school buildings and equipment to be available for Indian children; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12610) for the relief of war veterans who were disabled as the result of the Florida hurricane at Windly Island and Matecumbe Keys September 2, 1935, their widows, children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO: A bill (H. R. 12611) to provide for the granting of sovereignty to the island of Puerto Rico and to provide for neighborly relations with the proposed government of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DUFFY of New York: A bill (H. R. 12612) to supplement the act of June 25, 1929 (ch. 41, 46 Stat. L., 41), which authorized and directed the Attorney General to institute suit against the Northern Pacific Railway Co. and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: A bill (H. R. 12613) to provide for the extension of star-route contracts and authorizing the Postmaster General to grant additional compensation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Resolution (H. Res. 504) requesting the Secretary of State to transmit to the House of Representatives certain information relating to the protection of the American Legation at Addis Ababa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EKWALL: A bill (H. R. 12614) for the relief of M. Seller & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAVAGAN: A bill (H. R. 12615) for the relief of Arthur J. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 12616) for the relief of Luther E. Bozman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12617) for the relief of Guido Guidi; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGEHEE: A bill (H. R. 12618) for the relief of F. L. Applewhite, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 12619) for the relief of Mrs. Foneti Petrakos, executrix of the estate of Tom H. Petrakos; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 12620) for the relief of Jerome H. Howard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 12621) for the relief of G. A. Trotter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by departmental request), a bill (H. R. 12622) for the relief of Dr. Harold W. Foght; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 12623) for the relief of John M. Brant Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10839. By Mr. KING: Petition of the Honolulu Chapter of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10840. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Marion Richardson, secretary, Northern Circle Child Conservation League, of Columbus, Ohio, urging early hearings on motion-picture bills now in Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10841. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Bookkeepers, Stenographers, and Accountants' Union, New York City, approving the Walsh-Healey bill; to the Committee on Labor.

10842. Also, petition of the Gleason-Tiebout Glass Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Patman-Robinson anti-chain-store bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10843. By Mr. POWERS: Petition of Mrs. L. W. Ancker and others, relative to House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10844. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of the Board of County Commissioners of Cuyahoga County, requesting endorsement of House bill 12243; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10845. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Bayshore Shellfisheries Association, of Highlands, N. J., urging the President of the United States to authorize the appropriation of sufficient funds to defray the cost of relocating the Fort Hancock sewage outlet from Sandy Hook Bay to the Atlantic Ocean, as the present situation may pollute the bay waters and result in preventing the marketing of shellfish taken from the waters of Sandy Hook Bay; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1936

(Legislative day of Friday, Apr. 24, 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, May 4, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 158. An act authorizing the President to present a medal in the name of Congress to Johannes F. Jensen;

S. 427. An act authorizing the reimbursement of Edward B. Wheeler and the State Investment Co. for the loss of certain lands in the Mora grant, New Mexico;

S. 1494. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims", approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 555);

S. 2040. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, and acts in amendment thereof;

S. 2517. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Walter M. Graesser, a lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, retired;

S. 2611. An act to authorize the Utah Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association to construct and maintain a monument on the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Salt Lake City, Utah;

S. 2849. An act to provide for cooperation with Wellpinit School District No. 49, Stevens County, Wash., for the construction of a public-school building to be available for Indian children of the Spokane Reservation;

S. 3241. An act authorizing adjustment of the claims of F. L. Forbes, John L. Abbot, and the Ralph Sollitt & Sons Construction Co.;

S. 3372. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school district at Hays, Mont., for construction and improvement of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children;

S. 3460. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the persons entitled to compensation on account of private claim 111, parcel 1, Nambe Pueblo grant;

S. 3516. An act for the relief of Alice D. Hollis;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

S. 3544. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Texas Pacific-Missouri Pacific Terminal Railroad of New Orleans;

S. 3581. An act for the relief of Henry Thornton Meriwether;

S. 3687. An act to validate payments, and to relieve the accounts of disbursing officers of the Army on account of payments made to Reserve officers on active duty for rental alowances;

S. 3688. An act to validate payments, and to relieve disbursing officers' accounts of payments made to Reserve officers promoted while on active duty;

S. 3737. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire by donation land at or near Newburgh, in Orange County, N. Y., for aviation field, military, or other public purposes;

S. 3747. An act for the relief of Maizee Hamley;

S. 3748. An act to authorize the Bureau of Mines to conduct certain studies, investigations, and experiments with respect to sub-bituminous and lignite coal, and for other purposes;

S. 3769. An act for the relief of Marcellus E. Wright and Lee, Smith & Vandervoort, Inc.;

S. 3797. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing certain tribes of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes", approved May 26, 1920;

S. 3859. An act to authorize the procurement, without advertising, of certain War Department property, and for other purposes;

S. 3932. An act for the relief of Ann Rakestraw;

S. 3950. An act to aid in defraying the expenses of the Sixteenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1937;

S. 3977. An act to authorize the Washington Gas Light Co. to alter its corporate structure, and for other purposes;

S. 4135. An act for the relief of Helen Curtis;

S. 4214. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Sabine and Neches Rivers with a view to controlling their floods and regulating, conserving, and utilizing the waters thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 4416. An act for the relief of Josephine Russell; and

S. 4447. An act for the relief of J. L. Summers.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1827. An act for the relief of Lucille McClure;

S. 1975. An act to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy, officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps, and officers and enlisted men of the United States Army to accept such medals, orders, diplomas, decorations, and photographs as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered;

S. 3645. An act for the relief of Dampskib Aktieselshap Roskva;

S. 4395. An act for the relief of the State of New Jersey; and

S. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution to provide for participation by the United States in an inter-American conference to be held at Buenos Aires, Argentina, or at the capital of another American republic in 1936.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1075. An act for the relief of Louis H. Cordis;

S. 1379. An act to amend section 103 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the Canal Zone and section 542 of the Code of Civil Procedure for the Canal Zone;

S. 3685. An act for the relief of George Rabcinski;

S. 3789. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the city of Charleston, S. C.; and

S. 3839. An act granting a pension to Randall Krauss.

The message also announced that Mr. TABER had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11418) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, vice Mr. Buckbee, deceased.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 381) for the relief of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11035) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate nos. 4, 9, 20, 25, 29, 35, 42, and 45 to the said bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12098) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 9 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 58 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 190. An act granting authority to the Secretary of War to license the use of a certain parcel of land situated in Fort Brady Reservation to Ira D. MacLachlan Post, No. 3, the American Legion, for 15 years;

H. R. 397. An act for the relief of Robert Coates;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Matt E. Saylor;

H. R. 1397. An act to withdraw certain public lands from settlement and entry;

H. R. 1739. An act for the relief of Frank Gedney;

H. R. 2121. An act for the relief of Jane Murrah;

H. R. 5743. An act for the relief of Robert D. Doherty;

H. R. 5752. An act for the relief of May Wynne Lamb;

H. R. 6404. An act for the relief of D. B. Carter;

H. R. 6920. An act for the relief of Ella Goodwin;

H. R. 7363. An act for the relief of F. E. Hall;

H. R. 7642. An act for the relief of Katherine Trick;

H. R. 7764. An act to relieve restricted Indians whose lands have been taxed or have been lost by failure to pay taxes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7794. An act for the relief of Newark Concrete Pipe Co.;

H. R. 7825. An act for the relief of Michael Stodolnick;

H. R. 7839. An act for the relief of C. E. Rightor;

H. R. 8050. An act to authorize the acquisition of land for military purposes in San Bernardino and Kern Counties, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 8091. An act for the relief of Fields B. Arthur and Arthur L. Allen, copartners, Colorado Culvert & Flume Co., Glen Haller, Kenneth Austin, A. B. Hoffman, J. W. Jones, and Lloyd Lasswell;

H. R. 8228. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Bouchey;

H. R. 8278. An act for the relief of Earl Elmer Gallatin;

H. R. 8373. An act for the relief of James Fitzgerald;

H. R. 8440. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Achille and Albert Retellatto;

H. R. 8474. An act to provide for the creation of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument on Put in Bay, South Bass Island, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8482. An act for the relief of Jacob G. Ackerman;

H. R. 8502. An act for the relief of Theresa Link, Wencel Link, Edward Block, and John Meyers;

H. R. 8525. An act prescribing regulations for carrying on the business of lighter service from any of the ports of the United States to stationary ships or barges located offshore, and for the purpose of promoting the safety of navigation;

H. R. 8688. An act for the relief of Grace Schultz;

H. R. 8720. An act for the relief of Louis Manzumin;

H. R. 8784. An act to authorize withholding compensation due Government personnel;

H. R. 8884. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ollie Myers;

H. R. 8932. An act for the relief of John S. Hemrick;

H. R. 9042. An act to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Supply Base to the city of Newark, N. J.;

H. R. 9078. An act for the relief of Bertha W. Lamphear;

H. R. 9113. An act to provide for the residence of the United States commissioners appointed for the national parks, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9313. An act for the relief of the estate of Hans Ditmanson, deceased;

H. R. 9314. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry Copple, deceased;

H. R. 9315. An act for the relief of the estate of Fred Wilkins, deceased;

H. R. 9926. An act for the relief of Robert B. Barker;

H. R. 10044. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Fernand H. Gouaux;

H. R. 10101. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1935, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10168. An act for the relief of Arch A. Gary;

H. R. 10174. An act for the relief of Ezra Curtis;

H. R. 10242. An act for the relief of Clarence D. Weisz;

H. R. 10279. An act for the relief of the Pocahontas Fuel Co., Inc.;

H. R. 10435. An act for the relief of Emma Hastings;

H. R. 10439. An act for the relief of John B. Ricketts;

H. R. 10544. An act authorizing the erection of a memorial to those who met their death in the wreck of the dirigible *Shenandoah*;

H. R. 10641. An act to provide for the protection and conservation of equities of rights of the Government resulting from railroad land grants;

H. R. 10849. An act to authorize an appropriation for improvement of ammunition storage facilities at Aliamanu, Territory of Hawaii, and Edgwood Arsenal, Md.;

H. R. 10934. An act to authorize the transfer of the customhouse at Salem, Mass., from the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department to the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 11022. An act for the relief of Ethel Armes;

H. R. 11218. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds now on deposit or later placed to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11379. An act for the relief of William H. Milton;

H. R. 11493. An act for the relief of Perry Randolph;

H. R. 11533. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg;

H. R. 11616. An act to fix the compensation of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

H. R. 11747. An act extending the time for making the report of the commission to study the subject of Hernando De Soto's Expedition;

H. R. 11768. An act authorizing construction, operation, and maintenance of Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriation for that purpose;

H. R. 11791. An act to make available for national-park purposes certain lands within the area of the proposed Mammoth Cave National Park, Ky.;

H. R. 11799. An act to repeal the proviso of the act of May 18, 1928 (ch. 626, 45 Stat. 603), making additions to the Absaroka and Gallatin National Forests and improving and extending the winter-feed facilities of the elk, antelope, and other game animals of Yellowstone National Park and adjacent land, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11915. An act to amend the Coastwise Load Line Act, 1935;

H. R. 11917. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

H. R. 11921. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Blackstone, Seekonk, Moshassuk, and Woonasquatucket Rivers and their tributaries in the State of Rhode Island, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 11926. An act to provide for a term of court at Durham, N. C.;

H. R. 12033. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., certain public lands in California; and granting rights-of-way over public lands and reserve lands to the city of Los Angeles, in Mono County, in the State of California;

H. R. 12073. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in New Mexico as an addition to the school reserve of the Jicarilla Indian Reservation;

H. R. 12074. An act to consolidate the Indian pueblos of Jemez and Pecos, N. Mex.;

H. R. 12076. An act for the exchange of land in Hudson Falls, N. Y., for the purpose of the post-office site;

H. R. 12079. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Poteau River in Arkansas with a view to flood control;

H. R. 12080. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Sulphur River in Arkansas with a view to flood control;

H. R. 12133. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Congree, Watere, Santee, and the Cooper Rivers and their tributaries in the State of South Carolina with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 12135. An act providing for a preliminary examination of the Sandusky River at Fremont, Ohio, with a view to control of its floods;

H. R. 12158. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Patuxent River and its tributaries in the State of Maryland with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 12162. An act to create an additional division of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi to be known as the Hattiesburg division;

H. R. 12183. An act for the relief of Gladys Hinckley Werlich;

H. R. 12212. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain lands in Tuscumbia, Ala.;

H. R. 12220. An act to authorize the adjustment of the boundary of the Fort Marion National Monument, Fla., in the vicinity of Fort Marion Circle, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12222. An act to permit the temporary entry into the United States under certain conditions of alien participants and officials of the Leyden International Bureau attending an international conference to be held in the United States in 1936;

H. R. 12305. An act to define the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard;

H. R. 12370. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of Big Blue River and its tributaries with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 12408. An act for the relief of Robert D. Baldwin;

H. R. 12419. An act to apply laws covering steam vessels to seagoing vessels of 300 gross tons and over propelled by internal-combustion engines;

H. R. 12556. An act to create the Treasury Agency Service, to provide for the more adequate protection of the revenue and a more effective enforcement of the revenue and other laws administered by the Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 415. Joint resolution to carry out the intention of Congress with reference to the claims of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota against the United States;

H. J. Res. 465. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of July 18, 1935, relating to the Seventieth National

Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in the District of Columbia in September 1936;

H. J. Res. 525. Joint resolution to enable the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of participation by the United States in a conference at Brussels to revise the Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works concluded at Bern, September 9, 1886, and revised at Rome, June 2, 1928.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

S. 1432. An act to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, generally known as the War Minerals Relief Statutes;

S. 3842. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the Territorial Government of Wisconsin, and to assist in the celebration of the Wisconsin Centennial during the year of 1936;

S. 4229. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in comemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of Bridgeport, Conn., as a city; and

H. J. Res. 567. A joint resolution to provide an additional appropriation for expenses of special and select committees of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1936.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Copeland	Logan	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Couzens	Lonergan	Reynolds
Austin	Davis	Long	Robinson
Bachman	Dieterich	McAdoo	Russell
Bailey	Donahey	McGill	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Duffy	McKellar	Sheppard
Barkley	Frazier	McNary	Shipstead
Benson	George	Maloney	Steiwer
Black	Glass	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Guffey	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Hale	Moore	Townsend
Burke	Harrison	Murphy	Tydings
Byrd	Hastings	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Johnson	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Carey	Keyes	Overton	White
Connally	King	Pittman	
Coolidge	La Follette	Pope	

Mr. HATCH. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has been called to New Mexico on account of the death of his mother. Necessarily he will be detained from the Senate for several days.

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] are absent because of illness; and that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

FILING OF REPORT 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:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

Under the order of the Senate of the 4th instant, Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee on Appropriations, filed with me, as Secretary of the Senate, on May 6, 1936, the bill (H. R. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, with amendments and an accompanying report (No. 1987).

Very truly yours

EDWIN A. HALSEY, *Secretary.*

VETO MESSAGES RECEIVED FROM THE PRESIDENT 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,
Washington, May 7, 1936.

Hon. JOHN N. GARNER,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On Friday, April 24, 1936, the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the Senate presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bills (S. 713) granting jurisdiction of the Court of Claims to hear the case of David A. Wright, and (S. 929) for the relief of the Southern Products Co., which had passed both Houses of Congress and been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate.

The Senate, at 3:25 p. m. Monday, May 4, 1936, took a recess until 12 noon on Thursday, May 7, 1936.

During the interim the President of the United States sent by messenger two messages addressed to the Senate, each dated May 5, 1936, giving his reasons for not approving, respectively, Senate bill 713 and Senate bill 929. The Senate not being in session on the last day which the President had for the return of these bills under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, in order to protect the interests of the Senate so that it might have the opportunity to reconsider the bills, I accepted the messages, and I now present to you the President's veto messages, with the accompanying papers, for disposition by the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

DAVID A. WRIGHT—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 202)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, Senate bill no. 713, entitled "An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear the case of David A. Wright."

This act provides that the Court of Claims be given jurisdiction to reinstate, reopen, and rehear the case of David A. Wright, of Winona, Mo., against the United States, numbered 261–A in said court, and to readjudicate the same and determine the amount of costs or expenditures, if any, which the said David A. Wright may have expended or incurred in 1918 in the rehabilitation of a manufacturing plant at 1150 Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and in the beginning of production of heavy-duty lathes, to meet the needs, or the then anticipated needs, of the Ordnance Department for any gun-relining or gun-manufacturing project initiated and under way in the Ordnance Department of the United States Army, in reliance in good faith upon any promise or assurance given him by Maj. Charles D. Westcott, Ordnance Department, United States Army, or Howard Abbott, an engineer in the plant section of the production division of the Ordnance Department, that the said David A. Wright would receive a contract, or contracts, for the manufacture of heavy-duty lathes that would absorb such costs or expenditures, notwithstanding such Ordnance Department projects may have been contingent upon the continuance of the war and may have been abandoned because of the signing of the armistice of November 11, 1918.

During the World War David A. Wright undertook negotiations with two representatives of the War Department for

the purpose of entering into contracts for the manufacture of lathes for the United States. He claims that at their request he secured an additional building and enlarged his plant for the purpose of performing the prospective contracts. He later received one contract from the Ordnance Bureau for the manufacture of three lathes at $20,000 each, but the armistice precluded the making of any further contracts with him.

Mr. Wright later brought suit against the United States in the Court of Claims under the so-called Dent Act, which authorized suits to be maintained against the Government on contracts informally executed. In his suit Mr. Wright claimed a sum in excess of $92,000 for moneys expended in enlarging his plant and in preparing for the performance of contracts which he never received. The Court of Claims rendered judgment in favor of the United States, on the ground that the representatives of the War Department with whom he might have dealt, had no authority to contract in behalf of, or to bind, the Government (*Wright* v. *United States*, 60 C. Cls. 519).

The bill under consideration proposes to grant to the Court of Claims jurisdiction to rehear the case and to render judgment in favor of the claimant, if it is of the opinion that the expenditures were incurred by him in good faith in reliance upon the belief that the representatives of the War Department, with whom he dealt, possessed authority to bind the United States, and provided that he was justified in doing so under the circumstances. In other words, this bill proposes to abolish for the purposes of this case, the rule that the Government is not bound by an agreement, unless such agreement was entered into in its behalf by a representative having actual authority to make the contract.

Sufficient reason does not appear to exempt this claimant from the operation of the above-mentioned rule, and I, therefore, do not feel justified in giving my approval to this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 5, 1936*.

SOUTHERN PRODUCTS CO.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 203)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, Senate bill S. 929, entitled "An act for the relief of the Southern Products Co."

This act provides that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Southern Products Co., Dallas, Tex., the sum of $13,051.19 in full settlement of all claims against the Government, for the cost of removal and of the cost of reconditioning 9,097 bales of good, merchantable cotton, from its place of storage in the Bush Terminal Co. warehouse, Brooklyn, N. Y., the damage being caused to the cotton by climatic and other causes during its enforced removal and while it was exposed to the weather after removal from the Bush Terminal warehouse, Brooklyn, N. Y., as result of the commandeering of the entire storage warehouse on January 3, 1918, by the Secretary of War. The settlement amount represents the net cost to the claimant of removal of the cotton.

The claim involved in this bill was carefully considered by the appraisal section of the War Department claims board which functioned as a board of review in such matters and was rejected for the reason that it was not of the character of cases coming within the purview of the so-called Dent Act, which finding was approved by the Secretary of War.

Thereafter the claimant filed suit in the Court of Claims under the said Dent Act and other acts of Congress, and the court held that the case did not fall within any of the acts relied upon by the claimant.

It is apparent that awarding relief in this case would constitute a discrimination which would be unfair to many other potential claimants in similar situation, and would undoubtedly result in the presentation of claims for relief after such a lapse of time as would make it difficult, if not impossible, for the Government to secure adequate evidence in such cases.

For the above reasons I do not feel that I would be justified in giving my approval to this legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 5, 1936*.

A. RANDOLPH HOLLADAY—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 206)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1110, "An act for the relief of A. Randolph Holladay."

This act authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to A. Randolph Holladay the sum of $11,172.15, as a refund on income tax paid by him for the year 1927, which now cannot be refunded because of a closing agreement executed by him under the provisions of section 606, Revenue Act of 1928.

For the past 15 years the several revenue acts have contained provisions authorizing the execution of a closing agreement enabling taxpayers and the Government by voluntary action to set at rest the question of the amount of tax liability for any given taxable year. Under such an agreement neither the Government nor the taxpayer can reopen anew the question of such tax liability except for reasons of fraud, malfeasance, or misrepresentation of a material fact. In this respect, therefore, a taxpayer seeking to obtain relief notwithstanding the execution of a closing agreement, is in a position identical with one who seeks to obtain a refund notwithstanding the expiration of the period of limitations for obtaining such refunds. The taxpayer in the instant case failed to file any claim for refund and to pursue his statutory remedy upon rejection thereof. I do not see where this act differs in any material particular from various acts recently submitted to me and which I disapproved, to except certain taxpayers from the operation of the statutes of limitation pertaining to the revenue laws by extending the time for the refunding of taxes to such taxpayers for the reason that the closing agreement executed by A. Randolph Holladay was in the nature of a voluntary invocation of the statute of limitations.

In every case where the execution of a closing agreement works to the advantage of the Government, either the double payment or overpayment of tax legally due is involved. A corresponding advantage results to the taxpayer executing a closing agreement where subsequently it is discovered that additional tax is due. The present legislation would thus discriminate against the Government in that it would open the door to relief in such cases in which the statute operates to the prejudice of a particular taxpayer, while leaving the door closed to the Government in those cases in which the statute operates to the disadvantage of the Government.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 7, 1936*.

ART METAL CONSTRUCTION CO.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 205)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1138 (74th Cong., 2d sess.) a bill for the relief of Art Metal Construction Co.

This bill would extend to October 1, 1936, the period for filing suit by the Art Metal Construction Co. and would authorize and direct the Court of Claims of the United States

to hear and determine on the merits any suit commenced therein against the United States prior to that date for the recovery of income and profits taxes paid for the calendar year 1918. The bill would grant the Art Metal Construction Co. the right to file such suit notwithstanding the fact that, in a prior suit for the recovery of such taxes, a United States circuit court of appeals determined that the company did not file a valid claim for refund within the period of limitations provided by law.

On several occasions there have been submitted to me other bills which proposed to except certain taxpayers from the operation of the statutes of limitations pertaining to the revenue laws by extending the time for the recovery of amounts paid by such taxpayers. On those occasions, I expressed my accord with the enacted policy of Congress that it is sound to include in all revenue acts, statutes of limitations, by the operation of which, after a fixed period of time, it becomes impossible for the Government to collect additional taxes or for the taxpayer to recover an overpayment of taxes. I pointed out in each instance that such legislation selects a small class of taxpayers for special treatment by excepting them from that policy, thus discriminating against the whole body of Federal taxpayers and establishing a precedent which would open the door to relief in all cases in which the statute operates to the prejudice of a particular taxpayer, while leaving the door closed to the Government in those cases in which the statute operates to the disadvantage of the Government.

In this regard the instant measure (S. 1138) does not differ in principle from the bills which were under consideration on those prior occasions. I know of no circumstances which would justify the exception made by S. 1138 to the long-continued policy of Congress. Again I must express my belief that the field of special legislation should not be opened to relieve special classes of taxpayers from the consequences of their failure to protect their claims for the refund of taxes within the period fixed by law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 7, 1936.*

ANTON W. FISCHER—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 204)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1846 (74th Cong., 2d sess.), entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Anton W. Fischer."

This bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to refund to the estate of Anton W. Fischer, late of Owatonna, Minn., the sum of $275.98, under existing rules and regulations, said amount representing an overpayment of taxes, the recovery of which is barred by the statute of limitations. The bill would authorize and direct the refund notwithstanding the fact that the estate failed to institute suit for the recovery of such taxes, thus neglecting to avail itself of the remedy provided by law, and the period within which such suit might be filed has long since expired.

On several occasions there have been submitted to me other bills which proposed to except certain taxpayers from the operation of the statutes of limitations pertaining to the revenue laws by extending the time for the recovery of amounts paid by such taxpayers. On those occasions I expressed my accord with the enacted policy of Congress that it is sound to include in all revenue acts, statutes of limitations, by the operation of which, after a fixed period of time, it becomes impossible for the Government to collect additional taxes or for the taxpayer to recover an overpayment of taxes. I pointed out in each instance that such legislation selects a small class of taxpayers for special treatment by exempting them from that policy, thus discriminating against the whole body of Federal taxpayers and establishing a precedent which would open the door to relief in all cases in which the statute operates to the prejudice of a particular taxpayer, while leaving the door closed to the Government in those cases in which the statute operates to the disadvantage of the Government.

