership fee, your monthly dues, and besieging your Congressman to vote for this plan, think a little, not only of what the doctor tells it will do for you but of what it will do to people generally, and then take one thought as to what the doctor and his organizers are getting out of it and determine for yourselves whether they are working for the interests of those contributing to the plan or for their own interests.

And what are you getting, or what will you get, for the money which the local organizations and its members are contributing? In this circular you were promised $200 a month if you were eligible to receive the pension. Now you know from the admissions of those who promised you this sum, made on the floor of Congress, that they have no such plan in mind, that they have no such bill pending in Congress. Why be longer deceived? Put your faith and your trust in men that you know to be honest, in Representatives who do not promise the impossible. Be no longer deceived by those who, pretending to be working for your interests, are merely serving their own.

It is time that investigation was made, and the real purpose of these organizers and their lack of ability and sincerity disclosed to those they are deceiving.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I explained the attitude of the Democratic Party in connection with labor legislation. Shortly afterward my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN, made reply. Tonight, on the Star Radio Forum, Senator O'MAHONEY will explain the O'Mahoney-Mead bill. The title of his discourse will be, "National Charters for National Commerce." The bill is, in my judgment, an answer in part, at least, to the present economic problem. I hope you will listen to the Senator's address tonight.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the plight of deserving and needy people in this country who have kept off relief thus far but now find themselves in distress, as described by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] a few minutes ago, finds a deep response in my heart. The question I want to put to the gentleman and to the Members of this House now is: What are you going to do about it?

Mr. BLANTON. We ought to take Mr. Hopkins by the nape of the neck and throw him out of that building down there. Let us look at this from Mr. Hopkins' angle.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Our Colorado delegation went to see Mr. Hopkins a few days ago in behalf of 30,000 workers in the State of Colorado who are getting no relief and who cannot get work, although the public-works program in that State has been expanded 25 percent beyond its original objective, or from 31,000 to 42,000. Mr. Hopkins said to our committee:

We now have about 3,000,000 men and women at work in this country under the W. P. A. program. Tomorrow morning I could turn these 3,000,000 people out and put 3,000,000 more people in their places.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the $4,000,000,000 would not put to work over one-third of the idle people in this country. I said this to Mr. Hopkins:

What you were up against when we passed the $4,800,000,000 bill was 10,000,000 idle people in this country. You started out with an objective of putting 3,500,000 people to work. It was, therefore, obvious from the start that you could not take care of more than one-third of the idle people in this country. This is so in every Member's district. You have not yet exhausted the registered unemployed who were on relief November 1 when the W. P. A. program started, but naturally every idle man in this country will feel that he ought to be among the 3,500,000 who are put to work, and you have not got the money.

Mr. Hopkins nodded in the affirmative.

Mr. RICH. If we would tax mass production a little bit, these men from industry would be put back to work.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Regardless of where the money might come from, the point I want to make is that it is not there now. The fact that W. P. A. now has employed in Colorado about 42,000 men and women, while its original objective under the W. P. A. allocation for that State was only 31,000, does not mean that Colorado was given a 25-percent increase in its allocation. It simply means that in order to relieve unemployment distress immediately 11,000 more were put to work, which will simply shorten the life of the allocation. They will run out of money just that much sooner. Something had to be done, and they did all they could.

Administrator Hopkins made it clear in answer to the plea of our delegation that if he expanded the employment program in one State, he would be called upon to do it in every State. He instanced the fact that the mayor of one great city was asking for the employment of an additional hundred thousand; that the mayor of another great city was asking for a vast increase; and that he had scores of other requests. I hope I am violating no confidence when I say that Mr. Hopkins stated that if he merely maintained the present employment figures the W. P. A. appropriation would be exhausted by June 30, and that even to maintain it until June 30 the fund might have to be replenished from unexpended or defaulted sums in other appropriations. I even fear that the situation may be worse than Mr. Hopkins painted it. I got information from another inside source that the works-progress appropriation would be exhausted by April 1, and that they had contemplated reducing the present employment figures 400,000 in order to insure that the money would last until April 1. This action, it is true, was not taken, but even its contemplation indicates the straits to which the administration is being reduced to maintain its work-relief program. We had just as well face the plain fact that Mr. Hopkins is not putting these deserving, needy people to work because he has not got the money.

I have a letter from a Works Progress regional director in my State who has a district of nine counties. He says that he has at work now about 9,400 men and women in the nine counties, but that there are still 2,550 unemployed who were on relief and registered as unemployed, and on top of this 2,000 deserving, needy people who have succeeded up to this time in keeping off relief, but who are now as desperately in need of relief and of work and as deserving of it as any people in the State. I do not need to come to Washington to get this picture. I got it at home. I got it in my office and out among the people every day until I was driven almost to despair. That regional office has no money to employ these 4,500 people, the State director has no money to employ them, and the Federal Administrator, as he himself stated, could put 3,000,000 more people to work if he had the money.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that I knew before the shift was made from direct relief to work relief—I knew as far back as the 1st of October and so represented to the administrative heads at Washington—that there would be not less than 40,000 people in Colorado who would be outside of all forms of relief this winter. I was too conservative; 100,000 would come nearer the fact. As far back as the 1st of November I stated in the papers in Colorado that there must be another large relief appropriation passed by this session of Congress. It ought to be passed, and it ought to be passed now. I am advised that in the face of the opposition clamor against public works and relief, the President does not want to come to Congress at this time and ask for another appropriation to round out the present fiscal year, and that a request may only be made later on for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, my attitude on this matter is reflected in a letter I wrote a constituent this morning in answer to one suggesting that it would be a good thing if Members of Congress followed the suggestions in Al Smith's speech to the Liberty League. I told this constituent that, with as high as one-fourth of all the people in my congressional district dependent upon Federal aid for food, I could not find much light in Al Smith's suggestions to Congress, and that I had much more immediate worries than Mr. Smith and the Lib-

erty League. Mr. Hoover is a little more definite than Al Smith. He made a speech at St. Louis recently, in which he laid down a four-point program: First, stop public works; second, do it now—so we still have only one point; third, cut relief in two; fourth, study American history and the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter just received by me from W. P. A. workers in a county in my district. I wish Al Smith or Mr. Hoover had the answering of such letters as this every day. I would be interested in reading their answers.

WALSENBURG, COLO., *January 29, 1936.*

To JOHN A. MARTIN,
Congressman of Colorado, Washington, D. C.:

We, the workers on Huerfano County W. P. A. projects, assembled at a mass meeting in the Blue Glade Hall this 29th day of January 1936, have adopted the following resolutions:

Whereas the W. P. A. workers are furnishing their own transportation to and from the jobs, under the most miserable circumstances, and paying for medical service for themselves and their families; and

Whereas the workers and their families are going undernourished and without sufficient clothing, thereby threatening and undermining their general health; and

Whereas the minimum wage of $44 per month for W. P. A. workers has been tried and found out to be insufficient to adequately supply the necessities of life for the workers and their families: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we demand prevailing union wages on all W. P. A. projects, 30 hours per week, with transportation to and from the jobs, and medical aid to the workers and their families; be it further

Resolved, That we recommend that the W. P. A. administration set up for all children a hot-lunch project in all of Huerfano County schools; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of the following officials: Harry L. Hopkins, Federal Works Progress Administrator, Washington, D. C.; Senator Costigan, Colorado Senator, Washington, D. C.; John A. Martin, Colorado Congressman, Washington, D. C.; Paul D. Shriver, Colorado Works Progress Administrator, Denver, Colo.; Ed. C. Johnson, Governor of Colorado, Denver, Colo.; Charles Haines, Huerfano County Works Progress Administrator, Walsenburg, Colo.

——— ———,
Presiding Chairman.
——— ———,
Presiding Secretary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week the gentleman from Texas made a statement in his speech which I think reflects on my integrity. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. When the Wheeler-Howard Act was before the Congress and under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, you will recall I submitted an amendment to limit the amount of money given to the Indian Bureau for the purpose of carrying on propaganda among the Indians for this new act.

I think I was entirely right when I sought to limit the amount of $160,000 to $10,000; but the House took action, and that is all there is to it. I had my say, but the House thought otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, in a speech the following day the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] stated:

BURDICK, on page 1280, entirely misdescribes the self-government feature of the Indian Reorganization Act.

He made the statement that in referring to the act I said that any committee of Indians organized under the new act was always subject to the whim and the caprice of the Department of the Interior. He took exception to that statement and said that I misdescribed the act, and states this:

The committee or governing body of the tribe, under its constitution, is elected by the tribe and is subject to removal by the tribe alone.

I want to say that I did not misdescribe this act to the Members of Congress. I sat for 5 months on a committee which heard the complaints of the Indians; and if the Members of the House will refer to the hearings that were held on H. R. 7781, they will find set out in that document the fact that on the Klamath Indian Reservation the business committee did not suit the Department of the Interior, and this committee was removed. I say that the Department can remove any committee organized under the new act.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAVERICK. If anything I said the other day was merely a difference of opinion, I may be wrong, and the gentleman may be right. I would not cast any reflection on the gentleman at all.

Mr. BURDICK. The thing I disliked was the statement that I misdescribed that act to this body.

Mr. MAVERICK. I will change that to difference of opinion, because I have a very high opinion for the gentleman's intelligence, integrity, and ability. Also, I agree with you pretty much on your ideas of the Federal Reserve System; upon that I think the gentleman from North Dakota is one of the greatest authorities in the United States. I agree with the gentleman upon some matters of importance, so this Indian business is a difference of opinion on what I regard as a minor matter. The gentleman from North Dakota serves his people well, and if necessary I will make an apology 9 miles long. [Applause.]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, apparently this settles all difficulties.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I received notice from the Whip this morning to the effect that bills on the Private Calendar would be called tomorrow. Does that mean that an omnibus claim bill may be called up tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, an omnibus claim bill may not be called up tomorrow.

Mr. COCHRAN. An omnibus claim bill can be called up by unanimous consent tomorrow, if unanimous consent is granted?

The SPEAKER. The House may by unanimous consent agree to the consideration of such a bill, but under the rule omnibus bills may not be considered unless unanimous consent is given. Only individual bills on the Private Calendar may be considered tomorrow.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express the hope that the Speaker will not recognize anyone requesting unanimous consent for the consideration of an omnibus claim bill until the Members of the House have had 10 days' notice in advance. This thing of calling up such bills on 24 hours' notice is not fair to the House. The bills provide for appropriations and, as the gentleman from Colorado stated the other day, the Congress, without any regard for the condition of the Treasury, is continually passing bills calling for large expenditures. Members should receive a week or 10 days' notice so they can examine omnibus claims bills.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. DUFFY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee holding hearings with reference to amendments to the Clayton Act, as well as the Judiciary Committee itself, may sit during the session of the House tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, may I say that a great many Members are awaiting for bills on the Private Calendar to be called, and I shall be forced to object to any further unanimous-consent requests.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I merely rise at this time to take issue with my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in reference to Mr. Hopkins and the relief program. At the conclusion of Mr. BLANTON's speech I called Mr. Hopkins' office and talked to Mr. Aubrey Williams in reference to the query propounded by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] put to the House today in reference to relief. There is no one in this House who would not be perfectly willing to give that citizen to whom the gentleman referred preference—I refer to the patriotic Americans who have striven mightily to carry on without aid from the Government, and who finally found themselves penniless and at the end of their rope—and the answer of Mr. Hopkins is this: Does Mr. BLANTON want everyone who is on the relief rolls taken off and put these other people on? Or, is Mr. BLANTON willing, as I am, to appropriate the money to put them all on?

Mr. BLANTON. I want all American citizens in distress to be treated exactly alike, with no discrimination.

Mr. CONNERY. That is exactly what Mr. Hopkins wants to do.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want any halo or sacrosanct put around the heads of those on the relief rolls and give them Government work and say to every other worthy citizen in the United States whose family is starving, "You cannot have public work, because you have not been on relief."

Mr. CONNERY. I understand the gentleman from Texas perfectly.

Mr. BLANTON. I want American citizens in distress treated exactly alike, with no discrimination.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Hopkins wants to treat them all alike, but he cannot do so unless we give him the money. It is up to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], to support an appropriation that will first take care of those citizens to whom he referred, who have made sacrifices and have come to the end of their rope, and also to take care of that extra 100,000 that Mayor Laguardia is calling for in New York, who have to go on relief, as well as these other thousands that are referred to by the mayors of Chicago and every other city in the United States. Let us take care of all of them. Is my friend the gentlemen from Texas willing to appropriate the money to take care of all of them?

Mr. BLANTON. We appropriated $4,800,000,000 to furnish work to all distressed Americans. That is a stupendous sum of money. It was intended for the worthy unemployed. Congress did not intend that discrimination should be shown. We wanted all treated fairly, and justly, and exactly alike. One distressed American is just the same as any other distressed American. I want to see them all treated exactly alike.

Mr. CONNERY. And I repeat to my friend from Texas, that that is exactly what Mr. Hopkins wants.

Mr. BLANTON. It may be what Mr. Hopkins wants, but he is doing just the reverse. He is giving all the work to those who have been on relief, and is giving no work to any man who through many sacrifices has kept off of relief, although his family is now starving. We must change this intolerable situation. It is indefensible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PROCESSING TAXES

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, which I have today written Mr. Gustavus F. Swift, president of Swift & Co., Chicago:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1936.

Mr. GUSTAVUS F. SWIFT,
President, Swift & Co., Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. SWIFT: It is my understanding that by virtue of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the so-called rice-millers case, impounded processing taxes in an amount approximating $10,000,000 will be released to your company. In view of the fact that in paying these processing taxes you merely acted as a collecting agency for the Government of the United States, I am wondering what disposition your company expects to make of this money.

I assume that your company does not contend that it paid any portion of this tax or that it has any right or title to it at this time. I am basing this assumption upon the repeated statements which have been made by the packers of this country to the effect that they had not and could not absorb processing taxes, that they could not pass them on to the consumer and that the only alternative was to take them out of the price paid the producer. I assume that there is no question about this being the position of the packers of the country and of your own company. I specifically call your attention to the testimony of Mr. George E. Putnam, economist for Swift & Co., who testified before the House Committee on Agriculture on Saturday, December 17, 1932. At that time the committee had under consideration what was known as the Jones allotment bill, which imposed a processing tax upon hogs. After discussing at considerable length the effect and incidence of a processing tax on hogs, Mr. Putnam summarized the packers' position as follows:

"I should like to take up just 30 seconds by way of résumé of the principal points that I attempted to develop. I led you up through some rather dismal channels by way of showing some of the fundamental economic principles involved in the meat business and in the whole question of the incidence of a tax.

"First, the packer's profit margin is not sufficient to absorb a tax of one-half cent a pound or a tax of 2 cents per pound or a tax of 4 cents per pound.

"Second, the tax cannot be passed on to the consumer on the form of high prices because, first, the pork is highly perishable and must be moved at the market price, whether that price is satisfactory or unsatisfactory, and second, because there are a great many substitutes for pork, and if the packer attempted to pass on a tax on hogs to the consumer in the form of higher prices, the consumer would substitute not only other meats but any number of kinds of food. Therefore the tax must be passed on to the producer" (p. 232 of hearings).

In the course of the hearings on this bill Mr. Thomas E. Wilson, then president of Wilson & Co.; Mr. T. G. Lee, then president of Armour & Co., and Mr. Oscar Mayer, a packer of Madison, Wis., all testified to the same effect.

Mr. Mayer summed the matter up by saying:

"Under these conditions, any absorption of the tax by the packing industry is clearly impossible and there remains only the final alternative of pushing the tax back upon the farmer in the form of lower prices for livestock" (p. 283).

Mr. Lee said: "I am here for the purpose of stating to you from an experience of over 30 years in selling meat products that the proposed tax cannot be passed on to the consumer, and, likewise, that the processors cannot pay it" (p. 291).

Mr. Wilson said: "Now, as to the packer being able to pay this tax, there is nothing out of which he would be able to pay it, in his business. As I figure it, this would amount to approximately $300,000,000, the tax as proposed, and the manufacturers cannot take that out of their earnings. The packer has nothing out of which it can come. Therefore, if it cannot be passed on to the consumer and cannot be paid by the packer it must come out of the producer, in my opinion" (p. 268).

On March 6, 1935, the House Committee on Agriculture conducted hearings on the bill (H. R. 5585) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act. At that time Mr. Putnam, again representing your company, appeared, and for the purpose of ascertaining whether the predictions of the packers and their representatives as to the incidence of the tax were being borne out, I asked Mr. Putnam the following question:

"Mr. Putnam, is it your opinion that the farmer would today receive $2.25 more for his hogs if the processing tax were not in effect?"

Mr. Putnam replied:

"I say that if you will remove the processing tax from hogs the price of hogs would jump instantly $2.25 on the hundred, and I am most sure of that, for this reason: The farmer that produces hogs receives not only the market price, the current price, but if he is cooperating with the Government in the reduction of production program he receives a benefit payment of somewhere in the neighborhood of 90 to 95 percent of the processing tax. Now, do not misunderstand me; I do not say that the processing tax reduces the amount the farmer receives per hog, for on balance the processing tax is returned to him in the form of benefit payments but the market price is less."

In reply to a further question along the same line, Mr. Putnam replied:

"The market price is less by the amount of the processing tax" (pp. 254–255).

It would appear that it was still the belief of the packers after more than a year's experience with the processing tax that it was being passed back to the farmer. Indeed, I have never heard any other contention made by anyone representing the packing industry, and I take it for granted that no such contention is made now. Therefore, it would seem that the only fair and equitable disposition of this money would be for the packers to return it to the producers who had the amount of the tax deducted from the sale price of their hogs.

While it might take some time and trouble to return these taxes to the producers who have paid them, yet I assume that the records of your company are sufficiently complete to enable

you to make such refunds within a reasonable period of time. In all fairness and good conscience this should be done as soon as possible.

This same inquiry, of course, might well be made of all of those who engage in the packing industry. It is impossible, however, for me to write all packers regarding the matter, so I am writing to you because of the influential position and leadership of your company in the industry. I am sure that whatever position you follow in this regard will be persuasive as to other companies. I shall be pleased to hear from you to the effect that it is the purpose of Swift & Co. to restore to the hog producers of the country the tax which the Federal Government has collected from them through you.

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day, and the Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

IRRIGATION CHANNEL BETWEEN CLEAR LAKE AND LOST RIVER, CALIF.

The Clerk called the first bill on the calendar, H. R. 6773, to deepen the irrigation channel between Clear Lake and Lost River, in the State of California, and for other purposes.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COLONIAL MONUMENT IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5772, to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Colonial National Monument in the State of Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

THE HOMESTEAD NATIONAL MONUMENT OF AMERICA, GAGE COUNTY, NEBR.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1307, to establish the Homestead National Monument of America in Gage County, Nebr.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE TWENTY-FIRST AMENDMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8368, to enforce the twenty-first amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SARATOGA NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 89, to provide for the creation of the Saratoga National Historical Park in the State of New York, and for other purposes.

Mr. RICH and Mr. DIRKSEN objected.

AMENDMENT OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1425, to amend section 80 of chapter 9 of an act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly, a bill of this character was passed 4 weeks ago today. It was objected to by me when first called on the calendar, and later on I consented that the bill be brought up and the measure was then taken up and passed.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the proponent of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LAW CLERKS TO UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6376, to amend section 118 of the Judicial Code to provide for the appointment of law clerks to United States district court judges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

There being no objection, a similar Senate bill (S. 2643) was reported for the House bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Judicial Code be, and it is hereby, amended by the addition of the following section:

"SEC. 118b. Each United States district court judge is hereby authorized to appoint a law clerk when he deems the same to be necessary, and the senior judge of the circuit court of appeals having jurisdiction over the district where the clerk is needed shall certify to the necessity of the appointment, but there shall not be appointed more than 35 of such law clerks during the first fiscal year of the enactment of this amendment. Thereafter such number in excess of 35 per year shall be limited by the necessity of each case as hereinbefore provided. The salary of such appointed law clerk shall be at a rate not in excess of $2,750 per annum; and the appropriation of such amount as is or may be necessary to pay the salaries and travel expenses of such law clerks is hereby authorized."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A House bill (H. R. 6376) was laid on the table.

WINNEBAGO TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6740, to amend an act approved December 17, 1928, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment thereon in claims which the Winnebago Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this is an Indian claims bill, and I put in the RECORD a few days ago a letter that shows the House would not be justified in passing this bill, and I therefore object.

Mr. BACON, Mr. TABER, and Mr. RICH also objected.

INSPECTION OF MOTOR VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2001) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of Congress approved May 16, 1906.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Virginia a question. Page 2, line 16, implies that the act will include all towing vessels. As I understand, that will include all vessels, regardless of tonnage.

Mr. BLAND. That is true, and that is the reason I am asking that the bill go over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE TRUST PERIOD ON LANDS RESERVED FOR THE PALA BAND OF MISSION INDIANS, CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8252) to reimpose and extend the trust period on lands reserved for the Pala Band of Mission Indians, California.

There being no objection, the bill S. 2877 was substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the period of trust on lands patented to the Pala Band of Mission Indians in California under authority of the act of January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. 712), which trust expired January 5, 1935, is hereby reimposed and extended for a period of 10 years from that date: *Provided*, That further extension of the period of trust may be made by the President, in his discretion, as provided by the act of March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 976).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

COURTHOUSE BUILDING AT RUTLAND, VT.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 37) authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claims of subcontractors and materialmen for material and labor furnished in the construction of the post office and courthouse building at Rutland, Vt.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FORT FREDERICA NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8431) to provide for the establishment of the Fort Frederica National Monument at St. Simon Island, Ga.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2793) to amend the provisions of law relating to appointment of postmasters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. TABER, and Mr. JENKINS of Ohio objected.

TO CREATE AN INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7837) to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. BACON objected.

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT, 1921

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8851) to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921.

The SPEAKER. This bill requires three objections. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. BEAM, and Mr. BACON objected.

CLAIMS RESPECTING POST-OFFICE BUILDING, HEMPSTEAD, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2647) authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust claims of subcontractors, materialmen, and laborers for material and labor furnished in the construction of a post-office building at Hempstead, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I think this bill ought to have proper consideration at some other time. I object.

Mr. COSTELLO. Then I object to the present consideration of the bill.

CLAIMS OF GRAIN ELEVATORS RESPECTING INSURANCE, ETC.

The Clerk called Senate Joint Resolution 72, authorizing and directing the Comptroller General of the United States to certify for payment certain claims of grain elevators and grain firms to cover insurance and interest on wheat during the years 1919 and 1920 as per a certain contract authorized by the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CLAIBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

STAY OF ALIENS IN UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7221) to authorize the shortening or termination of the stay in the United States of certain aliens not admitted for permanent residence, to authorize the deportation of certain aliens admitted for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? This bill requires three objectors.

Mr. MAVERICK, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. JENKINS of Ohio objected.

ALIEN WIVES OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7975) to permit alien wives of American citizens who were married prior to the approval of the Immigration Act of 1924 to enter the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill will be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMUTING OF ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4340) to restrict habitual commuting of aliens from foreign contiguous territory to engage in skilled or unskilled labor or employment in continental United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners, or citizens of any foreign country, nation, or colony, or a citizen of a possession of any foreign nation or country, the boundaries of which touch the boundaries of the United States of America or are contiguous thereto, shall be permitted to habitually cross said international boundary line for the purpose of seeking employment, or engaging in any employment, vocation, or trade, either as skilled or unskilled labor employment, in the United States of America, to and from his or their residence or residences which are outside of the borders of the said continental United States.

SEC. 2. The words "alien", "foreigner", and "citizen of any foreign country, nation, or colony" shall be construed to mean any person who has his residence in said foreign country, nation, or possession or colony of a foreign country.

SEC. 3. Aliens within the purview of sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be held to be immigrants and shall be excluded from the United States, or shall be deported from the United States under the provisions of the immigration laws now in effect, unless they are in possession of an unexpired immigration visa at each separate application for admission or in possession of an unexpired reentry permit for each separate application to return from foreign contiguous territory.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act are in addition to the provisions of the immigration laws now in force, and shall be enforced as a part of such laws, and all of the penal or other provisions of such laws now applicable shall apply to and be enforced in connection with the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 24, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 5. The provisions of this act shall not be applicable to any person who is a bona fide employee of any common carrier operating between the United States and any foreign contiguous territory."

The committee amendment was agreed to; and 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 was laid on the table.

NATURALIZATION LAWS RESPECTING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4900) to amend the naturalization laws in respect of residence requirements, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the author of the bill, Mr. BLOOM, requested that I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice, and I make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS TENNESSEE RIVER, DECATUR, TENN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8586) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Tennessee and certain of its political subdivisions to construct, maintain, and operate

a toll bridge across the Tennessee River at or near a point between Dayton and Decatur, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF REGENTS

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which Senate Joint Resolution 118, providing for the appointment of Mr. Morris, a member of the Board of Regents was indefinitely postponed, and reinstate the same on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CALIFORNIA TO BRING SUIT IN COURT OF CLAIMS ON BEHALF OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill, H. R. 5167, to amend an act entitled "An Act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California", approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 602), by amending certain portions of sections 3 and 6 thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BACON, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. TABER objected.

FUNDS ALLOCABLE TO PUERTO RICO FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF

The Clerk called the next 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.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? This bill requires three objections.

Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. MERRITT of Connecticut objected.

DEPOSIT AND INVESTMENT OF INDIAN FUNDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8588, to authorize the deposit and investment of Indian funds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill to authorize the deposit and investment of Indian funds

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to withdraw from the United States Treasury and to deposit in banks to be selected by him the common or community funds of any Indian tribe which are, or may hereafter be, held in trust by the United States, and on which the United States is not obligated by law to pay interest at higher rates than can be procured from the banks. The said Secretary is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to deposit in banks to be selected by him the funds held in trust by the United States for the benefit of individual Indians: *Provided*, That no individual Indian money shall be deposited in any bank until the bank shall have agreed to pay interest thereon at a reasonable rate, except that the payment of interest may be waived in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior on active checking accounts: *Provided further*, That no tribal or individual Indian money shall be deposited in any bank until the bank shall have furnished an acceptable bond or pledged collateral security therefor in the form of any public-debt obligations of the United States and any bonds, notes, or other obligations which are unconditionally guaranteed as to both interest and principal by the United States, except that no such bond or collateral shall be required to be furnished by any such bank which is entitled to the benefits of section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, with respect to any deposits of such tribal or individual funds to the extent that such deposits are insured under such section: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained in this act, or in section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, shall operate to deprive any Indian having unrestricted funds on deposit in any such bank of the full protection afforded by section 12B of said Federal Reserve Act, irrespective of any interest such Indian may have in any restricted Indian funds on deposit in the same bank to the credit of a disbursing agent of the United States. For the purposes of said acts, said unrestricted funds shall constitute a separate and distinct basis for an insurance claim: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior, if he deems it advisable and for the best interest of the Indians, may invest the trust funds of any tribe or individual Indian in any public-debt obligations of the United States and in any bonds, notes, or other obligations which are unconditionally guaranteed as to both interest and principal by the United States: *And provided further*, That the foregoing shall apply to the funds of the Osage Tribe of Indians, and the individual members thereof, only with respect to the deposit of such funds in banks.

SEC. 2. Section 28 of the act of May 25, 1918, entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919", and all other acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHALING TREATY

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 3413) to give effect to the convention between the United States and certain other countries for the regulation of whaling, concluded at Geneva, September 24, 1931, signed on the part of the United States, March 31, 1932, and for other purposes, be rereferred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I have discussed it with the chairman of that committee, and it is satisfactory to him that it be rereferred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

PERIOD OF RESTRICTION IN LANDS OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8787, to amend section 3 of the act approved May 10, 1928, entitled "An act to extend the period of restriction in lands of certain members of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes", as amended February 14, 1931.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice to enable the committee to comply with the Ramseyer rule.

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

There was no objection.

SKILLED SHORTHAND REPORTERS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4886, providing for the employment of skilled shorthand reporters in the executive branch of the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF SHORTHAND REPORTING

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4887, to create a board of shorthand reporting, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this would create another board, would it not?

Mr. EAGLE. Which costs the Government not one penny.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman explain how that could be possible?

Mr. EAGLE. Gladly, because it provides that out of a fee of $25 each, to be paid by the applicants for a certificate as a certified shorthand reporter, all salaries and expenses shall be paid, and the bill expressly so states.

Mr. TABER. Unless this board passes on the qualification of someone, they cannot be employed as a shorthand reporter in the District?

Mr. EAGLE. That would not be true.

Mr. TABER. It would not?

Mr. EAGLE. No.

Mr. TABER. I think I will ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. EAGLE. I wonder if the gentleman would be patient and allow me to make a brief explanation of it, because I

am satisfied if he understands it as I do, he will not be disposed to object.

Mr. TABER. I am willing to reserve the objection.

Mr. EAGLE. At the request of the National Shorthand Reporters Association and State shorthand reporters' associations of many States, at the request of several of the departments of the Government, including the Interstate Commerce Commission, I have introduced this bill. A similar bill, S. 1453, was introduced in the Senate, unanimously reported favorably by the Senate committee, and passed unanimously by the Senate, and has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, and that committee has considered it and, in turn, made its favorable report.

The State of Iowa and the State of New York led off in the matter of securing accurate stenographic transcripts of public business. Many other States have, also, but those two, notably, have taken the lead.

I wish to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and other Members that at present, under the statute and under the rule prevailing, under the statute and under the custom prevailing, stenographers to make stenographic reports for great bureaus, like the Interstate Commerce Commission and other independent agencies of the Government, are obtained by competitive bidding. Contractors come and bid so much to do the work for 6 months or 12 months. You do not get a lawyer upon the basis of competitive bidding; if you did, you would lose every case. You do not get a doctor upon the basis of competitive bidding; if you did, you would likely go to your grave. Yet in matters affecting millions or even hundreds of millions of dollars in the Interstate Commerce Commission and other great independent agencies of the Government, and in matters affecting the rights and liberties of the citizens, bids are let to contractors at wholesale, who take them so low they cannot get the best stenographic service in the country, but get men who cannot compete with the successful and competent shorthand reporters of the country, and they often make reports upon which lawyers and litigants, rich and poor alike, cannot rely. The contractors make up the deficit, if at all, by the sale of extra certified copies of these imperfect records. This bill provides that three persons who have lived in the United States 5 years and have been public stenographers for 5 years shall be appointed by the President as a board of shorthand reporting, to be confirmed by the Senate. Thereafter the term shall be 3 years for such persons; that their compensation, and their only compensation, shall be a fee of $25 for each applicant to get a certificate. Nowhere does it say that the Government boards, bureaus, or departments are limited to those holding certificates, but the implied understanding is that they will employ such as have been examined, qualified, and certified, in order to have good services.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EAGLE. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman think the application fee a little high?

Mr. EAGLE. I do not, because if the applicant shall fail to pass, he could, within 2 years, without the payment of an additional fee, when better qualified come and be examined again.

At stated periods and times this board of three, paying their traveling expenses and their own compensation out of such $25 items from all over the country, go to different parts of the United States where it would be convenient for applicants to be examined. I think, therefore, the fee is not too high.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is there not danger of favoritism in an arrangement of this kind?

Mr. EAGLE. I do not think so.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order at this time.

Mr. RICH. Could not the Civil Service hold these examinations?

Mr. EAGLE. No; not under the present civil-service statute.

Mr. RICH. Would it not be more satisfactory for the Civil Service Commission to do this?

Mr. EAGLE. The Civil Service Commission law would have to be amended before it could so make by examination an eligible list of stenographers for such purposes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CLASSIFICATION OF POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3251, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when this bill was called 2 weeks ago I believe I made the statement to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] that I would favor a bill placing first-, second-, and third-class postmasters under civil service. I thought at that time this bill might be the answer to my prayer, but I find in studying the bill that it merely creates the machinery by which all existing postmasters may be blanketed into the civil service upon reappointment. For this reason and because of the highly political nature of the bill, I am forced to object.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will not the gentleman from Michigan withhold his objection to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I withhold my objection, Mr. Speaker, to permit the gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan what the other method is? This simply applies the present civil-service law to postmasters.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will answer the gentleman in this manner: I have in mind introducing a bill which I believe will take care of this situation and be fair to both sides of the aisle, because, after all, this is a political issue and nothing else.

I would provide, I believe, for the immediate elimination of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters; I would provide that these offices be immediately filled by competitive civil-service examinations; and to give inducement for promotion from the ranks of the postal employees I would provide in this bill that experience should rate, we will say, 60 percent, in order that there may be a career for some of these men who are actually doing the work at the present time without the honor of being called postmaster. We all know that in first-class offices in particular the assistant postmaster or the superintendent of mails does the actual technical work of the office and that the postmaster becomes merely a figurehead.

Now, there is no reason why this assistant postmaster, who quite often is a civil-service employee, or the superintendent of mails, should not have the title, already having the responsibility of doing the work; and I believe, as I have been thinking it over since the last call of the calendar, that this would be the only equitable way in which the situation could be handled. This would be fair to all the existing postmasters and fair to both sides of this aisle.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. If it is impossible for us to have this legislation enacted I shall be very glad to join with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan in advocating his plan. I want to compliment him on having a plan that approaches the solution of this question. It has, however, been the custom of the Civil Service Commission, gained from the experience in handling problems of this kind, to cover the employees affected as is done in this bill.

This bill contains their recommendations. A postmaster who is physically unfit, over age, or otherwise disqualified, would not be covered by civil service because they have to take a qualifying examination. I would like to see this bill advanced, because it is the recommendation of the bipartisan Civil Service Commission, and it advances the cause

of good administration and improves the personnel of this service.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman from New York and myself are in accord on what we want to accomplish, but the gentleman realizes that this bill would give a lifetime job to every first-, second- or third-class postmaster reappointed.

Mr. MEAD. Only after he could pass the qualifying test provided by the Commission.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. As I understand the bill, if this administration goes over into a second term, then upon the reappointment of the present postmaster he immediately obtains a civil-service status.

In other words, it is possible for all existing postmasters to be blanketed into the civil service upon reappointment.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TABER, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. RANSLEY objected.

RETIREMENT OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3044, to amend the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 349), for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service and in certain positions in the legislative branch of the Government, to include all other employees in the legislative branch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 349), for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service and in certain positions in the legislative branch of the Government, is hereby amended to include all other employees in the legislative branch.

SEC. 2. The provisions of such act of May 29, 1930, shall not be applicable to any employee in the legislative branch who is brought within its scope by section 1 of this act until such employee gives notice in writing to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, that he or she desires to come under the provisions of such act of May 29, 1930. Such notice must be given, in the case of any such employee in the service on the effective date of this act, within 6 months from such effective date, and in the case of any such employee entering the service after the effective date of this act, within 6 months from the date of such entrance.

SEC. 3. The provisions of section 2 of such act of May 29, 1930, and of section 204 of the Economy Act of June 30, 1932, and any Executive orders pursuant thereto, relating to automatic separation, shall not apply to any employee in the legislative branch to whom the provisions of such act are extended by this act.

SEC. 4. The term "employee in the legislative branch" where used in this act shall also include (a) officers elected by the Senate or House of Representatives who are not members of either body, (b) the legislative counsel of the Senate and the legislative counsel of the House and the employees in their respective offices, (c) the Capitol Police force, and (d) the employees of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and

SEC. 5. This act shall take effect on October 1, 1935.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 23, strike out the word "and."

On page 2, line 25, after the word "and", insert "(e) clerks to Members of the Senate, clerks to Members of the House of Representatives, clerks and employees to the several committees of the House and Senate, and all other employees.

"SEC. 5. In computing annuitable service, all employment prior to July 1, 1919, as clerk to a Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in his representative capacity shall be recognized as employment in the legislative branch if and when such employment can be shown by records or secondary evidence, and in the case of applications heretofore awarded or denied such cases shall be immediately reopened and readjudicated on the above basis from the date of separation, this provision to become effective from date of the approval of this act."

Page 3, line 14, strike out "5" and insert "6."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: On page 3, line 15, strike out "1935" and insert in lieu thereof "1936."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill 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.

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5051, to amend the Civil Service Act approved January 16, 1883 (22 Stat. 403), and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CLAIBORNE, and Mr. MORITZ objected.

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS FOR POST-OFFICE STATIONS, ETC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4672, to provide for the purchase of construction of buildings for post-office stations, branches, and garages, and for other purposes.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER AT OR NEAR ARROW ROCK, MO.

The Clerk called the next 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to be consistent with reference to these toll-bridge bills. This is in my own State. I object.

Mr. ZIONCHECK and Mr. COSTELLO also objected.

ISLAND OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1392, to extend the provisions of certain laws to the island of Puerto Rico.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, the island of Puerto Rico shall be entitled to share in appropriations now or which may hereafter become available for apportionment under the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", approved July 11, 1916, known as the "Federal Highway Act", and any act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, upon the same terms and conditions as any of the several States, and the island of Puerto Rico shall be included in the calculations to determine the basis of apportionment of such funds.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "1936" and insert "1938."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the words "known as the Federal Highway Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER AT LOUISVILLE, KY.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8661, supplementing the act of Congress approved February 25, 1928, entitled "An act authorizing the city of Louisville, Ky., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near said city."

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I understand this bill was included in an omnibus bill the last time and is already the law. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of any member of the committee who can speak for the committee,

I think the bill should keep its place on the calendar until a member of the committee makes the request.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

USE OF NET WEIGHTS IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TRANSACTIONS IN COTTON

The Clerk called the next 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. CLAIBORNE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MERRITT of New York, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GRANFIELD, Mr. BACON, Mr. TABER, and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH objected.

MALHEUR NATIONAL FOREST

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 464, to add certain lands to the Malheur National Forest in the State of Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE, Mrs. O'DAY, and Mr. RICH objected.

GENERAL MARQUIS DE LAFAYETTE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4989, for erection of monument to General Marquis de Lafayette.

Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. TABER, and Mr. RICH objected.

COMPACT BETWEEN WASHINGTON, OREGON, AND IDAHO WITH REGARD TO JURISDICTION OVER BOUNDARY WATERS

The Clerk called Senate Joint Resolution 23, giving consent of the Congress of the United States to the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, or any two of said States, to agree upon the jurisdiction to be exercised by said States over boundary waters between any two or more of said States.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. MOTT. Yes; I withhold it.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. May I inquire the purpose of the gentleman's objection?

Mr. MOTT. I understand the purpose of this bill is to allow certain interested parties in Oregon and Washington to go into the courts again for the purpose of redetermining the ownership of Sand Island, at the mouth of the Columbia River, which has already been determined and passed upon by the Supreme Court. The people at the mouth of the Columbia River object at this time to opening this matter again. I have recently received some letters from people living at the mouth of the Columbia, engaged in the fishing industry, and this is the objection they raise to it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will not the gentleman let the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. We might as well have it determined now.

Mr. MOTT. I have no objection if you would rather have the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may go over without prejudice and withdraw my objection.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT. I object, Mr. Speaker.

FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4451, to amend section 1044 of the Revised Statutes to provide a 10-year period of limitations on prosecutions for offenses involving frauds against the United States.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ROSALIE PIAR SPRECHER (NEE ROSA SPRECHER)

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7574, to amend an act entitled "An act relative to naturalization and citizenship of married women", approved September 22, 1922.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may state that there is a similar Senate bill on the table.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker I reserve the right to object and yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, if I may do so without losing control of the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am simply asking the gentleman to withhold his objection pending an explanation.

I appreciate the vigorous opposition of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] to any legislation that may impair our immigration policy, but this is an individual case which will in no sense affect our policy. I am just as strongly in favor of restricted immigration as the gentleman from Ohio, as my record as a member of the Immigration Committee will show; but this is a very worthy case, applying to a young lady who, when 16 years of age, came to the United States and was denied admission because of lack of quota and was sent back. She came over with her father and mother, her father at that time having an application for naturalization pending. Later on she came back under false colors, and while over here married the son of a reputable physician in Chicago. Then, on the advice of the immigration authorities in Chicago, she returned to Rumania with a tacit understanding there would be no objection to her coming back in the regular way. She is now denied the right to come back and is separated from her husband. This is an isolated case and was heard on its merits by the committee. I think, as a matter of justice, this bill ought to pass, and we ought to allow this woman to reenter the United States and be reunited with her husband. I think it would be a simple act of mercy to do this.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I further reserve the right to object and would like to make the statement, if I may, that I think this is a very important bill. The principle involved is far more important than the inconvenience that may result to any one individual.

The immigration law is different from any other law with which we have to deal. For instance, most of our laws deal with American citizens. An American citizen has rights under our law. He has recognizable rights, but an alien or a foreigner who has not yet arrived in our country has no such rights under our law. He must be here before he has any standing under our law. Then when we speak of the "rights of these people being invaded" we are taking an untenable position.

With this basic principle in mind I want you to bear with me a moment, because I wish you to know that this is not a personal objection on my part at all. I have great regard for the author of this bill, Mr. CHURCH, but there is a principle involved that we all might stop to consider. There are a great many of you who for years have been opposed to letting down the bars. Here is a big bar that you are going to let down if you allow this bill to go through. You are going to let the bar down and there will be absolutely no way for you to put this bar back up, because they will climb upon it and say, "This is a personal bill and only applies to one individual." Some of you were here in Congress when we threshed out the first individual bill of this kind. We had it up here for days and days, at different times, and here is what happened with respect to that bill. Many of you will recall that the bill involved a case that had been taken up in the courts of the United States. The individual concerned was a very wealthy man from New England, a boy in the American Army. He wanted to marry a girl in Germany. He applied for information and advice from the proper consular officer for the United States in Germany and was told that the girl's criminal record was such he could not bring her into this country at all. What did he do? He said, "I will bring her in anyhow." He then comes back to the United States and gets in touch with his rich relatives scattered all over the United States, and what did

he do? He married her anyhow, and then what was his next step? He comes down here and goes into the courts of the United States and brings a mandamus proceeding against one of our highest Cabinet officers, the Secretary of State. In other words, an individual clear across the ocean was trying to get jurisdiction in our courts to mandamus the Secretary of State to permit the entrance of this woman into the United States. What did the courts do? The case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court of the United States stood upon its dignity and said, "No; this individual has no recognizable rights under our law", and held accordingly. He then commenced a long fight to have a special bill passed permitting the entrance of this girl, with a criminal record, whom he had married in defiance of the Government, and to the everlasting discredit of Congress the bill was passed. Within the last year or two this bill was repealed as a useless part of the immigration laws.

If this bill passes, it will be the beginning of a new method of handling these immigration matters. I do not recall of but one case of this kind within my time here, and that is the case that I have already mentioned. This bill if passed will allow a woman to enter who came in illegally. One who had attempted to come to the United States as the daughter of a man who consented to play this part of practicing a deception on the Government officers.

But, as I have stated, I am not so much interested in this individual case as I am in the new principle that we are adopting. Just as sure as you commence letting persons into the United States of America by special bill you are tearing down the immigration bars and permitting a flood of new immigrants of all classes. Already nearly 30 special bills have been introduced expecting that if this bill is passed they shall enter. And why not?

I wish you to consider this fact. No committee of this House has ever assumed to vote out special bills to people who are not in the country, and who have no rights in our courts or in our country. The Pension Committee votes out special bills to persons who have a claim on the Government. The Committee on Claims votes special bills in cases where the individual has had a right to a claim against the Government and has lost it by reason of the running of the statute of limitation or some other good reason. These are the two committees out of which most of our special bills come. I repeat that the House should pause to appreciate just how important this step is. I should like this bill to be passed over to some later date until the Members have thoroughly familiarized themselves with the importance of the principle involved.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I call for the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PERSONAL INJURY AND DEATH CASES ARISING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2891) to provide for the adjustment and settlement of personal injury and death cases arising in certain foreign countries.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when any act of omission of any officer, employee, or agent of the Government of the United States, including all officers, enlisted men, and employees of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, results in the personal injury or death of any person, not an American national, in any foreign country in which the United States exercises privileges of extraterritoriality, the Secretary of State may consider, adjust, and determine any claim, arising after the passage of this act, for the damage occasioned by such injury or death in an amount not in excess of $1,500, United States currency, in any one case, and such amount as may be found to be due to any claimant shall be certified to Congress as a legal claim for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor, together with a brief statement of the character of each claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed: *Provided*, That this authorization shall not apply to cases of persons in the employ of the United States: *Provided further*, That no claim shall be considered under this act by the Secretary of State unless presented to him within 1 year from the date of the accrual of said claim: *And provided further*, That acceptance by any claimant of the amount determined under the provisions of this act shall be deemed to be in full settlement of such claim against the Government of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ONONDAGA CREEK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8797) to provide preliminary examination of Onondaga Creek, in Onondaga County, State of New York, with a view to the control of its floods.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination to be made of Onondaga Creek, in Onondaga County, State of New York, with a view to the control of its floods, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the control of floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1917, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE TIME FOR FILING ADVERSE CLAIMS IN SUITS AGAINST MINERAL ENTRIES, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8700) to amend an act entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the District of Alaska", approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459; U. S. C., title 48, sec. 386).

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. DIMOND. Will the gentleman withhold that? This does not cost anybody a cent. I cannot conceive of any objection to it that anybody can have.

Mr. TABER. It cannot be in the interest of expedition because it extends the time.

Mr. DIMOND. No; it does not. It shortens the time. If the gentleman will look at the statement at the end of the report, he will see that the period is now 8 months, and this is shortened to 60 days. I wanted to cut out the 60 days, but the Department said that cutting it from 8 months to 60 days would be reasonable and fair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the District of Alaska", approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459; U. S. C., title 48, sec. 386), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That in the District of Alaska adverse claims authorized and provided for in sections 2325 and 2326, United States Revised Statutes, may be filed at any time during the 60 days' period of publication, and the adverse suits authorized and provided for in section 2326, United States Revised Statutes, may be instituted at any time within 60 days after the filing of said claims in the local land office."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 2, after the word "publication", insert "or within 60 days thereafter."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6538) for the relief of the State of New Mexico.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman explain what this bill does for New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1930 there were certain losses caused by floods in Socorro County, N. Mex. The War Department through the National Guard loaned certain equipment and in making returns there was a loss of some $4,600 worth of materials. The War Department investigated the matter and the then Secretary War, Mr. Hurley, recommended that the State of New Mexico pay a certain amount, I think $1,600 or $1,800, and that $2,900 be

unasked of them, and that the State be relieved of the payment of that amount by the passage of this legislation. That is what this provides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is a similar Senate bill (S. 2206) on the Speaker's desk and, without objection, the Senate bill will be substituted for the House bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of New Mexico is hereby relieved from accountability for certain property belonging to the United States, of the total value of $2,839.04, which property was loaned to such State for use by the New Mexico National Guard and was unavoidably lost or destroyed, such total value representing the sum of the following items: $381.22 for property shortages listed in report of survey dated April 24, 1930; $334.53 and $62.95 for property shortages listed in two reports of survey dated April 25, 1930; $904.48 and $880.12 for property shortages listed in two reports of survey dated June 11, 1930; $11.35 for property shortages listed in report of survey dated July 11, 1930; $264.39 for property shortages listed in report of survey dated September 3, 1930.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A House bill (H. R. 6538) was laid on the table.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF MARK TWAIN

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 338, establishing a commission to be known as the United States Commission for the Celebration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Mark Twain (Samuel L. Clemens).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER], to ask unanimous consent that this bill be laid on the table and disposed of in that way officially. Will the gentleman withdraw his objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Inasmuch as the bill provides for a centennial which passed last year, I have no objection to laying the bill on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2656) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant concessions on reservoir sites and other lands in connection with Indian irrigation projects, and to lease the lands in such reserve for agricultural, grazing, or other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS FOR INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9018) providing old-age pensions for Indians of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SAN CARLOS APACHE INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2523) authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Comptroller General about this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 16, 1936.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is submitted herein individual report, as requested, on S. 2523, involving the San Carlos Apache Indians. Reference is made, also, to report to you on this bill under date of August 1, 1935, A-63577, a copy of which is enclosed herewith.

In addition to the recommendations made in that report on S. 2523, it is suggested, if this bill receive favorable consideration for enactment, that it be amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"except that before the deposit of the amount so appropriated to the credit of the said San Carlos Apache Indians, the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to ascertain and deduct therefrom the total gratuities theretofore paid to such Indians of the character provided for offset by section 2 of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1935, 49 Stat. 596."

It would take approximately 10 months for this office to ascertain accurately the amount of such gratuitites to be offset.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. MCCARL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 1, 1935.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: Further reference is made to your letter of July 5, 1935, acknowledged July 6, enclosing a copy of the bill S. 2523, Seventy-fourth Congress, entitled "A bill authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896", together with a copy of Senate Report No. 1016 thereon, and requesting that you be advised "what the records show in regard to this matter", and "did the Government carry out its agreement, or does it owe the Indians for this land?" The bill provides as follows:

"That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, as payment in full to the San Carlos Apache Indians, at the rate of $1.25 per acre for 232,320 acres ceded by them under the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896 (29 Stat. L. 358), less $12,433.63 received by the Indians as royalty under mining permits, the sum of $277,966.37 to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the San Carlos Apache Indians, and to be available for expenditure for the benefit of such Indians: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be subject to the payment of any claims, judgments, or demands against the San Carlos Apache Indians accruing prior to the approval of this act."

The said agreement of February 25, 1896, referred to in the bill, provides in pertinent part as follows:

"This agreement, made on the 25th day of February 1896, pursuant to an item in the act of Congress making appropriations for current and contingent expenses and fulfilling treaty stipulations with Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, as follows: 'The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to negotiate with the Indians on the San Carlos Reservation, Ariz., through an inspector, for the cession or relinquishment to the United States of the lands embracing the coal fields, and that any agreement made shall be submitted to Congress for its action', by Province McCormick, United States Indian Inspector, on the part of the United States, and the Apache, Mohave, and Yuma Indians, residing on the San Carlos Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona, by their chiefs, headmen, and members of said tribes, embracing a majority of all the male adult Indians occupying said reservation: Witnesseth—

"ARTICLE I

"That the said Indians do hereby cede, grant, and relinquish to the United States all right, title, and claim which they may have in and to all the land embraced within the following described tract, now a part of the said San Carlos or White Mountain Indian Reservation, to wit:

"All the land lying south of a line commencing at a point on the present eastern boundary of the said reservation, 1 mile south of Goodwin Spring; thence in a general direction west to the highest point on Mount Turnbull; thence in a westerly direction to a point on a line between the agency building proper and Stanley, or the Saddle Butte, 7 miles from said building in a southerly direction; thence in a westerly direction at longest possible tangents to the mouth of Hawk Canyon, not crossing said canyon; thence down the Gila River, following the south bank to a point where said Gila River crosses the present western boundary of the reservation.

"ARTICLE II

"That in consideration of the lands ceded, relinquished, and conveyed, as aforesaid, the United States stipulates and agrees to place in the Treasury of the United States to the credit and for the sole benefit of the said Apache, Mohave, and Yuma Indians, and to account therefor annually to them through their agent, the net proceeds accruing from the disposal of such coal and mineral lands, lying within the ceded territory, under the laws applicable thereto; and that said money shall be paid to them in cash from time to time as the same shall become available, pro rata, share and share alike to each man, woman, and child of the tribes now living upon and entitled to the privileges of the said reservation: *Provided*, That none of the money credited to said Indians under this agreement shall be subject to the payment of any claims, judgments, or demands against said Indians for damages or depredations, claimed to have been committed prior to the signing of this agreement.

"ARTICLE III

"That for the purpose of segregating the ceded land from the diminished reservation the new boundary line described in article 1 of the agreement shall be properly surveyed and permanently marked in a plain and substantial manner by prominent and durable monuments; and that the cost of said survey shall be chargeable to and be paid out of the proceeds of said ceded lands."

The letter dated May 22, 1935, from the Acting Secretary of the Interior to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate, incorporated in Senate Report No. 1016, Seventy-fourth Congress, copy of which report was enclosed in your letter and is herewith returned, states that the Indians received a royalty totaling $12,433.63 on actual production under mining permits. Interior Civil Claim No. 36223–1914, a record of this office, shows that the said sum of $12,433.63 was not the proceeds of royalty payments but of the sale by the United States Land Office, Phoenix, Ariz., on July 3, 1906, of four tracts of land containing 160 acres each within the involved area at $20 per acre. From the total proceeds of the sale, $12,800, there was deducted pursuant to article III of the said agreement of February 25, 1896, the sum of $366.37 for expenses of surveying, leaving net proceeds of $12,433.63 with which the said Indians were credited. The bill should state correctly the source of the said sum of $12,433.63.

The records show that the United States expended a further sum of $480.01 for surveying, which sum, in pursuance of article III of the said agreement, was subsequently during the year 1912 reimbursed to the United States from the fund "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor (San Carlos)", as evidenced by Second Auditor's Settlement No. 30323–1912. It thus appears that all reimbursable sums expended by the United States in the premises have been reimbursed to it.

What is hereinabove stated is all that the records of this office disclose. It has no information and therefore cannot advise you whether the Government did or did not carry out its agreement, or whether it owes the Indians for this land.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. McCARL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SWAMP LANDS, STATE OF WISCONSIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3045) providing for payment to the State of Wisconsin for its swamp lands within all Indian reservations in that State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY, WISCONSIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8655) providing for the transfer of certain Government property in Wisconsin to the State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of Wisconsin for institutional purposes, subject to the conditions and terms set forth in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act, the properties of the United States Government known and designated as the "Tomah Indian School" and the "Hayward Indian School", including equipment: *Provided, however*, That there is withheld from transfer under the act the properties known and designated as the "Tomah Indian Hospital", physician's cottage, the Tomah Agency Office, chief clerk's cottage, and such other buildings as may be required for hospital and agency use and land needed therefor as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, together with such equipment as the Secretary of the Interior may designate; also, the properties known and designated as the "Hayward Hospital", nurses' home, physician's residence, and such other buildings as may be required for hospital use and such land (in the immediate vicinity of the hospital) and (such) equipment as the Secretary of the Interior may designate: *Provided further*, That the State of Wisconsin agrees to furnish the Hayward Hospital and other buildings retained in United States ownership with an adequate water supply and sewerage connection; and also, at the Tomah plant, to furnish the Tomah Hospital, physician's residence, and other buildings retained in Federal ownership with water and sewerage connection; and also to heat same from the central heating plant until such time as a separate heating plant for the Government-owned buildings may be provided: *And provided further*, That this act shall become effective only when and if the Governor of Wisconsin shall file with the Secretary of the Interior formal written notice of acceptance of its terms.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "set forth in sections 1, 2, and 3."

The committee amendment was agreed to; and 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.

LEASING OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2148) to provide for the leasing of restricted Indian lands of Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after 30 days from the date of approval of this act the restricted lands belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma of one-half or more Indian blood, enrolled or unenrolled, may be leased for periods of not to exceed 5 years for farming and grazing purposes, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe and not otherwise. Such leases shall be made by the owner or owners of such lands if adults, subject to approval by the superintendent or other official in charge of the Five Civilized Tribe Agency, and by such superintendent or other official in charge of said agency in cases of minors and of Indians who are non compos mentis.

The bill 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.

RELIEF TO GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7293, to amend the act approved June 16, 1934, entitled "An act to provide relief to Government contractors whose costs of performance were increased as a result of compliance with the act approved June 16, 1933, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. ZIONCHECK objected.

SITE FOR NAVAL AIR STATION AT MIAMI, FLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8372, to authorize the acquisition of lands in the vicinity of Miami, Fla., as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask if this bill should not have been passed out by the Naval Affairs Committee instead of coming in here on the Consent Calendar?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is reported by the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. RICH. Was it reported unanimously by the Naval Affairs Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has no information as to the unanimity or otherwise of the report.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

There was no objection.

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8293, to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

MONUMENT COMMEMORATING ENTRANCE OF STEAM RAILROAD INTO WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 362, to authorize the selection of a site and the erection thereon of a suitable monument indicating the historical significance of

the first entrance into the city of Washington of a steam railroad, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. RICH objected.

EXEMPTION OF INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA FROM SECTION 4, EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 6166

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8316, to exempt the Indian Service within the State of Oklahoma from the requirements of section 4 of Executive Order No. 6166, dated June 10, 1933.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION OF NEHALEM RIVER, OREG.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3277, authorizing a preliminary examination of the Nehalem River and tributaries, in Clatsop, Columbia, and Washington Counties, Oreg., with a view to the controlling of floods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know how much that proposed preliminary examination will cost? If no one can tell me, I object.

COMPENSATION TO THIRD- AND FOURTH-CLASS POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8541, for payment of compensation to persons serving as postmaster at third- and fourth-class post offices.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States, in the settlement and adjustment of accounts and claims for services rendered at third- and fourth-class post offices is hereby authorized and directed to allow compensation as postmaster to persons who, upon the occurrence of a vacancy and pending the designation of an acting postmaster, assumed and properly performed the duties of postmaster at any such office subsequent to June 30, 1930: *Provided*, That in no case shall compensation be allowed for a period in excess of 60 days.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MONUMENT, CAMP MERRITT, N. J.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 27, to provide for the establishment of a national monument on the site of Camp Merritt, N. J.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH, Mr. ZIONCHECK, and Mr. DIRKSEN objected.

COLLECTION AND EDITING OF OFFICIAL PAPERS OF TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8951, to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the collection and editing of official papers of the Territories of the United States now in The National Archives", approved March 3, 1925, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I visited the Archives Building the other day, and if the gentleman can find a piece of paper down there to edit, I would like to have him go there and look for it, and notify me where I can see it. There is no paper, no files in The National Archives Building other than the old Food Administration files. They have 117 employees. They have 18 going around to the various Government agencies looking for historical documents. Aside from that, the rest of them are in the Archives Building, working, so the Archivist says, but I have been unable to learn what they are doing. I repeat, there is nothing in the Archives Building to edit up to this hour. How can they edit something that is not there?

Mr. LAMBETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. LAMBETH. I should like to say to the amiable gentleman from Missouri, who seems to have developed an obsession with reference to anything dealing with archives, that this has no reference to the new National Archives establishment whatsoever.

This bill relates to the distribution of what are known as the official papers relating to the early history of the Territories of the United States, which are being compiled and printed under the direction of the State Department, and it will save money by reducing the number of copies from 1,950 to 1,227. This bill amends existing law, which was enacted long before The National Archives, as such, was ever in existence, and enacts into permanent law a provision which has been carried in the State Department appropriation bill for the last 2 years. Now, if the gentleman wishes to ask me a question relative to the merits of this bill, I shall be very happy to try to answer it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Your bill says "Now in The National Archives." That sounds like National Archives Building to me. I also see on page 3 the following language:

That not more than the sum of $125,000, and under this authorization not more than $50,000 shall be appropriated for any one year.

I should like to have the distinguished gentleman advise me in what way it is not going to cost the Government any money when the appropriation is here authorized.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, replying again to my friend from Missouri, who is one of the watchdogs of the Treasury here, and I am very happy we have some watchdogs of the Treasury still in the House, if he will look at the report, a copy of which I now hand to him, he will find that this bill does not authorize any appropriation which is not already in existence. In other words we are amending the law so as to curtail the number of copies of these papers which will be printed and distributed. It will save money. Had the gentleman taken time to read the report of the Committee on Printing I am sure he would be heartily in favor of this bill, because it will save money.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the only way to save money is to take an appropriation away from an activity. If the purpose is to save money, why not amend the bill to make it provide that there must be a reduction of 50 percent of the amount now being spent? There is no other way to save money. They will find some way to spend it.

Mr. LAMBETH. I am trying not to argue with the gentleman but to answer his question. I wish he had read the report of the committee and knew what this was about. This appropriation was made some years ago in an act approved in 1925, before I became a Member of this body.

Mr. COCHRAN. But the effect is only to transfer the appropriation over to the Archives, is it not?

Mr. LAMBETH. No, indeed; it has nothing to do with the National Archives establishment. This is done under the auspices of the State Department. Some of these Territorial papers have already been prepared and distributed. The work is not yet complete, but it has proceeded to such a point that it would be extravagance and waste now to strike out the appropriation. The Committee on Appropriations provides a specific sum for this purpose in the State Department appropriation bill every year.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman is not referring to The National Archives establishment or to the National Archivist I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. LAMBETH. Not at all, not in any sense. This legislation was suggested by the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is twofold:

First. To curtail the number of copies of the various volumes of the Territorial papers which are being edited and compiled and distributed under the direction of the State Department. This will mean an appreciable saving.

Second. To provide more specifically as to the manner of distribution of these volumes which are furnished to State historical associations designated by the Governors of the various States and Territories. Under the existing law the Governor of each State might annually designate different historical associations to receive them so that when the entire work of approximately 25 volumes has been finally printed no one historical association or library would have received a complete set. This bill specifically provides that new designations may be made by the Governors only when

previously designated associations, commissions, museums, or libraries shall have ceased to exist. The adoption of this legislation makes absolutely certain the delivery of complete sets to agencies once they have been designated.

By unanimous consent, a similar Senate bill (S. 3447), was substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the collection and editing of official papers of the Territories of the United States now in the National Archives", approved March 3, 1925, as amended by the act approved February 28, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. 7, title V, sec. 168a), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"168a. The Public Printer shall print, bind, and deliver to the Superintendent of Documents, for distribution as may be directed by the Secretary of State, 1,227 copies of each volume of the Official Papers Relating to the Territories of the United States, of which not to exceed 3 copies shall be furnished to the Vice President and each Senator and 1 copy to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner; 4 copies to the Library of the Department of the Interior; and 1 copy of each volume to those historical associations, commissions, museums, or libraries and other nondepository libraries, which shall not exceed eight in number within each State, Territory, or insular possession, and which have been or hereafter may be designated by the Governor thereof to the Secretary of State of the United States, and the residue of the said 1,227 copies shall be for the Department of State for such use as the Secretary of State may deem appropriate.

"168b. In addition to the foregoing there shall be furnished to the Superintendent of Documents a sufficient number of copies of each volume for distribution to such depository libraries as may make written application therefor; and

"To the Library of Congress for international exchange and for official use in Washington, D. C., not to exceed 150 copies.

"The 'usual number' shall not be printed.

"168c. The historical associations, commissions, museums, or libraries and other nondepository libraries within each State, Territory, or insular possession, which have been or hereafter may be designated by the Governor thereof to receive these publications shall, during their existence, receive the succeeding volumes, the distribution of which shall be made by the Superintendent of Documents in accordance with the lists of designations transmitted to him by the Secretary of State, and a new designation may be made by the Governor only when a designated association, commission, museum, or library shall cease to exist or other designation may be authorized by law.

"168d. For defraying the expenses to be incurred in carrying out the provisions of this act, including the employment, either in or outside of the District of Columbia, of not to exceed five historical experts, especially informed on the various phases of the territorial history of the United States, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and the civil-service rules, and for all other purposes, including salaries for personnel, printing and binding, contingent expenses and traveling expenses, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not more than the sum of $125,000, and under this authorization not more than $50,000 shall be appropriated for any 1 year."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 8951) were laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. On the calendar there appear as Nos. 521, 523, 524, and 525 bills which have been objected to previously and stricken from the Consent Calendar. My inquiry is whether under the rules these bills are properly on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'CONNOR). The rule is plain. It reads as follows:

Should objection be made to the consideration of any bill so called it shall be carried over on the calendar without prejudice to the next day when the Consent Calendar is again called, and if objected to by three or more Members it shall immediately be stricken from the calendar and shall not thereafter during the same session of that Congress be placed again thereon.

If these bills were objected to finally during the last session they are properly on this calendar this session.

WAR MINERALS RELIEF ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1567, to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, generally known as the War Minerals Relief Act.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PAN AMERICAN EXPOSITION, TAMPA, FLA.

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 356, to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Pan American Exposition to be held in Tampa, Fla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Pan American Exposition to be held in Tampa, Fla., in 1939, by the Florida Fair & Gasparilla Association, Inc., or for use in construction, installing, or maintaining foreign buildings or exhibits at the said exposition, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of said exposition to sell within the area of the exposition and celebrations any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles, which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles, which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond, and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the Florida Fair & Gasparilla Association, Inc., shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by Florida Fair & Gasparilla Association, Inc., to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPOSITION TO BE HELD IN TAMPA, FLA., 1939

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 365, providing for participation by the United States in the Pan American Exposition to be held in Tampa, Fla., in the year 1939 in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the landing of Hernando De Soto in Tampa Bay, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this joint resolution authorizes an appropriation of $500,000. I have no particular objection to the holding of this fair in Florida. It might be justified.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF PRATTVILLE, ALA.

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 241, to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of Prattville, Ala.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC STUDIES OF FISH INDUSTRY, MARKET NEWS SERVICE, AND ORDERLY MARKETING OF FISHERY PRODUCTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8055, to provide for economic studies of the fishery industry, market news service, and orderly marketing of fishery products, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact that the Secretary of Commerce makes an unfavorable report, and inasmuch as the amount anticipated to be expended under this bill is not in accordance with the financial program of the President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

GRANT TO CALIFORNIA OF RETROCESSION OF JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN RIGHTS-OF-WAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7653, to grant to the State of California a retrocession of jurisdiction over certain rights-of-way granted to the State of California over certain roads about to be constructed in the Presidio of San Francisco Military Reservation and Fort Baker Military Reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is a similar Senate bill in reference to this matter.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 2175) be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of California a retrocession of jurisdiction over the rights-of-way covered by a certain grant from the Secretary of War to the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, of California, dated February 13, 1931, to extend, maintain, and operate State roads across the Presidio of San Francisco Military Reservation and the Fort Baker Military Reservation, as heretofore or hereafter amended by the Secretary of War, subject to all of the terms and conditions contained in said permit as so granted and any amendments thereof as aforesaid. The land and premises over which such retrocession of jurisdiction is hereby granted shall be the whole of the rights-of-way so granted by said permit and any amendments thereof, throughout their entire length and width, and for the entire distance granted therein, together with the land crossed by any toll bridge that may be erected by such Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District to connect the Presidio of San Francisco Military Reservation with the Fort Baker Military Reservation, and embracing the said toll bridge with its approach roads over the rights-of-way so granted by said permit and any amendments thereof.

SEC. 2. Should the United States assume exclusive control and management of said bridge and roads, as provided in said permit and any amendments thereof, the jurisdiction herein retroceded shall be suspended and revest in the United States for the duration of such control and management. Whenever the State of California shall cease to occupy said rights-of-way and land for the purpose authorized in said permit and any amendments thereof, then the same, including all jurisdiction thereover, shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 3. The retrocession of jurisdiction herein granted shall not take effect until the same is accepted by the Legislature of the State of California.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERECTION OF MARKER AT COLUMBUS, GA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9200, authorizing the erection of a marker suitably marking the site of the engagement fought at Columbus, Ga., April 16, 1865.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. RICH. I withhold my objection. The request was made this morning that these bills were supposed to be presented to the Advisory Committee of the Historic Parks Commission, which committee is supposed to pass on these bills.

Mr. CASTELLOW. They have approved this bill.

Mr. RICH. But the commission has not yet been formed.

Mr. CASTELLOW. This involves only $1,000. It is not for a park or for a monument. It is simply providing for a suitable marker covering a historical proposition.

Mr. RICH. I do not want to hold this bill up for the gentleman from Georgia any more than for anybody else. We passed a bill last year forming this Advisory Committee of the Historical Parks Commission, which committee is ready to pass on these bills and monuments, and I think they should be permitted to pass on these things. If they offer a favorable report, then I shall not object to this going through.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I am getting very tired of statues, monuments, and memorials, and regardless of this Commission or its reports in the future, I am going to object to further memorials or things of that kind. However, this does not come under that category.

Mr. CASTELLOW. We have no parks in our section of the country, and we felt like we were entitled to $10,000 for this purpose. However, that amount was reduced to $1,000, which we think is eminently fair.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if this does not refer to parks or monuments in the sense that the committee to which I referred a while ago should pass on it, then I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what national significance has this monument?

Mr. CASTELLOW. This was, in reality, the last battle of the Civil War. Efforts to secure passage of this bill have been made at intervals for a long time. I may say that the Historical Society of Columbus, Ga., has prepared a most interesting book recording the details of the battle. This society has meticulously considered the first reports made to the War Department regarding the battle and contends that these reports indicate conclusively the commanding officers considered this the last engagement of the Civil War which could be designated as a battle. The Historical Division of the National Park Service, however, did not agree in this conclusion, and for that reason we have been forced to abandon the hope of a more generous appropriation and are now asking for the modest sum of only $1,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If this bill is passed, what about bills commemorating the Battle of Big Dry Wash and other battles?

Mr. KNUTSON. Those matters should be fought out on their individual merit when they come up for consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall not object to this bill, but I will object to any further bills of this character.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to erect, or cause to be erected, in Columbus, Ga., a suitable marker, or markers, marking the site of the engagement of Columbus fought in that city on April 16, 1865.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEN. ROBERT E. LEE

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 232, authorizing the erection of an equestrian statue of Gen. Robert E. Lee in Arlington National Cemetery.

Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. RICH, and Mr. ZIONCHECK objected.

PROHIBITION OF STATEMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS ADVOCATING OVERTHROW OF GOVERNMENT BY VIOLENCE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6427, to prohibit statements and publications advocating overthrow of the Government by violence, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAMNECK, Mr. KVALE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. ZIONCHECK objected.

INTERSTATE REFERENCE BUREAU

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 156, to make available to Congress the services and data of the Interstate Reference Bureau.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the committee I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be tabled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

INDIAN BUFFALO HUNT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5263, to purchase and erect in the city of Washington the group of statuary known as the "Indian Buffalo Hunt."

Mr. RICH, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. ZIONCHECK objected.

FILING AND INDEXING SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4015, authorizing the establishment of a filing and indexing service for useful Government publications.

Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. TABER, Mr. BACON, and Mr. COCHRAN objected.

ERECTION OF TABLET IN THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1401, to authorize the erection of a tablet in the Washington Monument in honor of those who served in the armed forces of the United States during the World War.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CITY OF SKAGWAY, ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9130, to authorize the incorporated city of Skagway, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal works, and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $12,000, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the incorporated city of Skagway, in the Territory of Alaska, is hereby authorized and empowered to undertake all or any part of the hereinafter described municipal public works, to wit: Construction and reconstruction of sidewalks, reconstruction and reconditioning of city hall, and regrading, construction, and reconstruction of streets and crossings, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $12,000.

SEC. 2. Before said bonds shall be issued a special election shall be ordered by the common council of the said city of Skagway, Alaska, at which election the question of whether such bonds shall be issued in the amount above specified for the purpose hereinbefore set forth shall be submitted to the qualified electors of said city of Skagway, Alaska, whose names appear on the last assessment roll of said city for purposes of municipal taxation. The form of the ballot shall be such that the electors may vote for or against the issuance of bonds for the purposes herein specified up to the amount herein authorized. Not less than 20 days' notice of such election shall be given to the public by posting notices of same in three conspicuous places within the corporate limits of the city of Skagway, Alaska, one of which shall be at the front door of the United States post office at Skagway, Alaska. The election notice shall specifically state the amount of bonds proposed to be issued for the purposes herein specified. The registration for such election, the manner of conducting the same, and the canvass of the returns of said election shall be, as early as practicable, in accordance with the requirements of law in general or special elections in said municipality; and such bonds shall be issued for the purposes herein authorized only upon condition that not less than a majority of the votes cast at such election in said municipality shall be in favor of the issuance of said bonds for such purpose.

SEC. 3. The bonds herein authorized shall be coupon in form and shall mature in not to exceed 30 years from the date thereof. Such bonds may bear such date or dates, may be in such denomination or denominations, may mature in such amounts and at such time or times, not exceeding 30 years from the date thereof, may be payable in lawful money of the United States at such place or places, may be sold at either public or private sale, may be nonredeemable or redeemable (either with or without premium), and may carry such registration privileges as to either principal and interest, or principal only, as shall be prescribed by the common council of said city of Skagway. The bonds shall bear the signatures of the mayor and of the clerk of the city of Skagway, and shall have impressed thereon the official seal of said municipality. The coupons to be annexed to such bonds shall bear the facsimile signatures of the mayor and the clerk of said municipality. In case any of the officers whose signatures or countersignatures appear on the bonds shall cease to be such officers before delivery of such bonds, said signatures or countersignatures, whether manual or facsimile, shall nevertheless be valid and sufficient for all purposes, the same as if said officers had remained in office until such delivery. Said bonds shall bear interest at a rate to be fixed by the common council of the city of Skagway, not to exceed, however, 6 percent per annum, payable semiannually, and said bonds shall be sold at not less than the principal amount plus accrued interest.