In this regard the instant measure, S. 1846, does not differ in principle from the bills which were under consideration on those prior occasions. There appears to be no valid reason why the claimants in this case should not be bound by the provisions of the law, as are other taxpayers and the Government. I know of no circumstance which would justify the exception made by S. 1846 to the long-continued policy of Congress. Again I must express my belief that the field of special legislation should not be opened to relieve special classes of taxpayers from the consequences of their failure to invoke, within the period prescribed, the legal remedies provided by the law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 7, 1936.*

PROTECTIVE AND REORGANIZATION COMMITTEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report pertaining to a part of the Commission's study and investigation of the work, activities, personnel, and functions of protective and reorganization committees (being part IV, committees for the holders of municipal and quasi-municipal obligations), which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

H. R. 190. An act granting authority to the Secretary of War to license the use of a certain parcel of land situated in Fort Brady Reservation to Ira D. MacLachlan Post, No. 3, the American Legion, for 15 years;

H. R. 8050. An act to authorize the acquisition of land for military purposes in San Bernardino and Kern Counties, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 9042. An act to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Supply Base to the city of Newark, N. J.;

H. R. 10849. An act to authorize an appropriation for improvement of ammunition storage facilities at Aliamanu, Territory of Hawaii, and Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland; and

H. R. 11493. An act for the relief of Perry Randolph; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 397. An act for the relief of Robert Coates;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Matt E. Saylor;

H. R. 1739. An act for the relief of Frank Gedney;

H. R. 2121. An act for the relief of Jane Murrah;

H. R. 5752. An act for the relief of May Wynne Lamb;

H. R. 6404. An act for the relief of D. B. Carter;

H. R. 6920. An act for the relief of Ella Goodwin;

H. R. 7363. An act for the relief of F. E. Hall;

H. R. 7642. An act for the relief of Katherine Trick;

H. R. 7794. An act for the relief of Newark Concrete Pipe Co.;

H. R. 7839. An act for the relief of C. E. Rightor;

H. R. 8091. An act for the relief of Fields B. Arthur and Arthur L. Allen, copartners, Colorado Culvert & Flume Co.; Glen Haller; Kenneth Austin; A. B. Hoffman; J. W. Jones; and Lloyd Lasswell;

H. R. 8228. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Bouchey;

H. R. 8373. An act for the relief of James Fitzgerald;

H. R. 8440. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Achille and Albert Retellatto;

H. R. 8482. An act for the relief of Jacob G. Ackerman;

H. R. 8502. An act for the relief of Theresa Link, Wencel Link, Edward Block, and John Meyers;

H. R. 8688. An act for the relief of Grace Schultz;

H. R. 8720. An act for the relief of Louis Manzumin;

H. R. 8784. An act to authorize withholding compensation due Government personnel;

H. R. 8932. An act for the relief of John S. Hemrick;

H. R. 9078. An act for the relief of Bertha W. Lamphear;

H. R. 9313. An act for the relief of the estate of Hans Ditmanson, deceased;

H. R. 9314. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry Copple, deceased;

H. R. 9315. An act for the relief of the estate of Fred Wilkins, deceased;

H. R. 9926. An act for the relief of Robert B. Barker;

H. R. 10044. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Fernand H. Gouaux;

H. R. 10168. An act for the relief of Arch A. Gary;

H. R. 10174. An act for the relief of Ezra Curtis;

H. R. 10242. An act for the relief of Clarence D. Weisz;

H. R. 10279. An act for the relief of the Pocahontas Fuel Co., Inc.;

H. R. 10435. An act for the relief of Emma Hastings;

H. R. 10439. An act for the relief of John B. Ricketts;

H. R. 11022. An act for the relief of Ethel Armes;

H. R. 11379. An act for the relief of William H. Milton; and

H. R. 12408. An act for the relief of Robert D. Baldwin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1397. An act to withdraw certain public lands from settlement and entry;

H. R. 8474. An act to provide for the creation of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument on Put in Bay, South Bass Island, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9113. An act to provide for the residence of the United States commissioners appointed for the national parks, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10641. An act to provide for the protection and conservation of equities of rights of the Government resulting from railroad land grants;

H. R. 11791. An act to make available for national park purposes certain lands within the area of the proposed Mammoth Cave National Park, Ky.;

H. R. 11799. An act to repeal the proviso of the act of May 18, 1928 (ch. 626, 45 Stat. 603), making additions to the Absaroka and Gallatin National Forests and improving and extending the winter feed facilities of the elk, antelope, and other game animals of Yellowstone National Park and adjacent land, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12033. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., certain public lands in California, and granting rights-of-way over public lands and reserve lands to the city of Los Angeles in Mono County in the State of California;

H. R. 12212. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain lands in Tuscumbia, Ala.; and

H. R. 12220. An act to authorize the adjustment of the boundary of the Fort Marion National Monument, Fla., in the vicinity of Fort Marion Circle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 5743. An act for the relief of Robert D. Doherty;

H. R. 7825. An act for the relief of Michael Stodolnick;

H. R. 8278. An act for the relief of Earl Elmer Gallatin; and

H. R. 8884. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ollie Myers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 7764. An act to relieve restricted Indians whose lands have been taxed or have been lost by failure to pay taxes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11218. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds now on deposit or later placed to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12073. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in New Mexico as an addition to the school reserve of the Jicarilla Indian Reservation;

H. R. 12074. An act to consolidate the Indian pueblos of Jemez and Pecos, N. Mex.; and

H. J. Res. 415. Joint resolution to carry out the intention of Congress with reference to the claims of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 8525. An act prescribing regulations for carrying on the business of lighter service from any of the ports of the United States to stationary ships or barges located offshore, and for the purpose of promoting the safety of navigation;

H. R. 11915. An act to amend the Coastwise Load Line Act, 1935;

H. R. 11921. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Blackstone, Seekonk, Moshassuk, and Woonasquatucket Rivers and their tributaries in the State of Rhode Island, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 12079. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Poteau River in Arkansas with a view to flood control;

H. R. 12080. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Sulphur River in Arkansas with a view to flood control;

H. R. 12133. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Congree, Watere, Santee, and the Cooper Rivers and their tributaries in the State of South Carolina with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 12135. An act providing for a preliminary examination of the Sandusky River, at Fremont, Ohio, with a view to control of its floods;

H. R. 12158. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Patuxent River and its tributaries in the State of Maryland, with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 12305. An act to define the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard;

H. R. 12370. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of Big Blue River and its tributaries with a view to the control of their floods; and

H. R. 12419. An act to apply laws covering steam vessels to seagoing vessels of 300 gross tons and over propelled by internal-combustion engines; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 10101. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1935, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11533. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10544. An act authorizing the erection of a memorial to those who met their death in the wreck of the dirigible *Shenandoah;* and

H. R. 11747. An act extending the time for making the report of the commission to study the subject of Hernando De Soto's Expedition; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 10934. An act to authorize the transfer of the customhouse at Salem, Mass., from the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department to the Department of the Interior; and

H. R. 12556. An act to create the Treasury Agency Service, to provide for the more adequate protection of the revenue and a more effective enforcement of the revenue and other laws administered by the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 11616. An act to fix the compensation of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

H. R. 11917. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

H. R. 11926. An act to provide for a term of court at Durham, N. C.;

H. R. 12162. An act to create an additional division of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi to be known as the Hattiesburg division; and

H. J. Res. 525. Joint resolution to enable the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission to carry out and

give effect to certain approved plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11768. An act authorizing construction, operation, and maintenance of Rio Grande Canalization project and authorizing appropriation for that purpose; and

H. R. 12183. An act for the relief of Gladys Hinckley Werlich; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 12076. An act for the exchange of land in Hudson Falls, N. Y., for the purpose of the post-office site; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 12222. An act to permit the temporary entry into the United States under certain conditions of alien participants and officials of the Leyden International Bureau attending an international conference to be held in the United States in 1936; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. J. Res. 465. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of July 18, 1935, relating to the Seventieth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in the District of Columbia in September 1936; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of participation by the United States in a conference at Brussels to revise the Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works concluded at Bern, September 9, 1886, and revised at Rome, June 2, 1928; to the calendar.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the executive board of the Women's Trade Union League, of New York City, favoring the enactment of legislation for the creation of a court of appeals for civil-service employees with employee representation through recognized union representative, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Tennessee Valley Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, of Knoxville, Tenn., favoring appropriations for the completion of computations and adjustments of field surveys by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Council of the City of Akron, Ohio, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 4424, the so-called Wagner low-cost housing bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Workers' Alliance of District No. 2, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 3475, the so-called workers' unemployment insurance bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a resolution adopted by Mountain City Council, No. 12, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Frederick, Md., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 4011 and protesting against the passage of Senate bill 2969, relating to the deportation of undesirable aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WALSH presented the petition of Local Union No. 1917, United Textile Workers of America, of Franklin, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to stabilize conditions in the textile industry, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented the petition of Melford E. Roberts, of Stoughton, Mass., praying for the adoption of the so-called Townsend old-age pension plan, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of railroad employees and certain union labor organizations in the State of Massachusetts praying for the enactment of Senate bill 4174, authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve or disapprove of the consolidation or abandonment of carrier facilities of public service, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Department of Massachusetts Woman's Relief Corps, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of House bill 10771, providing pensions of $40 per month to Civil War widows married prior to January 1, 1930, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of independent retail druggists of Quincy, Mass., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 3154, to prohibit price discriminations, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the congregation of St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the adoption of measures for world peace and protesting against increases in our armed forces, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Malone Chamber of Commerce of Malone, N. Y., protesting against the passage of legislation compelling railroads in case of consolidation of facilities or reduction of service for the purpose of effecting economy of operation to keep on their pay rolls employees displaced by such efforts for economy, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., and vicinity, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 4174, authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve or disapprove of the consolidation or abandonment of carrier facilities of public service, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by William R. Carmer Camp, No. 8, United Spanish War Veterans, of Mount Vernon, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 4011, relating to the deportation of undesirable aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution of the New York Zoological Society, protesting against inclusion in the pending Interior Department appropriation bill of the proposed Grand Lake-Big Thompson transmountain diversion project, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the town of Waterford, N. Y., favoring flood control.

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

Whereas the dam in the Hudson River at Troy was maintained by the State of New York from 1820 to 1915 at a crest elevation of 13.2 feet above sea level, barge canal datum; and

Whereas the Government of the United States in 1915 replaced the said State dam with a new dam, one-half of which has a crest elevation of 15.2 feet above sea level, barge canal datum, and one-half crest elevation of 17.2 feet above sea level, barge canal datum, making an average increase in the height of this dam of 3 feet; and

Whereas the consequent increase of 3 feet in the elevation of the surface of the Hudson River above that dam has caused, during floods, hundreds of thousands of dollars of damage in the town of Waterford, in the northern section of Troy, and in the lower sections of Cohoes, including the washing out of the dike between Cohoes and Green Island; and

Whereas this increase of 3 feet in the elevation of the water above the Troy dam during the flood stages of the river is of benefit to no one, because the river is not navigable at such times and water power is useless: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the Congress thereof be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to install in said dam floodgates of such size and capacity that, during flood stages of the river, the elevation of the river surface above the Troy dam will not be raised higher than it would be if the dam had an elevation of 13.2 feet above sea level, barge canal datum; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND, to Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, to Hon. WILLIAM D. THOMAS, and to Hon. PARKER CORNING.

LOW-COST HOUSING

Mr. WAGNER. I also present a resolution adopted by the American Federation of Hosiery Workers favoring the pending housing bill, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

Whereas the bad, obsolete, and inadequate dwellings in which the majority of American workers are forced to live constitute a mockery of this country's vast resources of land, labor, materials, and technical skill; and

Whereas an absolute shortage of all kinds of dwellings is rapidly approaching both here and throughout the country, and is forcing rents to exploitive heights and forcing families to "double up"; and

Whereas continued severe unemployment in the building industry is inexcusable in view of the great and urgent need for new dwellings; and

Whereas ordinary private enterprise is not able and never has been able to meet the housing needs of average American workers; and

Whereas only a long-term program of Federal aid combined with local initiative will meet this situation adequately; and

Whereas labor has a double interest in the construction of low-rent dwellings, as the representative both of the unemployed building and material workers and of low-income families in need of better housing; and

Whereas labor's housing program is substantially embodied in the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill; and

Whereas this administration must keep its oft-repeated promises to the American people to improve housing conditions and increase employment in the building trades, which promises can be fulfilled only by the immediate enactment of the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill, preferably with larger appropriation and bond issues; and

Whereas the American Federation of Hosiery Workers is vitally concerned in securing the passage of the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill which will make it possible, we are convinced, to work out an arrangement with the Government regarding our own project, the Carl Mackley houses, which will enable us to reduce rentals to the point where most hosiery workers can live in the project and the financial problems of the undertaking can be solved: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Hosiery Workers hereby actively endorses and supports the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill and urges both the President and every Member of Congress to be likewise, and to make this bill into law at this session.

SALES OF MUNITIONS TO INDUSTRIAL CORPORATIONS

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs an editorial from the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of April 26, 1936, the leading newspaper of the State of Montana, entitled "Disturbing News."

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

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of Apr. 26, 1936]

DISTURBING NEWS

It is not only organized labor, but all classes of workers, who will read with resentment and suspicion the information given in the Senate investigation of large sales by a great manufacturing concern of machine guns and gas bombs to large industrial corporations.

When Liberty Leaguers and others of their frame of mind talk resoundingly of the American plan, it is fair to inquire what the implications are of what they call Americanism. The issue of labor relations is being forced into this campaign by those who oppose legislation intended to give to workers the opportunity and right of organization for collective bargaining. The company union is not the final word in the problem of labor relations, despite the determined fight by great mass-production industries to prevent national organization of their workers.

When disquieting testimony is gathered in Congress that in important industrial communities preparations are being made for actual war to prevent unionization, the issue takes a most sinister aspect. It is not the spirit of the age that we should maintain as the final American principal in labor relations an economic feudalism that puts all decision and power in determining standards of working conditions in the hands of a few managers of great corporations.

Labor wars and strikes are not a satisfactory way of settling questions involving such relations but some democratic principle must be introduced in their place in this social situation. If the Wagner Labor Act should be found unconstitutional the decision certainly would not settle the question. The necessity will then still exist for some other method of regulating the conditions under which great masses of our people are to work than the unregulated desires of a few managers of big industrial combinations.

Fascism and naziism abroad marked their advent to power by wiping out the right of workers to unite for their own protection. The attitude of such groups as those of the steel interests and the Liberty League supporters is in that respect decidedly facist in its trend. Their activities are disturbing the people of this Nation greatly and the recent hearings on armaments sales in certain industrial quarters will give a sharper edge to the apprehensions of millions of wage earners.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4252) to provide for the modification of the contract of lease entered into on June 12, 1922, between the United States and the Board of Commissioners of the port of New Orleans, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1988) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 250) extending thanks in appreciation of services rendered by Hayden W. Wren as superintendent of the docks of the port of New Orleans, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 439) authorizing the erection in the Department of Labor Building of a memorial to the officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and Immigration Border Patrol who, while on active duty, lost their lives under heroic or tragic circumstances, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1989) thereon.

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

S. 4376. A bill authorizing the State of Iowa, acting through its State highway commission, and the State of Nebraska, acting through its department of roads and irrigation, to construct, maintain, and operate a free or toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Dodge Street in the city of Omaha, Nebr. (Rept. No. 1990);

S. 4461. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Brownville, Nebr. (Rept. No. 1991);

S. 4462. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the towns of Decatur, Nebr., and Onawa, Iowa (Rept. No. 1992);

S. 4463. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the cities of South Sioux City, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa (Rept. No. 1993);

H. R. 1398. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near Crescent City, Calif. (Rept. No. 1994);

H. R. 8370. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Port Washington, Wis. (Rept. No. 1995); and

H. R. 10589. A bill to amend section 32 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes", approved August 30, 1935 (Rept. No. 1996).

Mr. SHEPPARD also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3992) for the relief of Capt. Laurence V. Houston, retired, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2007) thereon.

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8824) for the relief of the estate of John Gellatly, deceased, and/or Charlyne Gellatly, individually, reported it adversely, and submitted a report (No. 1998) thereon.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which were referred the following bills and joint resolutions, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3844. A bill for the relief of Mrs. M. N. Shawamberg (Rept. No. 1999);

S. 4140. A bill for the relief of Homer Brett, Esq., American consul at Rotterdam, Netherlands, as a result of money stolen from the safe of the American consulate (Rept. No. 2000);

S. 4584. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918 (40 Stat. 755), to extend and adapt its provisions to the convention between the United States and the United Mexican States for the protection of migratory birds and

game mammals concluded at the city of Mexico February 7, 1936, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2001);

S. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of participation by the United States in a conference at Brussels to revise the Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, concluded at Bern, September 9, 1886, and revised at Rome, June 2, 1928 (Rept. No. 2002); and

H. J. Res. 538. Joint resolution to provide for participation by the United States in the Ninth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy in Rumania, in 1937; and to authorize and request the President of the United States to invite the International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to hold its tenth congress in the United States in 1939, and to invite foreign countries to participate in that congress (Rept. No. 2003).

Mr. PITTMAN also, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10321) to amend section 4 of Public Act No. 286, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 19, 1935, as amended, reported it without amendment.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4487) to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Smuggler's Cove, Oreg., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2004) thereon.

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4317) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the city of Buffalo, N. Y., the right and privilege to occupy and use for sewage-disposal facilities part of the lands forming the pier and dikes of the Black Rock Harbor improvement at Buffalo, N. Y., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 2006) thereon.

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10544) authorizing the erection of a memorial to those who met their death in the wreck of the dirigible *Shenandoah*, reported it without amendment.

REORGANIZATION OF COURTS IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on the last day the Senate was in session I reported from the Judiciary Committee a bill changing the names of the courts in the District of Columbia. For some reason the report was mislaid and not entered in the RECORD. I again present the report this morning.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 4038) to amend an act of Congress approved March 3, 1863, entitled "An act to reorganize the courts in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1997) thereon.

CELEBRATION OF ADMISSION OF ARKANSAS TO FEDERAL UNION

Mr. ROBINSON. From the Committee on Rules, I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 229) providing for the contribution by the United States to the expense of the celebration by the State of Arkansas of its admission to the Federal Union. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, and I will state that it is my purpose to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the joint resolution.

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

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Arkansas desires to submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I should like to have the proposed amendment reported by the clerk.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have stated that it is my intention to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I now submit the amendment and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of aiding in defraying the expenses of an exposition commemorating the admission of the State of Arkansas into the Union, the sum of $150,000, which may be made available immediately. Such sum, when appropriated, shall be paid to the Arkansas Centennial Commission of the State of Arkansas, to be expended by said commission for such purposes as it may deem appropriate in connection with such exposition.

SEC. 2. The heads of the various executive departments and independent establishments of the Government are authorized to collect and prepare and lend, upon request, to the said commission articles, specimens, and exhibits which, in their judgment, it may be in the interest of the United States to exhibit at such exhibition.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Arkansas if the joint resolution has met with the approval of the Committee on Rules?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; it has the approval of the entire membership of the Committee on Rules in the form in which it is now presented.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SAN FRANCISCO BAY EXPOSITION OF 1939

Mr. JOHNSON. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 226) authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the San Francisco Bay Exposition in 1939 at San Francisco, Calif. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I will state that it provides for the mere recognition of the exposition to be held in San Francisco in 1939. It has neither authorization nor appropriation attached to it.

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

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

Whereas there is to be held at San Francisco, Calif., during the year 1939 an international exposition which has for its purpose the celebration of the completion of the San Francisco-Oakland Bridge and the Golden Gate Bridge, and which is designed to depict and exhibit the progress and accomplishments of the Pacific area of the United States in science, industry, business, transportation, and culture, and which, because of its world character, will contribute to cordial relations among the nations of the world; and

Whereas, because of its location and purpose, its scope and aims, said exposition 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 preamble was agreed to.

FOLDING SPEECHES AND PAMPHLETS

Mr. GLASS. From the Committee on Appropriations I report an original joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 260) was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for folding speeches and pamphlets, for the Senate, at a rate not exceeding $1 per thousand, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,000 for the fiscal year 1936.

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

INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS AND AFFILIATES

Mr. BARKLEY. On behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, I report back, with amendments, Senate Resolution 227, continuing Senate Resolution 71, authorizing an investigation of interstate railroads and affiliates with respect to financing, reorganizations, mergers, and certain

other matters, submitted by Mr. WHEELER on February 4, 1936, and I submit a report (No. 2005) thereon. I understand the resolution automatically goes to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. If it does not automatically go to that committee, I ask that it be referred to the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received; and, under the rule, will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on today, May 7, 1936, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1432. An act to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, generally known as the War Minerals Relief Statutes;

S. 3842. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the Territorial Government of Wisconsin, and to assist in the celebration of the Wisconsin Centennial during the year of 1936; and

S. 4229. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of Bridgeport, Conn., as a city.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 4586) for the relief of Andrew Smith;

A bill (S. 4587) for the relief of R. N. Teague and Minnie Teague; and

A bill (S. 4588) for the relief of the estates of N. G. Harper and Amos Phillips; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRD:

A bill (S. 4589) extending the time for filing a claim for reimbursement for the funeral expenses of Harold P. Straus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 4590) for the relief of Mary F. England, Margaret Fulton, and Tyler M. Fulton, children of Winston Cabell Fulton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BONE:

A bill (S. 4591) for the relief of the children of Rees Morgan; and

A bill (S. 4592) for the relief of Charles Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 4593) for the relief of Frank Barlass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 4594) to supplement the act of June 25, 1929 (ch. 41, 46 Stat. L. 41), which authorized and directed the Attorney General to institute suit against the Northern Pacific Railway Co. et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS:

A bill (S. 4595) for the relief of Ira W. Baldwin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4596) to amend section 21 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HATCH and Mr. CHAVEZ:

A bill (S. 4597) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the journey and explorations of Francisco Vasquez de Coronado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (by request):

A bill (S. 4598) for the relief of Dr. Harold W. Fought; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

A bill (S. 4599) granting an increase of pension to May Pennington; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 4600) conferring upon United States patent application, serial no. 575231, filed in the United States Patent Office by the United States, in the name of William H. Priess, the benefit and status of the same filing date, namely, February 4, 1919, upon which Lt. William H. Priess communicated and filed the same subject matter in the patents department, bureau of aircraft production; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

A bill (S. 4601) for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARBOUR and Mr. MOORE:

A bill (S. 4602) for the relief of the city of New Brunswick, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COPELAND (by request):

A bill (S. 4603) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Italian Star Line, Inc., against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE:

A bill (S. 4604) to prohibit the sale or transportation in commerce of canned food for cats, dogs, foxes, and other carnivorous animals which is unsound, unhealthful, and unwholesome; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4605) to provide more adequate protection to workmen and laborers on projects, buildings, constructions, and improvements, wherever situated, belonging to the United States of America; and

A bill (S. 4606) to provide more adequate protection to workmen and laborers on projects, buildings, constructions, and improvements, wherever situated, belonging to the United States of America; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 4607) to refund to Haffenreffer & Co., Inc., a Massachusetts corporation, certain taxes paid for revenue stamps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE and Mr. BARBOUR:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 261) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 262) granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY POSTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12511) to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR FLOOD CONTROL BILL

Mr. CAPPER submitted three amendments 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 were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO MERCHANT MARINE BILL

Mr. AUSTIN (for Mr. GIBSON) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. GIBSON to the bill (H. R. 8555) to develop a strong American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid national defense, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

TAXATION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BONE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9185) to insure the collection of the revenue on intoxicating liquor, to provide for the more efficient and economical administration and enforcement of the laws relating to the taxation of intoxicating liquor, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

CONFEDERATED BANDS OF UTE INDIANS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 381) for the relief of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered (2) two to the said bill.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered (1) one to the said bill, and agree to the same.

ELMER THOMAS,
LYNN J. FRAZIER,
W. J. BULOW,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

WILL ROGERS,
ABE MURDOCK,
USHER L. BURDICK,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE RITTER IMPEACHMENT TRIAL (S. DOC. NO. 200)

On motion by Mr. ASHURST, it was

Ordered, That the proceedings in the Senate in connection with the trial of Halsted L. Ritter, United States district judge for the southern district of Florida, upon articles of impeachment exhibited against him by the House of Representatives, be printed as a Senate document.

NIAGARA DIVERSION AND ST. LAWRENCE PROJECTS (S. DOC. NO. 201)

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a portion of the report submitted by the Power Authority of the State of New York which deals particularly with the Niagara diversion and the St. Lawrence project.

I ask this privilege because there is now pending before the Foreign Relations Committee a proposed treaty between the United States and the Dominion of Canada which deals with the restoration of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and also an increased diversion of water. I have opposed the ratification of that treaty, and this particular section of the report throws light upon that subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the portion of the report referred to will be printed as a Senate document.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12098, the State, Justice, etc., appropriation bill, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
May 6, 1936.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill (H. R. 12098) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, and concur therein; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 3. That in passing upon applications made for compensation under the provisions of the item for 'Payment to cotton ginners', contained in title I of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936 (Public Law No. 440, 74th Cong.), and upon payments pursuant to such applications, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Comptroller General of the United States are authorized and directed, in the interest of saving as much administrative expense as possible and in order to avoid delay in passing upon such applications, to assume that the additional expenses incurred in connection with the administration of the act of April 21, 1934 (49 Stat. 598–607), equaled 25 cents per bale, counting round bales as half bales, during the period June 1, 1935, to February 10, 1936, inclusive: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made on any application for such compensation unless the application is filed prior to September 1, 1936."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there is so much confusion in the Chamber I am unable to determine what report is now before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this is the action of the House of Representatives on the appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice, and so forth. There were practically no disagreements. On two amendments the House conferees desired to have a vote of the House. One was agreed to and the other of the amendments, numbered 58, was changed somewhat in language without changing its substance.

I move that the Senate concur in House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 58.

The motion was agreed to.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 11035, the War Department appropriation bill, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
April 6, 1936.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to the bill (H. R. 11035) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, and concur therein with the following amendment:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "$34,169,252: *Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1936, there shall be authorized 1,033 officers of the Medical Corps and 183 officers of the Dental Corps, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of June 30, 1922 (42 Stat. 721), and the authorized commissioned strength of the Regular Army is hereby increased by 75 in order to provide for the increases herein authorized in the number of officers in the Medical and Dental Corps."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "$61,383,965, and, in addition, $2,344,211 of the appropriation 'Pay of the Army, 1936', which sum shall remain available until June 30, 1937, for defraying the cost of increasing the enlisted strength of the Regular Army from an average of 147,000 to an average of 165,000 enlisted men, and the attainment of such 165,000 enlisted men shall be accomplished by recruiting at the rate of 1,500 men per month in addition to recruits necessary to maintain 147,000 enlisted men."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

"ACQUISITION OF LAND

"For the acquisition of land in the vicinity of West Point, N. Y., as authorized by the act approved March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1491), or, in lieu thereof, for such extensions and alterations as may be necessary in the existing pipe line and intake employed in supplying water to the United States Military Academy, $431,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no obligation to acquire any parcel of land shall be incurred until the Comptroller General shall have approved the proposed purchase price as being reasonable."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: On page 5, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after the word "purposes", insert the following: "except what is known as building numbered 19 thereon covered by existing lease and any building erected with the consent of the city of Little Rock, Ark., on the site of hangar numbered 1."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$16,196,370."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard and Organized Reserves, who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, volunteer to participate without pay as competitors or range officers in the national matches to be held during the fiscal year 1937, may attend such matches without pay, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, but shall be entitled to travel and subsistence allowances at the same rates as are provided for

civilians who attend and participate in said matches, but this proviso shall not operate to prohibit the pay of such competitors or range officers, provided funds for such payment are available from the appropriation 'Promotion of rifle practice, 1937', nor shall any provision in this act operate to deprive a Reserve officer ordered to active duty incident to the national matches of pay for the full period of such active duty, provided funds for such payment are available from the appropriation 'Promotion of rifle practice, 1937': *Provided further*, That."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "$106,000, of which $100,000 shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary of War for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of such suitable lands as in his judgment are required for enlargement of existing national-cemetery facilities"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$159,427,899, of which not exceeding $6,000,000 may be expended, at the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, upon river and harbor or flood-control projects heretofore specifically provided to be proceeded with in any legislative measure heretofore passed by either the Senate or the House of Representatives of the United States: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation the Secretary of War may, in his discretion and on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers based on the recommendation by the Board of Rivers and Harbors in the review of a report or reports authorized by law, expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency, outside of harbor lines and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation, such work to be subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report or reports thereon."

Mr. COPELAND. I move that the Senate concur in the various amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate in question.

The motion was agreed to.

STATE SALES TAXES AND FAIR TRADE PRACTICES

Mr. BENSON. Mr. President, we have passed the Robinson-Patman bill with many amendments, and anticipate having it before us again in the form of a conference committee report.

Aside from agriculture, relief, and unemployment, I do not believe any two economic issues have attracted more attention and interest on the part of the people of Minnesota than have the issues of fair-trade practices, and the peril of State sales taxes. In order that the Members of this body may be informed of the attitude of the people of my State on these matters, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD certain statements, which I send to the desk.

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

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE MINNESOTA RETAIL HARDWARE DEALERS AT THEIR ANNUAL CONVENTION JANUARY 1936

Unalterable opposition to sales tax, on the grounds that it would relieve large companies and trusts of a large amount of taxes, would not be a replacement tax, would work a hardship on small salaried people and farmers, would increase expenses of hardware merchants and would make dealers tax collectors.

Definite opposition to constitutional amendment to be submitted to voters in 1936, which would abolish State real-estate taxes. This would strike a serious blow at present tax system and would cause substitution of unfair and discriminatory tax system.

Advocating increase in chain-store taxes.

Urging passage by legislature of fair trade bill, which has for its main purpose the establishment of a fair price merchandise distribution system and the prevention of selling below cost.

Favoring principles of Patman bill and other legislation in Congress designed to strengthen Clayton Act, to prevent discriminations against independent merchants.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE STATE PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION IN ITS MEETING FEBRUARY 1936

1. Opposition to the sales tax.
2. Support of a chain-store tax.
3. Support of the Robinson-Patman antidiscrimination bill.
4. And a fair trade act.

STATEMENT BY GOV. FLOYD B. OLSON IN HIS KEYNOTE ADDRESS TO THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY CONVENTION MARCH 27, 1936

The Congress should, by adequate legislation, protect the independent merchant whose continuation in the merchandising field is being more and more jeopardized by the growth of the chain-store and mail-order house systems. Congressional investigation has shown that unjust, discriminatory price practices have been existing for many years, under which manufacturers have given chain stores price advantages over independent merchants. Legislation designed to outlaw this discriminatory practice and aid in price stabilization will be of great benefit to the independent merchant.

PERTINENT PLANKS IN THE PLATFORM ADOPTED BY THE STATE CONVENTION OF THE OFFICIAL ORGANIZATION OF THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY OF MINNESOTA, ON MARCH 28, 1936

We propose and recommend legislation by Congress making illegal the granting of price rebates and advertising credits by manufacturers to chain stores in discrimination against independent merchants, and ask for further appropriations for the investigation of these and other unfair trade practices against independent merchants.

We are unalterably opposed to a sales tax.

We advocate an improved chain-store tax for the benefit of the independent merchant and the consumer.