SEC. 4. The bonds herein authorized to be issued shall be general obligations of the city of Skagway, Territory of Alaska, payable as to both interest and principal from ad-valorem taxes which shall be levied upon all of the taxable property within the corporate limits of such municipality in an amount sufficient to pay the interest on and the principal of such bonds as and when the same become due and payable.

SEC. 5. No part of the funds arising from the sale of said bonds shall be used for any purpose or purposes other than those specified in this act. Said bonds shall be sold only when and in such amounts as the common council of the city of Skagway shall direct; and the proceeds thereof shall be distributed only for the purposes hereinbefore mentioned and under the orders and direction of said common council from time to time as such proceeds may be required for said purposes.

SEC. 6. The city of Skagway is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with the United States of America or any agency or instrumentality thereof under the provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act and acts amendatory thereof and acts supplemental thereto, and revisions thereof, and the regulations made in pursuance thereof, and under any further acts of the Congress of the United States to encourage public works, for the relief of unemployment, or for any other public purpose, including the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, for the sale of bonds issued in accordance with the provisions of this act, or for the acceptance of a grant of money to aid said municipality in financing any public works; or to enter into contracts with any persons or corporations, public or private, for the sale of such bonds; and such contracts may contain such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by and between the common council of said city of Skagway and the United States of America, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or any such purchaser.

SEC. 7. This act shall take effect immediately.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BATTLE OF BLACKSTOCK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4332, to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Blackstock.

Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. RICH, and Mr. JENKINS of Ohio objected.

BATTLE OF MUSGROVE'S MILL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4331, to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Musgrove's Mill.

Mr. DONDERO, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, and Mr. ZIONCHECK objected.

VETERINARY CORPS OF THE REGULAR ARMY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 363, to increase the efficiency of the Veterinary Corps of the Regular Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of promotion, longevity pay, and retirement there shall be credited to officers of the Veterinary Corps, and former officers of the Veterinary Corps now on the retired list, all full-time service rendered by them as veterinarians in the Quartermaster Department, Cavalry, or Field Artillery: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE COMMEMORATION OF THE BATTLE OF BIG DRY WASH, IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4309) to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Big Dry Wash, in the State of Arizona.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Interior Department appropriation bill of last year contained an item for the same purpose, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOMES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1301) to provide further for the maintenance of United States Soldiers' Home.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter, and beginning with the first calendar month after the passage of this act, there shall be deducted each month from the pay of each enlisted man and warrant officer on the active list of the Regular Army, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts, a sum not to exceed 25 cents, which sum shall be passed to the credit of the permanent fund, United States Soldiers' Home (trust fund) in the Treasury of the United States; the exact sum to be so deducted to be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of War, within the limit prescribed above, on the recommendation of the Board of Commissioners of said Home as to the amount required to meet the needs of the Home.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO GRANT RIGHTS-OF-WAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4292) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a right-of-way to the Arlington-Fairfax Railway Co. across the Fort Myer Reservation, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant to the Arlington & Fairfax Railway Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Virginia, its successors and assigns, under such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of War, a right-of-way over and across the Fort Myer Reservation, for railway purposes, with full power to locate, construct, and operate railway tracks, structures, trolley lines, signal devices, and other railway appurtenances and adjuncts, the width of such right-of-way to be determined by the Secretary of War; provided that the land shall not be used for other than railway purposes and when the property shall cease to be so used it shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "right-of-way" and insert in lieu thereof the word "rights-of-way."

Page 2, strike out the word "right-of-way" and insert in lieu thereof the word "rights-of-way."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant rights-of-way to the Arlington & Fairfax Railway Co. across the Fort Myer Reservation, Va."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

RELIEF OF WORLD WAR SOLDIERS DISCHARGED FROM THE ARMY BECAUSE OF MINORITY OR MISREPRESENTATION OF AGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8966) for the relief of World War soldiers who were discharged from the Army because of minority or misrepresentation of age.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers of the United States Army, their widows and dependent children, a soldier who served as an enlisted man between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, both dates inclusive, and who was discharged for fraudulent enlistment on account of minority or misrepresentation of age, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service on the date of his actual separation therefrom if his service otherwise was such as would have entitled him to an honorable discharge: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowance shall accrue by reason of the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That in all such cases the War Department shall, upon request, grant to such men, or their widows, a discharge certificate showing that the soldier is held and considered to have been honorably discharged under the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT M'HENRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8074) to amend the act of March 3, 1925, relating to Fort McHenry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress entitled "An act to repeal and reenact chapter 100 (1914, Public, No. 108), to provide for the restoration of Fort McHenry, in the State of Maryland, and its permanent preservation as a national park and perpetual national memorial shrine as the birthplace of the immortal 'Star-Spangled Banner', written by Francis Scott Key, for the appropriation of the necessary funds, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1109), be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out from the third paragraph the words "six hundred and fifty feet" and inserting in lieu thereof the following words: "six hundred and eighty feet."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AVIATION FIELD, VALPARAISO, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3018) to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire by donation land at Valparaiso, in Okaloosa County, Fla., for aviation field, military, or other public purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DETAILING ARMY OFFICERS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4452) to regulate the detailing of army officers for duty in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I object to the consideration of the bill.

LOANS TO FARMERS FOR CROP PRODUCTION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10213) to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1936, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that seems to be a rather important measure. Forty million dollars is involved. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his request for the moment?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. DOXEY. This is an important bill. The Senate already has passed a bill for this purpose. These crops are being put in now. Time is an essence in this matter.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. How much is involved in the bill?

Mr. DOXEY. Forty million dollars. It is a bill to loan money to the farmers for crop production and the crops are being put in now.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. How about reducing the rate of interest from 5½ percent to 3 percent?

Mr. DOXEY. This is the Farm Credit Administration's rate of interest. This bill is reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture of the House. It is an emergency. It is urgent. The Senate already has passed a bill. If we can get it through today we will be just that much ahead. If we do not, then we will have to ask for a rule to bring it in here.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman appreciates that we have not had time to make a study of the bill.

Mr. DOXEY. I realize that.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. A bill for $40,000,000 on the Consent Calendar is very unusual. The gentleman says that this bill is reported unanimously from the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. DOXEY. Yes. The ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], realized the urgency and necessity for this. That is the reason that it is on the Consent Calendar. It is true that it is for $40,000,000, but it is done every year. We are late now. The percentage of collections for the past year has been exceedingly gratifying.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman stress the fact that we are late now?

Mr. DOXEY. Yes. This bill affects the entire United States.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I do not want to put any hardship on the farmers, of course. I have always been in favor of assisting them.

Mr. DOXEY. It is a short-period loan. It is just something to give them an opportunity to get their crops in and tide them over a difficult period. It takes care of that type of farmer who cannot get a loan elsewhere but deserves it, needs it, and needs it now.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman's eloquence has almost persuaded me, but this is the first time, I think, we have ever passed such a bill on the Consent Calendar. However, if it has met with the unanimous approval of the great Agricultural Committee of the House, I shall not interpose my individual objection. For that reason I withdraw my request that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. Yes.

Mr. RICH. If the Agricultural Committee has consented that this bill go through, why bring it in today? Why not give the House an opportunity to discuss the merits or demerits of the bill? I would like to have some members on this side of the Committee on Agriculture get up and say that they are enthusiastically in favor of the passage of this bill. I want to know where you are going to get the $40,000,000.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. This matter has been discussed. This is just another $40,000,000 for seed loans for a short period of time. It is a matter of emergency.

Mr. RICH. If the money was expended a year ago and the money has been returned to the Treasury, why do you have to ask for this $40,000,000 now?

Mr. DOXEY. A similar bill was passed last year and we have collected nearly 90 percent of the money loaned out last year. We cannot reloan that money without the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. RICH. And the gentleman figures that we will get 97 percent back?

Mr. DOXEY. In some sections of the country we have gotten 100 percent back.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOXEY. A Senate bill was passed and I think it is now on the Speaker's desk. I do not know whether it is identical with this bill or not, but in the interest of good procedure, I think we had better substitute the Senate bill for the House bill. It might be for a different amount. I am not sure about that.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we take up the Senate bill and strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The trouble is we do not have the Senate bill at this time. It has not been messaged over to the House. The Chair will state to the House that there are one or two suspensions which will be taken up, and, if it is agreeable to the House, this matter could be passed over temporarily until we consider the two suspensions.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, we will not ask for a substitution of the Senate bill. We can work it out in conference. I think that will be satisfactory.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. When the Members of the House do not know whether a Senate bill is identical, then we ought to take time enough to try to get our ideas together with the Senate and find out whether we should substitute one for the other.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair was suggesting to the House that, if the House is willing, we could take up the suspensions and temporarily suspend further action upon the pending bill. Perhaps, by the time we have concluded consideration of the bills under suspension, the Senate bill will be here, and it will save some complications.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Why not pass this now and then suspend the action afterward when the Senate bill comes over?

The SPEAKER. Why not postpone consideration of this bill until later on in the afternoon? There cannot be any objection to that, with the understanding that it will be taken up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that further consideration of the bill be postponed until after consideration of the bills under suspension.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be laid aside temporarily.

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I withdraw my unanimous-consent request, Mr. Speaker.

EMERGENCY RELIEF IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the 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.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 13]

Adair	Darden	Harter	Reed, N. Y.
Allen	Dear	Higgins, Conn.	Rogers, Okla.
Andrew, Mass.	DeRouen	Higgins, Mass.	Russell
Bacharach	Dietrich	Hill, Ala.	Ryan
Berlin	Dingell	Hoeppel	Sadowski
Boileau	Disney	Houston	Sanders, La.
Boykin	Dockweiler	Kee	Sandlin
Boylan	Dorsey	Keller	Schulte
Brennan	Doughton	Kennedy, N. Y.	Shannon
Brooks	Drewry	Lee, Okla.	Short
Buchanan	Duffey, Ohio	Lesinski	Sirovich
Buckley, N. Y.	Dunn, Miss.	McLeod	Somers, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Dunn, Pa.	McSwain	South
Caldwell	Fernandez	Maloney	Steagall
Cannon, Wis.	Fiesinger	Marcantonio	Stewart
Carmichael	Fish	May	Sullivan
Casey	Flannagan	Mitchell, Ill.	Sweeney
Citron	Ford, Calif.	Montague	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, N. C.	Frey	Nelson	Taylor, Tenn.
Collins	Gasque	Nichols	Thom
Connery	Gassaway	Norton	Thomas
Cooper, Ohio	Goldsborough	O'Malley	Treadway
Cooper, Tenn.	Gray, Ind.	Parsons	Turner
Corning	Gray, Pa.	Patman	Wadsworth
Crawford	Green	Pearson	Walter
Crosby	Hamlin	Pettengill	Warren
Crowe	Hancock, N. C.	Rankin	White
Culkin	Hart	Reece	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eighteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3140, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all sums which the President has segregated or allotted or shall segregate or allot for projects in Puerto Rico out of the money appropriated by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 shall constitute a special fund to provide relief and work relief and to increase employment in Puerto Rico. The fund thus established shall continue available for expenditure until June 30, 1940. All income derived from opera-

tions financed out of this fund and the proceeds of the disposition of property acquired therewith shall constitute a revolving fund, which shall remain available for expenditure for the purposes and in manner authorized herein and in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 until Congress shall provide otherwise, notwithstanding any limitation of time contained in the said Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. Any agency or agencies lawfully designated or established to administer funds allotted hereunder or the revolving fund herein authorized may be continued so long as the said funds or any of them remain available for expenditure.

Projects for rural rehabilitation in Puerto Rico may include the acquisition, development, maintenance, and operation of agricultural enterprises. A reasonable charge may be made for materials and services produced or made available by any project: *Provided,* That such materials and services may also be supplied as compensation, in whole or in part, for services rendered by persons employed upon any project.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 15 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended by section 8 of the act of May 9, 1934, or any action taken thereunder, all or any part of the unobligated balance of taxes heretofore or hereafter collected from the processing of sugar beets or sugarcane in Puerto Rico and/or upon the processing in continental United States of sugar produced in or coming from Puerto Rico are hereby authorized, in the discretion of the President, to be transferred to the revolving fund authorized by this act. Not exceeding $10,000,000 of this fund may, in the discretion of the President, be set aside in the Treasury for use as an insurance fund to insure individual agriculturists in Puerto Rico, but to the extent only of such insurance fund and its accretions, against damage by hurricane to their farm dwellings and farm buildings, growing crops, plants, and trees, including trees used as shade for growing crops, warehouses and produce in barns and warehouses: *Provided,* That said funds may be so employed only during such periods as the Secretary of the Interior shall find and determine that commercial insurance is not available, and at premiums sufficiently high to keep the principal of the original insurance fund intact, and policies of insurance shall be issued hereunder only pursuant to such terms and premium rates as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe by regulations duly promulgated. Until otherwise provided by law all moneys collected as premiums on such insurance or otherwise in connection with the administration of such funds or the operation of such insurance activity shall constitute accretions to the fund and shall be held, together with the original insurance fund and all additions thereto, as a revolving fund for the purposes of such insurance.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico has 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has 20 minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, S. 3140 provides that money already allocated to Puerto Rico be expended over a longer period of time than that set up in the act providing these funds. There are no appropriations made and no additional expense incurred by reason of this proposed bill. Not only is there no appropriation set up and no additional moneys requested, but we estimate that twenty-five or thirty million dollars will be saved if this bill becomes law.

The situation which exists in Puerto Rico is quite different from that which exists in the States. There is an agricultural situation there, with no other industry. To rehabilitate the agricultural situation in Puerto Rico, as a result of the various hurricanes and storms they have had there, requires a long period of time. The rehabilitation provides that coffee bushes and shade trees to take care of those bushes, and methods of that kind can be pursued. It is a known fact that it requires 5 years from the time a coffee bush is planted until it produces. If we take the money that has been allocated to Puerto Rico and expend it in the time we now give, it will be wasted. If we take a longer period of time it will be saved. If we spend it hurriedly they will come back here in a year or two asking this Congress to appropriate additional moneys to save them from starvation, and we will again have to appropriate money.

What we are trying to do is to obviate the necessity for further appropriations. This bill has the endorsement of every member of the Committee on Insular Affairs, both Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman says it has the unanimous favorable report of the committee?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The report was favorable, and it was unanimous by the entire Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I understand the bill there is absolutely no provision of law with reference to the administration of the fund. The essence of it is merely to extend the time for the application of the fund to the condition now existing in Puerto Rico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And my understanding is that the purpose of this legislation is not only to rehabilitate the people who live in the island in a permanent way, but also to prevent economic and social collapse. Is this correct?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I should like to congratulate the Democratic Party on trying to be conservative and on taking their time in spending the money, for they have been so lavish in spending money in the past that if some halt is not called the country will be wrecked. I want to congratulate the gentleman in taking the right step.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman explain the insurance features of this bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. I, too, would like to have them explained.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am reliably informed that at the present time there is somewhere between $7,000,000 and $8,000,000 processing taxes impounded in Puerto Rico. It is proposed to use this money as a revolving fund to care for hurricane sufferers in Puerto Rico, because it is impossible to get insurance in this island due to the experience of insurance companies which in 1 year suffered a loss of 2,000 percent of all the premiums paid in.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman kindly advise us whether or not any part of these funds is to be used for the development of the tile or pottery industries?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; not at all.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I understood the gentleman to say that this bill does not authorize the appropriation of any money whatsoever in addition to the money that has already been authorized, but that it only permits an economic expenditure of what has already been authorized.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there are three features in this bill: First, there is a situation where the Congress of the United States a year ago appropriated $4,880,000,000 to the President of the United States to use for relief purposes, giving him a lot of discretion as to what he might do. Instead of allotting what might be needed for Puerto Rico within the period for which that money was appropriated and made available under the law for relief purposes, about five times the amount necessary has been allotted.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman's own story proves my contention, and he will see it if he will permit me to proceed. I shall not yield until I conclude the main part of my statement.

About five times what was needed was allotted. I want everyone to understand the proposal that is before us, because this is not the first time this bill has been up for consideration. It was called up under suspension last August and it was beaten because the House understood what it was about. Upward of $30,000,000 has been allotted for this purpose. The gentleman from New Mexico tells us he wants the bill passed in order that the money may be saved and not wasted, so that it may be spent over a period of 5 years upon projects the result of which we know nothing whatever about. It is customary in the operations of the Congress to make appropriations available for only a short period of time so we may see how things work, for we do not want to spend money on things that do not work well. This is an untried experiment, setting people up in the agricultural business in Puerto Rico. The administration has the authority to go on this year and until the 30th of June 1937 with this money. Why should they not use what they figure is reasonably necessary to establish whether or not it is going to be a reasonable expenditure, whether it is going to be a successful experiment, and then, if there is need for going further, to come back to the Congress and ask the Congress for more money?

Here is another important element to be considered: This bill should provide for covering into the Treasury the part of this appropriation, upward of $20,000,000, which is not necessary for taking care of the situation. It has been allotted to this island and may be used during the period for which the money is available. This $20,000,000 should be covered into the Treasury by this bill.

This bill has still another angle; that of setting up the Government in the insurance business.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. What is bad about that?

Mr. TABER. Any scheme which puts the Government into business is bad. [Applause.]

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. In addition to that it puts the Government into the insurance business away from home.

Mr. TABER. Away from home, and with a $10,000,000 capital.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. This processing tax belongs to the people of Puerto Rico. They just retain that there and rehabilitate the revolving fund. It does not put the Government in the insurance business.

Mr. TABER. It does put the Government in the insurance business.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is it not also a fact there are 350,000 people there on relief?

Mr. TABER. I do not know; but, according to the gentleman's own statement, this money could well be expended over 5 years. That means five times as much has been allotted as is necessary. From the gentleman's own statement it stands to reason that the trouble with the situation is they have allocated a lot of money for ruthless experimentation beyond the authorized period of this act, and they ought to cover the fund into the Treasury that is not needed. If the experiments happen to be successful over a period of 2 years, within which they can operate, they could then come back here and make a case, but they have not made a case. They have the authority to spend the money.

Mr. Speaker, we should stop the ruthless expenditure of money, and should cover into the Treasury the unnecessary allotment. There is not any sense in passing such a bill as this.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Does the gentleman think the Government is in the insurance business when it has lent hundreds of millions of dollars to insurance companies through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

Mr. TABER. Not where the Government has received collateral for the loans which is more than the face of the loan. I do not think that has anything to do with this case.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] understand that the purpose of section 1 is to terminate the expenditures for the dole in Puerto Rico?

Mr. TABER. No. The gentleman from New Mexico proved that was not so, because he said it was enough to carry on this experimentation over 5 years. If his statement was so, there would be no excuse for this bill. The two things do not go together.

There is no use trying to go on with that kind of argument and expect intelligent people to believe it. The Governor of Puerto Rico at his own solicitation came to see me on Friday week before last. He brought with him a man from the Interior Department. I asked them certain questions which they were unable to answer, and in order that they might have an opportunity, I agreed to submit questions to them, which I did. They did not submit answers, as they agreed to, on the following Monday, but did submit the answers last Saturday. The answers were not complete, they were not convincing, and contained no information upon which an intelligent man could vote for such a piece of legislation as this.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the membership of this House will sustain the record that they made last August and vote against the foolish method of spending money which is provided by this bill. We are trying to spread it over 5 years for projects we know nothing about, and on top of that we are trying to put the Government in the insurance business to the extent of $10,000,000. The whole thing is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to talk about the Puerto Rican situation without getting into what some people might call an extreme attitude. I have watched the situation there closely for 15 years. I have had the opportunity to sit around the table with people very active in Puerto Rican industries. We have sent about $12,000,000 a year down to Puerto Rico, so I am informed, for relief purposes.

Now, the United States may do one of two things: We may help Puerto Rico rehabilitate its idle, starving people, or the taxpayers of this country will have to contribute annually from ten to twenty million dollars in order to feed those people. Puerto Rico is overpopulated, as is Japan. We may either furnish work in Puerto Rico for the Puerto Rican people or else move them out of Puerto Rico to some other place. On the other hand, we may convert their energy into goods and take the goods to some other place or let the people there consume more of their own production and less of the goods we ship to them—thus becoming more self-sustaining.

With reference to the insurance fund, may I point out that the money accumulated through the collection of the processing tax on Puerto Rican sugar has been impounded instead of it being distributed to individual growers of sugarcane, as it was in the United States among both cane and sugar-beet growers. In the United States the individual farmer collected his benefit payments, spent the money in his own way. In Puerto Rico this did not happen. The benefit payments that might have been distributed to individual growers are segregated into a fund, and it is this money this bill is to set aside as an insurance fund to protect growers against hurricane damage that may occur in the future. Of course, additional funds are not to be collected through the imposition of processing taxes on account of the A. A. A. decision by the Supreme Court. And the present amount of this fund will probably not be ample to care for the great damage which follows the acts of a hurricane. However, if the people prefer to use their fund in the form of an insurance protection instead of consuming it without any thought of tomorrow, why should we object to their doing so?

Mr. William T. Reed, Jr., assistant counsel of the National Association of Insurance Agents, informs me under date of

January 15, 1936—wherein he refers to the ability of insurance companies to handle this problem—

Due to the high loss ratio experienced since 1928, I do not believe that any of the companies are in a position at present to undertake this type of hazard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that here is a problem the scope of which rises above the ability of stock- and mutual-insurance companies to handle. It becomes one which demands the highest policy of the United States and Puerto Rico in its solution. Are we to deny these people the right to use their own funds in a manner which will not only alleviate their troubles but at the same time result in the citizens of the United States having to contribute less dollars to Puerto Rican hurricane relief as well as welfare relief? The claim some make that this is destructive to private business because Government enters the field in this manner cannot be sustained. Private insurance activities have ceased, according to Mr. Reed's statement. The hazard is too great. Primitive man assumes and carries his own hazard when private initiative backs away from the problem or before private enterprise is created. Here is a case where private enterprise entered the field and gave up the task on account of too great a hazard. Now Puerto Ricans desire to mutually assume the hazard in this way. Furthermore, it should be kept in mind that Puerto Rican citizens have paid their share of processing taxes on articles shipped from the United States to Puerto Rico and consumed by the Puerto Rican people. Those taxes were collected and remitted to the individual farmers of the United States who grew cotton, pork, wheat, and other crops affected. The Puerto Rican is not complaining about that, but he is asking that he be permitted to use his own funds to help solve his own problems.

The rehabilitation feature of this bill is of greatest importance to these poor people. Since 1898 their condition has grown worse. They are real objects of American-dollar imperialism. Take the record and see how individual farms have been converted into great sugar plantations. How these very plantations, so few in number, have absorbed such a very, very great portion of the total acreage of fertile soils. How the people, through this taking over of the lands and as a result of the hurricanes, have been driven from pillar to post, into the slums of the city, and on relief. How individual farm families who once produced practically all of their subsistence have been forced off those farms and placed on what might be termed "seasonal" pay rolls, forced to work for mere existence, receiving whatever pay the concentrated holdings of farm lands desire to pay them for the stoop labor performed. Take particular note of how "absentee ownership" is bleeding white the productive elements of the islands; the enormous amount of dividends being paid by these "absentee owners" to their stockholders residing in other lands. Puerto Rico is a tragedy. It is a tragedy that has grown worse under the American flag. It was bad enough when we took over the islands with the large-scale farming which was in control even at that time.

Puerto Rico has a great surplus of laborers. More food must be produced there or more industries must be established or we shall have to contribute in increasing amounts to their subsistence. We cannot force on them their independence and let them starve. The scarcity of individual possessions, of food, clothing, medicine, educational facilities all tends to force many of them to live but little above the state of the savage. About 1,700,000 souls are crowded on that little island of about 3,435 square miles. What does "absentee ownership" care about these social and economic problems. The worse the conditions grow and remain short of revolution, the lower price at which stoop labor can be obtained and the greater the profit of that ownership can become. What appears on the surface as a favorable "trade balance" is set off by the "exports" of revenue in the form of dividends that leave Puerto Rico for other lands. Local ownership always assumes and shares a dissimilar responsibility to social and economic conditions to that of "absentee ownership"—this is fundamental and all in accordance with the economic system under which we live. We should accept the fact and then proceed to see what can be done which will raise the standard of living in Puerto Rico, make the people self-sustaining and make it unnecessary for the citizens of the United States to continually send ten or fifteen millions of dollars annually to Puerto Rico for relief. In my opinion this bill is a step in that direction and therefore I hope the members of the House will vote in its favor. We should keep in mind the basic industry—sugar—in Puerto Rico is a protected industry. Therefore, the benefits of that protection should continue or travel down to the pockets of some of the "stoop workers" of that island and not all be held to the benefit of absentee investors who have the benefit of the protection and the purchasing power of the American consumers who almost entirely consume that basic crop.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said that the President had certain powers of relief and that he had allocated five times more than these people were entitled to. I do not go to the length of saying that it is a misstatement, but it is an incorrect statement and wholly inaccurate. Previously the allocation to Puerto Rico has been from twelve to fifteen million dollars a year since relief started.

The purpose of this appropriation is to give the Puerto Ricans what amounts to $30,000,000 for 2 years, or approximately the same amount as has been appropriated before. This money is to be spent intelligently and judiciously, over a period of 5 years, for real rehabilitation of the Puerto Rican people. I cannot see how the average Republican can oppose this measure, and I am glad to note that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is for the bill. It looks to me as if the opposition is of a partisan nature. Some of you Republicans are just against anything the Democrats are for; certainly the arguments against it are not based on real facts or common sense.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat this money is to be spent intelligently and judiciously. If that is the fact, the Republicans should drop this partisan opposition and vote for the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Puerto Rico is the most tragic victim of American imperialism. This is the first opportunity we have to aid the people of Puerto Rico. As a matter of fact this bill does not give them very much. However, it is better than nothing. Why all this opposition to even this small measure of help? Is it discrimination? If not, to defeat this bill would be false economy. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his support of this bill. Puerto Rico has been kicked around too long. Why not give her a chance?

Mr. MAVERICK. The distinguished gentleman from New York is correct. I go with you in thought and know the study and application you have given the Puerto Rican question. The Puerto Ricans have been given slipshod treatment, and really pretty bad treatment as you say. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and appreciate the fact that he understands the question and has sympathy for the Puerto Rican people and will vote not according to party, but according to common sense and justice.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. MORAN. May I ask the gentleman this question? The money is going to be spent anyway and the only point involved is whether we are going to spend it as relief and receive no benefit or whether we are going to accomplish some useful purpose in the expenditure of the money.

Mr. MAVERICK. The gentleman is right. This money is going to be spent anyway and if we would do as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has suggested, they will take the money and, in effect, throw it away, because it will do little good—and will only feed people, while, according to this plan, the money can be spent wisely. The point is, if they can take this money and purchase real estate and spend it slowly it will be a good thing for the

Puerto Ricans, because they can be rehabilitated, and a good thing for ourselves, because it will relieve our tax burdens. In fine, it will assist the Puerto Ricans in being self-supporting.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. For a brief question; yes.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman mean to say they are going to throw this money away if we do not extend this time limit?

Mr. MAVERICK. I do not agree that it is going to be thrown away.

Mr. SNELL. That is what the gentleman stated.

Mr. MAVERICK. I will express myself a little better by saying that it would be much better spent if we permitted it to be done judiciously, according to a decent plan, and not just paid out for relief and to feed people.

Mr. SNELL. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. As I understand, this money comes from an emergency fund that expires on June 30, 1937.

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. If they have allocated more than they can spend or more than they need for just purposes down there, why should not the balance come back to the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. MAVERICK. The answer to that is they have not allocated more than can be spent, of course.

We have not allocated any more money than is a just amount. This money can be thrown out as a dole just to feed people or it can be used intelligently to purchase farms so that the people can rehabilitate themselves. There does not exist anything like the Rural Rehabilitation Bureau in Puerto Rico and this is for the purpose of agricultural rehabilitation. Industry is not covered; is not interferred with.

They have 300,000 families in Puerto Rico that are on relief. More than two-thirds of the population of Puerto Rico is on relief, and our purpose is to get them off of relief and get them back into agricultural pursuits, and to be self-supporting.

This will benefit the sugar industry of the United States, because this land is not to be used in sugar production, but put into other lines of agriculture. They will therefore have a diversified agriculture to make it a more complete economic unit, and where it will not be necessary to import so many products. It will therefore benefit Puerto Rico and also benefit the taxpayers of the United States.

This statement that the appropriation is five times too much is not true at all. This is one place where the President of the United States, the Director of the Budget, the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Senate of Puerto Rico, and every branch of the government agree that this is a proper way for this money to be spent, and I hope you gentlemen on the Republican side and on this side will not oppose the bill just to be in opposition, because this is one time when money is being spent with wisdom.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Is it not a fact that the Government is anxious to buy the land in Puerto Rico at the cheapest possible price and cannot do so without being taken into court, and if the matter goes into court it will take longer than the 2 years? Moreover, is it not correct that many will hold out for exorbitant prices unless Congress allots a reasonable time for purchase? Is not this bill really necessary for proper and correct administration?

Mr. MAVERICK. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution. You have really represented your people and have fostered legislation for the people of Pennsylvania which is of great benefit and a social advance. You are correct on this Puerto Rican question, and I am sure the gentleman has given it the same serious and conscientious study that he always does his constituency in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good bill; it is sensible, it is fair to the Puerto Rican, fair to the Government of the United States. I believe it should pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one in my friendship for the people of Puerto Rico, but as former chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs and as a member of that committee for 14 years, and having visited Puerto Rico on several occasions, I feel I am perhaps qualified to contribute something to this debate.

I am wondering, my friends, how many of you who voted for the $4,880,000,000 relief fund had any idea that that money would be carried over for a period of 7 years. We appropriated that money last year, in 1935. It is proposed in this legislation to carry this sum over to June 30, 1940. Surely, there can be no objection to the plan proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to place the unexpended portion back in the Federal Treasury, voting it out as future needs determine.

I consider it a very dangerous thing for this Congress to make appropriations available over a long period of time. I believe that the unexpended money should be covered back into the Treasury, and if the Puerto Ricans come before us and show need for renewing the appropriation we can then act as needs dictate. But to come in here at this time and propose to carry this on for another 5 years seems to me absurd and indefensible.

Congress has done many absurd things, and it is time that we get our feet back on the ground and legislate in a clear, sound manner, one which we can go home and defend.

Now, as far as the insurance plan is concerned, why not insure the buildings and crops of Minnesota farmers, the farmers in Ohio and Texas and California?

Mr. McFARLANE. We are taking care of the farmers in Minnesota; what is the gentleman crying about?

Mr. KNUTSON. Why not take in the whole country?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I know the gentleman from Minnesota wants to be fair, and I think he knows that this insurance fund is being provided by the farmers in Puerto Rico and not by the United States Government, not by the Public Works Administration.

Mr. KNUTSON. There were $35,000,000 appropriated or allotted for relief work. Does the gentleman deny that?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am talking about the insurance.

Mr. KNUTSON. Thirty-five million dollars was allocated to Puerto Rico for relief and for P. W. A. work. Of that sum $9,000,000 has been used for direct relief, making $26,000,000 for W. P. A. In all conscience that is a pretty good sum of money, and I do not believe anyone in Puerto Rico can accuse Uncle Sam of having been niggardly with the people of the island. They can come to Congress when they need further relief. Let Congress not blindly appropriate big sums that would be available for the next 5 years.

You cannot defend this measure to your own constituents, who are paying a large part of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. EKWALL].

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that my colleague on this side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], is usually the watchdog of the Treasury, and quite often I approve of what he says, but in this case I think he has the wrong idea. I believe this money should be spent in a judicious manner. The money has been allocated. You are merely asked for authority to spread over a period of years the expenditures which otherwise would have to be made by the middle of 1937.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EKWALL. No; I have not the time. It seems to me the insurance feature is entirely misunderstood, because this fund is already available. It is money that is impounded at the present time. It is merely for the purpose

of affording insurance in case hurricane insurance rates are too high or in case no insurance of this type can be secured at all. I have gone over this bill rather carefully. The thing that impresses me with its absolute fairness is the fact that every member of the Committee on Insular Affairs present at the time has approved the bill, and when Members of the type of KOCIALKOWSKI, SMITH of West Virginia, CARTWRIGHT, LARRABEE, ELLENBOGEN, SANDERS of Louisiana, RYAN, MCGEHEE, MASSINGALE, BELL, MAHON, O'DAY, SAUTHOFF, THURSTON, WELCH, COLE of New York, STEFAN, CRAWFORD, GINGERY, DEMPSEY, and IGLESIAS say the bill is a good bill, that is satisfactory to me, and I believe it ought to be to the other Members. I think the bill should pass as recommended by the committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I need to remind myself and the House that I am the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Expenditures. I do not annoy you with many such small matters, but the report on this bill interests me greatly. Puerto Rico tells us that she has too much money to be spent in a short time, and she begs us that she may not be forced to "hurriedly waste the money." The report says practically that she will waste it and spend it somehow within the time. They don't wish to waste this money, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] said that for once let us see to it that relief money is spent properly. I am glad to get that admission. We have plenty of towns in our districts that would have been glad to have W. P. A. money spent for worthwhile and permanent projects, rather than waste the funds on temporary and wasteful schemes hurriedly suggested. These Island people simply ask that they may be allowed to spend money properly and the suggestion appears like an indictment of the manner in which we are spending on the continent. This report is interesting indeed. They say, "Don't make us build a power plant in 2 years because we haven't the consumption for it now." Why, that is what we have been doing on the continent, is it not—building enormous power plants that will take many, many years to find customers to make use of them? They want to be treated quite differently from what our own municipalities have been treated. Would not all of us wish to make the same identical request? I read:

> Do not make us waste this money.

And to think that they agree they are going to waste it, and will waste it in 2 years unless you give them this extra time to spend it properly. I think it is a most remarkable report. It would seem to criticize our methods of spending relief funds. We know that the Insular Affairs Committee look well after their islands. That committee must assume their problems. Who ever heard of an Insular Affairs Committee that did not recommend about the maximum of benefits for them? We can hardly blame them, as they are the guardians and must get all they can of this easy money. But here is an absolute acknowledgment that they do not need the money; that they cannot spend it unless they waste it; but that they are going to waste it. They are making no different request than you and I would like to make for a great many projects in our own districts. They agree that they do not like to waste this money, but will do so unless we pass this bill. I could not resist the opportunity of reminding you that they are no different from most others, who will spend it even if it is to be wasted.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MILLARD. This money was appropriated for relief. Does that mean that the depression will not be over until 1940?

Mr. GIFFORD. They suggest that the relief problem of the islands will be before us for many years. This bill means that they really want to spend the money wisely.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does the bill appropriate any more money than has originally been appropriated? If not, what is the objection?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; they want to hold on to what they have. They have asked even for the processing taxes and the interest thereon and they want that money to go into the fund. They want also to go into the insurance business.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The Puerto Ricans are entitled to a square deal. They need a real chance. Why not give it to them? Furthermore, this money belongs to them, does it not?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; if what is given to them for relief belongs to them. But if they cannot use the $25,000,000, whose money is it? Does it belong to them simply because it has been allocated to them for relief? No; it belongs to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is their money. They should be permitted to spend it in a manner that will do the most good, such as is provided in this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, in this discussion I have noticed that about three-quarters of what has been said is not true. [Laughter and applause.] There is an absolute misapprehension of the facts. What happened in Puerto Rico is this: In 1928 there was a hurricane that wiped out, to a great extent, the leading crop that these people need on which to make a living; that is, the coffee crop. Puerto Rico grows the finest coffee in the world. This coffee has no competition. It is sold mostly in Europe. It does not go into the United States and compete with domestic crops. What happened in Puerto Rico is this: Coffee trees are very delicate and must be protected. They are protected by growing shade trees side by side as they grow the coffee trees. It takes about 5 years to grow them so that they will produce. If this money is spent on a dole, all we do is to pay out to these people who have been driven off these coffee plantations and have been forced into the slums of the city. There are 359,000 of them now on relief. You simply give them the money to keep alive, but you do not put them back in the coffee fields where they belong. You do not give them an opportunity to once more clean up those fields and raise coffee trees and earn a living. That is what this bill seeks to do. We spent $14,000,000 last year, and we spent $14,000,000 the year before that, and all we did was to hand out a dole. Instead of doing that, we expect that $30,000,000 will rehabilitate these coffee fields [applause], and move these people out from the slums, and put them back on their coffee plantations and make them self-supporting. That is the purpose of this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the request comes too late.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

The House divided; and there were ayes 150 and noes 49.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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. 9871. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the participation of the United States in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936; authorizing an appropriation therefor; and for other purposes", approved March 7, 1935; to provide for participation in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1936; to authorize an appropriation therefor; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3612. An act to provide loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1936, and for other purposes.