AMERICAN NEUTRALITY AND INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered yesterday, May 6, before the joint session of the Sections on International and Comparative Law and the American Foreign Law Association by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

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

Before considering the subject assigned, it is essential to state a few premises which will reflect the background for my conclusions:

1. Our neutrality law is domestic law. It is not treaty law. The present neutrality law sets out certain prohibitions governing the actions of American citizens in the event of a war while we remain at peace. The important point for our consideration today is that in spirit and in word it recognizes one of the old neutrality fundamentals, that belligerents shall be treated with impartiality.

2. Sanctions, as we shall use the term this afternoon, refer to those penalties which may be imposed upon a state as a result of international action rendered through an agency set up to speak a joint will. It is not a reprisal, for most states which are parties to the sanctions have received no injury. It is a penalty for lack of respect for an ideal, rather than a punishment for a wrong. The penalty is not primarily to punish the wrongdoer; it is rather to protect the peaceful process of joint action by placing restraints upon states to desist from lending indirect aid to a user of force. If sanctions call for force, then they do become penalties against the disturber of world peace. We have now the first real attempt to experiment with peaceful sanctions. The force sanction has not yet been tried. The right comes from the League of Nations Covenant.

3. We must remember that the League is not a universal league, and that as far as the imposition of penalties is concerned, there is no unanimous agreement even among League members respecting Italy. Whether sanctions will be attempted against Germany remains to be seen.

4. There is no relationship between the American law of neutrality and the League sanction either in law or in theory. In fact, the two are definitely out of harmony with each other. One acts only against a previously determined wrongdoer among belligerents, or, to use the League term, the aggressor, and the other acts impartially against all belligerents. The League sanctions impose restrictions upon the member states and their citizens. The American neutrality law imposes restrictions upon those persons under American jurisdiction. The aims of sanctions and neutrality are alike in that both attempt to gain their objectives by self-restraint. But the League cannot act directly, as there are no persons under League jurisdiction. There are no citizens of the League of Nations. Its acts, therefore, are only recommendations. If sanctions are respected by the member states, it is a moral reaction because enforcement is impossible. The American neutrality restrictions are enforced by American enforcing officers upon the citizens directly. The American neutrality is law. The League sanction is recommendation.

There may be times when a neutrality restriction may have the effect of a sanction upon a belligerent state; for example, if a League sanction recommended against the granting of loans to the aggressor and our neutrality law prohibited loans to a belligerent, the practical effect of both actions would be the same, and the American neutrality law would be sustaining a League recommendation or vice versa.

5. The neutrality law is a unilateral action. Sanctions are a result of multilateral recommendations.

6. The primary object of sanctions is to stop or to prohibit war. The primary object of our neutrality is to keep America out of war.

7. The sanction theory is based upon an acceptance of a moral attitude that war is bad, that it is of universal concern, and therefore should be prohibited. The neutrality theory does not consider the moral question, nor does it accept the idea of war's being a matter of universal concern. It definitely assumes it is not our concern. War is not condemned by the law; it is merely assumed to exist. Our neutrality's purpose is one of expediency.

Critics have assumed that our Neutrality Act should be used as a cooperating act to enforce collective security. This is hardly

a logical deduction, because under the collective theory there is in reality no place for the neutral. Although many thinkers have pointed out that League members may remain neutral when the League attempts a coercive action, logically the League theory is based upon the theory of preponderance; that is, that all unite against an erring member and that the force of the united action should be spent against the one condemned. Neutrality smacks of aloofness. Sanctions are the result of joint action.

All that I have said above is commonplace to the thoughtful, and therefore probably has no place here, but the world moves so fast that even the thoughtful have trouble keeping up with it. The speed with which we enacted our two neutrality resolutions and the fact that the world has been changing and acting so rapidly, justifies me in attempting to remove confusion at least from my thought.

The sanction idea as used by the League is, as I have said above, new; but a sanction thought of in the sense of penalties is old. The sanction instrument as used by the League of Nations is related to the boycott. Its success will depend upon the same factors, therefore, upon which the success of a boycott depends. The boycott was invented in ancient China. It was a political instrument, used primarily by those taxed, against an unjust assessment. It can be successful only when it represents the will of the majority or the many against one or the few. When it has been a minority movement it has always failed. It cannot be successful whenever it cannot command the moral and actual adherence, in a peaceful way, of all parties to the boycott. If force is used against it, it is helpless unless it resorts to force. Thus in a sense it is an instrument of public opinion, and tensely democratic in its final analysis. It is moral rather than legal, and its aim is to restrain or to convince. It wins by nonaction. If it attempts coercion, strife, bloodshed, and war result. It is primarily a peaceful process.

Now, apply these theories internationally and call the boycott a sanction, and let us see what we have. First of all, we have the will of the many against the one or the few. Secondly, we have an attempt to win by nonaction or self-restraint. A sanction in League theory is a peaceful process, and a state of war does not exist as a result of a resort to sanctions.

In the enforcement of the sanctions a state's leaders may be convinced that the sanction is proper, but such a state's citizens may not be convinced. Assume that the sanction is one curbing trade, and the curb is placed upon oil. With the highly mechanized instruments of warfare today, everyone knows that no war can be successfully carried on without oil; therefore there is an apparent medium available for the stopping of any war. If all the nations, with the exception of the erring one, in the League agree to an oil sanction and they recommend such a sanction to the respective states, the question is by no means settled. There yet remains a leading factor. These states themselves are not traders in oil. The oil trade is carried on by citizens of the various states, and sometimes by international corporations. These citizens have gained through national law many rights and privileges. Thus the curb which the various nations have decided to place is, in its final analysis, dependent upon the willingness and ability and the right of the states to force that curb against its own citizens. Thus we see there are tremendous barriers and real conflicts in law which must be overcome before this peaceful process can be successful. To this particular we must give thought; for a sanction is not just a boycott. In a boycott the persons placing the restrictions are the persons concerned. In sanctions the restrictions are placed by representatives of States, not by representatives of those restricted. Thus sanctions are more difficult to enforce than a boycott.

Some might assume that uniting for sanctions is no more difficult problem than the uniting for war, but it is very much more difficult. It is a peaceful process, and the laws governing peace are complex, while the laws governing war are simple. War encourages every economic activity, while a sanction is a restriction upon economic activities. In war, too, economic activities are encouraged by huge profits. In sanctions profits are not only cut off, but losses may result. Thus governments cannot help but have very much greater difficulty in curbing or directing citizens through a peaceful process than through a warlike one. That is a real problem, and it is in this that we are definitely in an experimental stage. War as a matter of propaganda, is easy propaganda, because it is a long habit of men. Propaganda for peace is in its experimental stage. The will for war is easy to arouse, the will for peace is hard.

If men had long vision, they would realize that the war process is destructive and the peace process is not, but men are not of long vision. Especially is this the case with men who buy to sell.

The League sanction, even when restricted to the simple process of acting against a predetermined aggressor, in its culmination is anything but simple. The members of the League are sovereign entities. The League itself is not sovereign. In theory the League has but one interest, that is to maintain the peace and to serve its members. League members have many interests; therefore there can be many kinds of sanctions, the success of any one of which will depend upon any number of factors, such as the geographical situation of the war area, the size, the importance and purpose of the aggresor state. The world is by no means a unit of interest. Territorial propinquity does give special interest. There are regional understandings, and even among neighbors there will be of necessity more good neighborliness in some cases than in others. Still the fact remains that more and more the realization that unilateral action is not enough becomes evident. To fight for collective security seems absurd, but to be without the collective guaranty would produce fears so great that nations probably could not stand. The guaranty without fighting for it is the task, and America has probably taught the way.

Now I am going to make you smile. When Woodrow Wilson and Henry Cabot Lodge advanced their respective theories about sanctions, both were right. Thus their clash in opinion was like a war clash, two rights contesting for supremacy. Both used logic, but each built his logic upon a different premise. Woodrow Wilson thought of sanctions as a weapon against aggression. Lodge thought of sanctions as a defense of the status quo. Each failed to realize that the sanction idea was not a simple one, and each refused to accept the premise of the other. Today we know from actual experience that both were right and both were wrong.

To illustrate: We have an example of each of these types of sanction before us. If sanctions are attempted against Germany for moving an army into the Rhineland, that will be a sanction in defense of the status quo. That is the type of sanction Senator Lodge objected to because it presaged the inability of nations to rectify wrongs done as a result of imposed treaties. Sanctions against Italy are different. They are sanctions against the aggressor. Italy herself realizes this fact because, while she objects to the sanctions against her, she recognizes the fact that Germany's disrespect for treaty promises are worthy of a penalty. The sanction against Italy is the type of sanction Woodrow Wilson thought of, one to stop war and to curb an aggressor. The proposed sanction against Germany was the kind Lodge foresaw. Sanctions against Germany would be definitely in defense of the status quo under the treaties of Versailles and Locarno, and France would support such an action, although she is cold toward making the sanctions against Italy more severe.

The same difference between these two types of sanctions is apparent and is proved by British public opinion. The people of Great Britain generally supported the sanctions against Italy, the aggressor, but they are cold toward the idea of using the sanction as a medium in the pressing of treaty provisions against Germany.

From these experiences which the world today is having will come proper modifications. I cite them this afternoon in defense of the statement I have made that the peaceful process is a difficult one.

Before leaving this line of thought, the practical aspects of the attempt to use sanctions as an assertion of international control do not greatly concern us in this discussion, but in the light of the Ethiopian and the Rhineland decisions, the League is assumed to have failed. Shall we then mark the instrument of sanctions down as a failure? That will depend upon the meaning of the word "failure." History will show that the boycott has not failed when properly used. Sanctions, whenever properly used as a peaceful international instrument to command a "decent respect for the opinions of mankind" will not fail.

As I interpret the Stimson doctrine of nonrecognition, that was merely an instrument used to command a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. Nonrecognition in the minds of many has failed, but we do not witness nations breaking any records in competition to be first to recognize Manchukuo. The end is not yet. In both Ethiopia and the Rhineland cases there is an element of self-determination. Public opinion today seems to imply that the League has failed in either case. Assuming this to be so, it still does not mean that Italy and Germany have succeeded, just as the nonrecognition stand against Japan may have failed, but this failure does not mean that Japan has succeeded. Time is an essence that must be taken into consideration in other things besides money contracts. Aguinaldo failed, but if the independent Philippines become a fact it will be his picture and not General Funston's that will hang in the schoolrooms of that land 150 years from now. I have already forgotten the name of the commander of our troops in Nicaragua during our difficulties with Sandino, but our policies toward that land today are not the same as they were. When I say what I have in regard to Nicaragua and the Philippines I do not wish to be thought disloyal to the past. I merely want to emphasize the fact that there is a logic of history which, some way or another, seems to have its way.

We must be conscious of actualities. No matter how great the idea, it must rest its success or its failure upon actualities. We must not expect nations which have selfish interests to be more concerned about principles of behavior than they are about those interests. Our task is to emphasize the fact that the long-range approach is the important one.

I have shown that the American theory of neutrality and the League theory of sanctions are not related. Still, one theory can be used to modify the other. Both may be developed into helpful aids toward better world control for peace, but each must be modified to do this. Neutrality must be broadened by attempting to get nations friendly to American aloofness to accept the same restraint in the curb on their citizens which our new neutrality has placed on our citizens. The key to this is for the American States to logically follow the theory of refusing to apply neutral restraints against American republics when they are at war with non-American states, and encourage them to implement our stressing of neutral duties by declaring for the same restraints upon their citizens whenever war exists. This will bring the Americas into harmony on the score of condemnation of belligerency. Then the League should assume the theory as expressed in our neutrality law, of condemning all belligerents at the outbreak of hostilities and stopping the fighting by sanction pressure. The fighting stopped, then is the time to determine the aggressor.

It can be argued that the League should attempt to restrain all violence between its members without waiting to determine which is the aggressor. This does not deny the principle of neutrality; it merely suspends the use of violence until a decision can be made as to which is the aggressor. This is what the policeman does in domestic government. He is not empowered to determine which is the aggressor; it is his duty to prevent the use of violence by either party to the dispute. The court will later decide, first, which was the aggressor and what should be the penalty, and, second, if decided, what were the merits of the dispute over which they were fighting. This should be more acceptable to the United States, which has in its legislation refused to determine the aggressor, but is willing to put an embargo upon both belligerents. There would in this way be a clear condemnation of war, and the troublesome questions of guilt and penalty may be left to future expediency without mixing the issues.

We shall never get clear-cut cases of success or failure of any peaceful process. Court processes are not successes or failures; they are merely mediums of arriving at the nearest approach to justice which men can come in settlement of differences. Our process of judicial review cannot honestly be acclaimed as either a success or failure, but no one here, I am sure, would suggest doing away with it. A peaceful process does not mean unanimous agreement. No one in America wants to see a single will in our country. We surely do not wish to see it in the world. Even our very venerable nine Justices disagree. Their disagreement does not mark our Supreme Court or our constitutional system a failure. The American way is unity of action after discussion. That is exactly what the League is attempting.

Let us remember that peace is maintained among our 48 States by certain guaranties—call them sanctions if you wish. Labor is guaranteed by law its right to strike, yet when strikes come there is not labor peace. Democracy rests upon the right of rebellion, yet when rebellion comes democracy ends, because democracy is first of all a peaceful process. It rests on the concept of live and let live. Our Constitution guarantees a republican form of government in all the States, but the American Union has persisted because we have never done much about that. You know what the Supreme Court said in the Rhode Island and Oregon cases on this score. You also know how our whole system failed in bringing agreement between Virginia and West Virginia in that long-drawn-out case. When certain citizens of Louisiana petitioned the Senate to do something because it was charged a political faction in that State had deprived the citizens of Louisiana of a republican form of government, you know what the Senate did. If President Roosevelt had set out to collect the processing taxes as Washington did to collect the whisky taxes in western Pennsylvania, we would not have needed to have bothered with the Soil Conservation Act. Shall we say that Roosevelt failed where Washington succeeded?

These are the dilemmas of peaceful processes. Their very inefficiency is what gives a Mussolini, a Hitler, and a Lenin logical support. The single will is pretty, but it ends in making man a victim of the state. Our concept of the Government as an agent of men has no place under this theory. Let us be slow in condemning that which makes us what we are.

Peaceful processes are complex, in fact our Government seems very inefficient and constantly against itself. We have peace in America, but no one would describe life in America as one continual round of bliss. World peace can be no more blissful than American peace. Sanctions represent an experiment with a peaceful process in an attempt to put law where law has not been before. That aim is worthy of the interest of all, if you believe as I do that a government of law is man's most advanced political concept in guaranteeing man those blessings which we consider worth while under our theory of liberty. To those who pin their faith on neutrality I ask, why not attempt to stop war rather than attempting to stop the legitimate acivities of American citizens? To those who pin their faith on sanctions I ask, why not stop the fighting first, then prove the wrongdoer afterward? To both I ask, if it is peace you want, why not honestly unite for peace?

THE MERCHANT MARINE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY

Mr. BACHMAN. Mr. President, on the 4th of May the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] delivered a radio address, arranged by the Washington Star, on Our Merchant Marine Problem. It presents a most concise and comprehensive statement on the subject. I desire its incorporation in the RECORD.

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

OUR MERCHANT MARINE PROBLEM

The question as to whether the American people shall have a merchant marine to meet the needs of our commerce and to serve as a naval auxiliary in time of national emergency, was answered in the affirmative 20 years ago during the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

No patriotic citizen should question the advantages of having an adequate merchant marine operating under the American flag. Those of you who live in the interior do not come into everyday contact with maritime matters, but, 20 years ago, our lack of a merchant marine was forcibly brought to the attention of the wheat grower, the cotton farmer and the factory worker. Europe was engaged in a bloody conflict. Merchant vessels of the nations at war were withdrawn from trans-Atlantic trade routes. Farm and factory products of all descriptions were forwarded from the interior of our country to the congested seaports, where no ships were available for transporting our goods across the waters to foreign consumers. Foodstuffs rotted at the docks. Our foreign trade was paralyzed. And when we were forced into the war—foreign ships carried our troops to France. Foreign ships transported food and equipment for our armies. Foreign ships even furnished auxiliary services to our battle fleet. For all of these services our Treasury later paid at war prices. This was not the first time that our Navy was forced to rely upon merchant vessels of foreign nations. Thirty years ago, the White Squadron was sent on a voyage around the world. The fact that the American battle fleet, on that cruise, was supplied with coal and food by foreign vessels is a black mark upon our maritime history.

We did not have a merchant fleet 20 years ago. Worse than that, we did not have adequate shipyards in which to build new vessels. In 1917, our few shipyards were crowded with vessels under construction for the Navy. In almost equal degree, that is our situation today. Because of the unsettled condition of the world, the United States is now engaged in building up its Navy to the full strength permitted by the exising naval-limitation treaty.

Do you listeners in the radio audience think we should wait until another emergency confronts the Nation before we start to rebuild our merchant fleet? Should we wait until our Navy is ordered out on active duty before we make provision for the supply vessels required for our warships and for our foreign commerce? I think you will agree with me that this "do-nothing" policy is both dangerous and costly.

The American people have not forgotten the lessons learned during the early years of the World War. Neither has this Government forgotten the costly solution. There is nothing mysterious or complex about our merchant-marine problem. Simply and plainly, the vessels comprising our merchant fleet have grown old and they are obsolete. They cannot compete effectively with the vessels of foreign powers which are equipped with modern and efficient machinery. The great majority of our merchant vessels must be replaced. There is nothing strange or unusual in that situation. It differs in no respect from problems that periodically confront every farmer and every businessman in conducting his affairs. It does not differ in kind, only in magnitude—in the amount of money and property involved—from the problems of everyday business life. It now confronts us collectively as a Nation. It will be taken in stride and solved, just as our people meet and solve all their problems.

We have today about 380 vessels—excluding tankers—engaged in foreign trade. Only 31 of these merchant vessels are truly modern. Therefore, a comprehensive program calls for the construction of approximately 350 modern ships.

Realizing that a ship normally cannot be built in less than 10 months to a year, and realizing further that 90 percent of our freight ships will be obsolete within the next 3 or 4 years, the Congress should not hesitate to take immediate steps to carry out the recommendation of President Roosevelt, expressed in the closing sentences of his recent message to Congress. I quote: "The American people want to use American ships. Their Government owes it to them to make certain that such ships are in keeping with our national pride and national needs."

Our merchant-marine problem is not a question as to whether we shall have a merchant marine but our problem is, How shall we maintain a merchant marine worthy of this great Nation? So long as the American lives and works on a higher scale than his foreign competitor, whether he be engaged in a shipyard or on board ship, just so long will construction and operating costs of an American merchant marine be higher than the costs of merchant vessels under foreign flags. This simple fact gives rise to our problem. In seeking a solution, there are three alternatives from which to choose. The first course of action open to the Congress might be to remove all of the standards from American shipping. This would mean that a ship built with coolie labor in China, or financed by the depreciated mark and built in Germany could operate under the American flag. It would mean that seamen of any nationality would be eligible for employment on American ships. This could result in nothing else than low wages and intolerable living conditions. Furthermore, our few existing commercial shipyards would stand idle henceforth. I do not think any American citizen would seriously consider this as an answer to our problem.

The second possible solution to our problem is Government ownership and operation. The traditional American policy is to foster private initiative. I favor a privately owned and operated merchant marine. I am of the firm conviction that American ingenuity, native ability, and shrewd business sense can, and will, result in a privately owned American merchant marine in which we may take pride, if the Government does its part in placing the American shipping industry on an equal footing with our foreign competitors. However, should private capital be unable or unwilling to assume its share of the burden of building and operating vessels, then, and then only, do I favor direct action by the Government to protect this Nation's position on the sea.

This third method of solving the problem is the honest, straightforward program recommended to Congress by our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. In his message to Congress of March 4, 1935, recommending shipping legislation, the President recognized the necessity of an American merchant marine and recognized the further fact that building and operating costs, and subsidies paid

by foreign governments, place the American shipping operator at a distinct disadvantage in comparison with his foreign competitor.

The President made certain concrete recommendations, the first of which was that Congress make provision for meeting the threefold handicaps between American and foreign shipping costs. He recommended that the Congress can well afford honestly to call a subsidy by its right name instead of appropriating large annual sums under the guise for payments of ocean-mail contracts. He urged that improper practices and abuses should and must be ended. He referred to improper operating of subsidiary companies. The payment of excessive salaries and bonuses, and other widely known abuses which have made for poor management, improper use of profits, and scattered efforts. It is not my intention to dwell this evening on these wrongdoings of the past. Cures for these evils will be included in a constructive law which has as its main purpose the rebuilding of our merchant fleet in accordance with the recommendations of our Chief Executive.

The disclosure of these improper practices is not the major reason for repealing the Merchant Marine Act of 1928. Since that act was passed we have increased our merchant fleet by the pitiful total of 31 ships. There is need for constructing this number during each of the next 7 or 8 years. It would be impossible to realize that objective under the 1928 act, which has not met with the success that was hoped for when it was enacted. Prior to 1928 the Government had little experience with subsidies for the shipping business. In amount and in manner of application the subsidies authorized by the 1928 act were faulty. For example, some steamship lines have been paid a subsidy at the rate of $8 per mile for vessels capable of making a speed of 18 knots on mail-contract voyages. Recent speed tests have shown, however, that some of these vessels cannot make the contract speed. Hence, their mail pay has been reduced. This reduction, like the original contract, does not take into account competitive factors which should be considered in extending financial aid to the steamship operator.

It is better to seek an adjustment of the system than to stand by and see our merchant marine rapidly disappear because the technicalities of the system would prevent proper Government financial aid. Commenting on this precise situation, the President said: "Given under this disguised form it is an unsatisfactory and not an honest way of providing the aid that Government ought to give to shipping. I propose that we end this subterfuge." Several subsidy measures are now pending before Congress. One bill, sponsored by the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, passed the House during the last session of Congress. It is now before the Senate. Three other measures are also before the Senate. One of these was introduced by Senator COPELAND, of New York. Another was offered by Senator GIBSON, of Vermont, and another was introduced by myself. Thus we find four measures before the Senate, representing divergent viewpoints on the ways and means of rebuilding and operating our merchant fleet in line with the President's announced policies.

It has been the desire of the President that these divergent views be brought into harmony. I undertook this task, and today introduced in the Senate a proposed amendment to the Bland bill. This amendment is the result of an earnest desire to compose the different ideas which have been advanced as possible solutions to our problem. I will discuss briefly some of the features of my amendment which, I think, are of interest to every one of you. Before doing so, however, I wish to assure my listeners that the delay in Congress since President Roosevelt urged a change in our merchant marine laws does not indicate a lack of appreciation by Members of Congress on the subject. There have been differences of opinion as to how to proceed. The Members of both Houses of Congress know that previous legislation has not attained its objectives. We have taken time for a study and deliberation with the hope that we can pass a good bill. I believe a careful analysis of the amendment introduced today will prove that fact to the satisfaction of each of you.

The provisions of my amendment fall into four classifications: First, the recommendations made by President Roosevelt are fully carried out. A threefold subsidy would be authorized to meet higher American construction costs—higher American operating costs—and subsidies paid to foreign steamship companies by their governments. Existing ocean-mail contracts would be terminated on March 31, 1937. It is believed that this period of almost a year will permit equitable adjustments of the present contracts, and will provide enough time to study carefully the needs for direct subsidy payment. All present ocean-mail contractors would be given the opportunity of negotiating a settlement of their contracts with the United States Maritime Commission. If a settlement cannot be agreed upon, any dissatisfied contractor is given the privilege of seeking redress in the Court of Claims.

The second classification embraces numerous basic principles contained in the bills offered by Senator COPELAND and Congressman BLAND—including a recognition of the desirability of having commercial shipyards on the Pacific coast. To that end, a 6-percent greater cost would be allowed for the building of new vessels on that coast. This additional allowance is necessary to cover the higher cost of materials and labor on the west coast. A heavy penalty is provided against any combination, understanding, agreement, or arrangement which would prevent full, free, and secret competition in submitting bids for Government contracts. The measure would include also a limitation of profits that can be earned by shipbuilders. This limitation is an absolute maximum of 10 percent on all construction cost.

Referring now to the ship operator—my listeners all know of the risk and hazards of marine operations. This has been taken into consideration in allowing a possible profit of 10 percent, which is slightly greater than for ordinary business enterprises. If operating expenses should decline after the Government has agreed upon the amount which is to be paid as an operating differential, or if some other fact would result in a steamship company earning more than 10 percent profit per year, the taxpayers would share in the higher earnings. All profits earned by a steamship company in excess of 10 percent per annum would be shared with the Government on a 50–50 basis. The whole Nation is keenly alive to the urgent need for a safety of life at sea program. The first duty of the United States Maritime Commission includes a positive direction that all new vessels shall be designed to afford the best and most complete protection for passengers and crew against fire and all other marine perils. Also, the President of the United States would be authorized to transfer the Steamboat Inspection Bureau to the United States Maritime Commission.

The third classification embraces certain principles included in a bill which I previously introduced. These include a positive mandate for a long-range program for replacements and additions to our merchant fleet. This mandate guarantees that the American merchant marine will have new, modern ships, even if the Government is forced to build them and then hire them out to private operators. The only reason for shipping subsidies is the fact American labor cost is higher than foreign labor cost. The Government and the seamen are equally interested in knowing that the subsidy reaches its intended beneficiary. I submit that labor regulations rightfully belong in the Department of Labor. These labor provisions would not only include enforcement of fair wages but would also include regulations as to working conditions, hours of labor, and number of seamen required to properly and safely man a vessel.

I also believe that the provision which requires all ship officers to be members of the United States Naval Reserve will meet with the hearty approval of everyone in my radio audience.

At the present time a considerable amount of insurance on our merchant ships is underwritten in foreign countries. These merchant ships are naval auxiliaries. Insurance underwriters naturally have access to blue prints and specifications of ships insured by them. My amendment would prohibit foreign insurance underwriting. This will protect the plans of our ships from foreign observation. The fourth class of provisions in my amendment meet certain recommendations made by a special committee of the Senate which investigated existing ocean-mail contracts. These include the creation of a new independent establishment for the administration of direct subsidies, and a provision calling for a uniform system of bookkeeping in the shipping industry, and for Government inspection of books, files, and records in the offices of shipbuilders and ship operators. The measure also contains administrative provisions to guard against the recurrence of evils disclosed by the Senate investigating committee.

In closing, it is well that my listeners be advised as to whether any unreasonable burden would be imposed upon them through the enactment of the measure I introduced today. The cost element in any legislation is of vital concern to the taxpayers. The proponents of some subsidy measures believe that the subject is too complex to place a limit upon the amount of money which may be spent. I do not hold with this view. The measure, concerning which I have addressed you this evening, contains a limitation of annual expenditures which closely approximate the present annual cost for our disguised ocean-mail contract subsidies.

Although future expenditures would not be materially greater than those at present, I am of the firm conviction that the results would be much more satisfactory. The amount of the subsidies would be based on actual requirements to accomplish a definite purpose rather than upon an arbitrary allowance bearing no relationship to that purpose.

If these recommendations, as I have outlined tonight be enacted into law during the present session, I am confident that every American citizen will, in a few years, again see the flag of the American merchant marine triumphant on the seven seas.

SOIL CONSERVATION IN THE SOUTHWEST—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting and timely address on the subject Soil Conservation in the Southwest, delivered over the radio on Tuesday last by my colleague the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

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

My friends, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, first, I want to express my keen appreciation for this opportunity of speaking to so many of you. The subject that I have chosen for discussion is one in which I have always had an inquiring interest. It is a subject which perhaps every citizen of my own State has thought of many times, but one which in the past has had very little thought from the citizenship of the country as a whole. However, the subject has become so acute that it is now receiving the attention of all serious and sincere minds throughout the Nation. The problem is one of national import and cognizance is being taken for once by a national administration that is conscious of the situation and of the economic and human values involved and is making a determined effort to remedy the devastating losses of the past and conserve what is left for the future.

Captain Bonneville, who traveled throughout the West for the original Astor, sent back glowing reports of the verdant forests standing in seemingly inexhaustible supplies of timber and abounding in valuable fur-bearing animals of every description; of the richness and fertility of the soils; of the rivers and streams teeming with fish and fowl; and of prairies on which there was green grass as high as a man, with countless buffalo and a vast number of wild game—actually the land of plenty.

A modern traveler headed for this region would see an entirely different picture. He would find rivers clogged with silt; fowl, once so plentiful, reduced to a minimum; the streams biological deserts which periodically flood their banks, doing damage to life and property; aquatic life gone or disappearing; and further West, the plains once so abundant in rich grass and foliage of every description, which later had been transformed into the greatest agricultural area in the world and rightfully recognized as the "Bread basket of the World", today would present a very apparent contrast. He would see howling clouds of black dust taking tons of the richest topsoil and depositing it as far east as the Atlantic Ocean; tributaries choked yellow with silt roaring into the Mississippi or the Colorado and finally depositing their load into the waters of the Atlantic or the Pacific.

But I wanted to speak particularly of New Mexico and the Southwest. New Mexico is directly responsible for its very existence upon the conservation of water, the soil, and the resources underlying it. In New Mexico and adjoining parts of the Southwest our civilization and existence is predicated upon the uses of the land. The prosperity of a vast area in this Western region depends absolutely upon the productivity of the soil. We know that our livestock industry and farming activities owe their very existence to the soil and consequently our treatment of the soil determines the success or destruction of our life as a State.

It is needless to remind you of the terrible depression that has beset our country in the last several years, but long before the general economic depression those who earned their livelihood from the soil knew something about hard times. The man on the range, as well as the man on the farm, knows the full meaning of falling prices and the scarcity of markets for his products. The farmer and rancher knew long ago something of the ever-increasing difficulties encountered in the production of crops and livestock. The overgrazing of range lands, the loss of fertility in the valley farms; the hardships encountered in securing water; the difficulty in obtaining loans for operations, were familiar to the people of the Southwest even before the crash of the stock market. No one living in that part of the country could have failed to see that.

Those living on the eroding lands of the United States are facing a problem so severe and so far-reaching in its significance that almost the entire population is now greatly concerned over its solution. The problem of erosion has become so urgent that it now calls for national planning. Various agencies and organizations are now actively combating the evil. Perhaps at no time in American history have the eyes of the people been turned toward the land as is the case today. The problems of the land are manifold, but conservation of the soil unquestionably stands far out in front of all the other pressing land problems combined. We are confident that as a Nation we are finding some of the causes of the trouble, and the Federal Government is attempting, as never before, to solve those problems.

Erosion is as old as the land itself. It was erosion that carved the great canyons, the picturesque mesas, and most of the valleys and pleasant glens of the world. But this age-old process proceeding under the stabilization of a cover of vegetation—forest and grass and other forms of vegetation—was so slow that the soil was maintained in adequate depth for all natural purposes. We are not concerned about that slow natural process, but we are alarmed at the depredations of the enormously speeded-up erosion now taking place over millions of acres where Nature's protective cover has been cut down or plowed up or grazed to the grass roots. In my part of the country we frequently do not have to go beyond our front doors to see what man-induced erosion is—the erosion that has been accelerated by man's unwise treatment of the land, his destroying the mantle of vegetation that protects the soil.

The entire Nation, from Canada to Mexico and from the Pacific to the Atlantic, feels its effects also. Not until recently was very much known about the great damage done to the crop lands of America by man-caused erosion. True, millions knew something of how the canyons had been cut out by erosion. The outstanding, spectacular effects of the process were known, but the unnoticed type of erosion that affects even the slightly sloping lands in the highly cultivated regions was not generally understood to be a serious menace. Not until good land began to be scarce did the attention of the American draw itself to soil erosion and its control. A few soil scientists had studied the problem and had warned us of its consequences if not controlled. One of my friends over in the Department of Agriculture, Mr. H. H. Bennett, of the Soil Conservation Service, tells me that he argued for 25 years about the necessity of getting a program of soil-erosion control under way before anyone would pay very much attention to his ideas about the subject.

Let us look at the situation from a national standpoint. According to the Soil Conservation Service, there are 50,000,000 acres of erstwhile farm land that have been essentially ruined for further practical cultivation. Another 50,000,000 acres are in almost as deplorable a condition. Something like 100,000,000 additional acres, still largely in cultivation, have lost all or the greater part of the topsoil, with a direct decrease in crop yields that is appalling. It has been estimated that if the farm land already ravished and ruined by soil erosion could be divided into 60-acre farms, and restored to its former productiveness, it would easily support more than a million families. The destruction is going on at a rate of at least 300,000 acres each year, and the annual direct cost to the farmers of the Nation is estimated at not less than $400,000,000. Probably no nation or race has been more wasteful of its land than the United States; yet the land is the most indispensable asset of our country.

The problem is all the more serious when we realize that soil erosion affects not only the farmer and rancher but all of society as well. The water that is washed off the farmer's land carries with it his valuable topsoil—his principal capital. This waterborne soil—this debris of erosion—goes on into the streams and reservoirs and irrigation ditches, where it causes still further costly damage. The increased rate of run-off from eroded slopes, together with the clogging of stream channels, causes ever higher floods. The reservoirs that were built to hold water are being filled with mud washed out of the hills. The land of the Great Plains, formerly protected by grass, has been plowed up and worked until the soil became powdery, and now it blows across the continent in great duststorms. So you can see what an important problem erosion is, and why we are all so interested.

Today our land is far more depleted than the land of those who came before us. Today we are facing two major problems, both caused by soil erosion which set in after the vegetative cover was destroyed. One of those problems is that of the depletion of range lands. The other is the silting or filling up of our storage reservoirs.

The Government has spent millions in constructing great dams, such as the Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande, the Coolidge Dam on the Gila River, the Roosevelt Dam on the Salt River, and the recently completed Boulder Dam on the Colorado. These investments are damaged at an alarming rate by the soil that washes into the reservoirs as the result of erosion from thousands of slopes up and down the watersheds. Instead of penetrating the soil, much more of the rainwater and melting snow run rapidly into the valleys and down the erosion-made channels, to be entirely wasted. This has led to the lowering of the water table and consequently reduced or destroyed the grazing values.

Although the ranges are sparsely populated, it has been estimated by specialists that the grazing value of numerous localities is less than half what it formerly was. If present conditions are permitted to continue, two-thirds of the people undoubtedly will be driven out of large sections of the Southwest, or even all of them from some of the worst eroded areas. The situation must be corrected, and without delay, otherwise there is no hope for those now living there.

Since those who live on the irrigated farms below the costly dams are also imperiled by the suicidal process of uncontrolled erosion the problem is even more acute. The water supply is being steadily diminished, and much of the water delivered to the farms is silt-laden, so that irrigation ditches are filled and must be cleaned out, and troublesome soil is piled up in the fields. The people below the dams are therefore at the mercy of those using the lands above the dams.

Obviously, therefore, erosion must be controlled over the watersheds draining into the water-storage reservoirs, from which the farmers below are dependent for irrigation. The ranges must be put on a sustained-yield basis. This depends upon the adjustment of livestock to the carrying capacity of the ranges—a condition which must some day be brought about if we are to survive. This job of controlling erosion on the ranges and of stopping the silting of the life-giving reservoirs is what the administration is attempting to do. The success of such work will depend largely, of course, upon the cooperation received by those using the land.

To my mind, the various pressing problems of our Nation are all interrelated: Our present problem of depressed farm prices arose out of overproduction, which, in turn, arose out of the plowing under of natural grazing areas and the use of inferior soil localities. The depleted soil and reduced yield and consequent misery of the people in those areas calls for resettlement on a businesslike basis on lands which are productive, water conservation in reservoirs and lakes by which the economic value of the water can be utilized, soil conservation through the adoption of scientific treatment for the soil. This in turn calls for the planting of soil-repleting crops, the retarding of waters of the little streams and arroyos so that they will flow less rapidly and not pour down in floods to menace the valleys below. These little dams and big dams holding back the valuable waters will constitute a nationally perfected plan of flood control. Lastly, it will reduce unemployment by utilizing those less fortunate members of our population in public labor of this type. Their self-respect will be maintained; they will be performing a laudable and necessary task and in addition they will be providing for themselves and families.

This story of erosion, its cause and results in the Southwest, can be summed up briefly like this: First, the land was partly or completely denuded by overgrazing; secondly, the rains ran rapidly down the slopes, carrying the soil with it into the Rio Grande, the Gila, and other streams; and, finally, we are left with the depleted soil, unable to support the population living thereon. It is an economic, moral, and patriotic obligation of the Nation, the State, the county, the community, and the individual to preserve our remaining areas of good farm land and grazing land, to restore

vegetation to the land of the West, not only to provide needed forage for livestock but to protect our reservoirs and irrigation projects and to stop this new evil of disastrous blowing away of the priceless topsoil from our semiarid lands of the plains. I know of no effort before the Nation more worthy than the soil-conservation movement now getting under way through the Nation. The job certainly is one of great difficulty; time will be required to complete it, and it is going to cost us something. It is my belief, nevertheless, that it is a job which we have to perform, regardless of the difficulties, if this is to be a permanently prosperous Nation.

The Sahara and other desert areas of the world, which scientists tell us were once luxuriant, cultivated regions, and China's former forest area, now denuded and bare, are vivid examples of what happens when man disregards Nature's balance.

Let us hope that partisan minds, interested only with election returns, may not describe as boondoggling the administration's patriotic efforts for the conservation of national resources, human as well as natural, which involve in this particular instance the preservation of life-giving and wealth-producing soil with its many attendant benefits. This program is of great value to the Nation and must of necessity go on.

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, my attention has been attracted to an address delivered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] at Pittsburgh on March 14, at a dinner given there in honor of the district attorney of Allegheny County, Pa., Mr. Andrew Park. The address is interesting, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

In discussing the problems of work relief, I wish first to say that I have voted for it consistently. Work relief has been necessary to provide for those who have suffered because of the depression. My words should not be construed in any way as against the principle of work relief. I am now concerned chiefly with the way it is being administered.

Early in the present session of Congress I introduced a bill calling for the local administration of local work-relief projects. I am convinced that long-range administration of work-relief projects from Washington is inefficient, unsatisfactory, conducive of partisan politics, wrapped up in red tape, and incapable of meeting our present unemployment needs. My bill has been approved by most of the mayors and county commissioners of the State of Pennsylvania. It has not, however, been voted out of the Senate committee to which it was referred. Under these conditions I am now bringing this issue to the people of the Nation, because this is a national issue of major importance. I have confidence that, once informed on this subject, the American people have enough common sense to solve this problem. I believe that a thorough-going investigation of the W. P. A. will show the necessity for administration of local work-relief projects by regularly elected local governmental officials.

An appropriation of $1,200,000,000 from the unexpended balance of the work-relief fund, Federal money already in hand but not yet spent, would enable local officials to sponsor substantial construction projects, create jobs for the unemployed in their respective communities, create markets for materials and equipment necessary to carry out the program, thus starting the wheels of private industry, creating additional jobs in a normal and orderly manner. I need not say that $1,200,000,000 is a tremendous sum of money. Rightly expended and properly administered, it can do much to provide honest work, stimulate private industry, and solve our unemployment problems.

The administration of the work-relief program and funds by locally elected officials, irrespective of party affiliation, would save millions of dollars in the cost of overhead, wipe out partisan politics as the dominant factor in employing men, put an end to red tape and delay in getting projects under way and result in projects of a more substantial character.

The purpose of the Federal Government to provide relief for the unemployed has been clearly demonstrated. The chief difficulty has been that an attempt has been made to administer this program exclusively from Washington. Work-relief projects of a local nature cannot be satisfactorily administered by a central bureau in Washington. They must be administered locally.

Every effort should be made to stimulate private business and build up private pay rolls. This can be accomplished more effectively when there is a local coordination between relief administration and private business enterprise. It is impossible for Federal officials working in and out of Washington to meet local needs as satisfactorily as local officials who have to rub shoulders day by day with the taxpayers who foot the relief bill. Democratic processes of government are more responsive in small areas than in large ones.

It is generally agreed that the purpose of work relief was not to give employment to those who were already employed, or to provide larger salaries for those who already had jobs, or to serve as an instrument of political patronage. This viewpoint is held by all who voted for the $4,800,000,000 work-relief appropriation as a public-welfare measure. However, it now becomes apparent that the original professed purpose of work relief has been prostituted to serve the partisan political purposes of those to whom the administration of these measures have been entrusted. With the W. P. A. administered centrally from Washington as at present, I believe these abuses are inevitable and inherent in the system which by its very nature is unworkable, out of touch with local needs, and a bludgeon in the hands of those who thirst for power.

I had hoped that the bill which I introduced in the Senate calling for the local administration of local work-relief projects, would receive favorable consideration in view of the fact that it was a nonpartisan suggestion. In the speech which I gave in the Senate when I introduced this bill, I stated that its acceptance by the present administration would show the desire to regard work relief as a public-welfare measure and not as a political weapon. However, no action was taken on this bill. Therefore, I felt impelled to introduce a resolution in the Senate asking for a thorough investigation of the work-relief administration. The resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas it is impossible to obtain accurate information concerning the work being done by the Works Progress Administration; and

"Whereas no reports are available showing the names, number, or salaries of employees of such Administration; and

"Whereas the press and citizens of the United States are denied access to and refused official information concerning the employment and other records of such Administration; and

"Whereas many and varied charges have been made in reports published as to the work of such Administration and of the political appointees and employees thereof; and

"Whereas the Works Progress Administration is surrounded by an air of mystery and secrecy: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Executive Expenditures, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the Works Progress Administration. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation."

When offering this resolution in the Senate, I stated that I had voted consistently for work relief, and that nothing which I should say should be construed to reflect upon the character of men and women on work relief. I expressed a desire to verify certain startling statements which had been made to me by responsible persons as to the number of political appointees serving as supervisors of W. P. A. projects in Pennsylvania, receiving salaries far above the average. I have not the names of these political appointees. If these appointments be in the interest of public welfare, I see no reason why they should not be available for newspaper publication and the public generally, as in the case of all other officials in the State of Pennsylvania.

I wish to state now as I said on the floor of the Senate that I do not desire the publication of the names of men and women on work relief whose income is in the lower brackets in accordance with prevailing wage standards. I know how difficult are the problems which face the ordinary worker in his attempt to make a dollar reach as far as possible. I am seeking information only about those who are collecting fancy salaries because of political appointments and those who seek to coerce workers to vote as they are told lest they lose their jobs.

Since I introduced my resolution I have been bombarded with information as to conditions in the W. P. A. I have detailed descriptions, accompanied by affidavits in some cases, of employment situations which are almost unbelievable because of the cruel way in which bread has been taken out of the mouths of hungry children for no other reason than that the father of the family refused to abandon his political convictions and hence lost his W. P. A. job. Practically all who have written me, with the exception of those who have sworn to affidavits, have asked that I make no specific mention of their names or situations for fear that they would lose their jobs. They may be sure that I shall keep faith with them and shall not make public their letters. This applies to all letters of this nature which I receive. But it must now be evident to every thoughtful person that these letters coming not alone from Pennsylvania but from all over the United States reveal a campaign of terrorism for political purposes which is unspeakably wicked and subversive of the most sacred principles of our American democracy.

In the light of these facts we are told that Mr. Harry Hopkins, Relief Administrator, orders investigations of his own bureau activities. If the situation were not so tragic, this would be humorous. No matter how good the intentions of Mr. Hopkins may be, and I am not questioning them, it is obviously impossible for any investigation which he may make to answer the crying need of an impartial Senate investigation of the entire W. P. A. at the earliest possible moment. I understand that Mr. Hopkins investigated the conduct of the chairman of the Indiana County Democratic committee of Pennsylvania asking a woman employee of the Emergency Relief staff for a contribution of $27 to the Democratic campaign committee as a token of her appreciation for the position she held. I understand that following this investigation Mr. Hopkins said that he could not be responsible for the actions of dumb politicians. This, of course, may sound explosive but it does not change the situation. It does make evident a pressing need for an early investigation of the Works Progress Administration.

One of my correspondents, whose name I cannot reveal, because he is an employee of the W. P. A. and I do not wish him to lose his job, writes me: "The conditions on the local W. P. A. work are most humiliating. Republicans are only placed in 'key' positions when Democrats are not available or through personal influence cultivated by sincere friendship or business association between a Democratic and a Republican leader, which is very rare. On all other occasions the Republicans are placed in 'minor' positions or 'demoted' to make room for a Democrat."

The same correspondent writes: "I am enclosing a letter that I received from David Lawrence, chairman of the Democratic State committee, to which was attached 24 subscription blanks for the new publication entitled 'We the People.' According to 'suggestions', I am to fill in the blanks and mail to Harrisburg with the $24 remittance." I wish to say that forced contributions to partisan newspapers or a political party cannot successfully be concealed today and will inevitably act as a boomerang on those who persist in these practices. Forced contributions to campaign funds are not in keeping with American principles. Political parties which resort to such tactics are soon discredited in the eyes of honest people. Of course, under pressure, some W. P. A. workers may say that they will vote the Democratic ticket but their votes may reveal an entirely different action on election day.

The present administration plan of the W. P. A. has done much to wreck the civil-service systems of our municipalities, the States, and the Nation. Competent men and women, long registered on civil-service lists, have remained unemployed while the positions which rightfully belong to them have been given to political favorites.

Thousands of good men, real executives, men of practical business experience, are walking the streets today when the entire Nation should be having the benefit of their ability. It is an intolerable situation when capable executives of this type go unemployed while the administrative positions in the W. P. A., which call for marked business ability, are given to those whose sole passport consists of political influence. Many white-collared executives are today unemployed. They have lost their homes through foreclosure, not through any inability of their own but solely because the business firms with which they were connected folded up when the storm of depression swept the country. These capable businessmen were the first ones who should have been summoned to give direction to work-relief projects at the very first call, irrespective of party affiliation. Today W. P. A. is still in swaddling clothes, with no promise of maturity, and yet these men remain unemployed.

We do not escape our responsibility to those who want work by declaring that we have too many white-collared workers. It would be just as plausible to say that we have too many bricklayers, plumbers, steamfitters, miners, farmers, and artisans generally. Our problem is to provide the necessary work. Suitable work for all qualified workers can be found no matter whether they wear white collars, blue collars, or no collars at all.

The poor quality of artificially made work on Government projects is often an insult to business intelligence. Moreover, it stands as a challenge to the imagination of American business executives. I do not say that we have too many workers. I do say that we shall make ourselves the laughingstock of the entire world—ridiculous in the face of history—if we do not speedily learn how to set ourselves to useful tasks.

In the face of the present unemployment situation it is amazing and almost unbelievable that the United States is importing steel from abroad. Imports of semifinished and finished steel products for the month of December 1935 amounted to 24,570 net tons. This would provide more than 1,000,000 man-work-hours. At the present time the operations of the iron and steel industry in the United States is but a little above 50 percent of capacity; 450,000 persons are now employed in the industry, which is slightly less than in 1928 and 1929. Imports of steel, however, are constantly increasing, having practically doubled in 1935 over 1934.

Another startling fact concerns the stoppage of work on work-relief projects in practically every State of the Union because of lack of skilled labor. If skilled labor is not recruited for these projects, they cannot be completed, and yet there are many skilled workers unemployed. Perhaps a partial explanation of this situation is found in the fact that work-relief jobs have been opened almost exclusively to those who have been placed on home relief rolls after having declared themselves entirely destitute. Many skilled workers have objected to a system whereby this is the only way to get a job. This is a tragic situation. It stands condemned by the American Association of Social Workers, who have advocated that the public-works program be entirely divorced from the assistance program of home relief.

No discussion of unemployment problems could leave out of account the fact that 6,000,000 citizens of other countries are holding jobs in this country.

The facts are as follows: In this country there are over 14,000,000 persons who were born abroad. Of this number it is estimated 7,000,000 have not been naturalized. It has been charged on the floor of Congress—I am of the opinion that the estimate is too high—that more than 1,000,000 of these are in this country illegally. Of our 7,000,000 alien residents, 1,500,000 are on relief, costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

This is a problem which we cannot refuse to face. It is now apparent to everyone that this large number of illegal aliens now holding jobs in this country deprive American and legally admitted alien citizens of these jobs, and this in itself accounts for a major share of our burden of unemployment. We have more unemployed in the United States than in all the countries of Europe combined. No other nation acts on the policy which we have adopted. We are paying the work-relief bill not only of our own country but of the other nations as well.

Added to this we suffer losses because of our foreign-trade policy. Last year we imported millions of dollars' worth of foreign food products, while at the same time we were paying our farmers to plow under and create a scarcity of various agricultural items. Go into the leading groceries of New York today and you will find English hams, Irish bacon, Polish sausage, and New Zealand butter. I am not advocating that we abandon foreign trade. Foreign trade is necessary, but I insist that we have no right to buy from abroad products which compete unfairly with American products, thus defeating American agriculture and industry and adding millions to our unemployed. During 1935 more than one-fourth of the food and agricultural products which we consume here were produced and paid for abroad. This does not include the $180,000,000 which we paid for coffee, tea, and cocoa.

When relief was first set up, 9 out of every 10 people who accepted it wanted work rather than a dole. A large majority of them want work today, although there are some people who, having learned how they can eat without work, will never work again. That is indeed an unspeakable tragedy. When men go to battle some are killed, and some come back home wounded and permanently disabled. This terrible war of depression which we have been fighting has killed some, and there are many others who have been permanently crippled in mind and body.

But the large majority of the working people of this country want work just as they always have. This is the sovereign right of every able-bodied man—the right to work—and we have no business planning to establish a system of society where the right of the worker to work is taken away from him. I well remember back 40 years ago when for a dollar a day I trudged back and forth from South Pittsburgh to Highland Park to do duty with a pick and shovel. Even a dry lunch at noon tasted mighty good those days, and the habit of working has clung to me all my life. Honest work means health and self-respect as well as wages for the worker. This is the right of the worker, and if I know the working men and women of this country, they are going to claim that right and will not be satisfied with anything less than honest jobs, honest work, and honest wages.

THE AMERICAN HOME MARKET—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY WALLACE

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, on last Monday the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, before a meeting of farmers at University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr., delivered an address which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD.

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

The United States has long been proud of its home market, as the broadest and wealthiest single market for goods in the world. The achievement of this great, undivided market was not an accident. Since 1787, no idea has been more precious to the American people than the idea of a nation undivided in its economic and political life. The statesmen of 1787 had got their stomachs full of sectional and State warfare along economic lines. Under the Articles of Confederation, States could set up tariffs and issue money by themselves. New York could and did put a duty on firewood from Connecticut and cabbages from Pennsylvania. The whole thing resulted in confusion. The framers of the Constitution erased these State economic barriers and conceived a government which would insure national economic unity for all time.

The United States grew to continent-wide size, and still this idea of a country without economic or social barriers of any kind remained our most precious heritage. No single concept so distinguished the United States from older countries as this vision of a great area of land, hospitable to all races and classes, uninterrupted by political or economic barriers. The concept was so precious that it was considered worth the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of lives during the Civil War to preserve it.

Sectional and selfish interests from time to time have tried to break down or whittle away this idea of economic unity and interdependence. Industrial sections have tried to increase their advantages at the expense of agricultural sections, and vice versa. One class has tried to stir up jealousies of other classes and to put across the idea that prosperity for itself could be advanced if other classes had fewer benefits. Some sections or classes have benefited for a time at the expense of other sections or classes, but never for long. During the 1920's, some industrial leaders began to think that industry could remain prosperous in spite of, or perhaps even because of, low prices and income to farmers, but this idea was exploded with the general depression of the 1930's. Since 1932, the Nation has returned with greater conviction than ever to the idea of balanced and interdependent welfare of all sections and classes.

This precious idea of Nation-wide economic unity has, I repeat, given the home market of the United States a place of tremendous importance in our economic thinking and practices. We have properly striven to make the most of this rich, free, continent-wide market to the end of increasing and protecting the American standard of living.

There has been one difficulty, however, in working out equably the ideal of the preeminence of our home market. While industry looked almost entirely to the domestic market, agriculture has had to look in considerable part to the foreign market. Industry has asked and obtained high protection for its goods in the home market, while agriculture, even if it wanted and got such protection on paper, could get very little benefit from it except temporarily following a year of unusually bad weather. Industry, too, succeeded in obtaining great advantage from the corporate form of organization as a means of exploiting its markets more efficiently while agriculture in its very nature could make little use of this mighty instrument.

Agriculture, I insist, has a right to some equivalent to the tariff and the corporate form of organization as used by industry, and I believe that to give agriculture such an equivalent is in the best interests of the Nation. Let me assure you that I shall not cease to work for such an equivalent to be made available to agriculture.

We know what we are talking about when we demand equality for agriculture with respect to the tariff. Since 1920, farmers' troubles have largely been the result of difficulties growing out of their unprotected export position. The collapse of the war market, coupled with a high industrial tariff policy and great foreign indebtedness to the United States, and coincident with a shift on the farms from animal to tractor power, left farmers with some 50,000,000 excess acres under cultivation. The products of these acres could no longer be sold profitably abroad, and piling up at home, they smashed prices for the home market as well. No adequate effort was made to meet this situation prior to 1933. Since 1933 the Government has grappled with the task of helping farmers to make the needed adjustment. This aim has been to adjust exportable surpluses to demand, and thus to keep those surpluses from weakening the home market as well as the foreign market. Surely no reasonable person, believing in the American ideal of a high standard of living, could deny the right of agriculture to a program which would put it on a level with industry in being able to participate in the benefits of the home market. And in the face of declining foreign markets, this could be done only by adjusting exportable surpluses to actual export opportunities.

Difficulties with the farm export situation have continued. Many nations have felt it necessary to adopt nationalistic policies, setting up quotas, embargoes, domestic subsidies, and the like on farm products. Through its high-tariff policy, the United States has been guilty with other nations of making international trade difficult. In our case, there has been little excuse for this policy, since we are now not a debtor nation but a creditor nation, and we need to enable foreign nations to send us goods to pay their debts and pay for our exports. Recently a beginning has been made through reciprocal-trade agreements toward increased foreign trade, and I should like to say right here that farmers more than any other group have the most to gain through this policy if wisely carried out. The progress, however, has necessarily been slow. In view of continuing difficulties in international trade, many Americans have lost faith in expansion of the foreign market as a way to renewed prosperity. They believe we should concentrate on the home market instead. Many of them are suggesting that agriculture as well as industry take the nationalistic view, that the time has come for the United States to become self-sufficient in every way possible.

It is entirely reasonable that farmers should want to make the most of our great home market. In a time of troubled international conditions, we may well sympathize with those who shrink from the risks and difficulties of foreign trade. The question remains, however, how can farmers really make the most of the domestic market?

A number of answers are being suggested at this time. I will mention them briefly first, and then discuss each one at more length. Some people, observing the increase in farm imports during the last 2 years, are saying that the thing to do is cut out all imports of farm products that can possibly be grown in this country. Give the American farmer exclusive right to his home market, they suggest, even if it means an embargo on all competitive imports. Nationalism for the farmer, they say, is the way to farm prosperity.

Another suggestion is that we set up a two-price system with no production control and sell the export part of our crops at low prices abroad and the domestic part at a higher price at home, with the Government or the farmers themselves absorbing the difference.

Other people have another suggestion. They point to the traditional ingenuity of American industry in developing new industrial products and methods, and they say, "Encourage new industrial uses for American farm products, and we won't have to worry about foreign markets or domestic surpluses." They present maps and charts showing the acreage that would be needed to produce for these new industries providing that they can be successfully launched.

There is undoubtedly a great deal of sincerity in the support behind all these suggestions. Certainly no plan that holds any real possibility for increased markets and income to farmers is to be neglected. Let us examine the proposals I have mentioned.

What about imports? Are farm imports serious? Have they damaged the domestic market and domestic prices? What is the relationship between farm imports and farm prosperity? Would farmers benefit if, by high tariffs or an embargo, we cut out all imports of those products which farmers themselves can produce? How much, in short, could farmers gain if the country adopted a nationalistic policy toward agriculture—not just keeping the status quo, but going all the way to 100 percent nationalism?