DOMESTIC SOURCES OF TIN

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3381) to provide for the protection and preservation of domestic sources of tin.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the interest of national defense, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose and intent of this act to protect, preserve, and develop domestic sources of tin, to restrain the depletion of domestic reserves of tin-bearing materials, and to lessen the present costly and dangerously dependent position of the United States with respect to resources of tin.

SEC. 2. There shall not be exported from the United States after the expiration of 60 days from the enactment of this act any tin-plate scrap, except upon license issued by the President of the United States. The President is authorized to grant licenses upon such conditions and regulations as he may find necessary to assure in the public interest fair and equitable consideration to all producers of this commodity.

SEC. 3. Any violation of the provisions of this act shall be a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] has 20 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] has 20 minutes.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to prevent the exportation of tin scrap from the United States. We are in this situation with respect to tin: We produce absolutely no virgin tin within the United States. Since we have been a Nation we have produced less than 1,500 tons in the United States, and our normal annual consumption of tin is in excess of 60,000 tons. We have within the United States an industry which acts as a reserve for our tin supply, inasmuch as it detins the tin scrap which comes from the canning factories and converts it into tin which, for all practical purposes, is exactly the same as virgin tin. This detinning industry has been during the last few years almost utterly destroyed because the Japanese have come into the market and have bid tin scrap up beyond the price which our detinners can afford to pay for this product. The reason the Japanese have been able to do that is that they have very low-grade labor, in the first place, but the principal reason that they desire this tin scrap is that in securing the tin scrap and detinning it they secure the high-grade steel upon which the tin is made. Therefore they achieve two purposes. One of their purposes is to destroy our detinning industry, which acts as a reserve in this Nation in time of war, and the other is to secure this high-grade steel which they use to amalgamate with the high silica ores which comes from Manchukuo to make armor plate.

Now, we are at the mercy of the world at large for tin. Tin is one of the essential commodities of this Nation, both in time of peace and in time of war. It is necessary that we take steps, especially so at this time, to protect what domestic sources we have.

Over quite a period of years the tin produced by the detinning industry in the United States has amounted to 27 percent of the tin consumed in this country, although in the last few years it has dropped to almost nothing because of the destruction of the industry. During the present worldwide emergency the situation with respect to tin has become particularly alarming. Although we consume almost 200 tons of tin in this Nation each day, at the present time the warehouse stocks of tin in New York comprise but 173 tons, just about 1 day's consumption; but of this supply of tin, 118 tons is Chinese tin. Chinese tin is tin which is a very poor grade and cannot be used in the making of tin plate.

The United States is absolutely at the mercy of foreign nations in regard to tin, because practically all of our tin comes from the Federated Malay States and from Bolivia. The source of all this tin is controlled by Great Britain. In fact, Great Britain today controls 85 percent of the tin of the world. So now we are in a very bad situation with respect to tin. Therefore, we have asked for this legislation in order to protect our domestic sources of tin.

This is a bill on which the Military Affairs Committee held very extensive hearings, and which was reported out unanimously by that committee. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this House is cognizant of the vital importance of the tin question to our Nation at the present time. A select committee of which the chairman was the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, and on which I had the honor to serve, made a long and careful study of the tin situation a year ago, and made certain recommendations which are yet to be acted upon.

We use in this country every year from 50,000 to 60,000 tons of tin. Tin is produced from four main sources, Bolivia, the Malay States, the Netherlands, and Nigeria. The Straits tin is considered to be the best. A year or two ago they organized in London what is known as an international cartel to raise the price of tin to the consumer. Remember that America buys more than half the tin produced in the world. By means of this international agreement they raised the price of tin to our consumers from about 20 cents up to 50 cents a pound. The latter figure is about the current price. For some reason they have been holding back the supply of tin for this country until, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has told you, we have at the present time less than 1 day's supply of tin in stock in the warehouses in New York.

Tin is absolutely essential in time of war or in time of peace, and I approach this problem, first of all, from the point of view of our national defense. Without tin we are at the mercy of an enemy coming in from the outside. We must, therefore, have some reserves. About 30 years ago there was developed in this country what was known as the detinning industry. We have now two companies engaged in this business, with 5 plants—1 in San Francisco, 1 in Chicago, 1 in Pittsburgh, and 2 in New Jersey. One of the Jersey plants is shut down because its supply of tin scrap has been largely taken by Japan. I have in my hand an advertisement by a Japanese firm in a New York paper:

We are detinners.

And they are asking for scrap tin.

Underneath appears a statement by our Jersey firm:

We were detinners, but the Japanese put us out of business.

The hourly wage in Japan detinning plants is 5 cents. In our American plants it is 55 cents.

The material used for detinning comes from scrap left over from the making of tin cans. Tin cans are not made of tin, but are made of steel that is baptized in tin. The detinning plants buy this scrap. It is baled and brought to them. The railroads are given millions of dollars worth of business in this freight carriage. When the detinning companies could

buy scrap at a reasonable price they could continue in business. If we put our detinning plants out of business, we put out of business a source of tin at home sufficient to take care of about 30 percent of our total needs in case of war. These detinning plants are highly technical institutions. If we let them go by the board, it would take years to assemble the skilled chemists and engineers and to create new machinery to set them up again.

Several questions are raised in this connection. I want to deal with them in a sentence. The first is the question of how this bill will affect the small producer of tin scrap. Under this bill the President has the right to issue a license to export to anyone whom he thinks is being unfairly treated. In the second place, it is a fact that for 14 years before the Japanese began to put the price up where we could not compete, and before they took from us this one domestic source of our supply, the small producers of tin-plate scrap were paid over 5 percent more than the large producers, like the Continental Can Co. Furthermore, one of these great detinning companies located in my district, and for this reason very fair in its disposition and intelligent in its conduct of business, has made a written guaranty that it will give to the small producer of tin-plate scrap exactly the same price given to the large producer, so all producers will be placed exactly on a par. This is in the record, as the chairman of our committee can verify.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not a fact that the price of tin-plate scrap has jumped from $2 a ton up to $18?

Mr. EATON. It went as high as $24 at one time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And it made it impossible for the reclaiming plants to purchase scrap tin.

Mr. EATON. Absolutely; it has put them out of business.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. When I was chairman of the Committee on Rules I was somewhat instrumental in assisting in the set-up of this select committee which investigated the shortage of tin in the country. I have not had a chance to see the report of the committee, although I understand it has been filed; but does this bill in a general way carry out the recommendations of that select committee?

Mr. EATON. I do not want to speak for the chairman of the committee, but this bill has our full sympathy. The chairman of the investigating committee has been instrumental in securing the consideration of this bill, which incorporates the main principles agreed upon in our report, so far as the embargo plan on scrap tin is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The ultimate purpose of this bill is to stop the exportation of any tin from the country. Is not this so?

Mr. EATON. The ultimate purpose of this bill is to stop the exportation at this time and under present world conditions of tin-plate scrap which is used in our detinning plants and absolutely necessary for their continuance in business and for our safety in war.

Mr. BLOOM. It is tin that is left over.

Mr. EATON. It is tin that is left over. As I said before, a tin can is not made of tin, but is made of steel plate that is baptized in tin.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want to get clear in my mind the effect of this bill. It will result in prohibiting the exportation of this commodity from this country unless a license is obtained.

Mr. EATON. Yes; as a national-defense measure.

Mr. MAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAIN. When the gentleman speaks of a tin can being a sheet of steel baptized with tin——

Mr. EATON. In tin. Immersed in tin.

Mr. MAIN. The gentleman is an advocate of immersing rather than sprinkling?

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. FORD of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD of California. With war going on in Europe and tin being such an important article in time of war, does the gentleman not think it is a very wise provision for this country to stop the exportation of any kind of tin?

Mr. EATON. Yes; of any kind of tin-plate scrap.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Where will be the market for this scrap tin?

Mr. EATON. We have a market here in our detinning plants that is starving to death because it cannot get the material for its use. These plants take scrap tin from the can factories, recover the tin, which is sold and used as 100-percent pure tin, or it may be used in another form in the silk industry to make the rustle that the ladies require in silk material. If the Japanese take all of this tin scrap, then our detinning plants go out of business, and in case of war we are at the mercy of anybody who wants to come over here and beat us up.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that Japan has been importing from the United States very large quantities of scrap steel, scrap iron, and scrap copper in addition to tin plate?

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There has been an increase of from 10 to 20 percent since 1932. The situation is becoming very alarming.

Mr. EATON. Yes. May I say further, this country is the only important industrial country which has not now an embargo against the exportation of tin-plate scrap.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does Henry Ford use a lot of tin?

Mr. EATON. I do not know. He used to, but not now.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, may I say that the time is here when the men and women constituting this body had better pay some attention to the needs and dangers of our own country. We have to go into the markets of the world and purchase this tin at a price which is made outside the borders of our country. We can keep 30 percent of it from going back, and we ought to do that, especially when in so doing we do no damage to any American industry while we keep going in our detinning plants an industry that is absolutely essential in time of war. I hope the membership will vote 100 percent for this bill and show for once that we are Americans first.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a sentence of this bill:

> The President is authorized to grant licenses upon such conditions and regulations as he may find necessary to assure in the public interest fair and equitable consideration to all producers of this commodity. There shall not be exported from the United States after the expiration of 60 days from the enactment of this act any tin plate scrap—

Remember the word "scrap", because I want to get to that question in a moment—

> except upon license issued by the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this turns over to the President the absolute authority to maintain an embargo on the exportation of tin plate scrap. Let me tell you just what the situation is with reference to tin and how important it is from a military standpoint. It is customary for us to export somewhere around 100,000 tons of tin plate, which represents approximately 1,500 tons of tin. That is to say, there is only a small amount of tin used with the tin plate. This is over three times as much as all the tin plate scrap available in

the United States. In other words, the amount of tin plate that we export is three or four times as much as the total tin plate scrap available.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. The gentleman is a wizard at figures, but I call his attention to the fact that we produce 250,000 tons of scrap with tin on it, and 35 pounds of tin is taken off every ton. If the gentleman will figure that out he will see that he is left in the hole.

Mr. TABER. No. The amount of tin plate exported is not very serious. The important thing about this matter is that there are two or three people operating these detinning plants. They have a monopoly in this country. They were paying about $1 a ton for the scrap, whereas the price now is somewhere around $12 or $13 a ton. That is the picture with reference to this situation.

From the standpoint of national defense, this bill does not mean a thing. It is simply a bill to maintain the monopoly of two or three concerns which operate about six detinning plants in this country. They can operate and pay a fair price for this product. This bill permits the President of the United States to issue licenses for the exportation of tin anyway. It does seem to me when we come to consider all these facts it is going a long way to pass a bill turning over the entire authority of Congress with reference to the issuance of embargoes to the President, thereby burdening him with this additional duty. Under the circumstances it seems to me we ought to defeat this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The reason the local detinning plants are not getting this tin today is on account of not being able to meet the Japanese competition?

Mr. TABER. I think they are getting it to a considerable extent. As I understand it, there are several plants operating at the present time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But as the Japanese have been moving forward they have taken this commodity away from the local detinners.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And if this embargo is placed in effect it will entirely replace the scrap in the hands of the firms to which the gentleman referred?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is there in the bill which will protect the fellow who has the scrap for sale?

Mr. TABER. He has to go to the President in order to get a license to export his scrap.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield so that I may answer the question?

Mr. TABER. Have I not answered it correctly?

Mr. EATON. The price of the product of a detinning plant is determined by the price of virgin tin, which is brought into this country, and if they have any tin to sell after they have detinned this scrap, it receives the same price as if it were imported from the Straits Settlements.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You simply have a refining cost in between.

Mr. EATON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 139, noes 14.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOANS FOR CROP PRODUCTION AND HARVESTING DURING THE YEAR 1936

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3612) to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1936, and for other purposes, with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, hereinafter in this act referred to as the "Governor", is hereby authorized to make loans to farmers in the continental United States and in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, during the year 1936, for fallowing, for the production of crops, for planting, cultivating, and harvesting of crops, for supplies incident to and necessary for such production, planting, cultivating, and harvesting, and for feed for livestock, or for any of such purposes. Such loans shall be made and collected through such persons, instrumentalities, and agencies, upon such terms and conditions, and subject to such regulations, as the Governor may prescribe.

"SEC. 2. (a) There shall be required as security for any such loan a first lien, or an agreement to give a first lien, upon all crops of which the production or harvesting, or both, is to be financed, in whole or in part, with the proceeds of such loan; or in case of any loan for the purchase or production of feed for livestock, a first lien upon the livestock to be fed. Fees for recording, filing, registration, and examination of records (including certificates), aggregating not more than 75 cents, may be paid from the proceeds of each loan. Fees for the release or satisfaction of record of the lien given to secure any loan shall be paid by the borrower. Each loan shall bear interest at the rate of 5½ percent per annum.

"(b) The amount which may be loaned to any borrower pursuant to this act shall not exceed $300: *Provided, however*, That in any area certified by the President of the United States to the Governor as a distressed emergency area, the Governor may make loans without regard to the foregoing limitations as to amount, under such regulations and with such maturities as he may prescribe therefor.

(c) No loan shall be made under this act to any applicant who shall not have first established to the satisfaction of the proper officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration, under such regulations as the Governor may prescribe: (1) That such applicant is unable to procure from other sources a loan in an amount reasonably adequate to meet his needs for the purposes for which loans may be made under this act.

SEC. 3. (a) The moneys advanced by the Governor in connection with each loan made under the provisions of this act are declared to be impressed with a trust to accomplish the purposes provided for by this act (namely, for fallowing, for the production of crops, for planting, cultivating, and harvesting of crops, for supplies incident to such production, planting, cultivating, and harvesting, and for feed for livestock, or for any of such purposes); and may be used only for the purposes stated in the borrower's loan application and until so used shall continue subject to such trust and be free from garnishment, attachment, or the levy of an execution. It shall be unlawful for any borrower to willfully use said trust fund for any purpose other than those stated in his loan application, except with the written permission of the Governor or his duly authorized representative.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to make any material false representation for the purpose of obtaining, or assisting another to obtain, a loan under the provisions of this act; or willfully to dispose of or assist in disposing of, except for the account of the Governor, any crops or other property upon which there exists a lien securing a loan made under the provisions of this act.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any person to charge a fee for the purpose of preparing or assisting in the preparation of any papers of an applicant for a loan under the provisions of this act.

(d) Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both.

SEC. 4. The Governor shall have power, without regard to the provisions of other laws applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States, to employ and fix the compensation and duties of such agents, officers, and employees as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; but the compensation of such officers and employees shall correspond, so far as the Governor deems practicable, to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Such agents, officers, and employees, or any of them, and the facilities of the Farm Credit Administration available for use in connection with such loans may also be used by the Governor to perform services for any institution operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, upon such terms and conditions as the Governor may determine; and such institutions are hereby expressly empowered to enter into agreements with the Governor for such purpose. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, and of collecting loans made under acts of the same general character, including loans made by the Governor with funds appropriated under the provisions of the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, the Governor is authorized to use the facilities of any agency, institution, or corporation, operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, and any officer or employee of such agency, institution, or corporation, or of the Farm Credit Administration, and may pay for such services and the use of such facilities from the funds made available for the payment of necessary administrative expenses; and such institutions and corporations are hereby expressly empowered to enter into agreements with the Governor for the accomplishment of such purposes.

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $40,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act. Any moneys so appropriated, and all collections of both principal and interest on loans made under this act, may be used by the Governor for making loans under this

act and for all necessary administrative expenses in carrying out the provisions of this act and in collecting outstanding balances on crop production, seed, and feed loans made under prior legislation of the same general character.

(b) Expenditures for printing and binding necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] be allowed to control the time and make such explanation of the bill as may be necessary.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual bill that we have been passing for the last few years for the purpose of making loans to that great class of farmers who are unable to actually give collateral to secure loans through any other credit activity.

I may say to the House that the experience in making these loans in the past, including the last year, is that collections from this class of people have been as high as 98 percent in some States.

The prompt passage of this bill is very urgent for the reason that a great many of the farmers are now ready to proceed with their crops and unless they are able to get this type of loan, where they can only give as collateral paper covering the crop being planted for the present year, they will be unable to carry on, and, naturally, there will be thousands of these people placed on relief rolls and in line for a dole.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. Does this bill grant the same privilege to tenants and share croppers as to other farmers?

Mr. FULMER. Yes. I may say to the gentleman that has been taken care of to the extent that they will not make loans to a landlord without taking into consideration the fact that the tenants get their just part of the loan. In this way the tenants will be taken care of.

Mr. KVALE. Is it not also true that these loans will be apportioned and evaluated so that the benefits will not all go to those having the earlier demands, namely, the cotton farmers, but will also be extended to the corn and wheat farmers and others of that type?

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely; even including the cases where they plant their crop as late as December to be gathered in the following spring.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the amount provided for in the bill?

Mr. FULMER. Forty million dollars in the House bill and $60,000,000 in the Senate bill. We are proposing to substitute the House bill for the Senate bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the same amount as provided for last year and the year before?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman stated that in some sections the return was as high as 98 percent. Of course, that is not very much of a statement with respect to what the actual facts are. Can the gentleman tell us what is the actual amount returned from these loans in all sections as finally averaged?

Mr. FULMER. The total collections up to this time, with other collections to be made, I believe run around——

Mr. JONES. The collections on previous loans have averaged around 70 percent. The 1935 loans have not all been collected. There are a number of wheat loans. I think the collections for 1935 are around 40 percent, but many of the wheat loans are not yet due. The previous loans covering a period of several years have run around an average of 70 percent.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. And is it not a fact that loan collections are being made all the time?

Mr. JONES. Yes; additional collections.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have always been in favor of this law, and I am simply asking these questions for information. When the gentleman says that 70 percent are repaid, does the gentleman include the overhead and the cost of making these loans, or is that outside?

Mr. JONES. That is the amount of total collections, as I understand it. The gentleman understands that the earlier loans were made in the drought area, and naturally there were smaller collections in those areas. In many instances the larger number of loans were made in such areas, and that has somewhat reduced collections.

But taking over the whole period, there has been a little more than 70 percent of these farmers' loans repaid.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have understood that it was higher than that, but taking it at 70 percent, with the overhead expenses taken out of that, and the overhead is pretty heavy.

Mr. JONES. Not very heavy; I do not remember the exact percentage.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Twenty-five percent?

Mr. JONES. Oh, no. It ran five or six million dollars last year. The 70 percent includes the extreme drought area, where only 15 or 20 percent was collected. In the area where there were normal conditions, as much as 90 percent has been collected.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I think the experts of the Agricultural Committee ought to furnish us and the country generally with a concrete statement of that.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will look at the end of the report he will see that that is all itemized. He will find a statement of all the previous loans.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Would the gentleman include that as a part of his remarks?

Mr. JONES. No; it consists of a lot of tables, and it would take up too much space.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman from Ohio is an assiduous and conscientious student, and I know he has been seeking information. I ask him and all Members to consider this fact, that many of the farmers in the drought area were forced to qualify for loans and had to pay $1.25 or $1.35 per bushel for seed which they were subsequently forced to repay with receipts for grain which yielded from one-fifth to one-tenth the cost of their seed when measured in bushels. Some of us made strenuous efforts to secure the privilege of his paying back in kind, but the Department looked upon that with disfavor.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I understand the percentage is much higher than 70 percent in some areas.

Mr. HOPE. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that the report shows that the percentage of collections in Ohio is lower than the average.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That does not apply in my district.

Mr. TABER. That is in reference to the 1935 crop?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Where they are not accustomed to marketing a large portion of their crops until after the first of the year. If the gentleman will turn to page 4 of the report, he will find that the loans to Ohio over a period of years have been only a million and a half altogether, and the total collections have been 68.2 percent. I think, with reference to the farming population, probably Ohio has as good a record in this as any other State.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. Is it not a fact that the percentage will be still increased, because these payments will continue and the percentage of payments will go higher.

Mr. FULMER. That is correct.

Mr. ROMJUE. In addition to that, it will be absolutely impossible for us to collect the same percentage from the various States, because some of the States suffered more through the drought than others.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does any of the $40,000,000 go to the officers of voluntary productive associations that loan money to their members?

Mr. FULMER. None whatever.

Mr. GIFFORD. Would the gentleman tell us how those not connected with voluntary associations proceed to get through a loan of money?

Mr. FULMER. By making application just like the other farmers.

Mr. GIFFORD. Direct to whom?

Mr. FULMER. To the farm agency in his State or county.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Would the gentleman state approximately what percentage of these loans have been made in emergency drought areas?

Mr. FULMER. I cannot give the gentleman that information. It may be that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] in his time will be able to give the gentleman that information.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. It occurs to me that the percentage must be very high. It also occurs to me that perhaps most of the delinquencies are in those areas.

Mr. FULMER. Yes; most of them are.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I happen to be quite familiar with conditions existing in the emergency drought areas in Minnesota and the Dakotas, and I believe that as soon as those regions have sufficient rainfall and the farmers get good crops most of the loans now delinquent will be paid and paid in full.

Mr. FULMER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CASTELLOW. And is it not imperative that these funds be made available as early as possible on account of the fact that planning of crops is now going on, particularly in the South in the cotton regions?

Mr. FULMER. Unless we have prompt action these farmers will have to go to some fertilizer dealer and obtain fertilizer on the promise that he will pay when he gets the loan and in doing so he will be charged an extra sum, whereas if he has the cash now he could buy the fertilizer at a lower price.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. And I think I ought to say that in some of the drought-stricken areas of the Middle West, if seed loans are not made available this year, there may be a considerable acreage that will not be seeded.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. We do not have the fertilizer situation the gentleman speaks of, but we have a comparable situation arising out of a scarcity of good seed, due to rust infestation and to the fact that the drought conditions in some countries has continued.

Mr. FULMER. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE NEUTRALITY BILL

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a public statement I made 2 or 3 days ago in relation to neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, the neutrality bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not a neutrality bill.

Neutrality means refraining from participation with either belligerent.

This bill promotes unneutrality under the guise of neutrality. It makes the United States a puppet state of Great Britain and a subsidiary of the League of Nations. It is more likely to involve the United States in war than to keep the United States out of war.

Section 4 of the bill gives the President discretionary power at any time during the progress of a war to impose embargoes on all articles and materials which he determines can be used in the conduct of war.

This section gives the President authority to participate in the sanctions of the League. It gives him authority to aid in the warlike actions which the League may take against any nation it determines is the aggressor in a conflict. It makes the United States a partner of the League in the wars of the League.

The League of Nations is controlled by Great Britain. Great Britain is now contesting with Italy the control of the Mediterranean. This bill makes the United States an ally of Great Britain in this contest. This is not neutrality.

Neutrality should mean peace for the United States. The United States will not have peace by intervening in foreign quarrels and in taking part in the political affairs of Europe.

Europe is divided into various armed camps. The United States cannot take sides with any of the camps and remain neutral. To take sides must ultimately lead to the involvement of the United States in war.

The President should not be given discretionary power to impose embargoes on articles and materials used in the conduct of war at any time during the progress of a war. If the bill is to pass, the bill should compel him to impose such embargoes automatically upon his declaring that a state of war exists, as he is compelled to do in relation to arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

In modern warfare, articles and materials used in the conduct of war are as essential to warring nations as are arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Therefore, this discrimination between arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and articles and materials used in the conduct of war, in the matter of embargoes, is indefensible and illogical. It is also hostile to the peaceful aspirations of the American people.

It is clear how such discretionary power in relation to articles and materials used in the conduct of war would be used in the present Italo-Ethiopian conflict.

Last fall, without authority of law, the President attempted to place an embargo on oil. At that time Italy stated officially that inasmuch as war was already in progress, she regarded such action as an unfriendly act. It was an unfriendly act. Under international law, it is considered unneutral for a country to change its policy during the progress of any war in a manner favorable or adverse to either belligerent. Therefore, whether embargoes on war materials are made compulsory or discretionary, they should not apply to belligerents already at war.

If an embargo were imposed on oil, Italy could retaliate with reprisals, and reprisals lead to war. Whatever the American people may think of Mussolini or of his form of government, they are friendly to the Italian people and wish to remain so.

It is persistently announced in Europe, particularly at Geneva, that the League of Nations will not place an embargo on oil until the United States has taken the initiative. Therefore, if such an embargo were imposed and war should ensue, the United States would be charged, and properly so, with causing the war.

The sanctions of the League are imposed by the stronger nations for their national interests; therefore, the United

States cannot support the sanctions of the League and remain neutral.

The precedent established under this bill in the present conflict would involve us inevitably in future wars. Wars revolving about Germany and Japan now seem likely.

Stalin controls the foreign trade of Russia in peace and in war. The discretionary power to impose embargoes in this bill gives the President a like complete control of the foreign trade of the United States in time of war. This is an expansion of Russian dictatorship in this country.

The Constitution of the United States directs the Congress to make the laws and the President to execute them. The discretionary power which this bill gives to the President to impose embargoes violates this principle. It gives the President the right to make laws and even to make war. Both rights are the prerogatives of the Congress under the Constitution and should not be surrendered to the President.

This Government is an American Government, not a Russian government. It is a government of laws, and not one of men.

The discretionary power in the bill also gives unlimited opportunity for secret diplomacy. If the United States is to be involved in wars, let every move and every action be known to the American people. Let us not have every move and every action shrouded in secret and lying diplomacy, such secret and lying diplomacy as enveloped Washington before and during the last war.

PACIFIC EXPOSITION OF 1938 AT LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 164, authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the Pacific Exposition of 1938 at Los Angeles, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 164, authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the Pacific Exposition of 1938 at Los Angeles, Calif.

Whereas there is to be held at Los Angeles, Calif., during the year 1938 an international exposition which has for its purpose the celebration of the completion of the Boulder Dam water and power project, and the depiction and exposition of the progress and accomplishments of the Pacific area of the United States in the fields of science, industry, business, transportation, and culture, as well as a means of inspiring more cordial relations among the nations of the world; and

Whereas said exposition by virtue of its scope and aims is deserving of the support and encouragement of the Government of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and respectfully requested by proclamation, or in such manner as he may deem proper, to invite all foreign countries and nations to such proposed exposition with a request that they participate therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I should like to have some explanation of this resolution and what it is proposed to do.

Mr. FORD of California. It simply proposes to ask foreign countries to participate in an exposition at Los Angeles for the celebration of the bringing in of the water and power from Boulder Dam.

Mr. SNELL. When is this to take place?

Mr. FORD of California. In 1938.

Mr. SNELL. As a matter of fact, of course, it has been the experience of this House that we first pass a resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate, and then afterward there is a request for an appropriation because you say it is necessary. What is the program?

Mr. FORD of California. The program is that the city of Los Angeles is planning to erect a group of exposition buildings right in the heart of the city. Those exposition buildings will be permanent buildings. There is nothing in this resolution that asks for a dollar.

Mr. SNELL. I appreciate that, but every other one has been started exactly the same as this. I speak from experience as far as that goes.

Mr. FORD of California. I am answering the gentleman on the basis of the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. But that is the way they all start, and then the President must invite foreign countries to come here and make exhibits. In order to take care of the property we are committed to appropriate money to help carry on the exposition. That has been the experience in the past.

Mr. FORD of California. I am asking for this resolution on the basis of its merits. We do not have to and are not seeking to appropriate any money.

Mr. SNELL. But that has been the experience. I do not like to object. If that is going to be the policy of this House to keep on doing it, all right. I am not going to object all the time to you people on the Democratic side spending all the money in the world.

Mr. FORD of California. I appreciate the gentleman's feeling.

Mr. SNELL. I do not feel any different about it and I do not desire any compliments about it. I know it is wrong. The other Members know it is wrong, but I do not think I should take all the responsibility of stopping these appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. J. Res. 164) authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the Pacific Exposition of 1938 at Los Angeles, Calif.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas there is to be held at Los Angeles, Calif., during the year 1938 an international exposition which has for its purpose the celebration of the completion of the Boulder Dam water and power project and the depiction and exposition of the progress and accomplishments of the Pacific area of the United States in the fields of science, industry, business, transportation, and culture, as well as a means of inspiring more cordial relations among the nations of the world; and

Whereas said exposition by virtue of its scope and aims is deserving of the support and encouragement of the Government of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and respectfully requested by proclamation, or in such manner as he may deem proper, to invite all foreign countries and nations to such proposed exposition, with a request that they participate therein.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering a second.

The Chair appointed Mr. FORD of California and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 63 and noes 31.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] 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 199, nays 106, answered "present" 1, not voting 124, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—199

Amlie	Buck	Cravens	Eicher
Ashbrook	Burch	Creal	Ekwall
Ayers	Burdick	Crosby	Ellenbogen
Bankhead	Burnham	Cross, Tex.	Englebright
Barden	Caldwell	Cullen	Evans
Barry	Cannon, Mo.	Daly	Faddis
Beam	Carter	Deen	Ferguson
Beiter	Cary	Delaney	Fish
Bell	Castellow	Dempsey	Fitzpatrick
Biermann	Chandler	Dickstein	Fletcher
Bland	Coffee	Dies	Ford, Calif.
Blanton	Colden	Driscoll	Ford, Miss.
Bloom	Colmer	Duffy, N. Y.	Fuller
Boland	Cooley	Duncan	Gasque
Boylan	Cooper, Tenn.	Eagle	Gavagan
Brown, Ga.	Costello	Eckert	Gearhart
Brown, Mich.	Cox	Edmiston	Gildea

Gillette	Lea, Calif.	O'Neal	Smith, W. Va.
Granfield	Lee, Okla.	Owen	Snyder, Pa.
Greenway	Lemke	Patton	Spence
Greever	Lewis, Colo.	Pearson	Starnes
Gregory	Lucas	Peterson, Fla.	Stubbs
Griswold	Lundeen	Peterson, Ga.	Sumners, Tex.
Haines	McClellan	Pettengill	Sutphin
Hancock, N. C.	McCormack	Peyser	Sweeney
Harlan	McFarlane	Pfeifer	Terry
Harter	McGehee	Pittenger	Thomason
Healey	McGrath	Quinn	Thurston
Hennings	McGroarty	Rabaut	Tolan
Hildebrandt	McKeough	Ramsay	Tonry
Hill, Knute	McLaughlin	Ramspeck	Turner
Hobbs	McReynolds	Randolph	Umstead
Holmes	McSwain	Rankin	Underwood
Hook	Mahon	Rayburn	Utterback
Imhoff	Maloney	Richards	Vinson, Ga.
Jacobsen	Mansfield	Robertson	Vinson, Ky.
Jenckes, Ind.	Marcantonio	Rogers, N. H.	Wallgren
Johnson, Okla.	Martin, Colo.	Rudd	Walter
Johnson, Tex.	Massingale	Russell	Wearin
Jones	Maverick	Sadowski	Weaver
Kahn	May	Sanders, Tex.	Welch
Kelly	Merritt, N. Y.	Schneider, Wis.	Werner
Kennedy, Md.	Miller	Schulte	West
Kennedy, N. Y.	Mitchell, Tenn.	Scott	Whelchel
Kloeb	Monaghan	Scrugham	Whittington
Kniffin	Moran	Sears	Wilcox
Kopplemann	O'Connell	Shanley	Wilson, La.
Kramer	O'Connor	Sisson	Wood
Kvale	O'Day	Smith, Conn.	Zioncheck
Lanham	O'Leary	Smith, Va.	

NAYS—106

Andresen	Farley	Lord	Robsion, Ky.
Andrew, Mass.	Focht	Luckey	Rogers, Mass.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gehrmann	Ludlow	Romjue
Arends	Gifford	McAndrews	Sauthoff
Bacon	Gilchrist	McMillan	Schaefer
Binderup	Goodwin	Maas	Schuetz
Blackney	Gray, Pa.	Main	Seger
Boileau	Guyer	Mapes	Short
Brewster	Gwynne	Marshall	Snell
Buckbee	Halleck	Martin, Mass.	Stefan
Buckler, Minn.	Hancock, N. Y.	Mason	Taber
Carlson	Hess	Michener	Tarver
Carpenter	Hoffman	Millard	Taylor, S. C.
Cartwright	Hollister	Moritz	Taylor, Tenn.
Christianson	Hope	Mott	Thompson
Church	Houston	O'Brien	Tinkham
Cole, Md.	Huddleston	Palmisano	Tobey
Cole, N. Y.	Hull	Patterson	Turpin
Crawford	Jenkins, Ohio	Perkins	Wigglesworth
Crowther	Kenney	Plumley	Williams
Darrow	Kinzer	Polk	Wilson, Pa.
Dirksen	Kocialkowski	Powers	Wolcott
Ditter	Lambertson	Ransley	Wolfenden
Dondero	Lambeth	Reece	Wolverton
Doutrich	Lamneck	Reed, Ill.	Young
Eaton	Lehlbach	Rich	
Engel	Lewis, Md.	Risk	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Knutson

NOT VOTING—124

Adair	Curley	Hart	Pierce
Allen	Darden	Hartley	Reed, N. Y.
Bacharach	Dear	Higgins, Conn.	Reilly
Berlin	DeRouen	Higgins, Mass.	Richardson
Boehne	Dietrich	Hill, Ala.	Robinson, Utah
Bolton	Dingell	Hill, Samuel B.	Rogers, Okla.
Boykin	Disney	Hoeppel	Ryan
Brennan	Dobbins	Johnson, W. Va.	Sabath
Brooks	Dockweiler	Kee	Sanders, La.
Buchanan	Dorsey	Keller	Sandlin
Buckley, N. Y.	Doughton	Kerr	Secrest
Bulwinkle	Doxey	Kleberg	Shannon
Cannon, Wis.	Drewry	Larrabee	Sirovich
Carmichael	Driver	Lesinski	Smith, Wash.
Casey	Duffey, Ohio	McLean	Somers, N. Y.
Cavicchia	Dunn, Miss.	McLeod	South
Celler	Dunn, Pa.	Mead	Stack
Chapman	Fenerty	Meeks	Steagall
Citron	Fernandez	Merritt, Conn.	Stewart
Claiborne	Fiesinger	Mitchell, Ill.	Sullivan
Clark, Idaho	Flannagan	Montague	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, N. C.	Frey	Montet	Thom
Cochran	Fulmer	Murdock	Thomas
Collins	Gambrill	Nelson	Treadway
Connery	Gassaway	Nichols	Wadsworth
Cooper, Ohio	Gingery	Norton	Warren
Corning	Goldsborough	Oliver	White
Crosser, Ohio	Gray, Ind.	O'Malley	Withrow
Crowe	Green	Parks	Woodruff
Culkin	Greenwood	Parsons	Woodrum
Cummings	Hamlin	Patman	Zimmerman

So a second was ordered.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. CROWE, is unavoidably detained from the Chamber. If he were here, he would vote "yea" on this roll call.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Warren with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Bacharach.
Mr. Geenwood with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Corning with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Driver with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. Crosser of Ohio with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Parks with Mr. Merritt of Connecticut.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Connery with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Mead with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Brooks.
Mr. Reilly with Mr. Gambrill.
Mr. Parsons with Mr. Richardson.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Claiborne.
Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Berlin.
Mr. Green with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Thom with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Darden with Mr. White.
Mr. Dunn of Mississippi with Mr. Zimmerman.
Mr. Fernandez with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Disney.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Gingery.
Mr. Keller with Mr. Stack.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Dietrich with Mr. Hill of Alabama.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Cummings with Mr. Sirovich.
Mr. Crowe with Mr. Sandlin.
Mr. Flanagan with Mr. Secrest.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Hamlin.
Mr. Higgins of Massachusetts with Mr. Brennan.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Smith of Washington.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Gray of Indiana with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Cellar with Mr. Sanders of Louisiana.
Mr. Citron with Mr. Curley.
Mr. Hill of Alabama with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Meeks.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Clark of Idaho.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. DeRouen.
Mr. Carmichael with Mr. Dorsey.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Fiesinger.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. O'Malley.
Mr. Montet with Mr. Dunn of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dear with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Doxey with Mr. Dobbins.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what committee has the call?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The call lies with the Committee on Insular Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

EXPOSITION CELEBRATION, 1938, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York has 20 minutes.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a speech I made in Philadelphia last Saturday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, the question of neutrality is an extremely important one, and so I am asking unanimous consent to include in my remarks a speech before the

Foreign Policy Association at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, delivered Saturday, February 1, in Philadelphia.

Before I offer this, however, I should like to make a few remarks: The Foreign Policy Association is a national organization devoted to the study of what its name implies. It has units in a number of the fair-sized cities of America, and has an especially strong unit in the city of Philadelphia. The Foreign Policy Association has its representatives in Washington, D. C., and maintains a research staff which prepares factual reports on current world affairs, dealing with such economic and political issues as neutrality, currency stabilization, and conditions in various foreign countries.

The vice president of the association and its representative in Washington is William T. Stone, whom I believe to be one of the ablest students in the matter of foreign policy, peace, and neutrality in the United States. The association is not a "lobby" in the insidious sense, although it frequently makes representations to Congressmen; its principal function being to inform its own members and give Members of Congress unbiased data on any subject relating to foreign affairs. This association, to me, is an example of what a decent lobby ought to be. They do not try to put pressure and cram their own ideas down a Congressman, but attempt to give fair and useful information with which you can form your own conclusions.

In Philadelphia, where I made my address, the local chairman is Hon. Francis Biddle, who served in Washington as head of the National Labor Relations Board for nearly a year. Mr. Biddle is one of the ablest lawyers in the United States of America, and is the type of man that we need in Government service. With a solid and substantial education, and a conservative background, he dealt realistically with the problems of the Government, and has sense enough and liberalism enough to know that we face great changes. He is the type of man who would make an excellent attorney general for the United States; a man who could coordinate the many legal functions of the Government, and who has the brains and courage to do a first-class job. I merely mention this because he has been interested in foreign policy, has given much of his time to the welfare of the country, and is the type of man who should be encouraged to enter the public service. The address which I delivered on that occasion is as follows:

ADDRESS BEFORE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1936, IN PHILADELPHIA

A week ago today I was visiting in New York City and was invited by Oswald Garrison Villard to attend the Saturday luncheon of the Foreign Policy Association, at the Astor Hotel. I was impressed by the fact that every person who spoke or asked questions was deadly in earnest against war. However, it seemed that nearly all persons who either asked questions or said anything trailed off into generalities or ended with vague conclusions. You see, I am a Congressman and must help prepare and pass upon actual legislation. I must put my thoughts into actions and deeds and upon paper and help make them a part of the law of the land. I cannot wrap myself in terms of nice ideology and consume from a year to 30 years in study. The Congress of the United States must act now, within the next 2 or 3 weeks; the bill will probably be on the calendar within a few days. My subject today is "Neutrality."

One of those who made comments at the meeting in New York was Walter Millis, the author of a most instructive book on the causes of the World War. I do not have his exact comments here, but in the Nation of January 29, 1936, he wrote:

"Perhaps the real point of the whole present neutrality debate is simply its indication of the complexity of the subject and our immense lack of concepts, public instruments, and popular understanding necessary to begin to deal adequately with it."

In the same article, concerning powers for the President, he said:

"If the President is to have power to deal with such violent situations as are here anticipated, they must be real powers, and that means that they must be as powerful for ill as for good."

And then he said:

"The only final safeguard against them lies in the American people's ability to understand its own objectives and control its own governmental agencies for their attainment."

Right here I should like to say that two things are necessary to make a good foreign policy—one is a knowledge of conditions in foreign countries, the other is a knowledge of conditions in the United States. I know America, and conditions in America, and I know what our people are willing to do to keep out of war.

So I will proceed upon the thought that it is our duty to understand our own objectives and control our own governmental agencies. For in the majority of the studies I have seen the reasoning on neutrality has been on the basis of old concepts and old ideas of international law, and not upon new concepts of neutrality which some of us in Congress hope to establish.

OLD AND NEW CONCEPTS OF NEUTRALITY COMPARED

What then are our old and our new concepts, and what do we mean?

Well, the old idea of neutrality was that a neutral had a "right" to trade as much and for as high profits as it pleased with the belligerents; the neutral nation further had a "right" because of the theory of "freedom of the seas" to sell all the munitions possible to the belligerents, with which they could kill each other; to sell all the food, clothing, and supplies necessary for the soldiers to march to the front so they could get at each other. That is the old idea of neutrality. We tried it out in 1914 and we went to war with Germany. Now the new idea is that by embargoes and restrictions of our own making, by refraining from the use of our so-called neutral rights under international law, and by the exercise of self-restraint and sacrifice, that we thereby stay out of war. Under the latter concept we have as little to do with belligerents as possible, operating under national laws duly enacted, and not relying on the vague practices of nations which are supposed to determine international law. We are told by some scholars that if we just follow international law properly, and protect our "rights", that we can maintain peace. The only trouble about international law is that it has been the law of war—at least, it has never kept this Nation out of war. I favor neutrality according to the modern concept and of the mandatory type.

I say this for many reasons; but Charles Warren, who as Assistant Attorney General during the war had the job of enforcing our neutrality laws, and who ought to know something about the subject, has said:

"Hence the situation confronting the United States today is that not a single neutral right of trade asserted by us is recognized officially by Great Britain, France, Italy, or Germany to any greater extent than it was between August 1, 1914, and August 1917."

What are we going to do about this situation? Demand our old "rights", which nobody recognizes, and shout about our honor and defense of the flag? I hope not.

I hope we are intelligent enough to give up those rights which will only involve us. But I know that there are two points of view in this country—and in this audience. Some tell us that permanent peace is not possible by neutrality and that we cannot keep out that way. They really want us to support what they call the "collective system"—to join with the League of Nations against an aggressor; and they say this will prevent war. I hold another view. First, because I know that the American people today are not willing to join the League against aggressors. Second, because I don't believe that sanctions will really prevent war.

I am not an isolationist. I am not opposed to the whole idea of the League of Nations. But when we fought the war to end wars we hoped that the League of Nations would remove some of the causes which make for war. It was supposed to find ways in which nations could bring about changes by peaceful means. But it hasn't done very much along that line. It hasn't used article 19 of the League Covenant. Instead, the big powers in the League are preventing any change.

LEAGUE FOR STATUS QUO OF WORLD NEUTRALITY FOR KEEPING THE UNITED STATES OUT OF WAR

The League group, it seems to me, are standing for upholding the status quo and maintaining the territorial limits set out in the Treaty of Versailles. I think the main question is whether our mission is to maintain the territorial status quo of the world, or of ourselves keeping the United States out of war. It seems to me that cooperating in sanctions with the League of Nations will only involve us in this conflict between status quo and revision powers, between those who are expanding and those who are trying to hold by military force what they have.

You can call this conflict by any name you want, but I believe that the policy of the United States should be to keep out. Now, they say that neutrality is isolation. Perhaps it is; but the new neutrality that we are talking about is not imperialism and is not power politics, and it won't obstruct the League of Nations if it really wants peace and not merely preservation of the status quo.

As far as that's concerned, the Nye-Clark-Maverick group have not abandoned all hope of international agreements. In fact the Nye-Clark-Maverick bill in the very first section provides as follows:

"The provisions of this act are necessary to preserve and maintain peace between the United States and foreign nations and to safeguard the interests of the United States in the absence of international agreements defining the rights and duties of States in time of war, and pending the initiation and conclusion of such new agreements as will insure peace, justice, and equality among nations."

I believe that neutrality is the best policy for the United States at the present time, in the face of the present world situation. I have an idea that since the United States of America—our own country—is not entirely free from a charge of being wholly without self-interest in the past, neutrality, at least, may be a stepping stone toward peace and more concerted action in the future. As for international effect, it may be that our neutrality—a knowledge by the world that we will not put up men, money, and munitions—may have a deterrent effect.

Observing collective action from a practical viewpoint, the League of Nations and the World Court have been thoroughly defeated, not only in the Senate of the United States, but in the

minds of the American people. The League of Nations has not prevented war. Recently the actions of the British in dealing with Italy and attempting to have us place sanctions on Italy, at the same time that they were trading with the belligerents—pious ideas expressed internationally, and with an attempt at the same time to split the swag of the Territory of Ethiopia—makes it utterly impossible for us to go into any League of Nations now.

NEUTRALITY IS NOT IMPERIALISM

We are met immediately by the statement that neutrality is a cold-blooded, un-Christian, selfish attitude, and that since civilization is about to be destroyed, we should prevent it. There is a great question as to whether we can save civilization. I doubt very much that the great imperialistic powers of the world are interested in saving civilization. They have their colonies to protect, their trade routes to defend, and their interests and investments in backward areas. They have never given any evidence that they put civilization above these things. If they, as separate powers, or combined as a League of Nations, call upon us to help save civilization, we ought first to ask them what they are willing to give up to save it.

Again I repeat that at the present moment there is no evidence that the imperialistic nations have changed one bit. From this it follows that the wars they engage in are primarily imperialistic wars. It follows also that when we get into such wars because of disputes about neutral rights, or because we want to save civilization, we are simply an innocent helper to an imperialistic and militaristic peace. We are not fighting for civilization when we fight alongside the great nations of the world today. We are fighting only to let everybody keep what they have grabbed—in other words, for the status quo by using American blood. Sometimes—as in the World War—we are fighting for our own aims, but indirectly for secret aims which are imperialistic and selfish. These facts were brought out by the Nye committee.

AMERICAN ATTITUDE IN WORLD WAR AND TODAY

In connection with these thoughts, let us discuss the attitude of the American people as of the World War and as of today. You will remember that when we went into the World War, and preceding it for many years, that we had an attitude of assumed moral superiority; we had a contempt for European institutions—and, of course, we were selling supplies to the Allies all the time. In the World War we were being treated with utmost disrespect by both of the belligerents—that is, the main belligerents, Germany and England—and our neutral rights were not respected by either belligerent, and we had sufficient cause to go to war with England, as we finally did with Germany. But while we were reaping profits from the sale of munitions and supplies, and while we had this high-toned attitude of not going into this conflict, we continued to make money. During this high tide of war boom and false prosperity, if I remember correctly, our attitude was one of superficiality and pretty much of hypocrisy.

But the situation is different now. For the American people, with something like 11 or 12 million unemployed, with not very good city governments in many places, with not the most efficient State governments in the world, and with a few things even yet to learn in the Federal Government, with also a memory of the losses of the last war in billions of dollars, and of human lives, have concluded it is best that we attend to our own business at home. And I don't mean that in the cruel spirit of entire isolation from the rest of the world. I mean it in the spirit that the American people themselves realize that we have something to learn of self-government. So our American attitude of neutrality is not the belligerent attitude of neutrality we had before the World War but one of simple, dignified willingness to protect our people first. Therefore, we have gained that much in the subject. We also learned from the World War that political and military isolation was not possible, unless we isolated ourselves economically. The truth is we started out with economic connections and were pushed into the war in a military and political way as a result.

NEUTRALITY BILLS COMPARED

Let us discuss the essentials of the various neutrality bills which have been presented to us.

The situation at the last session of Congress was somewhat as follows: The administration-Pittman-McReynolds group were then for giving unlimited discretionary powers to the President; the Nye-Clark-Maverick group were for mandatory neutrality, and granting the President no discretion whatever. We stood for the extremest type of embargoes and mandatory legislation. Since last session I find that most of us who are Members of Congress and who are primarily interested in keeping out of war have spent the recess and the first part of this session in discussing this situation. I think I can reasonably say that all groups agree on two points: First, as to the fundamental facts and major causes of war; and, second, as to certain conclusions. The administration group now seem to concur less in discretionary powers for the President and more for a definite type of neutrality; and the Nye-Clark-Maverick group have become a little bit more ready to be compromising and to enact legislation which is satisfactory to all. The situation, therefore, is somewhat better than it was last session, although the recent senatorial dog fight caused a ripple that has been very much embarrassing in addition to the powerful representations of the Italo-American groups who have protested the enactment of any bill.

Now, the essentials of the neutrality bills are as follows:

First, all neutrality legislation, of whatever kind or character, now seems to agree on the necessity for an outright embargo on munitions of war. Of all the important points involved in the legislation, there does not seem to be any objection to this provision.

The working of the McReynolds bill and the Nye-Clark-Maverick bill is somewhat different, and some of us believe the McReynolds bill is not clear enough and should be stated in more definite language.

As I understand it, the administration forces are not only willing to add the wording to include present belligerents but will insist upon adding it. There is no opposition to the adding of these words, except from certain Italo-American groups who have come down to Washington in large numbers to tell us that we should not apply embargoes against Italy.

WAR MATERIALS DEFINED AND EXPLAINED—DIFFERENCES IN BILLS

We then get into the matter of what we call "export of articles and materials used for war purposes." The Nye-Clark-Maverick statement as to the export of war materials is different. It appears that the purposes of both bills are the same; that is, not to increase the ordinary peacetime proportions of articles and thereby create a war boom, or more-than-peace-profit motive in the minds of commercial or financial groups, or special interests, and for acts which will lead us into war. However, it would appear that there are certain essential differences in the bill. The administration bill gives the President full discretion to decide when to apply any embargo, and also to fix the quota basis.

The Nye-Clark-Maverick bill makes the embargo mandatory on a basis of the normal peacetime trade over a 5-year period. Moreover, the Nye bill definitely says on page 5 that a provision of quota shall not "confer any right upon any belligerent state to the delivery * * * of any quota." It might be construed in some quarters that quota provisions would give an implication of a guaranty to deliver. This, however, is expressly denied in the Nye bill. In the bill the President is also authorized to call upon Congress for further restrictions in the matter of exportation if he believes it to be necessary.

A long technical discussion of this subject would only be tiresome, but the general idea is that the administration bill, although it is fairly written and to apply to both belligerents in case of the imposition of any "restrictions" is still of a discretionary nature, and this I oppose, along with a large group of Congressmen and Senators. The reason that I oppose this is that if we are to stick to neutrality and not to any concept of aggressor nations, or any concepts of morality in reference to foreign powers—if we are to be neutral, we should be neutral. And if we have too many ifs and ands and too many loopholes and changes, then the legislation is in effect both neutral and nonneutral, and for itself and against itself. It cannot be both national and international, provide for neutrality and also collective action. Therefore, instead of being legislation that will provide for its own enforcement, it will provide for its own defeat by virtue of its conflicting provisions.

I say this because the McReynolds bill in section 6, lines 22 and 23, has these words, after speaking of the equal application of embargoes:

"Unless the Congress, with the approval of the President, shall declare otherwise."

This is an unnecessary provision altogether, and does not give the bill any more force or effect, except to give unwarranted implications. Therefore, I should at least strike out the words "with the approval of the President", since Congress has to make its own acts and the veto powers of the President are known, anyway.

I think the whole provision ought to be cut out, because it is confusing.

RESERVATION OF INTERNATIONAL RIGHTS UNNECESSARY AND CONFUSING

The McReynolds bill also has the words, in section 9:

"*Provided*, That the United States reserves and reaffirms all rights under international law as it existed prior to August 1, 1914."

This is another confusing provision and means nothing, because nobody knows what international law was prior to August 1, 1914. Neutral rights are not recognized now and were not recognized after the war started August 1, 1914, and the clear implication in this provision is that we will stick to whatever we believe were neutral rights before August 1, 1914. But inasmuch as they are entirely vague and what rights we had were violated after that date, it is impossible to ascertain what our so-called rights really are. Therefore, this seems to be an indication that although we unquestionably allowed our rights to be violated during the World War, that we will insist on them in the future.

I desire to call attention to the report filed by Hon. SAM D. MCREYNOLDS, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, on this same subject. It seems to me that the report by Mr. MCREYNOLDS brings out just what I have stated. It is as follows:

"TRANSACTIONS WITH BELLIGERENTS

"Sec. 9. This section provides that whenever the President shall find that the maintenance of peace between the United States and foreign nations, or the protection of the commercial interests of the United States and its nationals, or the security or neutrality of the United States would be promoted by requiring nationals of the United States to assume the risk of commercial transactions with the governments or nationals of belligerent countries (in other words, if there is danger of our country becoming involved in the risk of commercial transactions with governments

or nationals of belligerent countries, or persons residing therein), the President shall so proclaim, and thereafter American nationals who engage in such transactions shall do so at their own risk. There is a provision in this section, however, which reads as follows:

"'*Provided*, That the United States reserves and reaffirms all rights under international law as it existed prior to August 1, 1914.'

"The reason of this date being placed in this amendment is from the fact that we had to a great extent a somewhat settled international law as to the freedom of the seas prior to August 1, 1914. During the World War the international law was violated by practically every nation engaged in that great war, and over the many protests of our Government to the Allied Powers, as well as the Central Powers before we became involved, and the war did not settle these questions. Even if one of our nationals shipped at his own risk, he ought to have the right given him under the international law, and while under this section we would not become involved in the war, yet if any of the shipments of our nationals were seized or confiscated during such war, they could at least rely on claims to be filed after the war that would give them a legal standing, and it would also give our Government the right to protest for any of our nationals during such war to such belligerents in case their rights under international law are being violated."

The Foreign Affairs Committee have done good and faithful work on the matter of neutrality, and I do not desire to be placed in the position of criticizing them severely. I am not a member of the committee, and do not wish to appear to find fault with gentlemen who have given so much time to so important a matter. However, I have, myself, given this serious attention, and when you get down to brass tacks the provision which has been offered seems to me just about as follows:

"Provided that the United States wants the cake of international law that got us into the World War, and wants to eat the cake of neutrality, without any sacrifice, and without learning what happened to our cake subsequent to August 1, 1914, and all the rules of cake eating having been broken, anyway."

This also means that I favor putting our own cake in our own pantry, and not selling it on credit for someone else to eat, and never getting paid for it, anyway.

Prior to August 1, 1914, was just prior to the beginning of the World War, and there are many nice books on international law written then. After that day we had the books, but no actual law, for our rights as a nation were constantly broken. So we put in a provision to give us the book rights we had at a certain time, and then we set our pot on to dream.

In any event, whatever our "rights" are, we should have them anyway; to put in this clause merely means to put in the law that we don't mean what we say about neutrality.

EXEMPTIONS IN ADMINISTRATION BILL WEAKEN NEUTRALITY

The administration bill in section 4 exempts food, clothing, and medical supplies from quotas. The Nye-Clark-Maverick bill does not. There may be an excuse for exempting medical supplies.

But once food is exempted, for the benefit of the wheat, corn, cattle, sheep, and other food producers, and clothing is exempted for the benefit of the clothing producers, and workers of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, the door stands wide open, and the engraved invitation is printed for all the oil people to ask exemptions, for the copper people, the steel people, and all the rest. We want no war boom in anything. Quotas providing against abnormal exports should be put on everything except, perhaps, medical supplies.

The administration bill, section 7 (b), allows American ships to carry contraband through war zones, unless the President, in his discretion, decides they had better not.

The Nye-Clark-Maverick bill makes it an offense for an American vessel to go through war zones with contraband.

The administration bill, in section 9, does not have the "cash and carry" provisions of the Maverick bill. It does not make shipments at the risk of foreign governments. It leaves them, mildly, at the risk of American citizens. That is still leaving us entangled with the risks that cargoes we sell will be torpedoed or bombed from the air. It is very important to have that risk completely carried by foreign governments or nationals, whereas, if foreigners buy here for cash and take all risk and responsibility we are not involved in the war at all.

The Maverick bill, section 7 (a), is mandatory and solely at the risk of the foreign government. They come and get it and if they lose it or have it torpedoed, we have no responsibility.

The administration bill does not make it unlawful for American citizens to involve the United States in war by traveling on the ships of foreign belligerents through war zones. It simply makes that travel at the risk of the individual citizen.

I believe that it should be unlawful for any American citizen to travel on belligerent ships through war zones. No matter how much we say "at your own risk", the lives and destinies of 130,000,000 people are involved when such travel is permitted.

FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

There is also in nearly all of the bills before Congress a section which concerns financial transactions with the belligerent governments. Section 5 of the administration bill makes it unlawful for the sale of foreign securities of belligerents, and the same is in section 9 of the Nye-Clark-Maverick bill. However, it does appear that the provision in reference to temporary or usual commercial transactions is weaker in the administration bill than in the other bill. The administration bill provides that the President may make certain exceptions as to so-called ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions, and of a character customarily used for commercial business. The Nye bill provides that credit shall not be extended over 6 months, and prevents the extension to any belligerent state of any credits which might become long-term loans, and prevents excessive foreign balances in American banks. I believe that this provision covering loans and credits is rather strictly drawn and drawn pretty much in detail for the reason that it is necessary that if we start out by granting short-term credits and let them pile up too much, they will eventually either lead us into the war or lead us into the extension of so much credit in another form that it will be just about the same as securities; I think that was about the way of the World War, that we started out by granting credits sufficient to develop a war boom, and then had to face the collapse of the boom unless we opened the doors for loans to belligerents. So we opened those doors. One of the outstanding reasons for our entering the World War was the granting of loans and floating of securities which led to an increasingly greater war boom, which would have collapsed as soon as Allied credit went bad, or if they had lost the war. It happened, by accident, perhaps, that we entered the war 3 months before Allied credit went completely bad.

The proposal of the administration is better than it was when presented last August. I think that their step is far in advance of anything that's ever been done before. I believe that this is of extreme importance. When we start talking about trade, that is a thing more or less difficult to control, but the limitations on loans and credits through the Federal Reserve Board, and through the Securities and Exchange Commission can pretty well control these things. It seems to me that if in the World War we had not extended any credit, if we had not permitted the flotation of any securities, and had stayed out of it in that way; that is, if we had maintained greater economic isolation, as well as political and military isolation, and had taken instead the trade of the South American countries and the countries which had been trading with England and European countries, that the probabilities are that we may never have gotten into the war, or at least, would not have been forced into it. In any event, we do know that we advanced, under the spur of profits, large amounts of money or credit in terms of money for goods, and having to do so we went to war to protect the rights of one foreign belligerent to arm its munition ships carrying munitions from America from submarine attack, although our own Secretary of State thought that these munitions ships had no right to be armed. It seems to me if we do not repeat this in the future, that we may be saved from the results of it.

Both bills have prohibitions as to American vessels carrying arms, various statements of risk in order to keep us out of trouble, travel by American nationals on belligerent vessels, a prohibition of the use of submarines from entering American waters, and the establishment of a munitions-control board, with power to license exports in peacetime as well as wartime.

I desire here to make certain specific references to the matter of neutrality, in which objections have been made.

POSITION OF AMERICANS OF ITALIAN DESCENT

Let us first take Americans of Italian extraction. This is indeed a difficult situation to discuss, and I wish to state it without any emotional basis, and without any unfairness. In the World War, Americans of German extraction were as patriotic as any other Americans. For Americans of German extraction then, like Americans of Italian extraction now, to protest their Americanism is unnecessary. I am already convinced of this. The hounding of Germans during the World War and for some time thereafter, and use of the term "hyphenated" Americans was unjust; however, in reference to those of Italian extraction now, I have this to say:

Many of these who claim to lead millions of Italians, some of them who claim to control "one, two, three, four, or five million votes", others who speak before congressional committees, with the obvious desire to put pressure on Congress asking preferential treatment for Italy, are doing themselves, their own people, and the cause of peace a disservice.

Many of these gentlemen insist that the present belligerents be exempted from embargoes under American neutrality. I see no reason for this. Suppose Abyssinia should finally borrow money and we should begin heavy selling to Abyssinia of various materials. Would not Italy, like Germany, sink our ships? Would not then any Italian-American who had taken active part in claiming preferential treatment for Italy find himself in an embarrassing position?

I fear these people will subject Americans of Italian extraction to humiliation and embarrassment. No person, by virtue of his racial background, has any more right to speak than any others. I recognize the background that the Italian-Americans have of culture, of the great history of Italy—but, by virtue of their having an Italian background, I do not recognize their right to dictate to Congress a course which may lead their country and mine into war, or which would be favorable to Italy as against any other power. Hence, we should recognize all Americans from the same viewpoint. Some Italian-Americans, in speaking of neutrality, say that the United States of America would thereby be working with the League of Nations in the matter of sanctions. I desire it plainly understood that when we adopt neutrality, we are adopting a national policy to protect the United States as far as that is possible by legislation.

I frankly state that no racial groups, no matter how great, should be recognized as such. I am not concerned with fascism or communism in foreign countries. It is none of my business, and neither is it the business of any other American citizen, whatever his racial background. I want it understood that this is not a jingo statement; not a statement intended to embarrass any person of another racial background. It is merely that, as Americans, we must be careful not to let the prejudices of racial background enter into our concepts of law—and the Americans of Italian extraction being patriotic, will of course not be misled.

ATTITUDES OF COMMERCIAL CLASSES

Now, to the second point, in reference to the objections of certain commercial classes. I have been told in letters and I have heard in speeches that the policy of neutrality would be ruinous to southern agriculture and industry. I take southern agriculture and industry because I am from the South, and because my State is the greatest cotton and oil area in the entire world. The people of Texas do not want to make money at the expense of human lives, and neither do any other people. The oil business today, from the exercise of proration, is at a very low ebb. Some wells capable of producing 30,000 barrels a day are cut down to 30 barrels a day. It would be much more profitable if these oil wells could produce a great deal more oil. But I am frank to say that if the normal peacetime oil sales are permitted—that is, if the proration is continued—that I can see no reason for complaint of these people in the oil business. The same is true of the cotton business. At the Foreign Policy Association meeting the other day in New York City a man from a port city stopped me and said that such a policy would ruin the "cotton industry" in the South—he, of course, meant cotton speculators, not farmers. I asked him if he wanted an increase to be sold to the belligerent powers, and he said, of course, that he wanted that; that what concern was it of ours what others did about war? That, of course, means that this man had learned nothing from the World War. He was a cotton speculator preceding the World War and saw us go into the war on account of commercial transactions; he sees the European powers owe us money, which will never be paid—he saw all the faults of that, and yet, he has learned nothing by it, and wants to do it over again. Take the cotton farmers—but especially the wheat farmers of the Northwest.

The wheat farmers put in hundreds of thousands of new acres of land, and now, this land which was temporarily used for war supplies and sale of wheat is being blown and eroded away. So, when we talk about the ruinous effect of neutrality on agriculture, I cannot see it at all, because if we put an embargo on munitions, and then put the usual agricultural products on the basis of a quota system, where the people can sell as much as they did before and no more, there is no reason for complaint either by the people at home or those abroad.

Everyone is certain, I think, that the question of what kind of foreign policy the United States shall have is the most important that has faced this country in many, many years. The real issue we are facing in Congress now is not whether the United States shall support the collective system or follow a policy of isolation—the real issue at the present moment in Washington is whether the United States should try to stand on its old traditional "neutral rights", or whether it is going to give up some of those rights along the lines which we are suggesting in the new neutrality legislation.

Suppose we go back to the old neutrality and insist upon our rights to trade in all the war materials, to provide the instruments of human destruction to belligerent nations. Is that going to help peace? Is that going to help international cooperation? It is not. On the other hand, if we can succeed in getting the new kind of neutrality, if we are willing to pay the price of it, then we will have made an important contribution to peace and lessened the danger of America's involvement in war.

EXPOSITION CELEBRATION 1938, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the Puerto Rican bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks made today during the consideration of the Consent Calendar.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

House Joint Resolution 164 provides merely that the President be authorized to invite foreign countries to participate in an exposition to be held in Los Angeles in 1938 in celebration of the bringing in to that city of water and power from Boulder Dam. I am sure every Member of this House is familiar with this gigantic engineering enterprise which has been surpassed by only one or two other engineering feats in the history of the world. We in Los Angeles feel justified in requesting that the nations of the world be asked to participate, because it is designed to show the other nations just what a magnificent drama of development has taken place in the great Southwest. The bringing in of a vast stream of water from the Colorado River and the development of a billion kilowatts of electrical energy will transform this whole Southwest section into a great industrial and commercial empire.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. In 1938 you will have completed 2 years of the San Diego Exposition.

Mr. FORD of California. That is correct.

Mr. SNELL. San Francisco held an exposition a few years ago and a resolution is pending for another exposition in San Francisco, is there not?

Mr. FORD of California. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. This makes four expositions for California within a short space of time.

Mr. FORD of California. The gentleman from New York calls attention to the fact there are four expositions projected out in California. I should like to know what other section of the country has enjoyed the rapid, vast, and important development that has taken place in this southwest section? We could hold an exposition every week and would be warranted in doing it by the development that has taken place.

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

Mr. FORD of California. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. Does this resolution come to the House with the endorsement of the administration, and is it in conformity with the financial program of the President?

Mr. FORD of California. What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. MAAS. Has it been approved by the administration?

Mr. FORD of California. No; I have not asked the administration to approve anything. Why should I?

Mr. MAAS. Bills usually go to a department. I assume this bill went to the State Department. Is there a report on the bill?

Mr. FORD of California. It is not necessary. This bill went to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and was reported out by that committee a year ago.

Mr. BURNHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield.

Mr. BURNHAM. This resolution does not call for any appropriation, does it?

Mr. FORD of California. It calls for no appropriation of any kind.

Mr. BURNHAM. It will not cost the Government anything?

Mr. FORD of California. No.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Can the gentleman tell us where we are going to get the money to finance this fair?

Mr. FORD of California. We are not going to get it from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. When you get money from the Federal Government, and that is the only place you will get it, one-tenth of it comes from Pennsylvania, and these expenditures have just about wrecked Pennsylvania and pretty nearly every State in the North. We have got to stop contributing to these things. That is the answer.

Mr. FORD of California. Let me tell something about this exposition, Mr. Speaker. We are going to build a set of permanent buildings in the city of Los Angeles to hold the exhibits which will be sent by the entire southwestern section of the country. It will be there the year around, it will be there from now on. It is not just a temporary thing we have in contemplation, but a permanent exposition on the order of the annual exposition in Toronto, Canada. Los

Angeles has not asked, and we are not now asking, for any money.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. Does the gentleman want the House to believe that he is not going to ask for something later?

Mr. FORD of California. I have made my statement in reference to that, and it stands.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. The report on this bill states that this exposition will be participated in by the neighboring States of Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Mr. FORD of California. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. So it is not a California exposition exclusively?

Mr. FORD of California. No.

Mr. BLOOM. It is an exposition which will be participated in by all Southwestern States?

Mr. FORD of California. Yes. It is for the purpose of showing to the country and to the world just what that great section out there has in the way of natural resources.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. UMSTEAD. The gentleman stated he would not ask for an appropriation. Does he expect to come in later under this authorization and ask for an appropriation?

Mr. FORD of California. I do not.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Does the gentleman expect that to be done?

Mr. FORD of California. I do not know. I am not responsible for anybody else. I am telling the gentleman I do not expect to.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Could the purpose of this resolution be carried out without additional funds?

Mr. FORD of California. What funds?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Without a subsequent appropriation by the Congress?

Mr. FORD of California. Of course it could.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Could the purpose of this resolution be carried out without the appropriation of funds?

Mr. FORD of California. It could.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If a Member now votes for this particular bill, does the gentleman feel that Member is under obligation to vote for an appropriation later on?

Mr. FORD of California. I do not know anything about an appropriation. I am not asking any obligations in connection with this measure.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I will vote for this bill, but I shall vote against any appropriation for same, even to the extent of $50.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, the inference is that this resolution will not involve any money. It is quite true the resolution in and of itself does not call for an authorization nor an appropriation, but we certainly do not propose to invite foreign governments over here and then not spend money entertaining them. If we expect to do that it would be better not to invite them at all. As a matter of fact, we are going to spend money to entertain them, if we do bring them over here, and we ought to be hospitable if they come as our guests.

I should like to see this exposition a success, but I am going to vote against this bill—first, because its success is not dependent on foreign guests, and, second, because the only time you ever put the brakes on spending money is when it comes to the veterans. Is this going to increase the taxes? Are we going to have to have a new source of taxes to pay for this exposition? You can find more ways to spend money than you can to raise it; in fact, you have hired a "brain trust" to go out and find new ways to spend money. But when it comes to the veterans we have to raise taxes, we are told, if we are to do anything for the veterans at all.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I was going to suggest that these foreign governments might send their payments on war debts over with their representatives.

Mr. MAAS. I think that is a good idea. We might amend this bill and invite them on condition that only those countries that paid their debts could come over. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when we had better think a little more about our own affairs at home. Let us have these expositions among ourselves. I am going to vote against any more of these appropriations so long as the attitude prevails that you cannot find money to take care of the veterans.

The gentleman from California said that this bill did not have to go to any department. As a matter of fact it has the approval of the administration, and I quote from the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee:

> Your committee has received information from the Department of State that no objection is offered to the passage of the resolution.

If there is no objection, that means approval.

I think the veterans themselves will feel very keenly the fact that the same administration that says it has no money to pay their bonus, no money to take care of their adjusted war pay, can spend several hundred thousand dollars to entertain representatives of foreign governments for whom they, the veterans, fought, and which countries will not even pay the interest on their debts. If these foreign governments would pay the interest on their debts, we would have plenty of money to take care of the veterans' bonus.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman does not for a minute mean that we are going to have to stop all legislation until we pass all the veterans' legislation? Does he mean we cannot pass anything until we have done everything the veterans want?

Mr. MAAS. I mean spending money on foreign governments for entertainment. We should not do that until we take care of our own people.

Mr. FORD of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD of California. The gentleman voted in favor of something like $13,000,000 for the Minnesota fire claims that had been paid before?

Mr. MAAS. Oh, they had not been paid before. The gentleman is misinformed. Under a previous Democratic administration these people were forced figuratively at the point of a gun to take less than 50 percent of the value of their property by the Government's own appraisals. I am not using my figures at all, but the Government's own figures.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. And that was during a Republican administration?

Mr. MAAS. No.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Under what administration was it?

Mr. MAAS. Under the administration of President Wilson.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. What years?

Mr. MAAS. The fire happened in 1918.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. But when were the guns put on these people?

Mr. FORD of California. In 1921.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASS. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The first settlement of these fire claims was forced by the Railroad Administration appointed by President Wilson.

Mr. MAAS. Absolutely.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very well the fact it is useless for anyone at this time to oppose any reckless expenditure. I appreciate the fact that this is an era of

unprecedented spending, and as far as I know, it has never been equalled in the history of the American Congress.

Now, with a proposition from your own President here to raise $2,500,000,000 of extra taxes, and he says it is up to you to do it, it would seem to me you would have just a little bit of responsibility about the spending of this money. This is the second time this afternoon we have had a suspension for the purpose of spending more money.

Let us now get to the real history of these expositions. I will not say everyone but nearly everyone I can remember has always come in here, first, with an authorization, and the man who presented the authorization has always said, "This does not require any money", but a little later, after a year or so, someone from his locality or State, a different man, presents a resolution calling for a certain amount of appropriation and the argument is always used, mind you, this is the argument that is always used, "The Federal Government has gone on record as approving this exposition, it has invited foreign countries to participate, and it would not be fair to them if we did not participate ourselves."

This is the situation, and you might just as well have put the appropriation in the original resolution, because it is absolutely sure to come, and when you consider we have just extended for another year the appropriation to take care of San Diego, Calif., providing for the same facilities they have there for their exposition, which will last 2 years, with one on deck for San Francisco, although we had one at San Francisco only a few years ago, it really is going too far.

I do not suppose it will have any effect, but, for one, I am standing for what I think is right, and I think, to a certain extent, we should guard the expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE].

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this resolution. Since hearing the remarks of our Republican friends, I am more convinced than ever that the real intent of this resolution is correct. We might as well be frank and perfectly candid about this proposition. There is not any use in trying to mislead anyone. If this resolution is passed it will authorize the President to invite these foreign countries and others interested to a celebration of the completion of the Boulder Dam project. This ought to be done. It is a worthy and worth-while undertaking.

This is a celebration of a power project that is going to mean much to the country and to the area involved. This section of the country has gone along with us in the other parts of the program, and we ought to go along with them. Of course, our Republican friends cannot see going along at all on any proposition, but I think this is a worth-while project, and it ought to receive the support of everybody on this side of the aisle.