First, let us look at the record of farm imports during the last year or two. The Department of Commerce records that during 1935, we imported a total of $1,100,000,000 worth of products which are classed as agricultural. This is a large sum, though a good deal less than the 10-year average of one and two-thirds billion dollars or the 20-year average of one and three-fourths billion. In 1929 we imported over $2,000,000,000 worth of agricultural products, and in 1920, nearly three and one-half billion dollars' worth. The 1935 total, like the other figures, included of course coffee, rubber, raw silk, tea, cocoa, spices, and bananas, all of which American farmers do not produce at all.

These products amounted to nearly one-third of the total, or about $334,000,000 worth. Occasionally some persons who raise an alarm about farm imports cite figures which include these tropical products. They neglect to identify them, and hence create an impression that farmers are being hurt instead of merely being supplied with coffee, tea, and rubber. Until the American people decide to forego coffee and tea, and until they are ready to pay three or four times as much for domestically produced rubber made from goldenrod or guayule in place of the tropical product, these noncompetitive imports will not, I think, become a controversial issue. This being a campaign year, however, almost anything can happen.

Taking out these items then, there is left some $600,000,000 worth of agricultural products imported in 1935 which were partly or wholly competitive. The largest item in this total is sugar, amounting to $133,000,000. We are supporting the sugar industry in this country with a high protective tariff. Likewise, high duties protect producers in the United States against the imports of many other items, such as wool and some of the oils.

The increased imports in the competitive list, including those items on which we have high protective duties, are partly on account of the improvement in the purchasing power of consumers in the United States, resulting in a return toward normal in the importation of items that we regularly imported before the depression. The most important single factor in the increased importation of many items, however, has been the drought of 1934.

I need not recall to this audience the seriousness of that drought. Suffice it to say, it was the worst drought in our history. It caused a reduction in our total feed supply, compared with normal, of some 50,000,000 tons, or about one-half. The corn crop alone was cut down by a billion bushels. The adjustments in corn and wheat acreage through the A. A. A. were negligible in comparison with the reduction due to the drought, and so far as feeds were concerned, these adjustments actually helped to improve the situation.

Those of you here today who had to buy feed at that time to carry your livestock through the emergency surely would not have chosen to bar out imports of these commodities which you yourselves needed. Yet those who now raise their hands in horror at the tables showing farm imports in 1935 invariably include these feedstuffs in their shocking figures, and they conveniently fail to mention that farmers were helped and not injured by the fact that moderate amounts of such products came in over the tariff wall.

Indeed, it is surprising that in the 18 months from July 1934 to December 1935, during which time the drought shortage was most felt, feed imports represented only about 7 percent of the drought reduction.

All of these imports, of course, paid the usual tariff duties—25 cents a bushel for corn, 16 cents a bushel for oats, 10 percent ad valorem for wheat unfit for human consumption, and so on. Only in the case of hay was the duty removed. But this free entry applied only to hay brought into the drought-affected area at the urgent request of farmers in the Northwest. The North Dakota Legislature, by the way, asked for removal of the duty on feed grains as well, but this was not considered necessary and the request was not granted.

The peak of imports caused by the drought was reached last year, the time varying with different products, depending on when the new crops were harvested. Since then, imports have greatly receded, and are now practically normal for most products. Imports of oats have been negligible since May 1935. Imports of corn have rapidly receded since last November; in March of this year they were 66 percent less than the same month last year. While rye tariffs are proportionately lower than tariffs on other grains, rye imports have been insignificant since August. Imports of butter reached their peak in the late winter of 1935; in the last half of the year they amounted to only a little over a million pounds, which is below the 10-year average. Imports of wheat have continued into 1936, because the drought shortage was not made up by our 1935 spring-wheat crop, which was greatly reduced both in quantity and quality by serious rust damage. The bulk of present wheat imports is hard spring wheat, brought in to meet our domestic requirements for this type of wheat. These wheat imports, of course, pay the usual duty of 42 cents a bushel.

One might go on to show the extremely small size of farm imports, even in the face of the terrible drought of 1934, as compared with our normal production. It is truly surprising that twice the worst drought since the Civil War should result in imports of corn representing only about 2 percent of our average production; wheat, a little over 3 percent; beef, including canned

beef, 3 percent of average slaughter; pork, one-tenth of 1 percent of average production; and butter, 1 percent.

The main facts to bear in mind, however, is that these increased imports were due to an absolutely unprecedented situation. I suppose the same situation is not likely to occur in the same degree for another 100 years, unless our climate is changing drastically. There is simply no point in viewing the farm imports of 1935, which were caused by the drought of 1934, as reflecting a normal situation facing the American farmer.

Of course, if one wants to compare the situation in 1935 with the situation in 1932, some rather striking facts can be brought out. Certainly imports were low in 1932; farm imports as well as industrial imports, in fact, were the lowest in a generation. When you start down near zero you can work up to some very handsome percentages, and this goes for other things as well as imports—farm prices and farm income, for example.

This leads us to consider the relationship between farm imports and prices and between farm imports and farm income. When farm prices drop following a period when imports have been coming in, it is sometimes thought that the imports caused the decline in domestic prices. This is almost never the case. When the price of oats dropped last summer the decline was not caused by the imports which previously had come in. It was caused by the sudden increase of domestic supplies with the harvesting of the new oats crop. Imports of oats amounted to less than 1 percent of normal production. Obviously their influence on the supply-and-demand situation affecting the domestic price was negligible compared to the coming in of a new crop of near normal size.

The same relationship holds true for other commodities, whether corn, wheat, beef, or butter. Imports are called in, over the tariff, by unusually high domestic prices, and to keep on attracting imports the price has to remain high. The tariff is really working for the farmer during such a situation.

But what about the tariff and its usefulness to farmers during a year like 1932? Well, in that year imports certainly were kept out, if that's the main thing we want. Imports of corn were 400,000 bushels, an amount which could be produced on a fraction of a Nebraska corn county. But corn was selling for as low as 10 and even 5 cents a bushel in Nebraska, and of what use was the 25-cent tariff on corn then? Wheat sold for 28 cents in Nebraska, and of what use was the 42-cent tariff in that situation? Butter sold as low as 14 cents, while being "protected" by a 14-cent tariff. Hogs sold for $3 a hundred and less, and of what use was the $2 tariff?

In 1935, following a year of extreme drought, it is true that some imports came in. But farmers also were receiving an average of 58 cents for corn, a dollar for wheat, over $10 for beef, $8 for hogs, over 30 cents for butter. Cash farm income stepped up from less than four and one-half billion dollars in 1932 to almost $7,000,000,000 in 1935. Back in 1932 I believe farmers would gladly have let in a few imports if at the same time they could have increased their cash income by 60 percent.

Whether the tariff for any farm product is at exactly the right point is another question. When there is excessive protection, so that prices rise to very high points, the result, of course, is either reduction in consumption or the coming in of more producers and eventual overproduction, so that the benefit is only temporary. The $2 tariff on sugar hurt the sugarbeet farmers in the continental United States by expanding production in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. But in view of the hold the tariff system has in this country, and in view of the fact that sweeping downward adjustments in industrial rates cannot be made suddenly without causing dislocations in industry and consequent injury, I feel that moderate protection for agriculture, so that an unusual situation may be taken care of without undue harm to consumers, is a reasonable policy. Any protection ought to be applied equally to both agriculture and industry and in such a way as not to harm those branches of agriculture which have long been in the export market.

But even for those farm commodities on which import duties can help farmers at times, the tariff method as a solution for the problem of producers of those commodities is extremely unwieldy. Under our form of government it involves a great number of agencies and interests and cannot be used as promptly and efficiently as farmers might wish to meet a given situation. This cumbersomeness of method is one of the prices which we must pay for the privilege of having a democratic system.

The tariff question on farm products comes down to this. For most American farmers 90 percent of the time the farm tariff does not mean a thing either way. During the other 10 percent of the time, following unusual weather, the tariff works as shown by the coming in of a few imports, and it means farmers are getting good prices for their products.

The real question is not whether we want a tariff for farm products; we already have one. The real question is, Are farmers going to accept the high-tariff idea as a cure-all for agriculture?

If they do, I tell you frankly farmers are going to be sold down the river again. Need I remind you how often in the past American farmers were sold down the river on this tariff issue? All through the twenties farmers asked for a real program for agriculture, a program that would enable them to meet the situation of surplus acres following the war. And what did they get? They got high tariffs. That is, the industrialists dominating the Government gave agriculture whatever ineffective and meaningless tariff increases they thought necessary to induce the farmers to stand for stiff and effective boosts in industrial tariffs. The result was that agriculture was not helped but harmed. Farmers had to buy in a protected market and sell in an unprotected one. Again and again a real program for agriculture was shelved, and farmers got this fake one instead. We came down to 1932, with surpluses three times the normal amount, corn at 10 cents, hogs at $2, wheat at 30 cents, and what did our tariffs mean then?

The kind of program that farmers and those of us who were working for farmers' interests wanted was one that would really make the tariff work for agriculture. Farmers wanted a program that would protect their home market from the price-smashing weight of surpluses that could not be sold either here or abroad. They wanted an equivalent to industry's tariff. In 1933, I think they got at least a start toward the kind of program they really wanted, with adjustments in acreage financed by processing taxes that were somewhat the equivalent of industry's tariff. They began to see their way to a balanced relationship with industry, so that agriculture as well as industry might obtain just benefit from the home market. Though the processing taxes have been taken away from farmers, I think they are not going to stop fighting for a real program for agriculture.

The high protective tariff is not agriculture's baby; it is industry's baby. If industry is to keep its high tariff, farmers want equivalent help, but they can get it only by protecting themselves from excessive exportable surpluses. And no high tariff, or even an embargo will do that.

By all means, let us make the most of the home market. But I want you to think seriously about the fact that farmers have more to lose through nationalistic policies than any other group. In the present year, 1936, farmers are cultivating probably thirty-five to forty-five million acres that are going to produce things which will be sold abroad. The most additional land they could use by cutting out imports would be perhaps 10 million acres. It just wouldn't be good sense to risk having to leave thirty-five or forty-five million acres idle in order to try to gain a market for 10 million acres. I don't think farmers are foolish enough to trade dollars for quarters, no matter how strong the pressure may be by those who are busy grinding their own axes.

The situation caused by the drought of 1934 is now pretty well over, although the effect of the drought on livestock marketings will be felt for another year. Imports brought about by the situation are receding and will soon be back to normal. With normal producing weather this year and next, extraordinary things could happen to supplies and prices of farm products. This is the central farm problem, and I am confident that farmers will not be misled by side issues, but are resolved to deal with the central problem through a real farm program.

We don't want to give up our remaining foreign markets—rather, we should like to see those markets improved—but we are all anxious that great surpluses of exportable farm products are not going to wreck the domestic market in the future.

To take care of this situation, some are suggesting that we discard all checks upon production and adopt a two-price system, or export bounty, which would be a straight subsidy of production. This, they believe, would enable farmers to send surpluses abroad at lower prices, while selling the domestic part of the crop at home at higher prices.

I believe this plan can work for a given commodity when certain foreign conditions are favorable and for a short time. In 1933, we were able to promote the sale of a quantity of wheat in this manner. However, as a long-time policy applied on a large scale, the dual-price or export-subsidy system would be certain to bring more grief than benefit to farmers and to the Nation, particularly if the system were used in place of some sort of control over production. If the export market should be underwritten in this manner, it would surely bring into production an increasing acreage of the commodity affected. Increasing production would mean increased export surpluses which in turn would require higher and higher subsidies to maintain price. Finally, it would result in the economic insanity of virtually giving away to foreign nations a large part of our wealth and soil fertility—very much as we gave away our crops and our soil fertility during the 1920's by lending to foreign countries money which they could not repay. I don't think we want to return to that kind of insanity. The pain of heavy surpluses and low prices when the thing finally crashes is too great.

Besides, it is extremely probable that we could not get rid of huge surpluses in this manner, no matter how big the subsidy, especially if at the same time we refused to accept imports. And, in passing, let me call your attention to the fact that many of those who argue for an export bounty are also vociferous advocates of embargoing imports. Other countries do not want to accept our products if we will not accept some of theirs. They are able to put up trade barriers overnight to keep out any of our products that they do not want to accept. Let us face the fact that the use of export subsidies by the nations of the world is really international price cutting. It is a form of cutthroat competition which ruins everybody if it is carried far enough. The only kind of international trade which is worth anything, on a large scale and in the long run, is the kind which trades goods and services for goods and services.

We do want to increase in every sane way possible the chance to sell more farm products abroad. And, by the way, it is worth mentioning here that the trend in exports of cotton and tobacco is once more upward, both of these being products less affected by the drought than other export products. As supplies of wheat and pork and other export products increase with normal weather,

we should regain a part of our foreign trade in these products, too; the situation is far from hopeless.

Of course, to sell abroad we must buy abroad. We ought to buy particularly more industrial products on which tariffs now are so high as virtually to create domestic monopolies. It seems to me that farmers interested in the tariff situation, if they really want to work for a more intelligent arrangement that would react to their benefit, might well look into our tariffs on aluminum, electrical equipment, chemicals and dyes, and certain other industrial products. They will be interested, I think, in following the results of the resolution recently adopted by the Senate which, while asking for data on A. A. A. benefit payments over $10,000, also requests the Tariff Commission for data on the benefits obtained by corporations from the tariff on such industrial products as these.

The real tariff issue, so far as farmers are concerned, it seems to me, lies in the question of monopolistic privileges enjoyed by some corporations and groups of corporations shielded from competition by a tariff wall. The use of tariffs by such interests hurts farmers in two ways. It helps to cut them off from markets for their products abroad, and it makes them pay higher prices for the things they buy at home.

As you know, efforts are being made by the State Department to work out better foreign-trade conditions through the reciprocal trade agreement policy. I have been interested to see just how this new approach might compare with the old approach of congressional tariff making. My conclusion, on the basis of what has been done to date, is that it is a much fairer approach, from the standpoint of agriculture at least, than the old logrolling method. In the new approach careful and painstaking study is made of each and every item on which it is proposed to reduce our import duty. This study takes into account the significance and effects of any duty reduction from a national point of view as well as from the standpoint of the particular industry involved. Under the old approach the height of the duties on particular items was determined primarily by relative political strength and bargaining skill of the various contending interests. In such a set-up it is evident that agriculture is at a great disadvantage from the start since most of the major branches of agriculture are, in general, on an export basis or so close to it that they are not in a position, under ordinary weather conditions, to benefit from increased import duties.

I believe that agriculture has obtained real benefits through the reciprocal trade agreement policy. Though temporary adjustments may need to be made by certain producers, I believe that farmers as a whole have very much to gain from the policy. However, I can assure you that wherever it seems to me that farmers as a whole are not getting a square deal in proposed trade agreements. I hope to be the first to point that out and seek for a remedy.

Among other suggestions for bettering the market of farm products is that of encouraging greater industrial use of farm products. This is a program which any friend of the farmer wants to encourage in every way possible. Industry, of course, is a big customer of the farmer even now. It buys more than 40 percent of its raw materials from the farmer today. It buys cotton for making clothes, it buys tobacco, it buys some of our corn for starch, for sirup, and other products, it buys a certain amount of soybean oil for paints, varnishes, and other industrial uses. The Department of Agriculture has long been experimenting in new industrial uses for farm products and has made important discoveries in this field. The Department, in cooperation with experiment stations of the leading Corn Belt States, has recently established a soybean industrial utilization laboratory at Urbana, Ill. It is also supplying funds for experiments in the use of cotton in road building. It will continue to explore such possibilities, I hope, with even increased facilities. Mr. Chester Davis was engaged in exploring the possibility of blending of corn-made alcohol with gasoline just before he took up his duties with the A. A. A., and he has continued an alert interest in the subject. I, myself, as a farm editor in 1932, sought to stimulate interest in this particular plan. I believe that no avenue should be left unexplored that may add to the uses of farm products and the wealth of the American people.

I am sure that farmers welcome the interest of industrialists in this experimental work. Time and money spent by them in opening up new uses for agricultural products is a fine contribution to the general welfare. However, I believe that this industrial-use program is not in itself a solution to the farm problem. Experimental activities are slow; something may come of this this year, or next year, or maybe in 10 or 20 years. I do not think we should rely exclusively on the possibility of a sudden industrial discovery opening up the need for the products of 30 or 40 million acres as a solution to the farm problem overnight. Here again it is a question of putting first things first. I do not want to belittle industrial experiments, but I do want to be sure that American farmers count no chickens before they are hatched.

Grim experience has taught agriculture the necessity to be realistic about the problem of achieving and maintaining the home market for its products. A healthy market here among the 125 millions of our own people is the farmers' first consideration. Nothing could be more vital to them than that. It is so vital that farmers have learned to apply the test of practicability to all the new proposals touching the problem.

Applying this test, farmers have learned that they themselves and the industries directly dependent upon agriculture comprise a large part of the home market. They now know that nothing is gained but everything is lost by extreme tariff measures, which in the name of protecting the home market, actually bring retaliatory amputation of our export outlets. They know this backs up farm products at home, wrecks American farm prices, cripples farm buying power and instead of building up the home market actually ruins it.

Having applied the test of practicability to the suggested alternatives, I think we may fairly classify into two main groups the workable measures to permit agriculture to make the most of the home market.

The first of these two groups of measures includes those designed directly to maintain a balanced agricultural supply situation in this country, to avoid piling up price-breaking surpluses, and to substitute sound and economic land use for exploitative methods which exhaust the agricultural plant.

The second of the two groups, bearing on the demand side of agriculture's problem, includes those measures designed directly to build up and maintain the purchasing power of the people of the towns and cities.

I have already touched upon measures comprising the first group. Farmers know a great deal about them. They understood the functions of the Agricultural Adjustment programs. These functions included reducing surpluses, restoring balance to supply, raising farm prices and helping to restore a home market to American industry. I believe most of them understand that the reciprocal-trade agreements are part of the general effort to remove barriers to international commerce, to revive world trade, reopen foreign outlets for farm products and improve supply conditions for our basic farm crops.

In the present agricultural-conservation program of the A. A. A., farmers are making another approach to the supply problem, although from a long-time as well as an immediate point of view. Farmers know that the reasons for ruthless exploitation of soil have often been economic—that under pressure of extreme supply and price fluctuations they have been alternately forced by ruinously low returns and induced by boom conditions to mine and sell soil fertility, or to expand the farm plant by turning under millions of acres of grass lands which should have remained in sod. I believe that farmers understand the public and private importance of stabilizing production, stabilizing prices, and of maintaining the productivity of farm land for years to come.

I think they also appreciate that, while the A. A. A. conservation program will be of immediate help in stabilizing supplies, still the program is not a direct production-control measure. It is well fitted to present needs, because the drought helped to dissipate surpluses. But farmers know that normal weather would bring surplus problems again, and will look forward to utilizing the method which the Supreme Court left open to them. The year 1938 is sure to see an interesting experimental effort by farmers to meet their supply problem through cooperation of the States. The Supreme Court did not abolish the farm surplus problem, nor did agriculture's interest in a balanced supply situation evaporate with the Hoosac Mills decision. But farmers were forced to look forward to using the method of cooperating through the States that the Court has left open to them. Agriculure will fight against recurrence of the surplus condition that ruined farmers in 1932.

I spoke of a second great group of measures available to protect and increase agriculture's stake in the home market. These measures include those which bear heavily upon the demand side of the farm problem. They comprise all those means by which this country is attempting to extend buying power to vast groups of our citizens who now have little or no buying power.

I wonder if the farmers have an adequate appreciation of the size of the market which could be opened to them in this country if the 10 or 11 millions of our people who now are unemployed were working, had incomes, and could become buyers of the goods of farm and factory. Besides the jobless, vast numbers of others have incomes so low or so uncertain that they can buy only meagerly.

The great problem of an industrial nation is to find methods which will assure distribution of the fruits of industry back to the masses of workers. Mass producing industries can function steadily and successfully only on a basis of mass consumption. Otherwise goods pile up, purchasing power becomes concentrated in a few hands, and civilization is shaken by recurrent plagues of unemployment and depression.

Our people have not yet solved this crucial problem of distribution. They are not expecting that a utopian solution will materialize from nowhere overnight. But the terrifying experiences of 1932 convinced them that the time has come to make serious and constructive efforts in that direction. In 1933, our Government undertook to cope with the problem before it was too late.

There is not time here to recite details about all the Federal measures which have sought to distribute purchasing power among masses of people who had none in 1932. People hungry or starving for want of money to buy food were placed on relief rolls, and surplus farm commodities were distributed among them. Increase in employment has been sought through public works, stimulation of home building, and through encouraging resumption of industrial activity by lending. Other labor and social-security measures have sought to replace the children and the aged in industry with able-bodied and mature people out of jobs, and to increase and maintain workers' income. Agencies have been set up to protect the savings of the people from being drawn into

the hands of speculators by sale of shaky securities. And right now Congress is considering tax reforms which will encourage redistribution of profits among the people through wages and dividends.

Admitting frankly that such efforts as these will need modifying and improvement, and that the degree of future reliance upon them will wane or grow from time to time as activity in industry rises or declines, still it is clear that they serve a tremendously important function.

Such measures use some of the technique successfully employed by the A. A. A. We know that revival of the purchasing power of 30 million farming population has resulted in great improvement in activity and employment in a good many industries.

Farmers should be quick to appreciate the significance for themselves of the converse of that situation. For them, the successful revival of industrial activity, the distribution of the products of industry among the masses of the people, the protection of the people's savings, and the stabilization of employment mean a healthy and growing home market for the products of the farm.

Gains have already been made in this direction. I have often indicated the importance of this factor in current farm improvement. A year ago, in my annual report to the President, I said that with prices then at a relatively high level, due to the improved supply situation, further improvement in farm income would have to come chiefly from improved industrial activity and better buying power among city workers. Such improved purchasing power has come about, not so rapidly as we would like, but fast enough to have effects exceeding our expectations. National income, exclusive of agricultural income, was higher in March than for any month since the third quarter of 1931.

During the first 3 months of 1936, farm income from the sale of products was over a billion and a half dollars, an increase of 20 percent over the income for January, February, and March of 1935, not including benefit payments. The recession in farm income and rural retail business that followed the Hoosac Mills decision has been succeeded by new gains as farm confidence has been restored, as benefit payments have been resumed, and the price situation has been strengthened. This increase in farm income came about not through increased prices, but through the ability of consumers to absorb a larger amount of farm products at a reasonable price through increased purchasing power. Even so, the improvement in farm income was about twice as great as the improvement in consumers' income. This was due in part to the fact that farmers receive approximately half of the consumer's dollar spent for food, so that when a consumer benefits from 10 percent more income the increased expenditure on food, if it all goes to the producer, means a 20-percent increase in the receipts of farmers.

I have pointed out before how very closely the trend of income to farmers follows the trend of factory pay rolls in the cities. In the case of dairy and livestock products, the income of consumers and what they spend for these products follow an almost identical trend. Both reached a low point in 1932, and both had increased by approximately one-third by the beginning of 1936. The same general rule holds, though with variations, for other farm products. Now that factory pay rolls and consumer purchasing power are increasing, farmers are benefiting in a rather striking way, since the margin taken out by middlemen tends to remain fairly constant, and additional consumer expenditure therefore goes quite largely to the producer.

Now, I think we can all see where the real hope of attaining and maintaining a great home market for American agriculture actually lies. It lies in keeping a healthy farm supply situation; in opening and keeping open the channels of international trade, so that surpluses of our great basic commodities will not back up on the farm; it lies in conservation of soil resources by sound production of sufficient supplies, not in the waste of these resources by reckless production of price-breaking surpluses.

On the demand side, agriculture's interests are served by building up the home market. Agriculture benefits from increased industrial activity and from measures designed to put purchasing power in the hands of the large numbers of people who still have almost none. This is agriculture's great stake in the national welfare.

What agriculture wants is customers with money to buy the products of the farm. For we all know that farmers with large quantities of stuff which they can't sell for want of customers with money, may be nearly as poor as people who need that stuff badly but who can't buy it. We all remember the milk strikes in the Middle West at a time when millions of city people needed milk and butter. Their need of itself didn't help dairy farmers because it could not then become a real market demand for dairy products. Agricultural markets are much improved since the farm strikes of 1933. We want more improvement such as we have already had in the South's demand for dairy products and in the North's demand for cotton.

We want to have a chance to sell the products of those three additional million acres which could be used, on a basis of improved wage scales and employment, by New York City's potential customers of agriculture. Think of the home market farmers might have if the distribution system were improved to give buying power to the millions of people who now have little or none. Such considerations are a hundred times more important than imports as a factor in broadening agriculture's home market.

Of course there are some rich and powerful interests in this country which reject and obstruct every Government undertaking, whether it falls in the first or the second group of measures I have named.

These people fought the Agricultural Adjustment programs first in Congress and then in the courts. They have created subsidized organizations pretending to speak for the farmers in opposition to the farmers' adjustment and conservation programs, and to talk up regimentation, imports, chemical salvation, or anything else that happened to come in handy in their efforts to arouse the farmers, or persuade the country that the farmers were aroused against measures which, for reasons of their own, these interests disliked.

The attacks on agriculture's programs have been accompanied by assaults directed against every effort of the Government to provide relief, create employment, and spread buying power among more people. The technique already familiar to farmers has been used in creating and subsidizing organizations to speak, in the name of liberty, or Constitution, or independence, or Republic, but always to speak for those interests which are fighting the Government's reemployment, relief, and recovery efforts.

The welfare of American agriculture is inseparably linked with the national welfare. The long depression that beset agriculture in the decade of the twenties was an important factor in the national depression of the thirties.

Agricultural improvement from 1933 to 1936 has made an important contribution to national economic recovery. Conversely, the Government's employment and other measures for industrial revival have helped in the improvement of the domestic demand for farm products.

The interests which fight against the farmers' programs are really striking a blow also against industry's markets. Those which fight industrial reemployment and recovery measures are striking a blow at the farmers' home market, and retarding the development of that market to its full potentiality.

The outlook for agriculture is bright. But keeping it so will depend upon maintaining the present healthy supply situation, reopening further the channels of world trade, conserving the fertility of the farm plant, and developing the latent home market. This last can only come from increasing the buying power of the large groups of people who now have little or nothing to exchange for goods. To give them employment and earning power is a problem challenging the best leadership and the sincerest thought of industry, of agriculture, and of government.

To meet this challenge we need more than ever the spirit of interdependence and unity in which our Nation was founded. Without this spirit we will be defeated by selfish pressure groups and narrow legalisms. With it we can go forward to new national achievements securely founded on the general welfare.

REGULATION OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, an editorial appearing in the New York Post of Tuesday, April 21, forcefully calls attention to the action of an employers' association which is actively advocating adoption of certain regulatory measures for the textile industry which are contained in the National Textile Act introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman ELLENBOGEN.

It is probably of some historical importance to note the declaration of one organization of businessmen supporting those legislative principles which are essential to natural economic recovery. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Post of Apr. 21, 1936]

WONDERS NEVER CEASE

Can business prosper by pulling down labor standards? It cannot. Is a certain measure of Government supervision a help or a hindrance to business? A help.

At least that's the opinion of the National Federation of Textiles, Inc., expressed by its president, Peter Van Horn. The federation is the trade association of the silk and rayon industry. It joins textile labor organizations in calling for enactment of the Ellenbogen bill to establish a little N. R. A. in the textile industry.

The federation hasn't suddenly gone altruistic. It isn't talking through its hat. It made a survey of what happened in 100 silk and rayon mills after the Supreme Court threw out N. R. A.

Hours of work were increased 13 percent. Employment was cut 13 percent. Wages were reduced 5 percent. Production was stepped up 30 percent.

Did that spell prosperity?

On the contrary Mr. Van Horn says that prices fell 5 to 7 percent and sales increased only 9 percent. The difference between that 9 percent increase in sales and the 30 percent increase in production raised the specter of new overproduction, further declines in employment, renewed deflation, more shrinkage in sales—the whole vicious pre-N. R. A. circle all over again.