The President ought to be authorized to invite all of these foreign countries over here to this celebration. It is a celebration that will be worth while in helping the under dog, the forgotten man, the fellow who needs it. It is going to bring cheaper power to him, give more power to the people who need power—irrigation and reclamation—and more consideration to the people who have been forgotten and absolutely overlooked by the Republican administration throughout its entire history. I hope the Democratic side of the aisle will will go down the line and vote for this proposition.

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

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. Who do you mean should go along with whom? [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLANE. I mean that the gentlemen on this side of the aisle, whom you could not understand at all, ought to go along with this proposition.

Mr. MAAS. I admit that.

Mr. McFARLANE. Of course, the power issue is involved in this, and the Power Trust will be very strong in opposing it.

Mr. MAAS. I thought you meant the foreign governments have gone along with us in spending our money.

Mr. McFARLANE. Oh, no; I do not believe you thought any such thing. In conclusion, let me urge you all to vote for this measure. The Boulder Dam is a great engineering accomplishment, and the nations of the world ought to be invited to attend this big celebration. They ought to be allowed to see how much real progress we have made under this administration on projects of this kind driving toward the accomplishments of cheaper power, better and safer farming conditions for the country, and adequate water supply for the people of that section of the Nation.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I speak for this exposition is because there have been expositions previously, and there will be more to come.

There is no great economy in opposing these expositions, even if there is no money in the present resolution. Back under a Republican administration we gave some millions to Philadelphia. I think about $3,000,000. I do not think the exposition was ever completed.

This exposition is for Los Angeles. There is another in San Francisco, for which the gentleman from California [Mr. McGROARTY] has introduced a resolution, and shortly there will be one for New York. They do not cost the Government one penny. I am not so foolish as to say there will not be an appropriation for this exposition. There should be. When the Government gets through, with the gate admissions, the concessions, the commemorative stamps issued by the Post Office Department, the Government will make more than it expends. That will be the case in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and New York. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make this observation, and that is that in spending this money it is not going to be a small sum. If anybody votes for this bill, they must do it not with the idea that it is going to be any small sum like $10,000. He knows that it will be a large sum, as we have appropriated in the past. I remember the exposition at Philadelphia, and we had a big fight on it. I do not know of any of these fairs that have paid the expenses except the one at Chicago. That, I understand, paid for itself. That was a great exposition, and it was in a great place. This will cost a million dollars, perhaps $2,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE] said that we never go along with the President. He is not quite right about that. Just the other day the President said something about levying more taxes. I do not know how all the gentlemen on this side feel about it, but for one I am willing to pay as we go and impose the necessary taxes now. New taxes must be levied some time, and if we pay as we spend the extravagance will end. We passed the bonus legislation. We always get together when it is a matter of appropriation that is easy. We will, I think, pass the Frazier-Lemke bill and that means three billion dollars more. In a little caucus the other day, on Saturday morning, evidently called for the purpose of finding ways and means to pay the bonus, those there were somewhat like the boy who had a cat by the tail but did not know what to do with it. We passed the bonus, but now there is difficulty in getting the money. Some one suggested we issue some new money against the gold now on hand, and then in the Sunday morning papers we learn that we do not have that gold, that it is all tied up, all earmarked, so we cannot do that. Spending must stop some time. Now is as good a time as any. This resolution means more money, and as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] will say, "Where are you going to get the money?" Are you going to get it out of that gold fund, or just how will you get it? We will go along with the President—I will change that and say the people in my district will be glad to have the Government do

as they do at home, and that is "pay as you go." Pay as you spend. We will go one step farther. If there is a message up there on the desk now asking for the repeal of the cotton act and the tobacco act and the potato act, I rather suspect that this side will go along with that also.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. When the gentleman speaks about the little boy having a cat by the tail——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, two cats by the tail, the bonus bill and the Frazier-Lemke bill.

Mr. KVALE. And I say to the gentleman that if we get a few more names to that petition up there we will have the Rules Committee by the tail.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And then, as Mr. RICH says, "Where are you going to get the money?" How will you find the funds to pay, to make good the appropriations? Only through new printing-press greenbacks or higher taxes—new taxes. Have you on that side the courage to follow the President on this sound suggestion—that we begin to think of pay day? Regrettable he did not think of that when he asked and received the $4,880,000,000. We should stop spending now, if not before.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, where are you going to get the money? That may seem like a foolish question, but it is not. I have nothing against Los Angeles or any of the other California towns that want to have a fair; but I tell you that within the last 5 or 6 years—3 years of a Republican administration and 3 years of a Democratic administration—if you look at the statements from the Treasury Department, you will wonder where we are going. You are putting this country in a position where we are building on sand. We are putting ourselves in a position where we are going to lead to the greatest fall the Nation has ever seen. You may not think about this expenditure of vast sums, but it seems to be the proper political thing to do if you want to come back to Washington.

You ought to have greater respect for your country than to sink it into the depths of financial ruin. This is a very, very serious thing. Where are you going to get the money is a slogan that each of you ought to take to heart. Why are the people leaving the Treasury Department? What is the reason that Mr. Awalt resigned this last week, and what is the reason the other strong men are going out? It is because of fear in their own minds they are not going to be able to handle the situation. And yet you men come around here and vote for any expenditure of funds; but when it comes to doing what your President requests of you, to vote for taxes, you will be like a bunch of sheep—you will all run away. You will not stand up and back him. You will do as you did with the bonus vote last week. You will all run away from him. The time is coming, and it is coming very soon, when he is going to say, "I want you to raise money"; and when that time comes, what are you going to do? Are you going to desert him? It is the most serious time in the history of this Nation. I tell you it is time for you to think. Let us be sensible about this right now. If you permit this bill to go through, you know it will require additional funds. With an already overburdened Treasury and with an overburdened people, you must give consideration to the fact of whether you are going to tax them or put the charge on future generations.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. I should like to bring to the attention of the Members that, unless this resolution is passed, it will be impossible for the State of California to invite foreign nations to participate in this exposition. There is only one way by which a foreign nation can be asked to participate in any celebration that is held in the United States, and that is through the State Department. Unless the invitation does come from the State Department, no other department of the Government, whether local or State or anything else, has a right to invite a foreign nation to participate. So it is the usual procedure to first ask the nations of the world to participate. As far as the expenditure of money is concerned, of course this resolution calls for no expenditure of any kind. But it is just the reverse, because, if you invite foreign nations to participate in any exposition that occurs in this country, they come here and spend their money. They erect buildings and will pay the expense of installing their exhibits, so it is just the reverse. The United States does not have to spend one cent for foreign participation in any exposition.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is my information that Uncle Sam will have $100,000,000 invested in Boulder Dam by the time the water is ready to be turned on. Now, as I understand, it is proposed to spend a couple of million dollars to celebrate the flow of the $100,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman from Minnesota voted for that at the time, and he should have thought of it then.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did, but I do not think we ought to celebrate a debauch.

Mr. BLOOM. Then the gentleman should say "I do think" instead of "I do not think."

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. COLDEN. Does not the gentleman believe it would be very fine for the United States to invite Mexico, the Central American Republics, and the South American countries to participate in this exposition?

Mr. BLOOM. No one can invite any foreign country to participate, except through the State Department. That is what this resolution provides. It does nothing else except authorize the President of the United States, through the proper channels, to invite foreign governments to participate. That is all it does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. One of the speakers said there would be a later authorization for entertainment. There is nothing in this resolution whatever for entertainment?

Mr. BLOOM. No; nothing of the kind. May I say this: When an appropriation is made for any exposition in this country, that appropriation is made for the exhibits of the Government departments. That money does not go to the exposition company for its own use. It is for the erection of a building to exhibit the different things pertaining to the Government of the United States. It has nothing to do with the local exposition at all.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BACON. As far as I can make out, we are going to have an international exposition at Los Angeles, San Francisco, and New York, all at approximately the same time. If we invite the nations to participate in all three of those expositions within a period of a year and a half or 2 years, they probably will decline all of the invitations.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not agree with the distinguished gentleman from New York, for this reason: If they have their exhibits in this country, whether it be at Los Angeles or San Francisco or New York, they will then transfer their exhibits from one city to the other. I think they will be more likely to exhibit when they can bring their exhibits here at one cost or one expense, and then be able to transfer them from one city to the other. They would be more likely to take advantage of that, instead of not coming here to exhibit at all.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. BACON. Does not the gentleman think it would have been more appropriate to invite the nations of the world to celebrate the repeal of prohibition rather than the bringing of water into Los Angeles? [Laughter.]

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What does the gentleman think of the proposition of inviting a foreign government to pay its own expenses of participating in this exposition, and we will credit them on account of what they owe us? Let them advance the money.

Mr. BLOOM. That question cannot be answered, of course. Furthermore, if the gentleman would only remember that you cannot get these people to continue to do business with you if you always keep on insulting them. I think this question had better be stricken from the RECORD, because it does not belong in these proceedings. If we are going to invite them, let us do so in the right way, without first making them think there is an insult attached to the invitation.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The last exhibits of a foreign country I saw at a fair were nothing more than merchandise-vending institutions, foreign countries coming to this country to sell merchandise and make a little money. I do not think this is the right attitude. I think they should be informed now that if they want to make exhibits, they should let them be exhibits and not make them for the purpose of dragging away a few dimes and nickels.

Mr. BLOOM. I could answer the gentleman's question, but I do not think I better.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I do not think the gentleman can.

Mr. BLOOM. It may astonish the gentleman, but I can.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think there has been enough demonstration here of the fact that this is an overstepping of bounds in the spending of money and that the Members will not vote for this resolution. This means, practically, participation in and financial support by the Federal Government in a celebration on the west coast. I am perfectly willing that occasionally any part of the country should have an exposition with a reasonable expenditure by the Federal Government. But every time such a resolution as this has been adopted it has been followed by a large expenditure of money, and this money has not come back to the Treasury. This resolution will be followed up by another resolution appropriating money, and the money will be appropriated, because we cannot stop a thing like this unless we stop it at the source and stop the first resolution. This is where the camel gets his nose under the tent. If the camel is not to get his nose under the tent we must defeat this resolution right here.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the House joint resolution be passed?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SNELL) there were—ayes 73, noes 65.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground 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 147, nays 119, not voting 164, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—147

Bankhead	Cooley	Duncan	Granfield
Beiter	Cooper, Tenn.	Eagle	Greever
Bell	Costello	Eckert	Gregory
Biermann	Cox	Eicher	Hamlin
Bland	Cravens	Englebright	Hancock, N. C.
Blanton	Creal	Evans	Healey
Bloom	Crosby	Faddis	Hennings
Boland	Cross, Tex.	Farley	Hill, Knute
Brown, Ga.	Crosser, Ohio	Ferguson	Holmes
Brown, Mich.	Cullen	Fiesinger	Imhoff
Burnham	Daly	Fitzpatrick	Jacobsen
Cannon, Mo.	Deen	Ford, Calif.	Jenckes, Ind.
Carter	Delaney	Gasque	Johnson, Okla.
Chapman	Dies	Gavagan	Johnson, Tex.
Cochran	Driscoll	Gearhart	Johnson, W. Va.
Colden	Duffy, N. Y.	Gildea	Jones
Kloeb	Marcantonio	Rankin	Thurston
Kniffin	Martin, Colo.	Rayburn	Tolan
Kopplemann	Massingale	Robertson	Tonry
Kramer	Maverick	Robinson, Utah	Umstead
Kvale	Monaghan	Rogers, N. H.	Underwood
Lanham	Murdock	Rudd	Utterback
Larrabee	O'Connell	Sanders, Tex.	Vinson, Ky.
Lea, Calif.	O'Connor	Scott	Wallgren
Lewis, Colo.	O'Day	Sears	Walter
Lucas	O'Leary	Secrest	Wearin
Lundeen	Owen	Shanley	Weaver
McClellan	Parks	Smith, Conn.	Welch
McCormack	Patton	Smith, W. Va.	Werner
McFarlane	Peterson, Fla.	Snyder, Pa.	West
McGehee	Peterson, Ga.	Spence	Whelchel
McGrath	Pettengill	Starnes	White
McKeough	Pittenger	Stubbs	Wilcox
McLaughlin	Rabaut	Sumners, Tex.	Wilson, La.
McReynolds	Ramsay	Sutphin	Wood
McSwain	Ramspeck	Terry	Zioncheck
Mahon	Randolph	Thomason	

NAYS—119

Andresen	Fletcher	Lehlbach	Rich
Andrew, Mass.	Focht	Lewis, Md.	Robsion, Ky.
Andrews, N. Y.	Ford, Miss.	Lord	Rogers, Mass.
Arends	Gassaway	Luckey	Romjue
Ashbrook	Gehrmann	Ludlow	Russell
Bacon	Gilchrist	McAndrews	Sauthoff
Beam	Goodwin	McLean	Schaefer
Binderup	Gray, Pa.	McMillan	Schuetz
Blackney	Griswold	Maas	Schulte
Brewster	Guyer	Main	Seger
Buckbee	Gwynne	Mapes	Snell
Buckler, Minn.	Halleck	Marshall	Stefan
Burdick	Hancock, N. Y.	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Carlson	Harlan	Mason	Tarver
Carpenter	Harter	May	Taylor, S. C.
Castellow	Hess	Meeks	Taylor, Tenn.
Christianson	Hobbs	Michener	Thompson
Church	Hoffman	Millard	Tinkham
Coffee	Hollister	Mitchell, Tenn.	Tobey
Cole, Md.	Hope	Moritz	Turner
Cole, N. Y.	Houston	O'Brien	Turpin
Colmer	Huddleston	Patterson	Whittington
Crawford	Hull	Pearson	Wigglesworth
Darrow	Jenkins, Ohio	Perkins	Williams
Dirksen	Kenney	Polk	Wolcott
Dondero	Kinzer	Powers	Wolfenden
Doutrich	Knutson	Ransley	Wolverton
Duffey, Ohio	Kocialkowski	Reece	Young
Eaton	Lambertson	Reed, Ill.	Zimmerman
Engel	Lambeth	Reed, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—164

Adair	Curley	Higgins, Conn.	Peyser
Allen	Darden	Higgins, Mass.	Pfeifer
Amlie	Dear	Hildebrandt	Pierce
Ayers	Dempsey	Hill, Ala.	Plumley
Bacharach	DeRouen	Hill, Samuel B.	Quinn
Barden	Dickstein	Hoeppel	Reilly
Barry	Dietrich	Hook	Richards
Berlin	Dingell	Kahn	Richardson
Boehne	Disney	Kee	Risk
Boileau	Ditter	Keller	Rogers, Okla.
Bolton	Dobbins	Kelly	Ryan
Boykin	Dockweiler	Kennedy, Md.	Sabath
Boylan	Dorsey	Kennedy, N. Y.	Sadowski
Brennan	Doughton	Kerr	Sanders, La.
Brooks	Doxey	Kleberg	Sandlin
Buchanan	Drewry	Lamneck	Schneider, Wis.
Buck	Driver	Lee, Okla.	Scrugham
Buckley, N. Y.	Dunn, Miss.	Lemke	Shannon
Bulwinkle	Dunn, Pa.	Lesinski	Short
Burch	Edmiston	McGroarty	Sirovich
Caldwell	Ekwall	McLeod	Sisson
Cannon, Wis.	Ellenbogen	Maloney	Smith, Va.
Carmichael	Fenerty	Mansfield	Smith, Wash.
Cartwright	Fernandez	Mead	Somers, N. Y.
Cary	Fish	Merritt, Conn.	South
Casey	Flannagan	Merritt, N. Y.	Stack
Cavicchia	Frey	Miller	Steagall
Celler	Fuller	Mitchell, Ill.	Stewart
Chandler	Fulmer	Montague	Sullivan
Citron	Gambrill	Montet	Sweeney
Claiborne	Gifford	Moran	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, Idaho	Gillette	Mott	Thom
Clark, N. C.	Gingery	Nelson	Thomas
Collins	Goldsborough	Nichols	Treadway
Connery	Gray, Ind.	Norton	Vinson, Ga.
Cooper, Ohio	Green	Oliver	Wadsworth
Corning	Greenway	O'Malley	Warren
Crowe	Greenwood	O'Neal	Wilson, Pa.
Crowther	Haines	Palmisano	Withrow
Culkin	Hart	Parsons	Woodruff
Cummings	Hartley	Patman	Woodrum

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Warren with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Bacharach.

Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Risk.
Mr. Corning with Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Driver with Mr. Short.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Merritt of Connecticut.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Mead with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Finerty.
Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Amlie.
Mr. Boylan with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Ekwall.
Mr. Crowe with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Boileau.
Mr. Connery with Mr. Schneider of Wisconsin.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Dockweiler with Mr. Keller.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Caldwell.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Dietrich with Mr. O'Neal.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Thom.
Mr. Doxey with Mr. Stack.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Cummings.
Mr. Reilly with Mr. Claiborne.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Higgins of Massachusetts.
Mr. Parson with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Gingery with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Lee of Oklahoma with Mr. Somers of New York.
Mr. Dorsey with Mr. Merritt of New York.
Mr. Chandler with Mr. Kennedy of Maryland.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Pierce.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Berlin.
Mr. Sisson with Mr. Carmichael.
Mr. McGroarty with Mr. Hook.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Richardson.
Mr. Montet with Mr. Ellenbogen.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Darden.
Mr. Sandlin with Mr. Brooks.
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Haines.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Sanders of Louisiana.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Gray of Indiana.
Mr. Ayres with Mr. Barry.
Mrs. Greenway with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Brennan.
Mr. Peyser with Mr. Green.
Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Cartwright.
Mr. Clark of Idaho with Mr. DeRouen.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Fernandez.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.
Mr. Citron with Mr. Dear.
Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Dunn of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Moran.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Dobbins.

Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BELL, and Mr. CANNON of Missouri changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SCHULTE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I announce that my colleague the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. CROWE, is unavoidably detained from the Chamber this afternoon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

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

There was no objection

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I was present in the Chamber waiting a roll-call vote. Before my name was reached I was called to the other end of the Avenue on official business for constituents and did not return in time to answer the roll call. I desire simply to make this statement in explanation of my inability to vote.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPEAL OF CERTAIN ACTS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

To the Congress:

I recommend to the Congress the prompt repeal of the act of April 21, 1934, as amended, known as the "Bankhead Cotton Act"; of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended, known as the "Kerr-Smith Tobacco Act"; and of title II of the act of August 24, 1935, known as the "Potato Act of 1935." This recommendation is made because of the termination of the programs of agricultural production adjustment under the act of May 12, 1933, as amended, known as the "Agricultural Adjustment Act", to which the three acts mentioned were auxiliary.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1936.*

CLAIM OF HOMER BRETT, AMERICAN CONSUL AT ROTTERDAM, NETHERLANDS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims:

To the Congress of the United States:

I enclose herewith a report which the Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to a claim of Homer Brett, Esq., American consul at Rotterdam, Netherlands, for the sum of $116.58, such sum representing the unrecovered amount stolen when, on the night of September 27, 1935, burglars entered the Consulate with a false key to the front door and with a powerful tool cut open the back of the safe and abstracted therefrom the iron cash box containing such money.

In view of the fact that the funds were in a locked iron cash box enclosed in a safe provided by the Government, it is apparent that no negligence can properly be imputed to Consul Brett, and since he made good the loss so occasioned, I recommend that an appropriation in the amount suggested by the Secretary of State be authorized in order to relieve this officer of the Government of the burden such loss has occasioned.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1936.*

(Enclosures: Report of Secretary of State, with enclosures.)

ANNUAL REPORT OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RAILROADS FOR 1935 (H. DOC. NO. 403)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Assistant Director General of Railroads for the calendar year 1935.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1936.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include at this point a resolution adopted by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation commending the work of Dr. Mead.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

The following resolution was adopted at a special meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, House of Representatives, on January 28, 1936:

In the passing of Dr. Elwood Mead, Commissioner of Reclamation, this committee lost a faithful and conscientious associate in reclamation endeavors. His broad experience, good judgment, and wise counsel proved valuable to the committee in its deliberations.

Mindful of his long association with the problems of reclamation, and his constructive work on behalf of irrigation, the mem-

bers gratefully record its appreciation of him by adopting the following: Be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, attest to the inspiration and support brought to its deliberations by Commissioner Elwood Mead; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be recorded in the minutes of the committee, and that a copy be sent to Dr. Mead's family as a testimonial of our sincere appreciation of his usefulness, not only as an official of the Government, but also as a friend and adviser.

HENRY E. STUBBS, *Chairman*.
WILLIAM A. EKWALL,
JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Executive Committee.
COMPTON I. WHITE, *Chairman*.

Attest:

EDWARD C. HALL,
Clerk.

JUNIOR AIR RESERVE, REVISED NAME, "AIR RESERVE TRAINING CORPS"

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 10662, a bill to set up the air reserve training corps, commonly known as the Junior Air Corps, and to include therein brief extracts from a number of letters which I have received commendatory of that proposal.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call attention to H. R. 10662, which I am appending hereto as a part of my remarks for the information of the Congress and the country. The purpose of this bill is to provide a reservoir of young men instructed in the ground school work of flying, called aerodynamics, and involving the mechanics of aircraft construction and repair, and also with ability to fly aircraft, so that the young men in this reservoir, which in a few years should number perhaps 20,000 or 30,000, may be called into the service and quickly trained into military pilots for the defense of the Nation.

THE PLAN WILL EMPLOY THE VOLUNTEER SPIRIT

The basic idea of this plan is to utilize for the Government the enthusiasm which all boys and young men now feel and manifest toward aviation. The records of the Department of Commerce, in the Bureau of Air Commerce, show that approximately 24,000 student pilot permits or licenses are outstanding. These young men are studying aviation and learning to fly at their own expense, and some of them are taking training in schools and colleges devoted exclusively to instruction in the principles and practices of aviation. If we can organize and direct this enthusiasm of young men for aviation, and standardize their training, and also classify them as to their aptitude and proficiency, it will save the Government vast sums of money that might be expended in trying to train perfectly raw and green recruits, and will also save weeks, if not months, of valuable time.

Mr. Speaker, while it is true that we are short on aircraft for the Army and the Navy, and more especially are we short on aircraft necessary for the training of the Organized Air Reserves and for the National Guard, yet we are also short on flying personnel necessary to meet a major emergency. It is true that we have in the Air Corps about 1,300 officers and probably 1,200 of them are now flying officers, yet many of them are beyond the age for effective combat duty in time of war, and most of them would have to be employed in instruction and in administration and in high command in the event of an emergency. It is also true that we have approximately 3,000 Air Reserve officers, but only about 1,400 of them are sufficiently up-to-date in their training to be able to function as combat pilots. It also appears that about one-third of this 1,400 are war-time pilots and must very soon pass out of the picture completely as combat pilots. One-third of the 1,400 are graduates of the Air Corps training center at San Antonio, Tex., and will be for 10 or 15 years available for combat duty, but must be constantly trained. The remaining third of this 1,400 officers have been commissioned directly from civil life as the result of the training which they received in schools and colleges teaching aviation. The presumption is that most of this remaining one-third are young men and will for several years be available for an emergency.

AIR FORCE MUST BE STRONGEST AT OUTBREAK OF WAR

But, Mr. Speaker, since air power is the first line of defense, and since we wish to insure as nearly as possible victory in the initial stages of any assault upon us, we must strengthen our air defense in both matériel equipment and in flying personnel so that in order to beat down any attack by air we may feel free to expend our personnel even in desperate resistance, realizing that we can quickly, if not instantly, replace them from our Reserves and from our second line of Reserves. For illustration, the 1,200 Regular Army pilots, being nearly all devoted to administrative and instructional work, can be augmented at the initial stages of war by approximately 1,000 Reserve officers able to function in combat. This will undoubtedly mean less than 2,000 thoroughly trained pilots, and I think we all have agreed that 3,000 airplanes should be our 5-year objective. I think, therefore, we should always have at least 3,000 young and well-trained pilots in both the Regular Army and in the Reserves. We should have from 20,000 to 30,000 young men whose qualifications are already ascertained, whose names and addresses are well known, who are thoroughly familiar with aircraft, its construction and repair, and who have already had solo experience ranging from 50 hours to 400 hours.

Mr. Speaker, some may think that these figures are extravagant. We do not hesitate to speak of mobilizing an army of 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 men. Thirty thousand is but an infinitesimal fraction of 2,000,000. The initial stages of air combat will be savagely fierce. Each side will strive fiercely and furiously for the mastery. This will result in the attrition of planes and pilots in large numbers. In such an emergency we can put all existing aircraft factories at work on 24-hour duty, enlarge them if necessary, triple and quadruple their working forces, and turn out in them all scores of planes a day. It would not be wise to construct in advance of war the very large number of planes we would probably need. As we hope war will be long deferred, the planes themselves would probably be obsolete and useless. But the human element must also not be neglected; probably we can build planes faster than we can train green and inexperienced youngsters into combat pilots. It is the part of prudence during these years of peace to ascertain through this Air Reserve Training Corps which of our young men have the knowledge and experience necessary to be quickly whipped into combat pilots. My plan proposes to do this with practically no expense to the Government. It will help the private flying schools and it will also indirectly help the industry. Every aircraft factory is a potential arsenal. Every private flying school is an actual school of preparation for defense. By keeping the names, the addresses, and qualifications of the successful classes of young men in all the approved schools in the records of the War Department, those best qualified for flying can be immediately put upon training for combat flying.

Those best qualified for ground work, as mechanics, as repair men, and so forth, can be assigned to that kind of service. We will need large numbers of both kinds. If we should need a total of 30,000 pilots in a major emergency, we would certainly need 150,000 mechanics having a knowledge of aviation and a knowledge of aerodynamics and familiar with the details of aircraft construction and repair.

IDEA OF R. O. T. C. EXTENDED AND APPLIED

Mr. Speaker, I am simply seeking to apply to this new branch of warfare—to wit, aviation—the idea and fundamental principle which prompted the Congress in the National Defense Act of 1920 to set up the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. There are 115 schools and colleges where senior units of the R. O. T. C. now function, with a total enrollment of about 72,000. There are 139 junior units in junior institutions not having the advanced course. In these junior units there are now enrolled about 53,000 boys. It is interesting to note that since 1920, 76,201 young men have graduated from the senior R. O. T. C. units. These young men now constitute the overwhelming majority of the active

Reserve officers. The wartime Reserve officers are fast passing out of the picture. Since we realize that 95 percent of the officers leading the combat units of the ground forces in time of major war must be Reserve officers, we can realize what these 76,000 R. O. T. C. graduates now mean to national defense. In addition to the 76,000 graduates, about 22,000 other college students were enrolled in the senior units, but, for some reason—perhaps physical defects or failure to attend the camp of instruction—they did not receive their commissions as Reserve officers. But most of these 22,000 are potential officers in the event of an emergency.

In addition, 429,670 young men in our military colleges and in our ordinary colleges and universities have received military instruction in the basic courses. All of these 429,670 have received a training far more valuable to them and to the country than two or three terms of Citizens' Military Training Corps camps. Therefore, all of these young men are potential noncommissioned officers in the event of an emergency. Their names are known, their qualifications recorded, and I think we should keep track of changes in their addresses, so that in the event of an emergency they might be readily employed as noncommissioned officers in helping to train the absolutely raw recruits from the farm and from the factory, from the store and the bank, from the countinghouse and the clearing house. All of this vast training of these more than a quarter million young men has cost the Government only $54,882,871.10.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if in the course of a few years, through my plan of an Air Reserve Training Corps, we can train, with practically no expense to the Government, between 20,000 and 30,000 young men and keep on adding to their number from year to year as the older ones lose interest and neglect their flying, so that we will have a reservoir of alert, active, and practically trained pilots for an emergency, it strikes me as a most wise and expedient plan for national defense. In the old days the militia cost the Government practically nothing. Afterward and prior to the World War, the National Guard cost the Government very little, if anything. No drill pay was provided; men and officers gave their time, and many of them gave their money for uniforms, for practice ammunition, and for the expenses of camps merely because they loved the training, and because they were patriotic enough to wish to be better prepared to assist in national defense.

The young men of today have the same patriotic impulses. They do not want a dollar mark put upon their patriotism. They want to get ready to serve their Nation. They love aviation, and they realize its vast and primary, and perhaps paramount, importance in national defense. Therefore, they want to obtain at least the preliminary training, and they and their fathers are willing to pay for it, provided the Government furnishes the very inexpensive supervision and assistance contemplated by H. R. 10662.

WAR DEPARTMENT WILL ABSOLUTELY CONTROL

There are no mandatory provisions in this bill. The bill leaves to the War Department absolute discretion in the making of all the rules and regulations to set up and to govern this corps. It leaves it absolutely to the discretion of the Secretary of War as to what aid and assistance will be given to this A. R. T. C. The paper certificates or diplomas and the insignia, such as wings, required to be furnished would involve a bagatelle of expense and amount to practically nothing. If some of the Air Corps personnel and if some of the Air Reserve officers called to active duty should be detailed to this work of supervising and administering this A. R. T. C., it would be perhaps the very best sort of training that these officers could have. The War Department is properly proud of the splendid job it did in organizing and setting up the C. C. C.

Undoubtedly the Regular Army officers who did this good job received themselves much valuable experience as a result of their work. When later all regular and camp administration in the C. C. C. was turned over to Reserve officers called to active duty for that purpose, these Reserve officers have received a training and preparation of enormous value to the cause of defense. Many of these Reserve officers had never had an opportunity to contact and manage men. They had never had responsibility such as the administration of camp discipline and a mess compelled them to receive. I believe the report of the Secretary of War shows that something over 9,000 Reserve officers have had active duty with the C. C. C., and I venture the opinion that 6 months' duty with the C. C. C. for a Reserve officer was almost as valuable training for him in the mobilization and training of raw recruits as were 6 months' duty with the Regular Army. Of course, an officer must know the details of warfare himself; a company officer should be the best soldier in the company. But the indispensible quality of any company officer and also of any battalion officer is personality, magnetism, leadership, and ability to inspire confidence in others. That is what these Reserve officers on duty with the C. C. C. obtain. That also is what Regular Air Corps officers and Air Reserve officers on duty with A. R. T. C. would receive.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, to sum up the ideal, the purpose, and the plan of A. R. T. C., I can say that it proposes to mobilize, organize, and standardize the knowledge of and the training in aviation of those young men who volunteer to take the course at their own expense, in order that they may enjoy the distinction of belonging to this corps, and of becoming graduates of this corps, of wearing its insignia, and of wearing its uniform. Of course, if they have a uniform, they must buy it themselves, just as Reserve officers now buy their own uniforms. Thus, we propose to accumulate a reservoir of young men who have the fundamental knowledge of aviation and considerable experience in the air. These will be classified, indexed, so as to be immediately subject to call in the event of an emergency. When called, their qualification card will show which ones should be detailed for further instruction in flying and to be made quickly into proficient military pilots. In like manner, the qualification cards will show which ones should be detailed to the ground work of the air force. Perhaps some of the latter class would be detailed to help carry on the work in the various aircraft factories, which would be quickly expanded, and be operating on the 24-hour schedule.

If we can get all these vast resources of national defense with practically no expense; if we would utilize and capitalize this enthusiasm of youth for aviation, if we would organize and standardize the instruction of these thousands of youngsters taking training in flying, then we will be following the traditional policy of America with reference to military preparedness. We will be predicating our preparedness upon the voluntary spirit of loyal, patriotic American citizens. We will be following the ideals laid down and followed by George Washington, as demonstrated so clearly by the historical studies and writings of Gen. John McAuley Palmer. We will be following the examples of the old militia, of the present National Guard, of the Organized Reserves, and more especially, will be following the example of the R. O. T. C. In other words, the A. R. T. C. will be to the air forces what the R. O. T. C. is to the ground forces.

I herewith submit for printing H. R. 10662.

A bill to promote national defense by organizing the Air Reserve Training Corps

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to organize a civilian reserve component for the United States Army, to be known and designated as the Air Reserve Training Corps, and to establish such rules and regulations as he shall deem fit and proper for carrying out the purposes and objects of this act.

SEC. 2. That all persons between the ages of 17 years and 24 years, of sound physical condition, and with a minimum education equivalent to at least a full high-school course, shall be eligible to be listed as cadets of said corps, and shall be entitled to receive such emblem or designation to wear upon the clothing as the Secretary of War may prescribe while receiving such course of instruction and training in aerodynamics and in the art of flying as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of War is authorized to use all proper means and agencies for the encouragement of said corps, by detailing either Regular flying officers, or Reserve flying officers called to active duty, to engage in the instruction and training of said cadets in such private flying schools and centers of air instruction and training as may be selected by the Secretary of War for that purpose, where the number of cadets shall not be less than 20, and where the standards of instruction and training shall have been approved by the Secretary of War, and wherever desirable

to coordinate said instruction with courses in any college or university.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of War is further authorized to encourage the development of said corps by permitting the use of such Army air fields from time to time as may not conflict with the work of the Air Corps of the Army and further by permitting the use of airplanes, aircraft generally, and equipment belonging to the Air Corps of the Army, if and when, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, such use is wise and proper in promoting the art of flying and in the training of said corps.

SEC. 5. That upon the completion of such course of training as shall have been prescribed by the Secretary of War and upon the satisfactory passage of final examination and tests by said cadets, the Secretary of War shall issue certificates of graduation to that effect, and said graduates shall then be entitled to wear such uniform as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War, and such insignia and other designations and decorations upon said uniform or civilian clothing as the Secretary of War shall prescribe and confer. All such graduates of the training prescribed for cadets shall be kept listed as to their addresses, business occupations, and other pertinent facts, so that the same may be available on shortest notice for service in the national defense in the event of a national emergency.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of War is authorized to select each year 20 of the most promising and efficient graduates of the primary instruction hereby authorized for each of the nine Corps Areas, and to give said graduates instruction at any school or flying field of the United States Army for such period as the Secretary of War may prescribe, and then to offer to all who shall be properly qualified Reserve commissions as second lieutenants in the Air Corps Reserve, and to call such number of said second lieutenants to active duty as Reserve officers in the United States Army Air Corps, for such time, as the Secretary of War may from time to time prescribe, and all appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized.

Mr. Speaker, on January 23 a hearing was had before the Committee on Military Affairs on this bill to set up the Junior Air Reserve, and about 35 witnesses from different parts of the country appeared, and many of them were heard, and practically all of them expressed approval of the principle contained in this bill. Previously on January 13 I had sent out a letter to about 300 or more citizens in all parts of the country known to be interested in the subject of aviation in reference to national defense. In response to that letter I received replies from about 150 persons, and all those who replied favored and approved the general proposition, and some of them were very enthusiastic in their endorsement, except one of them, and he expressed opposition. From among the 150 who replied I have selected certain representative letters from widely dispersed cities and States, ranging from California to Maine, and from them I have extracted very brief expressions, and herewith submit for printing in connection with my remarks said excerpts from the representative letters referred to. I invite careful reading of these extracts, because they show that the country recognizes that there is merit behind this proposition.

Mr. Hilding N. Carlson, of the New England Aircraft School, Inc., Boston, Mass., writes on January 25 as follows:

My chief desire to take part in the discussion on the bill pertains to provisions for the adequate training of ground personnel, primarily aircraft mechanics. For every airplane, in or out of service, there must be at least five men designated solely as aircraft mechanics whose functions is the maintenance, repair, and service of airplanes and engines. These men must, of course, be trained technicians. The time required to train a good aircraft mechanic equals, and perhaps exceeds, the time required to train a pilot, and this training is in every sense just as important.

Mr. F. Pace Woods, Woods Bros. Corporation, Lincoln, Nebr., in his letter of January 24 states:

The passing of such a bill would tremendously stimulate not only the aviation industry but would create a backlog of flyers who could be made available for the defense of our country almost immediately. Such a plan has been held back heretofore, I believe, due to the high cost of airplanes and their upkeep. The program of the Bureau of Air Commerce in stimulating development of aircraft for private use at low cost based on production has been far more successful than is realized by the public.

Mr. John L. Cousins, of the J. R. C. Flying Service, San Jose Airport, writes on January 22 as follows:

Any movement to the end of interesting young men in this country in flying, especially along military lines, is highly admirable and a tremendous asset.

Mr. E. A. Link, president of Link Aviation Devices, Inc., Binghamton, N. Y., states in his letter of January 23 the following:

Also we believe it would help interest more young men in learning to fly and therefore help civil aviation itself.