So the federation wants the Ellenbogen bill. It speaks not the language of the past, but of the future. Its president talks of a 35-hour week as a desirable reform. He points to the estimated $67,000,000 increase in purchasing power if a $13-a-week minimum is established for a 35-hour week. He says that 100,000 new jobs

can be created and that the cost of maintaining 100,000 unemployed will thereby be saved to the taxpayer.

All this to the federation means stabilization of its market, an end of cutthroat competition, and some protection against unfair practices.

It sounds strange in a time of unrestrained and often irrational attack on the New Deal to hear businessmen acknowledge some of its basic principles.

The silk and rayon industry may be the first, but we hope it won't be the last to do so.

Business is waking up to the fact that in order to have a market it must maintain purchasing power and that to maintain purchasing power a certain measure of Government supervision over minimum wages and maximum hours is necessary.

LINCOLN, THE IDEAL PROGRESSIVE—ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN WESLEY HILL

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, February 12, 1936, before the Los Angeles Lincoln Club, Dr. John Wesley Hill, chancellor of the Lincoln Memorial University, Cumberland Gap, Tenn., delivered an inspiring address on the subject of Lincoln, the Ideal Progressive. I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Hill's address printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. Toastmaster and friends, in my last conversation with Uncle Joe Cannon I asked the retiring Congressman about his religious faith. Jerking a stogy from his lips and exuding a column of smoke from his vocal chimney, he exclaimed: "I believe that when God Almighty organized this big corporation known as Humanity and capitalized it, He became responsible for the maintenance of its parity, and I'll be hanged if I part with my holdings in a panic!"

That was the gospel of St. Joseph.

It was likewise the gospel of Father Abraham, who in a letter to his friend Joshua Speed, written amidst the political problems and prognostications of 1860, said: "My text just now is 'Stand still and see the salvation of God!' "

If Lincoln were here today, he would reaffirm the inscription on our coin, "In God we trust", and emblazon it on our economic sky, knowing that the slogan stamped there was so sacred that even the versatile Robert G. Ingersoll suddenly turned orthodox and declared, "A dollar is not worth the paper it is written on if it cannot take the witness stand and swear 'I know that my Redeemer liveth.' "

This confession of faith is still our most precious patrimony.

If we neglect this inheritance, it will fall into alien hands.

The representatives of agitation and revolution are attempting to appropriate it.

There are over 200 revolutionary publications continually invoking the words of Lincoln in justification of their un-Americanism.

Lincoln, anticipating this distortion, said: "If I should die tomorrow, my obscurity alone would protect my principles from distortion."

That prophecy is fulfilled today in shameful misuse of Lincoln's name, in fragmentary and mutilated quotations of his words, in misapplication of his principles, in grotesque imitations of his democracy, in demagogic strutting in his livery, and in shocking perversions of his character.

The hour is opportune for a Lincoln renaissance, a revival of his letters, a return to the principles for which he lived and died, the integrity of the Constitution, equality before the law, religious tolerance, racial amity, industrial and social justice, sound money, a "lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations", national preparedness, and the solution of every problem "With malice toward none and charity for all, and with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

There is nothing Utopian or obsolete in these articles of faith. They are instinct with life, applicable today and adaptable through all time because truth is timeless, not irridescent baubles of political vacuity, nor preambulatory advertisements of political nostrums, but a body of faith, built upon the cornerstone of law, rather than tumult, expediency, or passion!

Lincoln was a constructive progressive; destruction had no place in his creed. His was a forward-looking program. He was not a dreamer nor a haloed illusionist.

He knew the difference between progress and motion.

The little boy on his hobby horse imagines he is making a two-ten record, when he is only wearing out the carpet. That is not progress but friction.

Lincoln was neither a reactionary nor a revolutionary. The reactionary would worship the devil on account of his antiquity; the revolutionary wearies of God because of His eternity.

Lincoln stood midway between the extremes.

In his address before the Historical Society of Connecticut, Charles A. Dana said, speaking of Lincoln: "He was never a step too late nor a step too soon."

If he were here today, he would not be a stand-patter but a steady-stepper.

Lincoln's progress was not in experiment, but by experience!

A surgeon advised his patient that an immediate operation was necessary.

The patient pled for time, insisting upon knowing whether the operation would be a success. "Certainly it will be a success", said the surgeon. "How do you know?" asked the patient. "Because", replied the doctor, "I always save 1 out of every 10, and the other 9 are dead!"

Lincoln knew how to bide his time.

He remembered the little couplet, "He who plants a seed beneath the sod, and waits to see it mount above the clod, he trusts in God!"

"A man", said Lincoln, "watches his pear tree day by day, impatient for the ripening of the fruit. Let him attempt to force the process, and he will spoil both fruit and tree, but let him patiently wait, and the ripened pear will at last fall into his lap."

Lincoln did not attempt to rebuild the world overnight. He built upon history; he likewise believed in posterity. If he were here today, he would plan for the protection of posterity from the unescapable burden of taxation awaiting future generations. In his zeal for the "forgotten man", he would not neglect the unborn.

To the radicals of his day, he said: "You are united in your determination to break with the past, but you are utterly divided among yourselves as to where you are going. You remind me of the little steamboat on the Sangamon, which had a boiler 3 feet long and a whistle 5 feet high, and every time it whistled it stopped. It exhausted its power in noise."

Lincoln did not mistake noise for growth, nor phosphorescence for illumination.

For a steady light a tallow dip makes a better light than a skyrocket.

Reason was the lamp by which he was guided. He was not controlled by impulse.

The impulsive man is the little chap who runs a private wire from the depths of his vacuity to the peak of his egotism, and because it is so high, he thinks he is talking with God, when he is only soliloquizing. Lincoln was not a soliloquist, but a syllogist.

If he were here today, he would make haste slowly! He would think problems out. He would not mistake a cerebral concussion for an idea! He would not be most undecided when he had made up his mind.

He would not mistake revolution for evolution!

He said, "Revolutionize through the ballot box", and again, "He would sooner have the fowl by hatching the egg than by smashing it."

To a committee from the Working Men's Association of New York, he said, "The strongest bond of sympathy outside the family relation should be one uniting all working people, nor should this lead to a war upon property, or the owners of property. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring himself that his own will be safe from violence when built."

Lincoln had no room for Marxianism in his political philosophy.

Socialism is not reform.

Robert Hunter, the placid philosopher of Marxianism, in his book entitled "Socialists at Work", says, "No reforms satisfy them. Their ideals and aims are beyond any immediate attainment, and national, State, and municipal ownership, social insurance, the demolition of slums, the abolition of child labor, the reduction of hours of toil, receive scant approval from Socialists for the reason that socialism is not a reform, but a revolution."

When, therefore, it is proposed to transfer property from private to public ownership, the credulous devotees of this obnoxious doctrine are ignorant of the fact that this revolutionary program includes land, mines, tools of industry, the home, the school, the sanctuary, and the most sacred institutions of civilization.

Government ownership may be a capitivating program to the ignorant and indigent who feel that it is the duty of government to feed them; but to the thrifty and self-reliant who understand that government derives its rights and resources from the governed, and that its function is to protect these rights, the doctrine of the dole is abhorrent.

It is State slavery built upon the principle that the citizen is the ward of the State, thrusting its meddlesome nose into the most sacred rights and relations of the citizen, subjecting him to its belittling and bedeviling espionage.

No less authority than the versatile H. G. Wells declares that: "Socialism is the State family, and just as privately owned utilities must be changed from private to public ownership, so the home, which is an institution of private property, must be transformed into public ownership, resulting in a widely extended communism."

Ah, the secret is out! The socialistic scorpion carries its sting in its tail.

The widely extended communism advocated by Wells is the promiscuous sexuality acclaimed by Lenin and Stalin.

Marriage is no longer a sacrament but a sacrilege. The home is scrapped and the cradle is transformed into a bolshevistic eugenic incubator.

Against this proposed nationalization of the home, its scientific mating, eugenic breeding, and moral degradation, Lincoln directs every power and passion of his head and heart! "The home", he declared, "is the cornerstone of our civilization", and recalling the scenes of his childhood in his cabin home, he exclaimed: "All that I am, or ever hope to be, I owe to my angel mother. I remember her prayers. They have clung to me all of my life."

In the midst of the bewildering problems of the Civil War, he said: "I am driven to my knees over and over again because I have nowhere else to go."

In a letter commending his dying father to the mercy of God, writing to his stepbrother, he said: "Tell father to put his trust

in God. He notes the sparrow's fall, and numbers the hairs of our heads, and will not forget the dying man who puts his trust in Him."

Compare these sublime sentiments with the licentious doctrines of the Communist manifesto, and the putrid preachments of Stalin and his retained assassins.

Lincoln believed in individual initiative, freedom of conscience, and worship, the bill of rights, and representative democracy. He would not clothe Government with paternalistic functions. To Lincoln there was no twilight zone between public and private ownership. He boldly declared: "The legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well in their separate or individual capacities. In all that people can individually do for themselves the Government ought not to interfere."

The wisdom of this utterance is seen in the debacle of every Government venture in the field of paternalism, notably Government control of the railways during the World War, which left the railroads in the condition of the old pawnbroker on the Bowery, who, having accidentally swallowed a dollar, threw up his hands in excitement and exclaimed: "I am a dollar in and a dollar out, and I cannot balance my books."

And the books are still unbalanced!

Upon the institution of private property civilization rests.

It has seen order and organization supplant savagery, anarchy, and disorder; freedom repress tyranny, and the principle established that a man's "home is his castle", and cannot be invaded except by due process of law.

"If there is any one thing", Lincoln insisted, "which can be proved to be the will of Heaven by external nature around us, without reference to revelation, it is the proposition that whatever a man earns with his hands, and by the sweat of his brow, he shall have the right to enjoy in peace."

When a man can no longer say of that which he has acquired through sweat of brain or brawn: "This is my own", when he becomes a nonproductive parasitical consumer, the mainspring of civilization snaps, incentive to progress ceases, life becomes a game of grab, and men will be reduced to beasts of prey.

The hour is at hand, therefore, for a reapplication of the principles which are fundamental to our national life: The Constitution without mutilation; liberty without license; equality without uniformity; prosperity without monopoly; ownership without communism; government without bureaucracy; patriotism without demagogism; business without regimentation; and progress without revolution.

The iconoclast has done his work, the burblers have exhausted their noise.

The hour for the builder has arrived!

We are surfeited with experimental legislation! "All kinds of twisting and turning done here" is the magic sign over the door of the new order of political prestidigitators!

The time is ripe for a return to sanity. Lincoln said: "True views are better than new views." Bills of lading should take priority over bills of legislation.

The Government should not make the fashion plate of the French milliner its model. That artistic genius goes into seclusion at the close of the season, and by some process of integral calculus, or special spectrum analysis discovers that changing styles cost our American ladies million of dollars for the shape of a crown, the color of a ribbon, or the attitude of a feather.

Business should not be regulated by political fashion plates.

It should not turn upon the attitude of a Government commission, the contortions of a shadow-dancing "brain truster", or a socialistic somnambulist.

Prosperity cannot be built upon the caprice of the moment; it cannot thrive in the dark.

Blind alleys are poor terminal stations for transcontinental systems.

Business should not be kept on the witness stand indefinitely.

If our Government is to continue as the embodiment of representative democracy, if it is to maintain constitutional authority, we must avoid everything that savors of bureaucracy, draw a line of demarcation between government by commission and government by constitution, and develop our national resources, genius, industry, and institutions through that personal initiative, private capital, sense of justice, and love of liberty as far removed from paternalism upon the one hand as it is from democracy upon the other.

Government by commission is headed toward despotism. It is only a matter of time when it arrives.

Bureaucracy is only another name for stagnation. Stagnation is the final step to damnation.

There are such bewildering contradictions between State and National commissions that business is frequently in the position of the two prospectors on the western plains in the early days.

They saw a buffalo bull charging upon them and fled for safety, one of them springing into a cave as the infuriated beast went by. Then the man in the cave jumped out and the bull rushed back, the man jumped in and the bull rushed by. The man in the tree shouted: "You infernal fool, while you are in the cave, why don't you stay there?" To which the man below answered: "What the dickens do you know about this cave? There is a bear in here!"

Between the bull and the bear of State and Federal regulations there has been naught for business but to jump in and out, backward and forward, in a vain attempt to escape the penalties of conflicting tribunals.

Constitutional government was the desideratum of Lincoln's statesmanship. He would not tolerate a dictator. Early in his career he depicted the dictator as one who "with towering ambition disdains a beaten path and thirsts and burns for distinction." He said: "When we as a people lose the genius of our own intelligence we become the fit subjects of the first cunning usurper arising among us."

In the midst of the chaos and confusion of world reconstruction, where militarism masquerades in the garments of peace; internationalism in the role of humanitarianism; preparedness is laughed to scorn by professional pacifists, and revolution stalks in the name of progress, we need to hear again the words of Lincoln: "I insist", said he, "if there is anything which it is the duty of the whole American people to revere and not to entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

Prior to this warning sounded by Lincoln, Washington warned us against "Entangling alliances with the Old World."

It was in our infancy that this advice was given, when our population along the seaboard was sparse, democracy was still on trial, the problem of self-government had not been solved, the American eagle had not been hatched. Today conditions are different, where Uncle Sam sits is the head of the table.

In our infancy, we were proud of our little antiexpansion bib and persisted in separation from the Old World, and living our own life. In the meantime, we continued to grow until the little antiexpansion bib looked like a cotton patch on the front of our blue uniform.

When the Maine blew up our bib was blown to tatters and America suddenly became a world power.

And now what do we propose to do with this power, utilize it as a monkey playing with a razor, dissipate it in muddling around without chart or compass, and permitting our institutions to perish, our flag to float at half mast, and our glorious heritage to suffer destruction through our failure to heed the words of Lincoln, when he warned us against "entrusting to other hands the preservation and perpetuity of our own liberties and institutions"?

Lincoln was not an isolationist. He recognized our accountability to the world. He saw beyond the Civil War a new era of democracy, the soul of which should be projected everywhere, and he would not tolerate the thought of provincialism.

His dream for America and the world was a "just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations", but he would recognize no international banner. He would not tolerate the red flag! He would not hang the American flag beneath the flag of the League of Nations.

His was not a program of self-surrendered rights and policies, the transfer of the power to declare war from Congress to an alien court, the submission of the Monroe Doctrine, our immigration policy, or any other question vital to our rights to a league of nations, but peace at home and "with all nations", characterized by such strength toward the strong and gentleness toward the weak that the world must recognize the source of our power in our devotion to justice, love of liberty, and consecration to humanity.

Standing for these ideals today at home and abroad, possessed of the greatest physical basis for an enduring empire the world has ever known; orphaned of the solemn instinct of antiquity; yet compensated in area for all that we lack in age; environed with mountains of silver and gold; boundless in resource, illimitable in energy and enterprise, a continental empire, threaded with a thousand lines of trade and commerce; a land of Edens and El Doradoes, it is not for us to carry our flag at half mast in any crisis, nor to surrender to dismay in the hour of darkness before the dawn.

Defeatism is not in our national vocabulary.

No, it is for us to develop that economic and spiritual supremacy, that faith in God and humanity, that courage to meet the greatest obstacles, and to face the greatest tasks unawed and unafraid, to meet it in a spirit worthy the ideals, institutions, and ancestry of which we boast.

Yes, worthy the immortal Lincoln, who, when Sumter had been fired upon, and the Nation itself was threatened with destruction, when the rock beneath his feet, called the Government, was turning into shifting sands, with faith incapable of bewilderment, took up his pen and wrote in his first message to Congress in 1861: "Having chosen our course without guile, and with a pure purpose, let us renew our trust in God, and go forward with manly hearts."

Brothers, the Lincolnian slogan for the hour is "Forward! Forward with manly hearts!"

THE TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM AND WORLD PEACE—ADDRESS BY HENRY F. GRADY

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Henry F. Grady, Chief of the Division of Trade Agreements, Department of State, before the annual meeting of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, at the Chase Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., May 2, 1936. The address is entitled "The Trade Agreements Program and World Peace." I feel that the address is of so much value that I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

I am confident that the members of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, who have worked long and earnestly for peace, readily appreciate the bearing of the Government's present commercial policy upon international cooperation and good will.

It must be evident to all that peace and prosperity go hand in hand. The periods of greatest economic development in the history of the United States have been periods of good times at home and of flourishing international trade. Periods of great depression accompanied by an agitation for higher economic protection follow wars and have in them the seeds of future wars. Economic nationalism, self-sufficiency, autarchy, or buy-American campaigns—by whatever name it is called—is not new to us today. It is high protectionism developed into a new and extreme form.

Tariffs in themselves are not a cause of war. They make possible to a certain extent some control over our national economic development, but when they become instruments of national self-sufficiency and are used to obstruct and divert the natural courses of world trade, they lead to commercial warfare and unfriendly relations among nations.

Some persons believe that economic nationalism is the only basis upon which the prosperity of the United States may be restored and that our tariffs should be greatly increased and that our imports should be further restricted. Such a belief is for the most part based upon confused thinking and a lack of an understanding of the fundamental nature of trade. A comprehension of even the elementary principles of political economy should make clear to a reasonable person that national self-sufficiency leads to unemployment, a lower standard of living, and international friction.

Those who seek to convert the United States to a policy of national self-sufficiency do not appreciate the vital importance of our export trade to the economic well-being of the country in general. They point out that our exports account for only 10 percent, or even less, of our total production. They argue, therefore, that the volume of foreign trade could be substantially reduced without resulting in a dislocation of our domestic economy. Such persons fail to realize, however, not only that the 10 percent may represent the difference between profit and loss in many industries but that such an average is often misleading.

This average of 10 percent obscures the fact that foreign markets are especially important to many of our basic industries upon which the prosperity of the country is to a great extent dependent. For example, in 1929 our export trade absorbed nearly 55 percent of the cotton produced in this country, over 40 percent of the tobacco, 33 percent of the lard, 18 percent of the wheat, 30 percent of the office appliances, 28 percent of the printing machinery, 30 percent of the sewing machines, 25 percent of the agricultural implements and machinery, and 14 percent of the automobiles. Many of these industries are large consumers of raw materials and semimanufactured articles domestically produced. For instance, preliminary statistics issued by the automobile industry indicate that in 1935 that industry alone consumed 77 percent of the plate glass produced in the United States, 75 percent of the rubber manufactures, 39 percent of the lead, 33 percent of the nickel, 23 percent of the steel and iron, 22 percent of the copper, 20 percent of the tin, 16 percent of the aluminum, 15 percent of the zinc, and 8 percent of the hardwood lumber.

Trade, in the last analysis, consists in an exchange of goods or services for mutual benefit. This is true of international trade as well as of domestic trade. Payment for merchandise sold abroad may be made in gold or with credit for a time, but eventually goods and services must pay for goods and services; in other words, imports must in the long run pay for exports. If prosperity is in a large measure dependent upon export trade, it is therefore no less dependent upon import trade.

A large percentage of our imports consists of noncompetitive goods, products which complement rather than compete with domestic products. Many of them could not be produced here at all; others might be produced, but not on an economical basis. Their production would result in a decrease in the productivity of labor and capital and an increase in the cost of living to consumers. The range of imports which we cannot produce at home efficiently or at all and which do not compete to an appreciable extent with domestic products can be enlarged.

I may point out that Federal Reserve bank indices, covering a 16-year period from 1919 to 1935, show a close correlation between imports and employment. When imports have increased, employment, and to a great extent wages, have increased, and, on the other hand, when imports have decreased, wages and employment have decreased. I do not mean to imply, of course, that imports are directly a major factor in the creation of employment, although, as a matter of fact, it has been estimated that about four-fifths of our imports, three-fifths consisting of crude materials and foodstuffs, and one-fifth of semimanufactures, require the employment of American labor in being transformed into marketable products. I do mean to point out, however, that better times and employment accompany increased activity in international trade.

If our foreign trade which absorbs the surplus resulting from and necessary to the high level of our agricultural and industrial productivity should be cut off, what would the result be? Not only the workers directly engaged in export industries, but also those who indirectly produce for export markets would join the ranks of the unemployed. Furthermore, factories relying upon imported materials for production would have to close down, adding further to economic distress and unemployment. Without cargoes our ships would lie idle, and enterprises closely affiliated with foreign trade, such as banking, marine insurance, warehousing, and transportation would be seriously affected. The domestic market would be glutted with goods intended for foreign consumers. Prices would drop, purchasing power would shrink, business would stagnate. A great depression would settle upon us from which there would be no recovery, for economic activity would be reduced permanently to a lower level. This would be the price of economic nationalism.

The evils of economic nationalism are visited not only upon those countries which choose to be self-sufficient. The import barriers raised by the countries desiring economic isolation are a disrupting factor in world trade in general. The other countries, being thus deprived of foreign markets, must seek new markets elsewhere with the result that competition in international commerce is increased, and prices become depressed. As a result of the decline in world trade, the countries which have neither desired nor sought to become economically isolated find themselves so isolated nevertheless. Such conditions of world depression result in a desperate struggle among nations to grasp what foreign markets remain. Each country seeks special treatment of its commerce by the other. Those countries which are discriminated against by a regime of special privilege find their world markets further limited. They retaliate with discriminatory restrictions. Thus, economic nationalism imposes a strain on international good will. It leads to commercial warfare and finally, in all likelihood, to armed conflict. The competition in import restrictions is as dangerous to world peace as is the rivalry in military armaments. There must be economic disarmament if future wars are to be prevented. Peace and prosperity are hardly possible under conditions of aggressive economic nationalism.

Nations—much like human beings or other members of the animal kingdom in this respect—are motivated by considerations of self-preservation. They will fight for their existence. Prosperity is a condition under which the economic opportunities for existence are freely offered. In our highly integrated civilization no one country possesses within its borders all the resources necessary to modern existence, but by the development of the resources that it has it is able to produce goods for other countries in exchange for the raw materials, foodstuffs, or manufactures which it needs. War may be resorted to, of course, to gain control over resources which are needed at home, but aside from that means, the creation of purchasing power abroad by the development of foreign markets offers for the most part the only opportunity today for obtaining food and materials with which a country may not be adequately equipped or able to produce domestically. A country which is deprived of its foreign markets faces as serious a problem as one whose most valuable natural resources have been seized by force of arms. The very existence of modern civilization is based upon the institution of international trade. When that trade is restricted to an unreasonable degree or diverted into artificial channels by a regime of special privilege and discrimination, and when the means of a nation's livelihood is thereby threatened, the peace of the world is endangered.

The question is, then, How may the barriers to trade be reduced and international commerce be restored upon a fair and equitable basis?

The Government of the United States has taken the lead toward the rehabilitation of world trade as a result of the passage of the Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934.

The trade-agreements program, which was instituted by that act, has two objectives: First, the restoration and expansion of international trade by means of reciprocal reductions of trade barriers and, second, the securing of equality and opportunity for American goods in foreign markets. The program seeks to develop trade on the basis of most-favored-nation treatment.

The unconditional most-favored-nation principle is opposed to the system of preference and special advantage. Simply stated, the principle is this: Any favor granted to one country is extended unconditionally and automatically to all countries which likewise extend to us any favors which are granted to third countries. Thus we receive the same kind of treatment we give. In other words, we do unto other countries as we would have them do unto us. This is the golden rule of international relations.

Under the Trade Agreements Act, announcements of intention to negotiate have been made with respect to 18 countries, and agreements have been concluded with 12 of those countries. There are four agreements with European countries, namely, Belgium, Sweden, Switzerland, and the Kingdom of the Netherlands; seven with Latin American Republics, namely, Cuba, Brazil, Haiti, Colombia, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Guatemala; and one with our neighbor, Canada, which is our second most important customer and second most important source of imports. All of the 12 agreements concluded, except three, namely, those with Colombia, Nicaragua, and Guatemala will be proclaimed when they have received the legislative approval of the Governments of Nicaragua and Guatemala, respectively, and will come into force 30 days after their proclamation.

The trade agreement with Canada, which came into force on January 1, 1936, stands out as one of the major achievements of the trade-agreements program with respect to the number of concessions and the volume of trade involved. Canada undertakes, in this agreement, to accord to the United States the most favorable tariff treatment accorded to any non-British country.

The importance of such an undertaking cannot be measured by mere statistics of trade. It marks a revolution in the trade relations between the two countries. It means that Canada has adopted with respect to the United States the policy of nondiscrimination which we are seeking to advance in the interest of peace and prosperity.

To review in detail the many concessions which have been obtained in the trade agreements thus far concluded with a view to restoring and expanding our international commerce would require more time than is at my disposal. Such information, in carefully tabulated form is, however, available to anyone upon request. In brief, the 12 agreements which have thus far been concluded provide for the reduction of foreign duties on a long list of our export commodities, increases in quotas for American products, the removal or lowering of various types of restrictive taxes, the binding of certain existing duties against increase, and of certain existing quotas against reduction, and the assurance of most-favored-nation treatment of American commerce.

Regardless of the great amount of consideration which is given in tariff bargaining to the welfare of individual industries and the various regions of production, the purpose in view, which is never lost sight of, is the prosperity of the country as a whole. That prosperity is dependent upon the revival and development of international trade in which all countries are offered an opportunity to participate upon an equal basis. This is not possible, however, without conditions of peace. On the other hand, peace is not possible in our modern civilization unless world trade is allowed to grow and nations are offered an equal opportunity to participate in that trade.

Secretary Hull has said of the trade-agreements program, "Our program is essentially an effort to substitute the instruments of commercial peace for those of commercial warfare and thus to provide an important element in the maintenance of peace itself." A program which has for its purpose the gradual lowering of excessive barriers to trade and the establishment of commercial relations upon a nondiscriminatory basis is surely a step in the direction of international good will and world peace.

THE BATTLE OF SAN JACINTO—ADDRESS BY G. A. HILL, JR.

MR. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I present for incorporation in the RECORD an address delivered in connection with the centennial celebration of the Battle of San Jacinto, by George A. Hill, Jr., of Houston, Tex., on April 15, 1936.

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the Kiwanis Club, I am deeply sensible to the honor that you do me in inviting me to address you upon the eve of the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Battle of San Jacinto. By heritage, by environment, and by long and appreciative contemplation, that occasion has sustained in me for many years a feeling of heightened pride of lineage, of race, and of country, and in the institutions of Anglo-Saxon freedom preserved by that epochal and heroic conflict.

With the Declaration of Independence at Washington on the Brazos on March 2, 1836, the colonists of Texas sealed their doom or their salvation. The swift march of events and an onrushing and conquering enemy made their action imperative—and the siege of the Alamo made all hope of a peaceful solution vanish. By action of the convention, Sam Houston was made the commander in chief of the army of Texas—a veritably nonexistent entity, and he proceeded at once, with an escort of three men, to Gonzales to recruit, equip, train, and maneuver his prospective command in such fashion as to serve his twofold purpose, viz:

First. To cover the flight of the women and children, the sick and the aged, and the official personnel of the Government before the armies of the destroying invaders; and

Second. To organize a strategic retreat, under the delay of which he might hope to deceive and divide the enemy, and develop an effective fighting force, capable of achieving victory whenever a fortuitous opportunity could be contrived.

The annihilation of the defenders of the Alamo on March 6, and the massacre at Goliad on March 27, spread terror and consternation, and Houston's retreat from Gonzales began, largely composed of an army of striplings of the average age of 20, from which there were defections and additions while marching to San Felipe de Austin, but which army numbered 783 on the fateful day at San Jacinto.

You will remember the burning of San Felipe, upon Houston's retreat; the delays on the Colorado and the Brazos; and the indescribable hardships from cold, rain, hunger, swollen streams, and sickness; also the arrival on Buffalo Bayou, opposite Harrisburg, on the day following the burning of the town by General Santa Anna, as he hurried on to Morgans Point in pursuit of President Burnet who had evacuated Harrisburg with his government none too soon. These events were replete with incidents marked by superb courage, inflexible purpose, heroic suffering, and uncanny vision, for indeed, the "Runaway Scrape", as the exodus of the civilians was called, had enjoyed the protection of Houston's retreating army, and Santa Anna's belief that the Texans were in full flight to Louisiana had caused him to mistake Houston's strength and purpose and to divide his own armies.