Mr. W. H. Marden, Airways, Inc., Waterville, Maine, in his letter of January 24 states:

I would be interested and glad to do anything in my power to aid the proposed Junior Air Reserve bill.

Mr. Elvan Tarkington, Tarkington Aviation Co., Indianapolis, Ind., writes in his letter of January 24 the following:

I would say emphatically that I am very much interested in your bill.

Mr. Richard A. Henson, of Hagerstown, Md., states the following in his telegram of January 24:

Am heartily in favor of such a proposal and assure you of my fullest cooperation.

Mr. Henry E. Moore, 2032 Belmont Road, NW., Washington, D. C., writes on January 24 as follows:

I am thoroughly in accord with your plan of training young men in aviation—as I am a young lawyer myself and am vitally interested in that field.

Mr. G. C. Rawls, Mississippi Power & Light Co., Jackson, Miss., states in his letter of January 23 the following:

I think your idea of promoting a plan whereby we will have a good supply of pilots is a good one for strengthening our national defense.

Mr. Edward A. Dycer, Dycer Flying Service, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif., in his letter of January 19 states:

This measure is constructive and practical and would likely stimulate the student flying activity it contemplates.

Mr. L. D. Ruch, Pioneer Aviation School and Sales, Savannah, Ga., in his letter of January 21, writes the following:

I most heartily agree with your bill and your idea of the junior air reserve.

Mr. George W. Orr, Roosevelt Field, N. Y., states in his telegram of January 22 the following:

I heartily endorse your constructive bill to provide a competent reserve air force and save taxpayers enormous sums of money by using commercial aviation schools for primary training.

Hon. Bernarr Macfadden, New York City, makes the following statement in his telegram of January 22:

You may count upon me for any assistance possible in successfully setting up this Junior Air Reserve.

Mr. G. F. Fox, of the Harvard Flying Club, Inc., states in his telegram of January 23 the following:

Suggest that you include in the bill that obsolete Government flying equipment be made available for ground and laboratory study.

Mr. William F. Centner, major, Air Reserve, superintendent, Port Columbus, Columbus, Ohio, writes in his letter of January 21 the following:

The proposition is certainly one of tremendous significance.

Mr. Howard B. Edwards, president of the University of Virginia Aviation Club, Charlottesville, Va., states the following in his letter of January 21:

We are very much in favor of a junior air reserve.

Mr. E. W. Cleveland, the Cleveland Pneumatic Tool Co., Cleveland, Ohio, writes in his letter of January 17 as follows:

I am happy to advise that we are in full accord with the junior air reserve.

Mr. Spindler Krause, of Newport News, Va., makes the following statement in his letter of January 21:

I believe this is a wonderful thing for both the Nation and the young men of our country.

Mr. John Nagel, Aerial Ambulance and Charter Service, Montebello, Calif., states in his letter of January 17 the following:

I wish to say that I would be very much interested in seeing such a bill go through and become a law.

Mr. Cecil C. Meadows, superintendent, Kern County Airports, Bakersfield, Calif., writes in his letter of January 18 as follows:

National defense and security demands the passage of your Junior Air Reserve bill.

Mr. Henry von Berg, of Johnson-von Berg Flight Instruction Service, Stockton, Calif., in his letter of January 15 states:

We certainly will do everything in our power to further it.

Mr. Wayne Bullock, Bullock Motor Co., Madrid, Nebr., in his letter of January 17 writes the following:

I sincerely believe your plan would be a big asset to the defense of the United States besides creating much toward the building of aviation.

Mr. E. A. Goff, Jr., airport manager, Kellogg Airport, Battle Creek, Mich., in his letter of January 17 makes the following statement:

We are ready and anxious to do everything that we can do to further your objectives.

Mr. Arthur J. LaPointe, Jr., Calumet High School, Chicago, Ill., in his letter of January 20, writes as follows:

We offer you our congratulations for the introduction of your bill to promote national defense through the organization of a Junior Air Reserve.

Mr. A. M. Woody, president Air Reserve Association of U. C., Louisville, Ky., in his telegram of January 21, states:

We are much interested in Junior Air Reserve and hope bill can be passed this session.

Mr. Milo E. Oliphant, department of aeronautics, Lansing, Mich., in his letter of January 18, makes the following statement:

I want to say that I would like to give my personal support to the plan. It is a splendid idea and would not only provide a source of trained pilot personnel in time of national emergency, but would also save the Government a great deal of expense in training these pilots. Looking at it from the other side, it is plain to see that it would be a great benefit to aviation schools which would be selected to give the required training.

Mr. Alex Pellett, Jr., San Francisco, Calif., writes in his letter of January 18, as follows:

I will be only too willing to cooperate with you in any manner that I can.

Mr. John G. Bailey, secretary of Kern County Pilots' Association, Bakersfield, Calif., in his letter of January 18, states:

The Kern County Pilots' Association, consisting of 45 licensed pilots, heartily endorse your junior air reserve bill.

Mr. John J. White, president of Private Fliers Association, Inc., New York City, states in his letter of January 18, as follows:

I feel that a junior air reserve which is properly operated and gives the youth of the country an opportunity to know what flying is all about is most desirable. It will develop their minds along the lines of interest in aviation, and I cannot too strongly commend any efforts made in this direction.

Mr. Raymond P. King, Gainesville National Bank, Gainesville, Tex., writes in his letter of January 16 the following:

May I say to you that I think that you are surely on the right track to accomplish something really worth while for this Nation in that you will create a reserve of flying men to whom the Nation can turn in time of an emergency.

Mr. Winston W. Kratz, of St. Louis Flying Service, Inc., St. Louis, Mo., in his letter of January 16 makes the following statement:

This company is definitely in favor of your efforts in regards to the House bill having to do with the formation of the junior air reserve.

Mr. Howard S. Smart, Eastern Flying School, Waltham, Mass., states in his letter of January 14 as follows:

Let me first congratulate you on the splendid work and assistance to the business men connected with aviation. It is a positive and progressive effort to further the cause that will be of great benefit to the coming generation.

Mr. Herbert Whitney, of Lake City, Fla., in his letter of January 15 writes the following:

I am anxious to do anything I can to promote it.

Mr. William D. Strohmeier, president, National Intercollegiate Flying Club, Amherst, Mass., in his letter of January 16, makes the following statement:

Your proposal to establish a reserve corps among college pilots is a very timely one and one which should be of vital importance to the national defense.

Mr. Craig Isbell, Springfield Aviation Co., Springfield, Ill., writes in his letter of January 14 as follows:

We wish to take this opportunity to go on record as being heartily in favor of this bill and to assure you of our support in your efforts to obtain this legislation.

Maj. J. H. Doolittle, St. Louis, Mo., in his letter of January 15, states the following:

I believe the idea as outlined in your bill H. R. 4336 is an extremely sound one and would have the effect of stimulating interest in aviation and strengthening our air defense.

Mr. W. G. Hambrick, of Fort Worth, Tex., in his letter of January 14, writes as follows:

I am in favor of the legislation as proposed. Some day we may need several thousand young men who can fly.

Mr. Ralph E. Knapp, manager of Pocatello Flying Service, Pocatello, Idaho, in his letter of January 8, makes the following statement:

I believe this is the positive solution to both national defense and the help that private and commercial schools have been waiting for to impress the public that airplanes are not only for pleasure but are a definite form of transportation that needs the support of the people.

Mr. Carl F. Kaiser of Roseville, Mich., in his letter of January 27, writes as follows:

Organization of junior air reserves would be helpful to both commercial and military aviation.

Mr. Bertram A. Totten, Civilian Conservation Corps, Chatsworth, N. J., writes in his letter of January 27 as follows:

In conclusion, allow me to say that we of the Conservation Corps will welcome any proposal federally or otherwise which will be consistent to our personal aims, ambitions, and aspirations, and to our country's national defense.

Mr. William H. Stewart, president of the Stewart Technical Trade School, New York City, states in his letter of January 16 as follows:

I am heartily in accord with your plans.

Mr. William F. Clifton, principal of Sheffield Public School, Sheffield, Iowa, writes in his letter of January 14 as follows:

As a pilot, I consider you one of our too few friends in Congress, and assure you we appreciate your accomplishments and efforts to date.

Mr. Walter H. Beech, president of the Beech Aircraft Co., Wichita, Kans., in his letter of January 7 states the following:

I believe if we could get several thousand young men flying who would have the basic training necessary to enter combat flying, it would be a strengthening factor to our air force.

Mr. G. D. Owsley, North Suburban Flying Corporation, Glenview, Ill., states in his letter of January 7, as follows:

I beg to advise that I am heartily behind this movement.

Mr. Fred B. Sheriff, Commissioner of Aeronautics, Helena, Mont., in his letter of January 7, makes the statement as follows:

The cause is undoubtedly constructive and worthwhile and I should very much like to see something done.

Mr. Louis R. Inwood, Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America, Washington, D. C., in his letter of January 9, states as follows:

I have very deeply appreciated your sincere interest in private flying and the private flying schools of the United States and believe, as you do, that genuine cooperation and understanding between the military air force and civil aviation within the United States is vital to an adequate national-defense plan.

Mr. L. A. Faunce, vice president of the Warner Aircraft Corporation, Detroit, Mich., in his letter of January 7, writes as follows:

The writer was pleased to receive your letter of January 3 and wishes to take this opportunity of informing you that he is in full accord with your bill, H. R. 4336.

Mr. C. J. Brukner, president of the Waco Aircraft Co., Troy, Ohio, writes in his letter of January 9, as follows:

I have long favored some kind of an arrangement whereby the Federal Government could give encouragement to the training, in private schools, of a junior air reserve to be made up of able-bodied young men suitable for military pilot training in the future.

Hon. John C. Bennett, Jr., of Louisville, Ky., in his letter of January 8 writes as follows:

I wish to say that I think your idea of a junior air reserve would be one of the best things that could be done today for national defense.

Mr. E. W. Hudlow, of the Spartan School of Aeronautics, Tulsa, Okla., writes in his letter of January 7 the following:

I was very glad to hear from you regarding the junior air reserve. I believe this to be one of the greatest moves our Government could make to help develop American youth into better citizens and to give training that all healthy young boys desire, as well as to build up our national defense.

Mr. Malcolm L. Hathaway, of Easton, Md., in his letter of January 14, writes as follows:

We are very much in accord with the plan outlined in the bill.

Mr. Paul D. Selby, vice president of Hanford Airlines, Sioux City, Iowa, writes in his letter of January 13 the following:

The junior air reserve is a most necessary adjunct to our national-defense program.

Mr. Clyde E. Brayton, president of Brayton Flying Service, Inc., Robertson, Mo., writes the following in his letter of January 13:

My personal opinion of House of Representatives' bill no. 4336 is the most progressive move to help commercial aviation that has so far been started.

Mr. Karl E. Voelter, All American Airport, Miami, Fla., in his letter of January 13 states the following:

I wish to state that I am heartily in favor of such action.

Mr. C. R. Douglass, vice president of Valley Airways, Inc., Winchester, Va., writes in his letter of January 14 as follows:

As we see it, an organization such as the junior air reserve will not only directly strengthen our air forces by furnishing an unlimited supply of trained personnel but will bring into being an unexpected number of trained mechanics, factory men, designers, and engineers by stimulating commercial aviation. As commercial aviation grows, so will the number of trained men available for aviation use in time of emergency.

Mr. Fred W. Pultar, Southern Aircraft, Inc., Valdosta, Ga., in his letter of January 13, states:

I beg to advise that I am very muchly interested in the junior air reserve for young men.

Mr. Dudley M. Steele, chairman of the aeronautics commission, the American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind., writes in his letter of January 3 as follows:

Aviation interests feel that you are one of its strongest friends.

Hon. C. H. Warrington, Sportman Pilot Association, Washington, D. C., writes in his letter of January 8 as follows:

I have the honor to acknowledge yours of the 3d and to voice my approval of your contemplated legislation.

Mr. O. P. Herbert, president of Safair, Inc., Roosevelt Field, New York City, in his letter of January 5 writes as follows:

We received your letter of January 2 today and hasten to assure you of our full support for your bill to set up a junior air reserve.

Mr. Richard D. Morgan, president of Air Service, Inc., New Castle, Del., writes in his letter of January 13 as follows:

I have read your letter and bill with interest and feel that your plan is a most worthy one.

Col. Oliver L. Parks, president of Parks Air College, Inc., East St. Louis, Ill., writes in his letter of December 20 as follows:

I am very much interested in being of assistance to you, because of your great personal interest in commercial aviation.

Mr. E. W. Hudlow, vice president of the Spartan School of Aeronautics, Tulsa, Okla., states in his letter of January 7 the following:

After reading your House bill, H. R. 4336, I have a suggestion that I would like to offer. It is very essential that the air force have a well-trained ground crew. In fact, it takes about five men to each airplane in order to keep it serviced, checked, and airworthy. There will be a number of boys who would be eligible for the junior air reserve, but due to some slight physical defect would not be able to pass the flight examination.

THE TRAGEDY OF THE HIGHWAYS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio speech which I made on Friday last entitled "Death at the Wheel."

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by myself over a National Broadcasting Co. network, during the program "Congress Speaks", Friday night, January 31, 1936:

On December 8 I spoke over the radio on the subject, the Tragedy of the Highways. Since then I have received letters from all over the country, from hundreds of persons, urging that action be taken at once to relieve the situation. I wish each and every one of you could read those letters. Some of them are pathetic, for they come from those who have lost loved ones. They are eager to encourage any step which will prevent others suffering the pain and anguish they themselves have experienced.

Since the 1st of December it is conservative to estimate that fifty-four hundred men, women, and children have died as the result of automobile fatalities. One hundred lives a day—every day—one life every 15 minutes. Death is still at the wheel. No one expects that legislation will stop this terrible slaughter. We do know, however, that if the State traffic regulations were uniform in their provisions, enforcement would be simplified, those who are physically or mentally unfit to drive would be taken off the highways (in the words of one official, there are too many 30-horsepower brains driving 90-horsepower motors), headlight glare in night driving would be controlled, street lighting would be improved, wild speed would be reduced, brakes would be tested regularly, and the ultimate result would be a lessening of the number of accidents.

On December 18 last, an accident-prevention conference was called by our humane Secretary of Commerce Daniel C. Roper. It met in Washington and laid out a program dealing chiefly with causes of accidents and suggested remedies for them. Two high points of the conference program appeal particularly to me. One is that the conference is seeking to meet immediate problems with educational material. The other is that of attempting to obtain uniform vehicle regulations throughout the United States. A committee on this work has been set up, with my distinguished and very able colleague, Representative EMMET O'NEAL, of Kentucky, as its chairman. Mr. Labert St. Clair, transportation assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, was appointed director of activities of the conference. Today I am talking solely of the motor fatality phase of the problem, and at a later date I intend to take up the other phases of the matter.

Gradually, America is awakening to the fact that no one is exempt from the dangers of the road. My only surprise is that it has taken so long to formulate a plan and to get it started. Over a year has elapsed since my bill was introduced in Congress. This measure calls for a study and research of traffic conditions and measures for their improvement. The bill does not call for the creation of new departments—only existing facilities will be used—the money is available, the organization is there and ready to go ahead as soon as authorization to do so is granted. States rights will not be interfered with by this measure. The sad part of it all is not that just a year has been wasted. During that year more than 36,000 lives have been lost by automobile accidents. That is the terrible part. For some of these lives could have been saved. It appears that the 1935 figures will show an increase over 1934. The 1935 total will probably be very close to 36,400 with a corresponding increase in permanent disabilities and injuries.

In 1934 there were 36,000 automobile fatalities. But there is another side to the picture. In addition to those deaths, you must consider the 105,000 persons who were permanently disabled and the 1,500,000 temporarily incapacitated. Think of the mental and physical suffering involved. Aside from this, there is the economic loss, and that is estimated at $1,580,000,000. It is so shocking, so staggering, when one has the figures before him, that it seems as if the country were becoming calloused and human life becoming cheap.

We all shudder at the thought of war. The traffic fatality situation is far worse than any war the United States has ever fought. Figures were given recently which show that in all the conflicts our country has had, from the Revolutionary War down to and including the late World War, 244,357 lives were lost. The period

of time covered by those wars was approximately 150 years. Compare the traffic fatalities of only 15 years with this, and you find that 389,000 men, women, and children have been killed in or by automobiles. We need neutrality on our highways.

The average person goes on his way confidently, with the feeling he is perfectly safe, but here and there the lightning strikes each day and he is either killed or kills. His whole life picture and that of his family are completely changed. The family never forgets his death if he is killed—he never forgets the fact he has killed somebody. That horror will be with him always—and it's infinitely greater if it be his own fault.

The public authorities have responded in bringing this picture more and more before the public eye. However, when you compare what was done in the way of publicity in depicting the horrors of the World War, when only 38,000 American lives were lost during the entire conflict, the fatalities of last year, which were 2,000 less, enough has not been done.

Some of the American indifference to this crashing, smashing death is vanishing, however. A great deal of fine, intelligent, and valuable research work has been done. It has been determined that from 12 midnight to 1 o'clock in the morning the hazard is nine times as great as from 12 to 1 in the middle of the day, in proportion to the amount of travel. Similarly, the average accident hazard between 6 p. m. and 6 a. m. is four times as great as that between 6 a. m. and 6 p. m.

We are gradually getting somewhere with the problem. We are finding out the facts. What we need now is legislation to put this knowledge to use. The manufacturers have become interested and have set up a number of committees which are to deal with important aspects of the traffic problem. They have just announced a large-scale cooperative plan of safety work, one of its items providing for 15 fellowships in the Traffic Research Bureau of Harvard University.

State and municipal authorities are increasing their activities; grade-crossing elimination is being carried forward all over the country—1,500 of these death traps will be made safe in the coming year. Educational programs are being set up, many of them modeled on the Milwaukee plan, which has worked out so successfully. That plan, controlled by a commission, with the very hearty cooperation of the police department, has made Milwaukee the safest city in the United States. It is not a complicated program, and much of its success comes from the fact that the commission is made up of 12 men, each of whom is an expert in his own particular field, each realizing just what the situation demands. As a result, the public schools have a course of study embracing all phases of the traffic problem from driver training to law enforcement. The police department works closely with the commission. There is no ticket fixing in Milwaukee.

Safety studies should be a part of the curriculum of all schools. There is a great opportunity for activity of this nature in the organizations of the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, and the Campfire Girls. With their eager enthusiasm they can be of wonderful help. It is a tremendous challenge to the youth of America. Arrangements have been completed for introducing general accident-prevention courses in the C. C. C. camps. If these 421,000 young men are taught the principles of safety, an army of most useful safety leaders soon can be established.

With all these agencies at work, anxious as they are for a betterment of the conditions, the one most crying need at the present moment is for uniformity of traffic laws. The demand for this is national. This is borne out by the result of the Nation-wide poll conducted recently by the American Institute of Public Opinion. Last Sunday's Washington Post printed the figures on this poll. It showed that 95 percent of the voters agree that there must be uniform traffic laws and regulations in all States. In a day or two I am introducing another bill in Congress that takes in a broader scope than my previous one. I am glad to see more persons taking interest daily in the safety problem. It is only through such interest that we can master the situation. Instead of death at the wheel, let us have safety at the wheel.

REPUBLICANISM AT THE CROSS ROADS—LET'S SEE THE COLOR OF THE CHICKEN BEFORE WE PUT THE POT TO BOIL

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, as a Democrat, I have no fault to find with the theory that the business of an opposition party is to oppose.

Progress, in government as in everything else, lies in the give and take of constructive criticism. But it is my contention that criticism, to qualify as constructive, must be sincere, honest, and well balanced.

No intelligent American citizen, whatever may be his party affiliations, whatever he may think of the New Deal, can conscientiously accept or countenance the particular brand of political windjamming that has burdened the air waves and filled the headlines during the past month.

Some of it defeats itself without the necessity of comment or refutation. Even the most hide-bound and ostrich-headed conservative must begin to recognize the fact that the old catchpenny scarewords that were used to give the public the nervous jitters back in the twenties have lost their black magic and no longer create even a mild furore.

Crying "red", "Communist", and "Socialist" in this year of 1936 is not good for a one-night stand in a third-rate house. The public is looking for something newer and better. It refuses to be distracted by slapstick when the legitimate fare has run out.

Fortunately the American people are able to profit by the example of two powerful European dictatorships which had as their slogan, "Communists must be wiped out." By the time our European neighbors waked up to the fact that they were fighting an enemy that had never really made an attack on their own borders, they discovered that another, and for them, far more malignant form of dictatorship had stepped in to throttle them within their own country.

The American workingman will not let himself be betrayed into a similar position by the trickery of would-be capitalistic dictators.

A recent radio address delivered by one of my colleagues of the opposition opened with the statement that it was to be addressed to the laboring man since business and professional men who are not already back in the Republican Party need to have their heads examined.

The enemies of the New Deal do well to cast their juiciest bait before the workingman. He will prove a wary nibbler at best. Agreed that his first concern is knowing which party is able to restore business confidence and provide a steady job for him at an American standard of wages. It has been his first concern since the fiasco of 1929 showed him how unstable was the so-called security of a boom era.

Through the years of 1930, 1931, and 1932 he was given ample opportunity to see just what a Republican administration could and did do to provide him with a steady job.

For the first time, in 1933, the laboring man, factory worker, farmer, and miner found his problems the primary concern of an administration.

President Roosevelt recognized the fact that so many of his predecessors seemed to have overlooked, that the prosperity of business, industry, and Wall Street depended entirely on the prosperity of the (in 1933) appropriately labeled "man in the street."

The charge has been made that he called in professors of economics from the universities—inexperienced theorists—to help him formulate a plan for the immediate relief of the starving and the eventual restoration of economic security.

If he did so, it was because he could not escape the realization that the colleges were the only places left where the first principles of sound economics had not been distorted to fit the insanity of the "every man a millionaire" slogan of our boom era. Certainly there were few, if any, among the politicians and businessmen, industrialists, and financiers who could lay claim to having brought forth any basic economic principles in an effort to stem the tide of speculation and restore sanity before we were swept overboard in the inevitable shipwreck.

It was from the theorists on the side lines that the warnings came, and they were ignored by our hard-headed, practical men. The President had reason to seek a "brain trust."

Incidentally I might question the purported opprobrium in the term "theorist." Every forward step in science, technology, and government has been made because some theorist saw a way to build something new on the basis of old facts, and experimented until he made what he saw visible to the popular mind.

President Roosevelt was the first to admit that the N. R. A. was an experiment. The country was facing a crisis that demanded drastic and immediate measures. Business could not and did not ask to be left to pick itself up while the unemployed starved.

But now that business has experienced a 50-percent recovery, on the strength of confidence and buying power restored under the N. R. A., it is determined to throw off the helping hand and let the other fellow shift for himself. It made no objection to calling out the Army when its own

house and lot were in danger, but now that they are saved it disapproves the Army on principle and wants it disbanded.

And to make felt its disapproval, it quotes facts and figures with approximately the same accuracy and understanding as a parrot.

Anyone knows that the same set of figures can be made to prove any side of an argument provided care is exercised in selecting portions to be quoted and emphasis is shaded accordingly. Enemies of the New Deal are adepts at this doubtful accomplishment.

They quote the American Federation of Labor Bulletin to the effect that there were eleven and one-half million men still out of work in 1935, as against fifteen and one-half million in 1933. And this, they hasten to remind us, after a $15,000,000,000 Government appropriation.

What they fail to point out is the fact that the eleven and one-half million figure for 1935 includes three and one-half million who are employed on Federal work-relief projects. It also include a 2,000,000 increase in job seekers since 1933. In other words, including those employed on Federal work-relief projects, better than 9,000,000 more men are gainfully employed today than were so employed in 1933.

Is that failure?

No one claims that the whole problem is solved while there are men still unemployed. But it is apparent, at least to 9,000,000 men in this country who have directly benefited, and should be apparent to the business men, who have benefited more or less directly by this increased buying power, that the New Deal has come a long way toward a solution.

In his radio address delivered on December 28, 1935, the Honorable HAMILTON FISH, Jr., stated that as a result of the A. A. A. the United States has lost half her cotton-export trade. The answer to that is a quotation from the Department of Commerce summary of foreign commerce for November 1935. During the 4 months ending with November 1935 the United States exported 2,574,786 bales of cotton as against 1,894,142 bales for the same 4 months of 1934.

I might add, from the same source, that the total exports of American merchandise have risen from $1,147,176,000 worth of goods in 1932 to $2,021,089,000 worth of goods in 1935. And that, in the face of an acknowledged world tendency toward national self-sufficiency and a definite tightening of export markets.

With long faces our rock-ribbed conservatives point out that the election of a Republican President is the only thing that will restore confidence. It seems a contradiction in terms to speak of restoration of confidence in the same breath with deliberate misrepresentations and falsifications aimed at the destruction of the very thing they claim to seek to restore.

Bemoaning the fate of the poor wage earner who watches the skyrocketing of prices with grave dismay, they neglect to call attention to the fact that, whereas the cost of living has increased 2.9 percent under the New Deal, a legitimate sign in itself of business recovery, the average earnings of the working man have increased 6.8 percent.

The alarum seems more in the nature of a false alarm.

We are expected to accept without question the Republican promises of "a sound and workable program for the benefit of the American farmer, which will restore the foreign markets for our exportable farm surplus and protect our domestic markets for the American farmer." But I hardly think the farmer himself will prove so gullible. He was fed on promises too long by previous Republican administrations. He is going to demand to see the color of the chicken before he puts the pot on to boil.

In his December 28 speech Mr. FISH puts the blame for alleged unconstitutional enactments of the New Deal on a supine and rubber-stamp Congress. Yet he did not hesitate to conclude his remarks with the prediction that most of the Republican candidates for the United States Senate and Congress who will be up for reelection in 1936 will be for the nomination of Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH as Republican candidate for the Presidency, if for no other reason than in order to help get elected themselves.

Just what does that promise in the way of an independent, purposeful, and unmanageable Congress?

I shall not attempt to argue the Supreme Court's findings on the constitutionality of the N. R. A. and the A. A. A. If there was room for two opinions within the Supreme Court itself, it is not to be expected that opinions without it will be one and universal.

But I do take exception to the meaningless cry that the administration and the New Deal have broken with the Constitution of the United States as set forth for us by its framers. Let me point out that there have been 21 amendments to that original Constitution and each of them has broken with some expressed conviction of the men who framed it. It is extremely doubtful if they or the original Supreme Court itself would have passed on any of them as constitutional.

In the case of most of these amendments, existing conditions were the primary factor in passing upon the constitutionality. It is open to question whether existing conditions were given due consideration in the Supreme Court's ruling on the N. R. A. and the A. A. A.

Where, for example, were those who cry "dictatorship" when the eighteenth amendment was passed. The Supreme Court slept 10 years over that usurpation of State rights. And it took this allegedly socialistic administration to resubmit it to the will of the people.

The Republicans have launched their campaign. They have extended a friendly hand to the malcontents and renegades of the Democratic Party. They are prepared to weep on the necks of the American people over their sufferings under the New Deal.

It is up to the intelligent American citizen to decide for himself whether or not a wet collar is sufficient compensation for a return to the economic apathy of the Hoover administration.

ON "TAKING A WALK"

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, 1936, Gov. Alfred E. Smith made an address before the American Liberty League, which was officially replied to on January 28 by the Senate majority leader, JOSEPH T. ROBINSON, of Arkansas. In 1928 Governor Smith was the Democratic Presidential nominee and Senator ROBINSON was the candidate for Vice President.

Sufficient time has now elapsed for the stilling of our emotions, so that we can calmly and with some respect to reason examine the whole scene and threatened impasse brought about by the Governor's address.

In the meantime, many things have been said and done which might well have been left unsaid and undone. As one who campaigned with Governor Smith and whose political fortunes were tightly bound up with Smith's Senator ROBINSON has proper standing to criticize the position now taken by the Governor. It would be much better, in deed, if all who have since found fault with Smith were equally eligible to the right to belabor him for what he said in his Liberty League speech.

In the 1928 Presidential election Smith and Robinson carried eight States—Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Rhode Island, and South Carolina. I admit the right of any official representative of any one of this group of States to express his disapproval of the utterances of Governor Smith insofar as it touches the Democratic Party organization and policy. Such men have solid footing when commenting adversely or otherwise on Smith's suggestion that nothing may be left for him and others who feel as he feels but to "take a walk" after the National Democratic Convention in Philadelphia this year.

I can go farther than that, and, grant the right and privilege of any individual, as an individual, expressing his own personal views on the subject; but I shall not agree that it is particularly palatable that Governor Smith shall be berated for suggesting that some may have to "take a walk"

when, and if the time comes, by those who themselves in 1928 led the way in "taking a walk", strayed away from their historic Democratic traditions and deserted the Democratic Party nominees, not because of any political principle involved, as is now involved, but on altogether reasonless and personal grounds.

I want to express my thought on the subject and wish that I might give it directly to the Governor himself. As a Democrat from the North, particularly as a Pennsylvania Democrate, with a lifetime of service to the Democratic Party in Pennsylvania, with generations of Democratic Party devotion behind me, and as one who believed in and followed Governor Smith's leadership in 1928, I am entitled to a hearing on this subject.

Governor, you would not say that years and years of Democratic Party affiliation in Pennsylvania, since 1860, let us say, was an indication that a man was in a party for the sake of profit. You would give him the benefit of the doubt, if there were any, and say he must have been actuated by deep and abiding principles—right or wrong—in which he believed and on which he tacked his faith.

As one who claims to be that kind of a Democrat not in years but in principles, and one who joyed at the terrific blow you delivered to the Republican machines in Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties, from which, by the way, they are not likely ever to recover, I have a right to talk "United States" to you.

Governor Smith, we Pennsylvania Democrats have been a sorry lot in a melancholy state. It has not been just the proper caper to be a Democrat in our State—not for many, many years. It has been rather an unmixed evil. It did not advance one in politics, in society, in business, or in the professions, or in finances. Whereas in some parts of the country it was eminently proper, polite, politic, and profitable to be a Democrat; in Pennsylvania it was just the reverse, and a Democrat in most sections of that State was looked upon as a fool for principle or a fanatic, or a nitwit, fairly sensible in a way, but more or less non compos.

Now, Governor, whom do you suppose you may walk out on? Certainly not on those who walked out on you in 1928. You are walking out, if you do walk out—and I have my doubts that you will—on those of us who did not walk out on you. Do you know how much you increased the Democratic vote in Pennsylvania in 1928?

John W. Davis received for President in 1924, 409,192 votes in our State. In 1928 you, Governor, received 1,067,586 votes, and you remember the kind of a campaign that was urged and waged against you. You remember the "hot stuff" pulled out of the hat of the Republican National Committee.

What about the 15,016,443 who supported you, stuck by you, and voted for you in 1928? You have no right to walk out on us, Governor, just because the going gets tough. A democracy is the people's business and must always remain the people's business, and the Democratic Party is the people's party in that democracy, and it is your business as a great Democratic leader to keep it such. A democratic form of government must of necessity depend mainly for its success upon men who feel the pulse beat of the common aching heart and who speak the inarticulate thoughts of the striving hosts of men.

No, Governor; you have no right to walk out on us, regardless of the provocation. It is your duty to help our Democratic ship steer a safe course through the turbulent mounting billows of discontent, depression, and impending disaster.

I really think, Governor, that is what you are trying to do when you suggest "taking a walk." But as for actually doing that, you know you should not do it. You must not "walk out" on more than 15,000,000 Democrats in these United States and more than 1,000,000 in Pennsylvania. You would not think of such a thing.

ANDREW JACKSON

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we all revere the memory of Andrew Jackson. Much has been written and said about this great Democrat. Many times when I hear present-day speakers proclaiming their allegiance to Jacksonian democracy I wonder, if they had lived in his time and had been called upon to take part in the fight waged by this champion of the common people, whether they would have espoused the cause—"Jacksonian democracy"—and faced the odds opposing Jackson with the zeal and devotion they profess today.

Read the account of President Jackson's fight against the money power during his administration as written by a Republican—a Lincoln Presidential elector.

Everyone should read the history of the great battle between Andrew Jackson and the money power in Benton's Thirty Years in the Senate.

History on the money question is simply repeating itself. In Jackson's time we had but one great corporation in the United States—that was the old United States Bank, with a capital of $35,000,000 and a charter that expired in 20 years. The great money power of that generation was concentrated in that bank and its branch banks in all States of the Union. Thirty-five millions do not seem very big when compared with the corporations we have now, but the old United States Bank had one vast advantage over all other corporations. We had no United States Treasury then, separate and apart from that bank, and the laws then required that all the money belonging to the Government should be deposited in that bank. This gave its managers millions of money and vast power, for money was worth from 1 to 5 percent a month, and no restraint on the amount they could issue, except their good faith. Banks then printed their own paper money and the law permitted them to circulate $5 in paper money for $1 of capital, with no restraint except their good faith to prevent them from circulating $100 to $1 of their capital, which was often done.

Nicholas Biddle was president of the great bank. He was the money king of that day and generation. He lived in a marble palace on the banks of the Delaware, 15 miles above Philadelphia, and there in that palace of pure white marble, with great Corinthian columns, this money king dispensed hospitality equal to almost any king in Europe. Thousands of people thought him vastly greater than General Jackson.

Sometime before Biddie's charter expired he took a trip to Washington to have a talk with his then friend, Jackson, about a new charter for his bank. The old one was to expire in 1836, and as Jackson was a candidate for reelection he thought it would be a good thing to tell him about the vast power of his bank and its many branches. He told Jackson that the merchants and men of affairs through all the States were, as a rule, largely indebted to his banks and that through the influence of his branch banks he could control the election in any State in the Union. Then up rose Andrew Jackson and, with suppressed emotion, said: "Mr. Biddle, if that is true, and I think it is, I tell you here and now, that if you can control the election in any State in the Union, that is too much power for one man to have in a free country in time of peace. And I will tell you further, here and now, that if you can get a new charter from Congress for that bank, by the Eternal, I will veto that charter."

Then the great money king set himself to work to defeat the election of Andrew Jackson. The first thing that Banker Biddle did was to buy up or influence all the great Democratic papers that were for sale from Boston to New Orleans. They even bought Jackson's home organ, the old Washington Globe, edited by Jackson's personal friend, Gen. Duff Green. When Jackson saw them using Government money to buy up Democratic papers, editors, etc., he said to his Secretary of the Treasury: "Mr. Duane, I don't want you to put any more Government money in that bank; it will blow up; the money is not safe." But Mr. Duane was himself a banker and a very rich man for that day. Of course, he was in sympathy with the money power and he said: "I can't obey that order." Then, he was told to take an indefinite furlough for the benefit of his health and Jackson put Roger B. Taney in his place, the man who afterward became Chief Justice of the United States.

Clay, Webster, and Calhoun were then all in the United States Senate and all candidates for President against Jackson. Benton, Jackson's great defender, called them "the great triumvirate." At the proper time these great men made great constitutional arguments to show how Jackson had turned Cromwell and was trampling the Constitution and the liberties of the people underfoot.

The next move Biddle's henchmen made was to get up "honest" Democratic meetings—"honest" primaries to denounce and head off the President.

A great anti-Jackson, an "honest" Democratic meeting of this kind, was held in Philadelphia, where the great bank was located, at which they gave a free dinner to 80,000 men—all paid for by the great bank. They appointed a committee of 300 Democrats to go to Washington and ask Jackson to desist from his course in ruining the country. When this committee got to Washington, one of these pride-swollen bankers so far forgot himself as to say to the President that if he persisted in his course the people would rise up en masse and come to Washington with shotguns, pitchforks, and anything that would kill "to expel the Goths from Rome." Jackson replied: "Do you come here to threaten me?

If you men dare to put any of your big threats into execution, by the great Eternal, I will hang you high as Haman!"

For a time it did look blue for Old Hickory. It seemed as if he was being forsaken by all his friends. But after a while it began to be seen that for each great banker that left him four or five honest farmers, mechanics, and laborers came to him.

When the election was over and the vote counted, Andrew Jackson, the hero of the people, had swept the whole country by storm. He had more majority than the other candidates had votes. Then the Democrats rejoiced.