When Houston arrived at Harrisburg he comprehended Santa Anna's predicament. After providing for his sick and exhorting his troops to renewed efforts he followed Santa Anna's course as far as the Lynchburg Ferry, realizing that Santa Anna would have to return there from his camp at Morgans Point to effect a crossing, and that Houston's army could confront him there. Santa Anna, believing it to be Houston's purpose to also cross at Lynchburg in his supposed flight, and desiring to prevent this, hurried to Lynchburg to make his encampment and await reinforcements.

On the afternoon of April 20 there was skirmishing and brief but desultory firing, and Santa Anna's reinforcements under General Cos arrived during the night.

On the morning of the 21st Houston literally and figuratively burned his bridges. He sent Deaf Smith to destroy the bridge over Vinces Bayou, the only avenue of escape for either army, and then restrained his forces until midafternoon for the attack.

The remainder is history—unprecedented and imperishable!

Seven hundred and eighty-three Texans launched an attack upon the armies of Santa Anna and Cos, totaling 1,500 men, and in 18 minutes killed 638, wounded 208, and captured 738 in a devastating defeat and rout of the Mexican forces that, in its awesome finality, crushed and forever removed tyrannical sovereignty over Texas, achieved the independence of the Republic of Texas, made Santa Anna captive, and launched the movement for the territorial expansion of the United States and its constitutional Government unrivaled in the history of our country, and eventually added many millions of square miles to the area of the United States.

The attack of the Texans was like the scourge of holy wrath.

Its scorching fire was but one burst of avenging flame from the crucible of despotism into which had been poured the compound of a vicious tyranny, a stupid absolutism, a broken faith, and the excessive cruelties of insensate massacres by the unwanted masters of the Mexican people—they themselves the mere pawns of Santa Anna's ruthless dictatorship.

And so, with the coming of peace and the establishment of a beneficent government, the people of Texas progressed upon their way, enjoying the blessings of a bountiful nature and its yielding to the arts and the crafts and the sciences, until those who loved and revered its history realized that its priceless benefits might be lost if its people forgot how painfully and perilously such liberties were purchased.

And so it was that, as the years went on, only relatively few of our people realized the tremendous portent of the sufferings, the privations, the heroism, and the achievements of their pioneer forefathers and the glorious pages of history written in the lives and exploits of those who fought for and founded the Texas Republic—and a scant little band, from year to year, reviewed and revived the lessons of our history and, for its worth as a permanent lesson in patriotism, made countless pilgrimages to the battlefield of San Jacinto and urged its purchase and preservation by our State.

After 61 long years the efforts of this faithful band of pioneers and their descendants secured, in 1897, during Governor Culberson's administration, a legislative appropriation of $10,000 for the purchase of the battlefield. The newspapers of that day—40 years ago—record their meetings, their historical recollections, their hopes and plans.

I exhibit to you a photograph then taken of Capt. James Converse's ship upon which the veterans were taken to the battlefield, and I am having passed among those present a reproduction of the newspaper accounts of the meetings of the veterans, and their recollections of the battle, and their identification of landmarks on the battlefield, just prior to its purchase by the San Jacinto Commission appointed by Governor Culberson. From all of this, you will sense their aspiration for a worthy monument on the site of the battlefield, and their joy in its acquisition by the State, and their hope for what we are now upon the threshold of experiencing in worthy celebration and suitable recognition.

The great field Mass of the Catholic Church, commemorating a century of civil and religious liberty; the dedicatory and commemorative exercises of the great Masonic orders; the patriotic program of the Sons and Daughters of the Republic; and of the San Jacinto Centennial Association; the generous action of the State and Federal Governments—all of this is a fruition those blessed souls would have loved to live for.

My grandfather, James Monroe Hill, who was a veteran of the battle, and the chairman of the San Jacinto Commission, who purchased the battlefield for the State, in his letter of thanks on May 7, 1897, to the Governor and the legislature, was truly prophetic of this happy day, and with your indulgence, I shall conclude my remarks with a quotation from his letter:

"What character of man would withhold gratitude to his ancestry, or the placing of a shaft bearing evidence of the place of their interment? What character of man can today accept, by inheritance, the grand privileges wrought by those men on that sacred spot, and be so devoid of patriotism that he would withhold his support to commemorate such a glorious event? (Thank God, but few such men live in our State.)

"We have an abiding faith that you will see that the good work which you have so graciously commenced shall receive due consideration by succeeding bodies."

CONSERVATION AND CITIZENSHIP—ADDRESS BY HARRY G. VAVRA

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address delivered by Mr. Harry G. Vavra, national president of the Educational Conservation Society, on April 4, 1936.

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

On behalf of the American Conservation Week Committee, comprising various Government agencies charged with the protection of natural resources in their respective States, I extend greetings to you on the occasion of National Conservation Week.

It is altogether fitting and proper that this occasion is being observed with appropriate ceremonies in schools, churches, museums, parks, and other places throughout the country.

It is our duty to give adequate attention to the conservation of natural and human resources in order to protect ourselves from floods, droughts, dust storms, forest fires, and pollution.

Conservation in its present-day sense is not merely preservation or hoarding of natural or other resources, but means rather their careful, well-considered use, with the avoidance of waste and prodigality and with a due consideration of their exhaustibility, or the difficulties of their replacement. The proper practice of conservation may in many cases involve the obligation to take what measures are possible to replace what we consume or, more correctly, to enable the processes of nature to replace it.

The effective and continued practice of conservation is a patriotic obligation of the most important kind. The future responsibility and greatness of our Nation will largely depend on the extent and efficiency with which we carry out its principles during the present generation.

The idea that we can waste and prodigally consume important and valuable resources without regard to the future, and that "some substitute will be found when they are gone", is one of the most prevalent and most criminally stupid of the ideas that are held at the present day. It is the idea of the spendthrift who is running through his inheritance.

While the human race will no doubt accomplish many things in the future that we have not yet been able to do, it will, as far as science now tells us, apparently have to do them with much the same means and resources that we use.

The often-expressed opinion that we shall be able to obtain mysterious power in large amounts from new and undeveloped sources, "from the sun", "from breaking up atoms", from "harnessing the tides", from water power, etc., is eagerly seized on by thoughtless people who are ready to believe that which is pleasant, and to assume that we can waste the coal, the oil, etc., on which we are now dependent. It is likely to prove a fallacy fatal to our civilization.

The exhaustion of the present easily and abundantly obtainable supplies of oil, coal, and metals is going to put the human race face to face with problems which no scientist or economist likes to even think about. Will civilization survive that crisis? No one can predict. All that we can be sure of is that our present prodigality in the use, much of it wasteful use, of such resources is bringing the time when we shall be face to face with those problems much nearer than we like to realize. We still think of them as matters for "posterity", not for ourselves, to worry about. But every year we ourselves come nearer and nearer to being the "posterity" for whose welfare we show so little concern.

If civilization is to survive, man must enter into a harmonious relationship with nature. Unfortunately, this principle has often been disregarded and violated. Such folly has caused many calamities. Serious losses have been inflicted on present and future generations. The accomplishments of a lifetime of labor have often been wiped out through the unwise location of agricultural and other developments in regions subject to great floods and excessive droughts. Agricultural lands have been wasted by preventable soil erosion. Streams have been needlessly polluted by oil, sewage, and industrial wastes, thus endangering not only health and human life but wildlife and fisheries. Unnecessary clearing of forests has been partly responsible for droughts, dust storms, floods, and pollution. Unjustified drainage practices have destroyed lakes and marshes, increased the danger of floods, droughts, and forest fires, and promoted the destruction of much wildlife. Lack of conservation measures to protect the people against these calamities has largely contributed to undermining the health and prosperity of many parts of the Nation.

This spring we are suffering from the effects of unprecedented destructive floods. They have resulted in a tremendous loss of life and property. They have been destructive to human life through causing deaths, epidemics, and famine. They have wiped out the savings of many people. They have interfered with normal business operations. They have destroyed soils, crops, forests, and wildlife. They have paved the way for droughts and forest fires. They have endangered navigation. Unquestionably this situation is partly due to unusual conditions of weather and snowfall, but very largely to reckless deforestation. Experiences of China, Italy, and Spain, where the people have paid a great penalty for the destruction of their forests have not been heeded.

Like the droughts and dust storms, floods have been increased if not largely caused by unscientific cultivation of the soil, and unnecessary drainage of lakes, and marshes, as well as by deforestation.

In order to prevent floods, it is necessary to stop the wasteful practices by man which have caused them. Flood-control measures must make provision for a dense cover of vegetation as well as for engineering works such as reservoirs and levees. It is necessary to maintain a dense vegetative cover by means of grasslands and well-kept forests and to apply contour plowing and terracing to farm lands on slopes for the purpose of diminishing washing away of the soil by rain and melting snow. Furthermore, there is a vital need for the enactment of adequate laws providing for the necessary public regulation of private lands, particularly the forests, to prevent misuse where effects may be destructive in large areas belonging to others.

Water pollution is another serious public menace and is one of the greatest problems now facing the American people. If we do not put an end to pollution it surely will destroy us.

Pollution by sewage and industrial waste, of the lakes, rivers, and streams, renders the water unsuitable for human consumption, endangers public health and the health of animals by spreading disease germs, destroys fish or aquatic life, and results in an enormous loss of fertilizing elements. It aggravates the increasing difficulty of providing an adequate water supply for large communities. This pollution could be prevented and controlled to a large extent by scientifically utilizing the waste products and by means of sewage-disposal plants. Although pollution is of local origin, the control of it is an interstate problem, as it usually affects the stream for long distances, and all human interests depend on it. The discharge of sewage, chemicals, or noxious substances into a lake or stream should never be allowed whether it be done by a city or other community, a factory or an individual.

Oil pollution of coastal waters has become a very serious question not only of local but international character. It has been caused to a large extent by the great increase in the number of oil-driven and oil-carrying ships in the world, and by the thousands of motor boats. It has resulted not only in the waste of large quantities of oil but in the immense destruction of wild fowl and fish.

Unlike the other substances with which water is polluted, oil floats and pollution caused by its affects chiefly the surface of the water. A very small quantity of oil will spread out in a thin film over a large extent of water which wind and waves may cause to drift toward the shores, covering the beaches with filthy grease and rendering the coastal waters unfit for bathing or other recreation. More serious than this the film is poisonous to the eggs of fishes which mostly float near the surface and to the minute creatures on which the young fishes feed, as well as to the young ones themselves. If there are no young fishes there will be no large ones for man's use. The oil film is also extremely destructive to sea birds, including wild ducks and other aquatic game birds saturating and gumming their feathers so that they cannot fly and often resulting in their death. Tens of thousands of such birds are destroyed along our coast every year by oil.

Laws prohibiting the discharge of oil into the sea cannot be enforced because the guilty ship is usually outside the 3-mile limit at the time the deed is done. The logical remedy is to secure an international agreement among the powers for the compulsory use of an effective separator by all oil-burning ships.

There is no doubt that, had the American people been taught the importance and principles of conservation in the schools, many serious calamities, as pollution, floods, droughts, and forest fires, could have been mitigated or even prevented. We must now unite in a drive to destroy these great menaces or they will destroy us. We must make the public more conscious of this responsibility and we can accomplish this by impressing its importance on the minds of our boys and girls who will eventually have to deal with the problems. In other words, it is our duty to introduce conservation as a regular required subject into every school in America. To achieve this end, the Educational Conservation Society, with the cooperation of State departments of public instruction, has issued courses of study on the natural resources for the public elementary schools, high schools, colleges, and universities, and a program for the training of teachers, supervisors, directors, and Government workers in the field of conservation. This movement has already received the approval of the Department of the Interior, the Federal Office of Education, the United States Bureau of Biological Survey, State Departments of Education, State Departments of Conservation and Game and Fish, many State Governors, college heads, and superintendents of schools.

In a recent address delivered at the North American Wildlife Conference, Dr. John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education said: "It would seem that while the Federal and State Governments are engaged in the terrific and somewhat disheartening struggle to repair by direct methods the damages which have been done to our forests, lands, streams, and wildlife by the ignorance and indifference of our citizens, a small appropriation for education, through which there can quickly be put into the minds of millions of people the challenge to conserve what we have left and to rebuild our lost fortunes, would be the most profitable of all investments."

There is a vital need for the creation of an educational service on the conservation of national resources in the United States Office of Education and for Federal assistance to the States in the promotion of conservation education in the public elementary schools, high schools, colleges, and universities.

Educators and conservationists are now appealing to the National Government for the establishment of a division of conservation education in the United States Office of Education and for an annual appropriation to assist the States in paying for the salaries and preparation of teachers, supervisors, and directors of conservation subjects on the natural resources.

Citizens in every community of the United States can do their part in protecting natural resources from unnecessary waste and

destruction. The foundations of national prosperity and the happiness of present and future generations are dependent upon conservation.

It is your duty to obey the Federal and State conservation laws. Make your community a more beautiful place to live in by working for constructive education and legislation, by preventing forest fires and keeping the grounds clean, by planting trees, protecting the wild flowers, birds, and animals, and by taking part in the establishment and protection of forests, parks, and wildlife sanctuaries.

If all citizens will fulfill these obligations, outdoor America will be preserved for present and future generations.

FEDERAL THEATER PROJECT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, about 10 days ago the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] in a forceful address to the Senate made what I regard as some very unjustified criticisms of and attacks upon the Federal theater project. I have received a telegram of protest which is signed by some of the leading actors and leading playwrights of our country, none of whom benefits by the project at all, and by some of our leading producers. I should like to have the clerk read the telegram for the information of Senators.

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

The Chief Clerk read the telegram, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 1, 1936.*

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building:

Undersigned deplore recent aspersions on directors of the Federal theater project and point to careers of Hallie Flanagan, national director, and Philip W. Barber, New York City, director, as proving they particularly fitted to lead this worth-while American enterprise. Mrs. Flanagan, first woman granted Guggenheim fellowship, which given for her distinguished original work in theater production, Grinnell College and Harvard. Foundation specifically asked she study methods dramatic production foreign countries, which she did, to enrichment American theater. For 9 years she directed Vassar College experimental theater, which work brought her wide acclaim. She has long been exponent for production American plays in American way. Many Federal theater hits in New York are convincing answers to recent ridiculous charges of incompetence. Undersigned point also to Mrs. Flanagan's sympathetic understanding of unemployment problem as another prime requisite for position she holds. Mr. Barber long associated with progressive theater movement, and it was under his immediate supervision that New York Federal theater developed such outstanding theatrical successes as Macbeth, Murder in the Cathedral, Chalk Dust, and Triple A Plowed Under. Urgently request you read brilliant records to Senate and offset charges read by Senator DAVIS.

Helen Hayes, George Kaufman, Philip Merivale, Theresa Helburn, Brooks Atkinson, Lee Shubert, Clayton Hamilton, Sidney Howard, Henry Chanin, Raymond Massey, Heywood Broun, Joseph Wood Krutch, Dorothy Dunbar Bromley, Wollcott Gibbs, Kelcey Allen, Lawrence Langer, Arthur Pollock, Austin Strong, John Howard Lawson, John Chapman, Malcolm Cowley, Edward Reed.

Mr. DAVIS subsequently said: Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has today stated that, in his opinion, I have made some very unjustified criticisms of and attacks upon the Federal Theater project. I call attention to the fact that I have made no statement, publicly or privately, on the Senate floor or elsewhere, which could rightfully be construed as an attack upon the Federal Theater project. I wish to make this very clear. The remarks which I have made concerning the administration of the Federal theater project have been very carefully weighed, and I have not spoken upon this subject without careful consideration. I ask those who may chance to be interested in this subject to read with equal care the statements which I made on April 20 and April 24. I have written in some detail upon this subject to Mr. Frank Gillmore, president of the Actors' Equity Association, in New York City, and in the interest of the understanding in this matter of the Senator from New York. I should be glad to have him read the letter referred to, which is a part of the RECORD.

The Senator from New York had read into the RECORD a telegram signed by a number of prominent actors and playwrights stating of Mrs. Flanagan:

She has long been exponent for production American plays in American way. Many Federal theater hits in New York are convincing answers to recent ridiculous charges of incompetence.

I wish to say explicitly that at no time have I charged Mrs. Flanagan with incompetence. I have no personal knowledge of the project which she is conducting and therefore have no basis for forming a judgment of this matter. I ask that those who are interested in the right of American actors to work on the Federal theater project be careful not to misconstrue any statements which I may make so that the continuance of a work project for worthy actors shall not be jeopardized.

I wish to make very clear that if Mrs. Flanagan has long been an exponent of production of American plays in the American way I congratulate her on taking this position. Naturally this is rightfully the attitude which anyone who is appointed to lead an American national theater project should have. My only knowledge of Mrs. Flanagan comes from reading the books listed under her name in the Congressional Library entitled "Shifting Scenes", "The American Plan", and "Can You Hear Their Voices?" I should like to ask those who have any interest in this subject to read these plays to judge for themselves the impression which they give regarding the author's attitude toward communism and the American plan of life.

I do not know Mrs. Flanagan, and hence at no time, publicly or privately, have I ventured to make any statement about her whatsoever. I have simply called attention to the works which she has written and have introduced evidence concerning her administration presented by others. I made no comment whatsoever upon the evidence thus introduced.

I have no desire to misinterpret the remarks either of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] or of Mrs. Flanagan. The information concerning the Federal theater project transmitted to me was first sent to President Roosevelt. The matter was not acted upon for almost 30 days. I had previously attempted to gain information concerning the administration of the Works Progress Administration without success by writing to Mr. Hopkins. Desiring that this important matter should be brought to the attention of the Senate so that a full explanation might be given the taxpayers of the country, I introduced the available evidence.

I asked specifically that if Mrs. Flanagan did not write the books to which I had referred or if she had changed her mind concerning the principles which they expressed, she be given an opportunity to clarify her position. A number of messages have come to my desk concerning the Federal theater project and Mrs. Flanagan, but as yet no word has been received concerning the one issue to which I have called attention, namely, the books of Mrs. Flanagan. I should be glad to know from her or from some person whom she may authorize to speak for her if these books actually represent her point of view today.

NATIONAL FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I have the attention of our leader for a moment? The Committee on Commerce has had before it for a long time—I think I may say for almost a year, but certainly for the past 2 months—the omnibus flood-control bill. I should not feel myself true to my trust as chairman of the Committee on Commerce unless I made every possible effort to secure action on the bill.

I think it is one of the best-prepared bills we have ever had on the subject, if I may say so without taking any personal pride for that result. It contains a declaration of policy. The projects included in the bill and recommended by the committee have been considered by the appropriate committees of the two Houses, and every single project has received the full approval and endorsement of the Board of Army Engineers.

I am very anxious, and the other members of my committee and many Members of the Senate are very anxious, to have early action on the bill. Floods have occurred all over the country. Several hundred persons lost their lives and millions of dollars' worth of property were destroyed. Action should be taken on the bill in order that the two Houses may agree in conference as to the final form of the bill and that the Army Engineers may proceed with the work.

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

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that large appropriations have been made by Mr. Hopkins' organization, and such appropriations have been expended in many States, for flood relief and for other activities which are comprehended in the bill to which the Senator refers?

Mr. COPELAND. Eight or ten or possibly a dozen such projects have been given some money out of the Emergency Relief funds. But, by and large, it is safe to say that all these projects—indeed, I may say all the projects in this bill—are projects which have not been provided for by relief funds.

Mr. KING. And is it not a fact that Congress has recently enacted a measure carrying more than $187,000,000 for rivers and harbors and for flood control, directly or indirectly?

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator refer to the lower Mississippi flood-control bill?

Mr. KING. No; not to that bill.

Mr. COPELAND. According to the final action just taken by the Senate, we have appropriated $121,000,000 for expenditure on rivers and harbors; but these are all projects having to do with the coast line, and not having to do at all with the control of floods on inland rivers.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact—and I ask for information—that we recently passed a measure carrying $187,000,000 or $184,000,000?

Mr. COPELAND. For the lower Mississippi?

Mr. KING. No; the lower Mississippi bill carried $275,000,000.

Mr. COPELAND. To what measure does the Senator refer?

Mr. KING. My recollection is that we passed a bill for surveys of rivers and harbors projects, and that the bill carried an appropriation of approximately $184,000,000 for work upon accepted projects.

Mr. COPELAND. I think the Senator must have in mind the bill we brought here last year, which was defeated by the very efficient filibuster of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. The amount involved was not $175,000,000, however; it was about $775,000,000.

Mr. KING. My recollection is that there was one quite different from that.

Mr. COPELAND. No; the measures which have been adopted are the rivers and harbors items carried in the Army appropriation bill—$121,000,000—and the flood-control bill with reference to the lower Mississippi, which was passed by the Senate the other day. Those are the only ones which have been made effective by action of the Congress.

Mr. KING. In view of the appropriation for this purpose, according to the Senator's own statement, of over $300,000,000, perhaps three hundred and fifty or four hundred million dollars, and other enormous appropriations which have been made and will be made before Congress adjourns, does the Senator think we are justified now in seeking an appropriation of several hundred million dollars more to be expended during the next year?

Mr. COPELAND. I assume that it all depends upon what our attitude is toward the control of floods. We had a bill here last year which, as I said, was defeated by a very active and successful filibuster. That bill included projects around Pittsburgh, for example, on the Allegheny and the Monongahela Rivers, and projects on the Susquehanna and other Rivers, which, if the bill had passed and the works included in it had been installed, would have prevented the recent floods in Pittsburgh, Wheeling, Louisville, and Cincinnati, as well as in my own State, in Elmira, Binghamton, and other points in New York. There is no doubt in my mind that this country, because of its recent experiences, demands that something shall be done by the present Congress to make certain that we are going forward in this undertaking.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that the Senator is addressing himself to the leader on this side of the Chamber for the purpose of urging that a time be fixed for action on the flood-control bill.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator is right.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to join the Senator in that course. I should like to ask him if his committee has had ample opportunity to learn from the Army Engineers the amounts of money which will be needed, and the measures which it will be necessary to undertake, in order to prevent floods in the regions where there were devastating floods this very year.

Mr. COPELAND. The bill to which I refer carries projects providing safety for every point where floods occurred this year, except a few in Maine and New York, where the surveys have not been completed. But provision is made in the Senator's own State with reference to the Merrimack River and the Connecticut River——

Mr. WALSH. And the Blackstone River.

Mr. COPELAND. And the Blackstone River.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I know that. I desire to know whether the committee has gone further, and has made provision for sections of the country other than New England.

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, yes; every section of the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Forty States having flood-control projects are included in this bill.

Mr. WALSH. I think there will be a great deal of disappointment in the regions mentioned if some action is not taken during the present session of Congress. I find that people of the recent flood areas are deeply interested, and are persistent in asking for action. Only this morning I received a communication from a group of leading citizens of the Connecticut Valley who have formed an organization, drafted resolutions, and express a desire to cooperate with the Federal Government to hasten action and to assist in undertaking whatever may be necessary to prevent future floods.

Mr. COPELAND. I will say to the Senator that there are protests coming from every part of the country because we have not already had action on the subject.

Mr. WALSH. That is in accord with my convictions.

Mr. COPELAND. And I have no question that it will be a campaign issue if we do not do something about it.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President——

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. WAGNER. I simply wish to add that, so far as our State is concerned, I know the situation is in very safe and competent hands in charge of my colleague; but he knows, as I know, that people who have suffered so much as the result of the flood last year and some floods this year are exceedingly concerned and disturbed by the reports that Congress may not act this year by appropriate legislation so as to prevent the recurrence of devastating floods in the future. I merely desire to add whatever humble efforts I may make to the efforts of my colleague to secure the enactment of legislation on the subject this year. It would be a great disappointment to the entire country if it should not be enacted.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I had not thought there would be any extended debate on this matter. My purpose in rising was simply to ask our leader if he thinks it possible for us to include in the program of bills to be considered the measure dealing with floods.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I thought the Senator was advised that I have been conducting some conferences with a view to ascertaining whether and when the bill to which the Senator refers may be brought forward. Let me say to the Senator that I shall be glad to confer with him further about the matter in the hope that a conclusion concerning it may be reached in the early future.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator.

CHARLESTON ARMY BASE TERMINAL, CHARLESTON, S. C.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3789) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the city of Charleston, S. C.

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. COPELAND, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. JOHNSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

BATHING POOLS IN THE DISTRICT—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on the last day before the recess the Senate passed Senate bill 4540, to provide for the operation of bathing pools in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes. The bill has not been transmitted to the House, and I now enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

REAL-PROPERTY TAX IN VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8287) to establish an assessed valuation real-property tax in the Virgin Islands of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I may say that this bill, now the unfinished business, passed the House several weeks ago, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, of which the President pro tempore, now presiding over the deliberations of the Senate, is a member, was considered by that committee, and I have been authorized to report the bill with two amendments. I now desire to have the Senate act on the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first amendment.

The first amendment of the committee was, in section 3, on page 2, line 9, after the word "value", to strike out "Until the President shall determine that adequate administrative authority and organization exist in a municipality under local law for levying, assessing, and collecting taxes imposed or authorized under this act, such taxes shall be levied, assessed, and collected under regulations prescribed by the President" and to insert in lieu thereof "If the legislative authority of a municipality shall fail to enact laws for the levy, assessment, collection, or enforcement of any tax imposed under authority of this act within 3 months after the date of its enactment, the President shall then prescribe regulations for the levy, assessment, collection, and enforcement of such tax, which shall be in effect until the legislative authority of such municipality shall make regulations for such purposes", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. Until local tax laws conforming to the requirements of this act are in effect in a municipality the tax on real property in such municipality for any such calendar year shall be at the rate of 1.25 percent of the assessed value. If the legislative authority of a municipality shall fail to enact laws for the levy, assessment, collection, or enforcement of any tax imposed under authority of this act within 3 months after the date of its enactment, the President shall then prescribe regulations for the levy, assessment, collection, and enforcement of such tax, which shall be in effect until the legislative authority of such municipality shall make regulations for such purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in section 4, on page 2, line 23, after the words "deposited in the", to strike out the word "colonial" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "municipal", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. All taxes so levied and collected shall be deposited in the municipal treasury of the municipality in which such taxes are collected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, at the top of page 3, to strike out section 5, as follows:

SEC. 5. The Virgin Islands Co. is authorized to pay annually into the colonial treasuries of the Virgin Islands on account of lands in the Virgin Islands owned by the United States and in the possession of the Virgin Islands Co. sums which the corporation shall determine to be equivalent to the real-property taxes payable on such lands if they were in private ownership. The Virgin Islands Co. is authorized to pay annually into the colonial treasuries of the Virgin Islands such sums as the corporation shall determine to be equivalent to the several taxes which a private corporation similarly situated would be required to pay into the said treasuries.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 5. The Virgin Islands Co. shall pay annually into the municipal treasuries of the Virgin Islands in lieu of taxes an amount equal to the amount of taxes which would be payable on the real property in the Virgin Islands owned by the United States and in the possession of the Virgin Islands Co. if such real property were in private ownership and taxable, but the valuation placed upon such property for taxation purposes by the local taxing authorities shall be reduced to a reasonable amount by the Secretary of the Interior if, after investigation, he finds that such valuation is excessive and unreasonable. The Virgin Islands Co. shall also pay into the municipal treasuries of the Virgin Islands amounts equal to the amounts of any taxes of general application which a private corporation similarly situated would be required to pay into the said treasuries. Similar payments shall be made with respect to any property owned by the United States in the Virgin Islands which is used for ordinary business or commercial purposes, and the income derived from any property so used shall be available for making such payments.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this amendment was considered by the committee, as I have indicated, and it met with the unanimous approval of the members of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in section 6, on page 4, line 16, after the word "real", to insert the words "and personal", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed as altering, amending, or repealing the existing exemptions from taxation of property used for educational, charitable, or religious purposes. Subject to the provisions of this act, the legislative authority of the respective municipalities is hereby empowered to alter, amend, or repeal, subject to the approval of the Governor, any law now imposing taxes on real and personal property.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there are no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], who has taken a great interest in this measure, is unavoidably absent. I have not had time to confer with him concerning the various provisions of the bill, but I assume, from the statement of the Senator from Utah, that the bill is satisfactory to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. KING. I make that statement.