Of the millions who (now) inhabit our great Republic how many know that such a man as Nicholas Biddle ever lived? His marble palace is gone, and in the wreck of his great bank only $20 was found to redeem a paper circulation of over a hundred million.

Andrew Jackson was indeed a great man. His name will live forever with the Republic. He saved the people of his day from the grinding curse of a moneyed aristocracy. (Charles Schreiner, a Lincoln Presidential elector in 1864. Courtesy O. J. Lynge, Ponderay, Idaho.)

Truly, history repeats itself. We are confronted today with the business of 120,000,000 people in this country prostrate before the organized greed of an entrenched money power, with the public mind confused by cunning and misleading statements adroitly put out to conceal their machinations and true state of facts concerning the cause for the financial difficulties that have overtaken the country due to the overthrow of the very principles that President Jackson successfully defended and maintained and the domination of the forces he opposed, now in control of the Nation's finance and credit.

MILITARY ROAD

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 330, to close Military Road temporarily, number 505 on the Union Calendar, be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs for further consideration.

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

There was no objection.

EXTRAVAGANCE OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I made over the radio on last Saturday night.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio address made over the Columbia Broadcasting System on February 1, 1936, as follows:

I should like at the very outset to give you a note of warning. It is this: If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good, but if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in its spending, extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Perhaps my listeners recognize that warning as having been uttered before. It was. It was made by Candidate Roosevelt at Pittsburgh, October 19, 1932. It is the surest self-indictment ever uttered by any man.

In the more than 3 years that have passed since Candidate Roosevelt sounded this solemn truism, we in the United States have lived in an unprecedented era of spending. We have been under the thumb of the spendthrift. At no time since March 1933 has our Budget been balanced. Continuously since that time we have piled up huge deficits. If we but take his own warning in the face of this sorry condition, then the country truly is on the road to bankruptcy.

Never before, I repeat, have we seen in this country such utter disregard of sound governmental finance. Never before have we seen so much money spent, such debts accumulated, such deficits piled up.

Already this year, with but a little more than half of the fiscal year gone, the New Deal deficit is more than $2,000,000,000 and about $13,000,000,000 since 1933. The public debt, when Mr. Roosevelt came into office was $20,934,728,350. That was the public debt on February 28, 1933. Under the loose fiscal policies of the New Deal that debt has grown until on December 31—a month ago—it had reached the unprecedented figure, an all-time high, of $30,557,324,062. And instead of the Government living within its income, it was spending approximately $2 for every one taken in.

Now Mr. Roosevelt is himself responsible for the statement that the credit of a nation is good only when that nation is living within its income. He also has been responsible for the statement that at the very top of the credit structure of the country are the obligations of the Federal Government, and that those obligations suffer only to the extent that Government is permitted to be extravagant, wasteful, and ill-managed.

He said further in relation to this, and I quote: "They suffer if the Federal Budget is not balanced, and particularly where the deficit of 1 year is not cleared up in the succeeding year."

Consequently by his own word Federal obligations are suffering because the Budget is not balanced, and certainly the deficits instead of being wiped out from year to year are being added to.

How the Roosevelt administration is spending the taxpayers' money is as important as the amount it is spending. In the few minutes at my disposal I intend to discuss not only how much is being spent but where it is going, and I entertain the conviction that all of you are necessarily and equally interested in this.

To use another platitude of the President, I want to recall to you that he said, and I quote: "Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy."

Every honest, thoughtful citizen approves that statement. But it has not been lived up to by the Roosevelt administration. One of the first acts of the New Deal was to introduce two budgets instead of one, as had been the practice in this country for 150 years. That was the start of a loose fiscal policy. The purpose of two budgets, as I pointed out nearly 3 years ago, was for the distinct and very definite purpose of fooling the people about Federal expenditures, and my statement at that time was most prophetic in the light of present-day facts.

The two budgets simply help to furnish an alibi for New Deal spokesmen, who everywhere are trying to defend the extravagant expenditures of the present administration. They are continually crying out, until unfortunately they have made some people believe it, that it is only the relief burden that is unbalancing the Budget. That is far from the truth. While I know that the enormous and, in all too many instances, wasteful expenditures for relief have been a factor in keeping the Budget unbalanced, do not let them fool you for a moment that it has been the only cause for the increased cost of your Government under President Roosevelt. The fact of the matter is that routine costs of Government have mounted tremendously, and routine costs are wholly aside from expenditures being made as emergency expenditures.

The expenses for conducting ordinary Government in the last year of the Hoover administration amounted to $3,865,000,000, while the expenses in prospect for the fiscal year 1936–37 for the same purpose, and I again emphasize not for emergency purposes, show an increase of a little short of $1,000,000,000, or an increase of 23 percent, under an administration that was pledged to reduce these same expenditures 25 percent.

Now, that is only one side of the picture. The other side which necessarily is a part of that picture, is that while these normal expenditures have constantly increased, revenues also have increased. This means that if President Roosevelt and his New Deal were giving this country even the semblance of efficiency and frugal management there would not be the budgetary problem which in its present form, as Mr. Roosevelt has said himself, leads to bankruptcy.

An additional fact is that the taxpayer's money has been expended in ever-increasing amounts in practically every one of the departments of Government. Current appropriation bills show this. And the answer, to some extent, is that the New Deal has made constant additions to the Government pay roll for the regular departments, in a very palpable effort to build up a tremendous political machine.

According to the Civil Service Commission's report of November 30, 1935, there were 602,230 employees in the regular departments of the Government. When Mr. Roosevelt came into office there were 572,091 in the same regular establishments. Now, this is an increase of 30,139, and, mind you, that increase is in the regular establishment. Now, let us examine the number of New Deal employees added to so-called emergency New Deal agencies. The total number on November 30, 1935, according to the Civil Service Commission, was 197,849, and if you add the 30,139 increase in the regular branches, you find that in less than 3 years of New Deal government there have been added 227,988 employees. Most of these are outside the civil service. They are for the most part political appointments. And these figures of increases that I have given you do not include the military, legislative, or judicial branches or the thousands of part-time employees on the pay roll.

Now, this has been done by a man who pledged himself to uphold 100 percent the platform on which he rose to the Presidency. Need I remind you again that one of the principal planks in that platform was a reduction by 25 percent of the costs of government?

The personnel increase, however, is only one source of increased spending. Another, and by far more reprehensible, waste is involved in the terrific extravagance surrounding silly boondoggling projects, which fail utterly to create jobs anywhere near commensurate with the money frittered away.

A few days ago the President, speaking at Newark, N. J., expressed the hope that we were boondoggling ourselves out of the depression. He ought to be a judge, for his administration has furnished more jazz music for the American people to dance to than any other administration in history. But he seems to have forgotten one important thing, and that is that he who dances must pay the fiddler. You taxpayers will be paying this New Deal fiddler for many years to come. Your children will be paying him and your children's children will be paying him.

I want to give you just a few samples of some of the ways Mr. Roosevelt is spending the taxpayers' money. Some $25,000 has been allocated to build a dog pound, to be equipped with shower baths, to take care of stray dogs in Memphis, Tenn. Among the drama projects—and there are many—there has been set aside

$330,000 to equip and send out over the country a New Deal theatrical troupe, probably to furnish amusement for relief workers on useless W. P. A. projects.

There is such a multitude of these boondoggling projects of the more fantastic varieties that it is difficult to pick out the most fantastic among them.

I am inclined to believe that when President Roosevelt said at Newark on January 18 last—and I quote him—"If we can boondoggle ourselves out of this depression, that word is going to be enshrined in the hearts of the American people for years to come", he was both apologetic and at the same time expressing a forlorn hope. The haphazard way in which relief funds have been used on hundreds of these ludicrous schemes spells waste and rank extravagances which the Roosevelt administration never will be able to live down.

There was another note of apology in the President's Newark speech, and it requires no exaggeration to interpret in this note a desire of the President to shift responsibility. It is obvious, of course, why the President wishes to do this. It was the second time he somewhat plaintively sought to say, "Someone else, not I, is responsible for these wasteful projects." Mr. Roosevelt cannot escape responsibility. He has had to approve these projects before W. P. A. money was made available for them. It was his power; he insisted on having it; he exercised it. The burden is on his doorstep.

To sum it all up—the taxpayer's money is today being spent with unparalleled prodigality in every department of the Government. And notwitstanding the billions we have wasted, Mr. Hopkins says we still have a peak load on relief. That tells the real story of the success of the administration in boondoggling, regimentation, raking leaves, and pump priming. In fact, we have tried everything under the "trial and error" rule of this administration except the American way of working, saving, and paying our honest debts.

The present regime is not only abhorrent to the average citizen but it is destructive of that thrift, energy, and spirit that made America what it is today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WARREN, for 1 day, on account of official business.

To Mr. CROWE, for today, on account of important business.

To Mr. DARDEN, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. GRAY of Indiana, for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. HIGGINS of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. PLUMLEY), indefinitely, on account of serious illness in family.

To Mr. PARSONS, for an indefinite period, on account of attending a funeral.

SUPREME COURT VS. NEW DEAL DICTATORSHIP

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, including a radio address delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co. network Saturday evening, February 1, 1936:

Before discussing the subject of my remarks this evening I propose to digress for a few minutes to make certain observations.

The other night Senator ROBINSON, in his attack and attempt to smear Governor Smith, which, after all, is a Democratic dog fight, nevertheless failed to answer the specific charges that the various planks of the Democratic platform had been violated and repudiated by the New Deal administration.

We Republicans are perfectly willing to let the Democrats call each other pet names, and even invent a few for the edification and entertainment of the public. It is the old story of the pot calling the kettle black. It is not, however, my fight, but it must be obvious to all the onlookers on the side lines that the New Dealers cannot take criticism from either Republicans or Democrats. The feathers are still flying where the shot hit, and it is beginning to look as though Al Smith's hot shot was only the first of a barrage of feather-producing shots from Jeffersonian Democrats. Al Smith, John W. Davis, former Governor Ritchie, former Governor Ely, Bainbridge Colby, Lewis Douglas, former Senator Jim Reed, William R. Hearst, Governor Talmadge, and a host of other Democrats are scattering hot shots, pot shots, and buckshots liberally into the New Deal vulture and filling the sky with clouds of feathers. We Republicans have no objection to the softening up process, as it makes it easier for us to land the knockout wallop next November.

My good friend JOE ROBINSON referred to me in his speech as being alarmed about the Communists. I am not in the least alarmed. All I suggest is that alien Communists or alien Fascists or Nazis, or even alien conservatives who do not like our laws and institutions, and who teach class hatred and spread poison against our form of government, should be deported back home and their jobs given to loyal American citizens walking the streets who believe in our American institutions. I suggest to my good friend JOE ROBINSON that if his party would throw out the host of young radicals, Socialists, and near Communists, never before affiliated or identified with the Democratic Party, who are now shaping its policies, and give their jobs to loyal Jeffersonian Democrats, that the split in the Democratic ranks might be patched up before the New Deal loses all of its feathers.

I am sorry that the great speech of Senator BORAH pitched on a high constitutional level and calling for a living platform in the interest of the American people was not broadcast on a coast-to-coast network. He is a great American and a standpatter for the Constitution, the powers of the Supreme Court, preservation of the home market for our wage earners against competition of the pauperized labor of Japan and Europe, and for Americanism against internationalism. He will speak over a coast-to-coast network from 10 to 10:30, eastern standard time, on Washington's Birthday, Saturday evening, February 22, and I hope all those who believe in the fundamental principles of our Government and the restoration of constitutional and representative government in opposition to political and economic dictatorship and the reestablishment of a government by law instead of Executive orders will listen in and arrange BORAH dinners and meetings for that purpose.

A Borah-for-President national committee will open officially next Monday at the Hotel Willard at Washington, D. C., under the direction of Hon. Carl G. Bachmann, a former Republican whip of the House of Representatives, and all Borah clubs and supporters should communicate directly with him there. I am for Senator BORAH because I believe he has the greatest appeal to the mass of voters. I appreciate he is not popular with the big interests and the reactionary politicians. If he has the support of the rank and file, he should be nominated, as that is the surest way to win; otherwise I am for the strongest candidate that is developed—preferably from the West, and with a liberal record.

As a comprehensive five-point, or quintuple, Republican program after all the New Deal feathers have been plucked, I suggest the following platform, upon which all conservatives and liberal Republicans can unite:

1. Repeal of Franklin "Deficit" Roosevelt.

2. Liquidation of the "brain trust" termites—Rexford Guy Tugwell, Felix Frankfurter, the Corcorans, and the Cohens—and of class hatred and state socialism.

3. Liquidation and repeal of all unsound, un-American, socialistic, and unconstitutional New Deal acts that have destroyed confidence and prolonged the depression.

4. The restoration of the powers usurped from the Congress and the States and the reestablishment of a government by law, in place of economic and political dictatorship through Executive orders. The preservation of the powers of the Supreme Court and of the Constitution against usurpation or nullification by both the Congress and the President.

5. The enactment of sound workable and constitutional agricultural legislation for the benefit of the farmers of the South and of the West and the restoration of the vanishing foreign markets and a price parity, or an equilibrium between the products of the farms and the protected industries of the North and East.

The Constitution of the United States in spite of what the Communists, Socialists, radicals, and a growing number of New Dealers tell the American people—that it is a scrap of paper for the benefit of special privilege, wealth and private property—is the greatest charter of human liberty ever devised by the mind of man. It is what makes for the rights and liberties of the American people and of popular government. It is the safeguard of our free institutions and representative and constitutional form of government, as opposed to the autocracies and dictatorships of the Old World. It is the bulwark against dictatorships of the left and of the right, communism and socialism on one side and of fascism and Hitlerism on the other.

The Supreme Court of the United States stands like a rock against political and economic dictatorship, while a supine and subservient Congress is surrendering, under the whip and spur of party patronage and upon the arrogant demands of President Roosevelt, its legislative powers and functions. It has not been the servile and partisan Congress that has withstood the encroachments and usurpations of the Chief Executive upon its constitutional powers, which it has delegated away in a cowardly manner, but the Supreme Court that has boldly declared that such delegation of power as in the N. R. A. case was in violation of the letter and spirit of the Constitution. More recently the Supreme Court held that the Federal Government—that is, both the Congress and the President—had usurped the powers of the States in the triple A. Every writer on government for a hundred years or more has pointed out that when the executive powers are combined with the legislative powers you have tyranny. A rose by any other name smells as sweet, and a dictatorship by any other name smells as rotten.

Thank God for the Supreme Court of the United States, which, without fear or favor, continues to uphold our representative and constitutional form of government in spite of the efforts of the New Deal termites like Rexford Guy Tugwell and the other members of the "brain trust", who seek to undermine our American system and the Constitution itself.

Al Smith was right when he called the Constitution the civil bible of America, protecting the rights of the minority—racial and religious—and upholding the rights and liberties of large groups of American citizens who are vitally interested in the preservation of constitutional government.

I am not one of those who believes that the Constitution must not be amended in an orderly manner and in accordance with

the methods prescribed, by a two-thirds vote of Congress and three-fourths vote of the legislatures of the various States. Personally, I am inclined to believe that the less tampering we do with the Constitution and with the powers of the Supreme Court the beter it will be for the American people. I am opposed to curbing the powers of the Supreme Court to pass on acts of Congress and so is the Republican Party. We will welcome a clear-cut fight with the New Dealers on this issue.

I am strongly opposed to any and all the proposals suggested to destroy the power of the Supreme Court to hold acts of Congress unconstitutional. The general plan suggested is to give Congress a free hand to control wages, industry, and farming through national planning or economy without regard to the rights of the States or the limitations provided in the Constitution.

If such an amendment were adopted, and God forbid, we would be launched into fascism, Hitlerism, and sovietism over night. It would mean the creation of a gigantic and crushing bureaucracy at Washington which would attempt to regiment and control every human activity. It would mean the destruction of our free institutions, State and local governments, and the establishment of collectivism and State socialism on a stupendous scale. Our experience with the N. R. A. should be a sufficient lesson as to what to expect.

The improvement of business conditions dates from the decision of the Supreme Court holding the N. R. A. unconstitutional and doing away with the mass of bureaucratic edicts and restrictions and resulting confusion that the attempt to control seven or eight hundred different businesses from Washington created. The fact is that the N. R. A. had failed and collapsed of its own weight before the Supreme Court decision. It is physically impossible to control hundreds of industries through bureaucracies at Washington without confusion, graft, and inefficiency. No one denies that some provisions of the N. R. A. were good and praiseworthy, such as doing away with sweatshop hours and wages and child labor in certain industries. The President loves to harp on the child-labor provision of the N. R. A., but the fact is that most of the Northern and Eastern industrial States had child-labor laws long before N. R. A. and the dozen States without such laws are practically all Southern Democratic States. Let the President use his influence with these States and stop his child-labor political propaganda in order to curry favor for the unconstitutional N. R. A. and thereby befog the issue.

A large part of the New Deal legislation was obviously in defiance of the provisions of the Constitution and usurped the powers of the Congress and of the States. It was nothing more or less than government by nullification, which that fearless old Democratic President, Andrew Jackson, in whose memory the New Dealers recently held a Belshazzar's feast at Washington, pronounced to be treason. As one after the other of the New Deal nullification measures are held unconstitutional these "brain trusters" and New Deal termites are more than ever determined to undermine and destroy the Constitution and particularly the power of the Supreme Court. We Republicans are prepared to accept the challenge and say "Lay on Macduff; and damn'd be him that first cries, 'Hold, enough!' "

The New Dealers, since the two great props of their new social and economic order, the N. R. A. and A. A. A., have gone the way of all other nullification measures, are floundering around uncertain how to proceed, and afraid to inject a direct constitutional amendment empowering Congress to regulate and control wages, hours, industry, and agriculture without constitutional restrictions. After a few more decisions by the Supreme Court, such as holding the Guffey coal bill, the potato amendment, and the Bankhead cotton bill unconstitutional, the logic of events and the desperation of the New Dealers in seeing the entire unconstitutional fabric of their experiments crumble away and disappear, will force them to advocate a constitutional amendment providing for economic or national planning. It will be highly interesting and politically diverting to witness the trials and tribulations of the dyed-in-the-wool Democrats of the South try to side-step this death blow to State rights.

We Republicans, however, will not retreat from any attack directed against the Supreme Court or any attempt to undermine its influence or curb its powers. We propose to uphold and defend both the Constitution and the Supreme Court and to preserve for ourselves and for generations of free unborn American citizens the rights and liberties guaranteed in the Constitution and the blessings of orderly representative and constitutional government. We do not deny the right of any individual or party to propose a change in the Constitution, but we will fight in every way within our power the New Deal efforts to undermine and destroy the power of the Supreme Court to hold acts of Congress invalid when in violation of the provisions of the Constitution. If this power of the Supreme Court is destroyed, the Congress might legislate the President out of office and establish a dictatorship of their own.

The "horse and buggy" days are preferable to the plain buggy days of bureaucracy, regimentation, collectivism, and squandermania. The American people have a right to change or alter their form of government, but let us not throw overboard the experience, wisdom, and safeguards of the past, under which we have become the greatest, richest, and most powerful nation in the world, with the freest people and the highest standards of wages and of living. Let us steadfastly refuse to import foreign principles of government to undermine our American system in order to erect a gigantic dictatorship at Washington based on some imported form of either nazi-ism or communism.

Thank you and good night.

THE FRAZIER-LEMKE FARM-MORTGAGE REFINANCING BILL

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech that I made over the radio last Friday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address which I delivered at Washington, D. C., over the National Broadcasting Co. network during the program "Congress Speaks" Friday, January 31, 1936.

The recent action of the Supreme Court in holding the Agricultural Adjustment Act to be unconstitutional has put the farm problem squarely up to the Congress. It remains to be seen whether the majority in Congress are willing now to assume their constitutional duty and responsibility as lawmakers and to report out and enact farm legislation of their own making, or whether they will follow their usual custom of doing nothing on their own account and content themselves with merely rubber stamping whatever new farm bill the President and his Secretary of Agriculture may choose to send them as a substitute for the invalidated Triple A.

The history of the Democratic majority in Congress from the day of President Roosevelt's inauguration down to the present moment would seem to indicate that they will probably do the latter. From the opening day of the Seventy-third Congress in March 1933 this overwhelming 3-to-1 administration majority in Congress has refused altogether to legislate on any subject. They have delegated their effective power to make law to a small group of men not in the legislative department but in the executive department who, under the Constitution, have no authority whatever to make law.

The A. A. A., for example, was made by Wallace, Tugwell, and a group of ex-college professors in the Agriculture Department, whose names would be quite unfamiliar to most of those who are listening to me. The majority in Congress had nothing to do with the making of it, and the minority was not even permitted to try to make a good bill out of it by amendment. The minority also sought to offer a complete farm program of its own as a substitute for the A. A. A. This offer was rejected by a straight party vote, and the minority was told it could take the Triple A just as the professors wrote it, or nothing.

Now that the Supreme Court has thrown out the work of the professors, and the administration has openly admitted that it has nothing to offer in its place except a substitute bill which was written by the same professors and which has for its purpose the doing of precisely that which the Court has emphatically said cannot be done without a constitutional amendment, the minority in Congress today is trying very desperately again to secure consideration for its own farm program, a program for which it has been fighting in Congress for 3 years and the enactment of which—let make it perfectly plain—has been prevented to date solely through what we believe to be the unwarranted opposition and interference of the President and his Secretary of Agriculture in a matter which is the exclusive business of the Congress.

I think every farmer is familiar with the minority's farm program in Congress. The program consists of three major bills—the Frazier-Lemke farm-mortgage-refinancing bill, the cost of production bill, and the export-debenture bill. Almost every farm leader who is recognized by the farmers themselves as an authority has endorsed this program * * * Nearly every unit of the two great national farm organizations—the Grange and the Farmers' Union—has endorsed it. A majority of the States of the Union through formal resolutions of their State legislatures have repeatedly memorialized Congress to enact at least a part of this program at once. Thirty-three State legislatures, for example, have petitioned the Congress to enact the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill, which is the keystone in the arch of this program. The Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives has favorably reported this bill.

More than a majority of the entire membership of the House have attached their names to a discharge petition demanding a vote on this bill. And yet, with all of this support and demand for a real effective and constitutional farm program the majority leaders of the House, who dictate the making of the rules of that body and who are themselves controlled entirely by the dictates of the Chief Executive in this regard have succeeded to date in preventing a vote either on the Frazier-Lemke bill or on any other part of the farm program of the Congress. They have done this through the control of the Rules Committee, which is the political committee of the House, and without whose permission no vote can be taken on any bill except on a petition signed by a majority of the whole membership of the House. Many more than a majority, which is 218, have at different times signed the petition to force a vote on the Frazier-Lemke bill. But we have never been able to get 218 signatures on the petition at any one time, because whenever we approached the 218 mark the Democratic leaders have persuaded a few of their brethren to withdraw their names. We have 211 signatures on the discharge petition today and require only seven more to compel a vote on the Frazier-Lemke bill.

I am addressing myself here particularly to the farmers who are supporting this legislation and who are interested in knowing why

the Frazier-Lemke bill has not been voted upon and who has been responsible for preventing the vote on it. So far as these farmers are concerned, I know it is not necessary for me to discuss the provisions either of the Frazier-Lemke bill or any other part of the farm program I have referred to. For the benefit of others, however, who may not be so familiar with it, I want to take the remaining time to comment very briefly on just one of the three bills making up this legislative program.

Of these three bills the Frazier-Lemke bill is, of course, the most immediately necessary and the one which has the best chance of passage at the present session, in spite of the opposition of the President. The bill embraces a comprehensive, carefully worked out national plan for permanently lifting the farmer out of his present state of insolvency through the refinancing of the impossible mortgage load which agriculture, as a national industry, is now carrying. It undertakes to refinance all farm mortgages at a rate of 1½ percent a year to be applied on the interest and 1½ percent a year to be applied on the principal, the whole loan to be amortized over a period of 47 years. As security for these loans the Government takes the farm mortgages themselves. Upon these mortgages farm-loan bonds are issued, which are held by the Treasury as the basis and security for a new issue of Government notes with which the refinancing is done. The amount required will be $3,000,000,000. The provisions of the bill for annual repayment of principal and interest are such that a greater amount than three billion will not be outstanding at any one time, the money received by the Treasury annually from installments of principal and interest being reloaned until the refinancing of all farm mortgages is completed. It is generally conceded that under this plan the farmer can and will repay his loan.

It is conceded also that the Government will not only not lose money in this refinancing, but that it will actually return a profit to the Government. It is conceded further by most financial experts that this refinancing plan is not inflationary, as some of its opponents contended when the bill was first introduced. And finally it is conceded, and this is important, that the Frazier-Lemke bill is entirely constitutional.

The problem of farm-mortgage refinancing is no longer a matter which concerns only the farmer. It has become a national necessity. One-third of our entire population is engaged in agriculture. For years they have been without buying power and the little buying power they have now is steadily decreasing. With one-third of our population deprived of the ability to purchase the goods and services of the rest of the population, it is admitted by nearly everyone now that the rest of the population cannot prosper, and that unless agriculture can be given a new lease upon life, not only will the future of the farmer be a hopeless one, but that the future of every other industry will likewise be hopeless.

The people of the United States have very emphatically demanded that this condition be remedied and the majority of the people of this country, as well as a majority of the Members of Congress, believe that the Frazier-Lemke bill and its companion legislation is the proper method of solving the problem. With all of this support, therefore, we think there is ground for believing that we shall prevail at the present session in spite of the opposition of this administration.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3398. An act to establish the Air Corps Technical School and to acquire certain land in the State of Colorado for use as a site for said Air Corps Technical School and as an aerial gunnery and bombing range for the Army Air Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution to correct errors in the enrollment of Private Act No. 349, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 29, 1935, and to clarify the duties of the Comptroller General in connection with said act; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to the early settlers whose land grants embrace the site of the Federal City.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 4, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

645. A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1935; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

646. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting a report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1935; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

647. A letter from the treasurer of the Washington Rapid Transit Co., transmitting a copy of the balance sheet of the Washington Rapid Transit Co. as of December 31, 1935; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

648. A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1935; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

649. A letter from the president of the Georgetown Gaslight Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Georgetown Gaslight Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1935; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KING: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9999. A bill to authorize an exchange of land between the Waianae Co. and the Navy Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. House Resolution 407. Resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Navy for information concerning the failure of the Marine Band to fulfill its engagement to render a musical program at a meeting of the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense (Rept. No. 1931). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 10835) to promote the conservation and profitable use of agricultural land resources by temporary Federal aid to farmers and by providing for a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATTON: A bill (H. R. 10836) to authorize the preparation of a comprehensive plan for controlling the floods, regulating the flow of waters, land reclamation, and conserving water for beneficial uses, in the basins of the Sabine and Neches Rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 10837) to provide for the sale of certain land in Crow Wing County, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 10838) to provide for the issuance of permanent contracts to all contractors and subcontractors on star routes, compensation thereon, establishing a preferred list covering former contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAMSAY: A bill (H. R. 10839) to regulate the jurisdiction of the inferior Federal courts of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM: A bill (H. R. 10840) to convey certain lands and buildings to Capital Post, No. 4, the Amer-

ican Legion, Carson City, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TONRY: A bill (H. R. 10841) to provide for giving preference to citizens in the employment of labor on projects financed wholly or in part with Federal funds; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 10842) to amend section 21 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 10843) to amend paragraph A, section 51 (Title I–Income Tax) of the Revenue Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 10844) to recognize civilian service during period of construction of the Panama Canal in determining rights of officers of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 10845) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate steam engineering in the District of Columbia", approved February 28, 1887, as amended March 4, 1925, and to provide for the licensing of firemen operating steam boilers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 10846) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and enter judgment upon the claims of contractors for excess costs incurred while constructing navigation dams and locks on the Mississippi River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McSWAIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 10847) to authorize the acquisition of land for cemeterial purposes in the vicinity of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 10848) to amend the act approved February 7, 1913, so as to remove restrictions as to the use of the Little Rock Confederate Cemetery, Ark., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 10849) to authorize an appropriation for improvement of ammunition storage facilities at Aliamanu, Territory of Hawaii, and Edgewood Arsenal, Md.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEENEY: A bill (H. R. 10850) to extend the provisions of the 40-hour law for postal employees to watchmen and messengers in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 10851) to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in west Texas; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10852) to repeal the Cotton Act (Public, No. 169, 73d Cong.); to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10853) to repeal the Potato Control Act, section 61 and section 62 and title II of Public Act No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 10854) to repeal the Kerr Tobacco Act, the Bankhead Cotton Act of 1934, and the Potato Act of 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER: Resolution (H. Res. 408) creating a select committee to investigate the distillers, brewers, and rectifiers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McGRATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 479) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to conduct surveys and investigations to determine the most feasible right-of-way for a coast-defense highway between the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., and the Presidio of Monterey, Calif.; to construct and maintain an adequate national defense highway thereon, and to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 therefor; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SCOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 480) authorizing the Navy Department to appoint a board to conduct an investigation of Puget Sound, Columbia River, San Francisco Bay, Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor, and San Diego Bay for air and naval bases; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging the continuation of the Works Progress Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing Congress to enact constructive farm legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: A bill (H. R. 10855) for the relief of Eberhart Steel Products Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 10856) for the relief of William Weisbrod; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CROWE: A bill (H. R. 10857) granting a pension to Harry Dubs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ECKERT: A bill (H. R. 10858) for the relief of George Lehere; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FENERTY: A bill (H. R. 10859) for the relief of Francis Boyd Brann; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10860) for the relief of John Sweeney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10861) for the relief of Eugene F. Clements; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10862) for the relief of Patrick Michael Dougherty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 10863) granting an increase of pension to Agnes E. Silvernail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10864) granting an increase of pension to Mabel A. LaForge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10865) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10866) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Van Rensselaer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10867) granting an increase of pension to Ellen V. Gillson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10868) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide L. Rapelye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10869) granting an increase of pension to Clara A. Dekay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10870) granting an increase of pension to Anna N. Osterhout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10871) granting an increase of pension to Emma Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10872) granting an increase of pension to Minerva C. Bedford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10873) to authorize the award of a decoration for distinguished service, namely, the Congressional Medal of Honor, to Acors Rathbun Thompson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 10874) for the relief of Joseph Patrick Gorman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: A bill (H. R. 10875) for the relief of Lamborn & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10876) for the relief of Adele Fowlkes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 10877) for the relief of Edward James McCarten; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 10878) for the relief of C. O. Crosby; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10879) for the relief of J. Drayton Grimke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 10880) for the relief of Charles R. Mann; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 10881) for the relief of Henry V. Pattin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10882) granting a pension to Katherine L. Frost; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10883) granting a pension to Margaret Haskin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10884) granting a pension to Elise M. Lum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10885) granting a pension to Lu M. Linscott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10886) granting a pension to Lura P. Markley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10887) granting a pension to Ida Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10888) granting a pension to Olivia Stebbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10889) granting a pension to Clara L. Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10890) granting a pension to Daisy Vredenburgh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10891) granting a pension to Della Bond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10892) granting a pension to Irene C. Flack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 10893) to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act approved September 7, 1916, as amended, to Merton Terence Cross; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 10894) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10895) granting a pension to Margaret Malinda Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 10896) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Coons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10897) granting an increase of pension to Emma I. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLGREN: A bill (H. R. 10898) for the relief of Benjamin F. Vader; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10899) for the relief of O. J. Refsnes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 10900) for the relief of John Meirose; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 10901) granting an increase of pension to Eliza James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9903. By Mr. FISH: Petition signed by 28 citizens of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of New York State, petitioning Congress to enact legislation at this session that will indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9904. By Mr. GRAY of Pennsivania: Petition of voters of Indiana County, Pa., desiring to have a dry District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9905. Also, petition of residents and voters of Ford City, Pa., believing that our Nation's Capital should have laws affording better control of liquor traffic, and believing that the Guyer bill (H. R. 8739) would further this end; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9906. By Mr. HAINES: Petition of citizens served by star route no. 10536 in Franklin County, Pa., urging enactment of legislation at this session that will indefinitely extend all star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9907. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of L. W. Murphy and 22 others of Sublette, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9908. Also, petition of C. S. Sigler and 19 others, of Norwich, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9909. Also, petition of Ed. E. Gahnstrom and nine others, of Geneseo, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9910. Also, petition of Nellie Lane and 59 others, of Bazine, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9911. Also, petition of Vern Grass and 41 others, of Minneola, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9912. Also, petition of W. E. Hinkle and 53 others, of Cimarron, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9913. Also, petition of H. S. Meyer and 49 others, of Brownell, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9914. Also, petition of L. E. Dent and 31 others, of Harper County, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9915. Also, petition of Lew Burch and seven others of Selkirk, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9916. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. U. S. Davis and 126 other signers from Morrill, Kans., favoring passage of the Guyer Act, regarding liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9917. Also, petition of Kelma Kapitan and 130 other signers from Blue Rapids, Kans., favoring passage of the Guyer Act, regarding liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9918. Also, petition of S. H. Pitcher and 105 other signers from Topeka, Kans., favoring passage of the Guyer Act, regarding liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9919. Also, petition of Elizabeth M. Jones and 75 other signers from Reserve, Kans., favoring passage of the Guyer Act, regarding liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9920. Also, petition of O. A. Opseth and 65 other signers from Everest, Kans., favoring passage of the Guyer Act, regarding liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9921. Also, petition of Rev. M. H. Eells and 100 other signers from Topeka, Kans., favoring passage of the Guyer Act, regarding liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9922. Also, petition of Bertha Q. Summer and 70 other signers from Mahaska, Kans., favoring passage of the Guyer Act, regarding liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9923. Also, petition of Mrs. O. A. Opseth and 59 other signers from Everest, Kans., favoring the passage of the

Capper bill, prohibiting all advertisement of alcohol beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9924. Also, petition of Mrs. A. Frank Johnson and 68 other signers from Leavenworth, Kans., favoring passage of the Guyer Act, regarding liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9925. By Mr. MONAGHAN: Petition requesting that the star-route bidding system be abolished, and that a permanent tenure of service should be instituted with fair and reasonable pay based upon that of other forms of United States mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9926. Also, petition requesting that the star-route bidding system be abolished, and that a permanent tenure of service should be instituted with fair and reasonable pay based upon that of other forms of United States mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9927. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Brooklyn (Kings County) Council Auxiliaries to Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Kerr bill H. R. 8163; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

9928. Also, petition of the State Planning Council, Albany, N. Y., urging the creation of a permanent national planning agency to carry forward the work started under the present temporary national resources committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9929. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of citizens on star route 7210, from Lewis, N. Y., relative to House bill 10756; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9930. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Clifton, Colo., requesting passage of House bill 8739, providing for prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9931. Also, petition of citizens of Crawford, Colo., requesting passage of House bill 8739, providing for prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9932. Also, petitions of citizens of Cedaredge, Colo., requesting the passage of House bill 8739, providing for prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9933. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of Trenton, N. J.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9934. Also, petition of R. L. Grimsley and others; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9935. Also, petition of the League for American Neutrality, New Haven, Conn.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9936. Also, petition of Jesse C. Duke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1936

(Legislative day of Thursday, Jan. 16, 1936)

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, February 3, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is unable to be present today on account of illness. It is desired, if practicable, that he participate in the proceedings on the bill which constitutes the unfinished business. I shall therefore submit a request for unanimous consent, and I ask the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY].

I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar, and that at the conclusion of that order the Senate take a recess until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I am in accord with the proposal made by the Senator from Arkansas. I think the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] should be here for the first presentation of the unfinished business, as he is the author of the bill and submitted the report thereon. I desire to follow him briefly in opposition to the measure. I am glad to accede to the request of the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

Mr. ROBINSON. I should like to add to what I have already stated that, in the event the Senator from Alabama should not be able to be present on Thursday, I may desire to proceed then with the consideration of the bill. I think that information is due the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MCNARY. I thank the Senator from Arkansas, and I shall cooperate along that line.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] are necessarily detained, and that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is absent on account of illness.

I wish further to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH] was absent yesterday and is absent today because of illness in his family.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] is necessarily absent.

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

REFUND OF CERTAIN COUNTERVAILING CUSTOMS DUTIES—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 170)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred, with the accompanying bill, to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1626, entitled "An act for the refunding of certain countervailing customs duties collected upon logs imported from British Columbia."

The bill provides for the refund of certain customs duties assessed or collected on importations of logs of a kind classi-