Mr. McNARY. And has met the approval of the entire committee?

Mr. KING. There is only one member of the committee who has not been consulted, who did not happen to be present at the meeting when the bill was considered, the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], but I am sure he will not interpose any objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted as a part of my remarks a portion of the report which I submitted accompanying the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

The Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8287) to establish an assessed valuation real-property tax in the Virgin Islands of the United States, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

In the bill as it passed the House there was a provision that the real-property taxes provided for in the act should be levied, assessed, and collected under regulations prescribed by the President until he determined that there was adequate administrative authority and organization in a municipality under local law for that

purpose. The committee recommend that this provision be changed so that the regulations of the President shall not become effective unless the legislative authority of a municipality fails for a period of 3 months to enact laws for the levy, assessment, collection, or enforcement of the taxes imposed by the act. If such regulations are prescribed by the President, they are to remain in effect until the legislative authority of the municipality shall make regulations for such purposes.

The committee has also modified the provision of the House bill relating to payments by the Virgin Islands Co. to the municipal treasuries of amounts which the company determined to be equivalent to the taxes which it would pay if the lands of the United States in its possession were taxable, so as to provide that the valuation of such lands should be fixed by the local taxing authorities for the purpose of such payments. However, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reduce the valuation to a reasonable amount if he finds, after investigation, that the valuation so fixed is excessive and unreasonable. It is also provided that similar payments shall be made with respect to any property owned by the United States in the Virgin Islands which is used for ordinary business or commercial purposes, and the income derived from any property so used is made available for making such payments.

The purposes of the bill as it passed the House are set out in full in House Report No. 1559, Seventy-fourth Congress, which accompanied this measure, and in a so-called justification for the enactment of the bill prepared by a committee of Government officials appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands. This report and justification are incorporated herein and made a part of this report, together with certain data in the form of tables, and a memorandum from the Department of the Interior dated April 2, 1936.

JUSTIFICATION

Since the purchase of the Virgin Islands of the United States in 1917 there have been a number of investigations made into the social, economic, and fiscal affairs of those islands. Mr. Herbert D. Brown, then Chief of the Bureau of Efficiency, in his report in 1931 covering the fiscal affairs of the municipalities of the Virgin Islands, summarized the findings of previous investigators. The following quotations set forth the gist of Mr. Brown's summary relating to the fiscal situation of the Virgin Islands:

"Need for new tax system: One of the things that has impressed all investigators is that the tax system needs revision. The Joint Commission of 1920 chronicled the fact that they found 'the system of taxation in the islands unjust, inefficient, and archaic.' They recommended that the entire system be reformed with a view to securing a greater income and with a view to equalizing the burdens of taxation. In 1924 the Secretary of Labor's Federal Commission recommended that the Government 'send to the islands a tax expert to cooperate with the people and local authorities in the preparation of a system of taxation to replace the present system.'

"In 1925 Mr. Roswell F. Magill was accordingly designated to report on the tax system. He recommended that the tax laws for the islands be made uniform and that a single administrative unit be provided, charged with the duty of levying, assessing, and collecting the tax. He proposed a new system and recommended that it be adopted by Congress in lieu of the present Federal legislation and the local ordinances in conflict with the system, showing apparently by this proposal that he too recognized the futility of depending on the local councils to put through tax legislation. But no action was taken.

"Ground and building tax: Second in importance in the municipality of St. Croix, is the tax on ground and buildings. Buildings in the country occupied or used by the owner of the land or his employees are not taxed. In the towns, should any building which is intended to be rented out remain untenanted and not used for 2 or more consecutive months, a proportional reduction is allowed in the building tax. It would seem that taxes on buildings should be assesed, levied, and collected regardless of use or occupancy.

"Land tax should be increased: The ground or land tax should undoubtedly be increased. One way to turn the land back to the people, that is, to break up the large landed estates and give the poorer people a chance to become small land owners is to increase reasonably the tax on uncultivated land. The large land owners will be glad to sell in order to be relieved of their taxes where they cannot use the land profitably.

"Writing about the need for reform of Virgin Islands laws, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels brought out in a letter addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Insular Affairs, on October 24, 1919, the detrimental effect of the tax laws: 'The laws * * * are so drawn that land permitted to lie idle and unproductive is absolutely free [sic] from taxation, while the burden of taxation falls most heavily upon the land in cultivation and sustaining extensive improvements. Such laws discourage building and agricultural advancement and are, therefore, very detrimental to thrift and industry. A revision of these laws that would place a premium upon production and improvements and cause the burden to fall heaviest upon the idle estates of absentee landlords would soon render the islands self-supporting and thus serve to reduce the calls upon Congress for further appropriations to maintain the essential governmental activities therein.'

"Land tax necessary: But that is not the only service that the United States Government must perform, if the end desired is justice for the small farmer and general prosperity for the islands. Owners of land will continue to hold large tracts of it out of use as long as the tax on land remains as light as it is at present. We see no remedy except to make it unprofitable to hold out of use extensive areas of arable land.

"Since many of the persons who own the largest tracts are also members of the colonial councils, it seems unlikely that any remedial legislation of this kind can be obtained through the councils. This is one of the phases of taxation that we are studying. Our conclusions will be submitted in a supplemental report. It is our belief at this time that the difficulty can only be remedied by legislative action on the part of the United States Congress."

A commission of educators, appointed to report on the educational system of the Virgin Islands in 1929, makes the following observation:

"* * * American administrations have admittedly done little to date to correct some of the outstanding industrial abuses of the islands, such as land monopoly and a vicious taxation system * * *."

The present real property tax laws in the municipality of St. Croix are as follows:

(1) Ground and building tax enacted 1802, rates as amended Nov. 16, 1907): (a) For town properties—7⅓ bits ($0.0146) per square ell (24$\frac{1}{10}$ inches) of the "measurement of every story of a building"); (b) for vacant town lots—one-fourth bit ($0.0025) per square ell; (c) for country properties—all land used or laid out for cane or cotton cultivation, francs 3.50 ($0.70) per acre. All land used or laid out for cultivation other than cane or cotton, also pasture land, 66⅔ bits ($0.133) per acre. All useless land, 5 bits ($0.01) per acre.

(2) Percentage tax: 4 percent of actual or estimated annual rental value of buildings in town, or country buildings rented to persons other than laborers or employees of the estate. In the towns, buildings remaining vacant and not actually occupied for more than 2 months, pay no tax whatever for the time so vacant; neither ground and building nor percentage tax.

(3) Immigration tax (enacted Sept. 13, 1855; amended June 6, 1862); 50 bits ($0.10) per acre of land in cane cultivation, cotton cultivation, or pasturage.

(4) Road tax (enacted June 17, 1931; amended Sept. 30, 1932): Under the road ordinance of July 14, 1923, estate owners were compelled to make repairs on and to maintain a stated allotment of public road, whether first-class road or second-class road. By ordinance of September 30, 1932, all public roads are repaired and maintained by the Government and a tax, based upon an equitable allotment of all public roads in each of the eight quarters of the municipality among property owners in each quarter in accordance with their acreage in each quarter, is levied semiannually at an annual rate of 2 cents per foot of allotment for each foot of first-class road allotment, and of $0.0075 per foot of allotment for each foot of second-class allotment. An acre of land in cultivation is allotted 3 feet of road, whereas an acre of land not in cultivation is allotted 1 foot of road. One foot of first-class road is to be allotted for each 2 feet of second-class road allotment.

The present real-property tax law in St. Thomas is the real-property tax law of February 25, 1922, which provides for a tax on real estate, improved and unimproved, to be levied by a tax assessor and collected on July 1, for the preceding calendar year, at a rate not exceeding 1 percent of the assessed value of all real estate in the municipality not exempt from taxation. The maximum assessed valuation of cultivated land is fixed at $45 per acre; pasture land at $20 per acre; bush land at $10 per acre.

According to the 1930 census, the total value of farm lands and buildings in the municipality of St. Croix is $1,934,790. According to an unofficial office valuation, town buildings, exclusive of land, in the municipality of St. Croix, are valued at $733,000.

According to the 1930 census, the total value of farm lands and buildings in the municipality of St. Thomas is $465,921. The assessed valuation of all real property under the existing real-property tax law in St. Thomas and St. John for the fiscal year 1933 is $3,441,509.

The estimated yield of revenues for the fiscal year 1935, in the budget for the municipality of St. Croix for the property taxes listed above, is as follows:

Ground, building, and percentage tax	$21,000
Road tax	4,800
Immigration tax	4,200

The estimated revenue under the real-property tax law for the fiscal year 1935, in the budget for the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John is $33,000.

Under the laws in the municipality of St. Croix, fertility, location, and general productiveness of land is not a factor in determining the amount of tax to be paid on land. The same land may be taxed under the ground and building tax and immigration tax, 80 cents per acre, if it is in cane or cotton cultivation, but if not in cultivation, it will be taxed only 23⅓ cents an acre.

As an illustration of the manner in which the St. Croix tax laws work, there may be cited the case of a 30-acre tract of land purchased several years ago by the Government from a private estate owner at a purchase price of $1,200. Prior to the purchase by the Government this land was not in cultivation and on the whole tract a tax of only $7 per annum was collected. The Government resold this tract to three homesteaders, who immediately put the entire area into cultivation. They now pay a total of $24 per annum in real property taxes. Parenthetically, it is to be noted that an export tax of $6 a ton on sugar, levied by act of Congress of February 25, 1928, imposes an additional tax on the production of land in sugar cultivation which is estimated to increase the taxation on that land in the amount of approximately $4 an acre per annum.

Because of the operation of the property qualifications for suffrage in the Virgin Islands, the membership of the legislative bodies there is largely made up of large property owners. Mr. Herbert D. Brown and other observers have agreed that because of this situation there is little probability that an equitable assessed valuation property tax could be got through the local legislatures. For this reason the present bill is offered for enactment by the Congress of the United States, but in order to give as wide latitude as possible to the local legislatures, provision is made in it to make the Federal tax operative only in the absence of local legislation conforming to the Federal requirements. A flexible method of administration under the Federal law is provided to permit the development of a satisfactory administrative procedure based upon local requirements. Regulations governing the establishment of a board of appraisal, a board of review, of determining the relative weight of factors entering into valuation and administrative procedure generally, will be provided for in rules established by the President of the United States.

The rate of 1.25 percent of assessed value is considered a reasonable rate for land in productive use. Citing again the illustration given above with respect to a 30-acre tract in St. Croix, the annual real property tax under this law would be $15 instead of the $24 now levied under existing local law.

Each of the two municipalities of the Virgin Islands has its own local treasury and its own local budget. All funds collected in either of the municipalities under this law should be deposited in the colonial treasury of the municipality in which the tax is collected.

Specific grant of power is given to the local legislatures of the municipalities to alter, amend, or repeal existing real-property tax laws in order to remove the restriction imposed by section 4 of the act of March 3, 1917, providing for the establishment of a temporary government for the Virgin Islands of the United States, under which those legislative authorities are prohibited from altering, amending, and/or repealing any tax laws in effect at the time of the passage of that act.

LAWRENCE W. CRAMER,
Lieutenant Governor of St. Croix.
ROBERT HERRICK,
Government Secretary.
GEORGE S. ROBINSON,
Government Attorney.

Summary of taxes, Virgin Islands, fiscal year 1935

	Municipality of St. Thomas and St. John	Municipality of St. Croix	Total
Direct taxes:			
Real-property tax	$33,000		$33,000
Personal-property tax	4,400		4,400
Trade tax	6,000		6,000
Lamp tax	1,200		1,200
Horse, carriage, and boat tax	500	$2,800	3,300
Income tax	7,000	8,615	15,615
Ground, building, and percentage tax		21,000	21,000
Immigration tax		4,200	4,200
Quarter-percent tax		2,800	2,800
Automobile tax		4,400	4,400
Gasoline tax		6,000	6,000
Road tax		4,800	4,800
Indirect taxes:			
Customs dues	10,000		10,000
Vendue fees and percentages	50	300	350
Taxes on inheritances	3,600	1,000	4,600
Court fees and fees from police office	5,000	3,000	8,000
Stamp dues	1,600	2,000	3,600
Fees from steamer tickets	600		600
Fees from grants and dues on burgher briefs, etc	2,000	1,000	3,000
Internal-revenue tax	30,000	17,500	47,500
Import duty		17,500	17,500
Export duty		35,000	35,000
Ships' dues		2,000	2,000
Cranage and wharfage		1,600	1,600
Total taxes	104,950	135,515	240,465
Sundry revenues	24,312	21,860	46,172
Total revenues (estimated)	129,262	157,375	286,637
Total expenditures (estimated)	230,708	239,975	470,683

Estimated per-capita tax, Virgin Islands, compared with certain Southern States

[Population 1930, 22,012]

	Total per-capita tax
Virgin Islands	$10.92
Alabama	20.78
Mississippi	31.67
Tennessee	26.24
Kentucky	24.59
Virginia	33.60
North Carolina	31.44
South Carolina	26.08
Georgia	22.53
Florida	65.21

Deficits, Virgin Islands

1931	$221,412
1932	231,230
1933	218,435
1934	155,437
1935	172,600
Total direct taxes	106,715
Total indirect taxes	133,750
Grand total taxes	240,465

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
DIVISION OF TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS,
Washington, April 2, 1936.

MEMORANDUM

H. R. 8287, a bill to establish an assessed-valuation real-property tax in the Virgin Islands of the United States, was passed by the Houseof Representatives on January 20 and referred to the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs on January 22. This bill is identical with S. 2838 with its amendment introduced by Senator TYDINGS on May 13, 1935. Although the two bills are identical, it is probable that the enactment of this legislation would be expedited by action upon the House bill, which has already passed in that Chamber.

The provisions of this bill which establish a real-property assessed-valuation tax in the Virgin Islands are, without question, sound and equitable and are necessary, because under existing prohibitions the local legislature is probably without power to repeal existing archaic real-property tax laws. Objection has been raised by the members of the colonial councils in the Virgin Islands to the enactment of this bill, but that objection must be considered in the light of the nature of the representative system in the Virgin Islands, which excludes all but propertied persons from the suffrage. It is believed that the mass of the people would thoroughly approve establishment of an equitable tax system whose effect would be to compel large property holders either to use their land or to sell it to others who might do so.

It is to be emphasized that the bill will not preclude the colonial councils from passing real-property tax laws. On the contrary, it makes clear their authority to do so, merely establishing a tax rate which shall obtain until the local legislature acts.

The most important and pressing problem for the municipality of St. Croix is for additional funds to maintain its existing institutions such as schools, hospitals, medical institutions, etc. Because the Virgin Islands Co. has been held to be a Federal agency, the local government can secure no revenue from land under its control or from its operations. It has been variously estimated that between $25,000 and $40,000 tax loss is sustained by the municipality by reason of the Federal character of the Virgin Islands Co. The situation is so acute that it has been necessary to request an additional appropriation for the present fiscal year as a contribution to the municipal deficit for the municipality. A deficit of $30,000 in excess of that anticipated at the beginning of the fiscal year has resulted from the tax-free status of the Virgin Islands Co. It is of immediate and pressing importance that action be taken at once to rectify the situation that has arisen as a result of the operations of the Federal Government in the island of St. Croix. The very meager resources of that community prevent the possibility of finding other sources of revenue locally which can supply the loss resulting from the operations of the Virgin Islands Co.

The urgency of action is further emphasized by the fact that assessments must be made within the next month for local taxes to be collected in 1937. Thus, unless this bill is passed immediately the municipalities will not receive the additional revenue therein provided until 1938.

Finally, it is to be pointed out that the provisions of this bill are wholly consistent with the provisions of both drafts of an organic act now before the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. The immediate passage of this bill would, therefore, in no way embarrass consideration of the organic act. On the other hand, any delay in the consideration of this bill until the proposed organic act shall have been reported may result in the serious financial embarrassment of the local government during 1936 and 1937.

It is therefore urgently recommended that the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs give its prompt and favorable consideration to H. R. 8287, both because it rectifies gross inequalities in the real-property tax laws of the municipalities and because it makes provision for the payment by the Virgin Islands Co. of sums in lieu of taxes to the municipality of St. Croix.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12527, making appropriations for the Naval Establishment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, personally I have no objection to the Senate proceeding to the consideration of the bill at this time. The bill was reported yesterday during the recess of the Senate in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into a day earlier, when I was absent from the Chamber. Ordinarily, as we all know, the bill would go over for a day under the rule, giving opportunity to

every Senator to study the provisions of the bill and to read the report. This morning several Senators have suggested to me the propriety of the bill going over and taking the usual course. I conferred with the Senator from South Carolina a few moments ago, and he said that, while the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] could not be present tomorrow, he was willing to proceed today. If that is agreeable to the Senator from South Carolina, and there is an agreement between the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from South Carolina, I have no objection.

I wish to observe, however, that according to the RECORD 21 Senators are absent, and in view of that fact, the bill not having gone through the usual procedure of going over for a day, I am curious to know whether the Senator desires to drive forward today.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, because of the noise in the rear of the Chamber, I did not hear the statement of the Senator. Did he state that he has no objection to the Senate proceeding with the consideration of the bill today, but that he does not want to have the consideration concluded today?

Mr. McNARY. I stated that personally I had no objection to the present consideration of the bill. I am speaking for some Senators on this side who have objected because the bill has not taken the usual course of going over for the day. Consent was given while I was absent that the bill might be reported during the recess, and I make no complaint about that, but on one other occasion when a similar course was followed I asked that the bill go through the usual formula and go over for the day. I am advised by the Senator from South Carolina that he has conferred with the Senator from North Dakota, and that it is the desire of the Senator from North Dakota that the Senate go forward with the bill today.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, that is a correct statement.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, if I may interject, the only thought I have to suggest is that it would be far preferable if the bill could go over until next Monday or Tuesday, but if the leaders feel that that is impossible, I should prefer that the Senate proceed with the bill today.

Mr. McNARY. One concluding observation, Mr. President. In view of the statement of the Senator from North Dakota, my pleasure would be served by the Senate considering the bill today. However, may I make the request that the consideration of the bill be not concluded today, and that the bill not be put upon its final passage today?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, if the Senator makes the request, unless the Senator from Arkansas has some good reason to the contrary, I have no objection to agreeing to the request.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Oregon in the request that the consideration of the bill be not concluded today. Some of us have had no chance to read it, because of attendance in committee hearings. The Senator from South Carolina knows a number of us are on the Committee on Appropriations and on the Finance Committee. I should like to have the bill go over until next week, if possible.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I think it is a very reasonable suggestion that the bill be not finally disposed of today, but I do not see the pertinence in the last suggestion of the Senator from Utah that it go over until next week. I have no objection to laying the bill aside or deferring final action on it until tomorrow, if that meets with the requirements of Senators. But I think we should proceed with the bill today for the convenience of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is agreeable to the suggestion I made a few moments ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12527.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Naval Establishment—Office of the Secretary—Miscellaneous expenses", on page 3, line 17, after the words "in all", to strike out "$1,132,500" and insert "$1,162,500", so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, namely:

NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For traveling expenses of civilian employees, including not to exceed $2,500 for the expenses of attendance, at home and abroad, upon meetings of technical, professional, scientific, and other similar organizations when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, such attendance would be of benefit in the conduct of the work of the Navy Department; not to exceed $2,000 for the part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of such experts and at such rates of compensation as may be contracted for by and in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy; expenses of courts martial, purchase of law and reference books, expenses of prisoners and prisons, courts of inquiry, boards of investigation, examining boards, clerical assistance; witnesses' fees and traveling expenses; not to exceed $15,000 for promoting accident prevention and safety in shore establishments of the Navy, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy; newspapers and periodicals for the naval service; all advertising of the Navy Department and its bureaus (except advertising for recruits for the Bureau of Navigation); costs of suits; relief of vessels in distress; recovery of valuables from shipwrecks; maintenance of attachés abroad, including office rental and pay of employees, and not to exceed $8,000 in the aggregate or $900 for any one person for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 118a); the collection and classification of information; not to exceed $185,000 for telephone, telegraph, and teletype rentals and tolls, telegrams, radiograms, and cablegrams; postage, foreign and domestic and post-office box rentals; necessary expenses for interned persons and prisoners of war under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, including funeral expenses for such interned persons or prisoners of war as may die while under such jurisdiction; payment of claims for damages as provided in the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year 1920, approved July 11, 1919 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 600); and other necessary and incidental expenses; in all, $1,162,500: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the expense of any naval district in which there may be an active navy yard, naval training station, or naval operating base, unless the commandant of the naval district shall be also the commandant of one of such establishments: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed $515,000.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, is not the Senator from South Carolina going to offer a statement in explanation of the general nature of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I do not desire to make any extended statement in explanation of the bill. In fact, I understood from the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] that he desires to discuss the measure, and I wanted to permit him to do so at the earliest possible opportunity.

The bill making appropriations for the Navy for the next fiscal year, as reported and as passed by the House, carried $531,068,707. As reported to the Senate by the Appropriations Committee it carries $529,125,806, a reduction of $1,942,901 in the amount of the appropriation. The bill as it is reported to the Senate is under the estimates of the Budget Bureau for the next fiscal year in the sum of $20,465,493.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has not made any very material changes in the bill. The few changes which have been made in the bill as passed by the House are set forth in the report in detail, and I know of no important change in the bill which would necessitate my detaining the Senate or making any extended explanation of it.

I have no other statement to make at this time.

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

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, before the Senator insists on his suggestion of the absence of a quorum I should like to make a statement. Will the Senator withhold his point of no quorum?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah withhold his suggestion?

Mr. KING. I do.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator in charge of the bill, who was chairman of the subcommittee considering the bill, will recall that I was called away from the committee meetings when the bill was under consideration by reason of my duties in connection with the conference on the District of Columbia bill. I did not bring to the attention of either the full committee or the subcommittee dealing with the Navy appropriation bill a matter which I promised to bring to their attention. That matter had to do with the pay of the civilian professors. Under the practice there has always been an increase of compensation within grades of $100 a year. I hold in my hand the announcement made by the Naval Academy on the 26th of June 1935. It is a printed announcement signed by the Superintendent, and says, among other things:

The initial salary of an instructor is at the rate of $2,800 per annum, pay to begin on the date of appointment. Increases of pay are provided for longevity. Promotions are made on the basis of merit as vacancies become available.

The practice was to allow an addition of $100 a year to the pay of the civilian employees until they reached an outside limit of pay.

I am making an appeal to the Senator in charge of the bill to permit an amendment, on page 15 of the bill, line 21, as to pay of the professors and instructors, in order that it may go to conference and the subject be considered on its merits. I am making this unusual request because I am called away from the city, and must leave tonight, and will not be here again until Monday morning. I am very eager that his matter should be given consideration. I feel guilty because I was asked by the civilian professors to make this plea to the committee, and I was not able to do so.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I will state to the Senator from New York, that the matter to which he refers was never even mentioned in the committee. The committee had no information about it. Therefore, I am unable to answer the Senator. I will say, however, that we have given to the civilian professors to whom the Senator from New York refers, the provisions for retirement, which were the only matters that were presented in their behalf by the authorities at the Naval Academy, and, because that is so——

Mr. COPELAND. Please do not say that final word.

Mr. BYRNES. The matter to which the Senator refers not having been presented to the committee either by the Bureau of the Budget or by the Department or by anyone, the committee really has no information on the subject. Evidently the House committee has no information on the subject either.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator that it was my fault that the committee did not receive the information. I brought up the matter of the retirement, and that had already been recommended, but the matter to which I am now referring, I did not bring up. I have a statement here of all the facts involved. I do not ask conclusive action, but I do ask that the matter go to conference, in order that it may be considered on its merits. It involves only $4,400.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, let me say that I am advised that the matter was presented by the department to the Bureau of the Budget, and it was rejected by the Bureau of the Budget on the ground that they were not at this time recommending any increases in salary. That information has just been received by me from the clerk of the committee.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I ask if it is not a fact, however, that promotions in grade in other branches of the Government, in relation to other employees, have been resumed?

Mr. BYRNES. So far as my information goes that is correct, but I do not know the status of civilian professors as compared with other employees in the departments of the Government. The Naval Affairs Committee may have had the matter under consideration.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New York will not press the matter because at the present time there is, and for some time past there has been, some agitation to do away with all civilian instructors and to substitute naval officers as instructors and teachers instead of the civilian instructors; and I am afraid that if this matter is pushed, without going through the regular naval channels, there will be further efforts in that direction.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from New York that by reason of his action in the committee the employees in question at the Naval Academy have been benefited at this time, and it seems to me they ought to be satisfied with the improvement in their condition, and should present the matter to which the Senator has just now referred at some subsequent time when it can be considered by the House committee and by the Senate committee.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum which has been prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks, and also that attention be called to the fact that in the printed notice which is posted in the academy I find this language:

The initial salary of an instructor is at the rate of $2,800 per annum, pay to begin on the date of appointment. Increases of pay are provided for longevity. Promotions are made on the basis of merit as vacancies become available.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum is as follows:

PROVISIONS FOR ANNUAL PAY INCREASES, CIVILIAN PROFESSORS, UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

In March 1919, under authority of an act of Congress (39 Stat. 607), the Secretary of the Navy established a schedule of annual salary increases for instructors and professors at the Naval Academy.

This schedule, with minor charges, has been effective since its inception in 1919, and Congress provided funds each year until 1933 to carry out its provisions.

During the "Economy Act" years, of course, no annual increases were made.

Annual increases were provided for and made in the fiscal year 1936, but no funds are provided in the pending Navy appropriations bill for pay increases during 1937.

As a matter of fairness and Government integrity, funds should be provided for pay increases for the fiscal year 1937.

The public notices, posted throughout the country, advertising vacancies in past years at the Naval Academy, contained statements that a definite schedule of annual salary increases was in effect. These statements were seriously considered by men who accepted positions on the faculty of the academy.

Most Government employees, who are entitled to regular salary increases, have not only had such increases resumed, but have had their rate of pay increased to what it would have been had there been no interruption by economy acts. (Public Act 480, 73d Cong., and Public Act 133, 74th Cong.)

In view of this, it would be fair to provide for civilian professors at the Naval Academy not only the scheduled salary increase for 1937, but to provide funds to raise their rate of pay to what it would have been had there been no interruption by economy acts.

The schedule of salary increases for the civilian faculty at the Naval Academy provides annual increases of $100 to eligible instructors and professors. There are at this time 44 men to be considered.

MAY 7, 1936.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I realize the force of what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has said. I feel guilty about the matter, however, in that I promised to present the matter in the committee but did not do so. Had I presented the matter in committee, I suppose the reply of the Senator from Massachusetts would have been the same as that he now makes in the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a representative called upon me and asked me to interest myself in the pension appropriation for civilian instructors. However, the matter to which the Senator has just adverted was not called to my attention.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am sorry it was not, but the reason is probably that I was expected to do what I failed to do.

I have made my plea. The matter will appear in the RECORD. I hope in the morning when it shall have been read by the chairman of the subcommittee he will give the question further attention, if he thinks it wise to do so.

Mr. BYRNES. I shall be glad to read the memorandum and consider it.

Mr. COPELAND. I should not wish that to happen which the Senator from Massachusetts suggests. I should not want to do something which would result in the detachment of these men from the service. However, I feel it is only fair to them that they should have promotion within grades.

TERM OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT AT SHAWNEE, OKLA.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. During the present session of Congress two identical bills were introduced, one in the Senate and one in the House, providing for the holding of a regular term of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma at Shawnee, Okla. The Senate passed the Senate bill on April 24 and sent it to the House. The House has passed a similar House bill and sent it to the Senate. The latter bill is now on our calendar, being Calendar No. 2059, House bill 11994. In order to adjust the matter I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill, and in event the House bill shall be passed, that the Senate bill be recalled and thereafter indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11994) to provide for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma at Shawnee, Okla., which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a term of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma shall be held annually at Shawnee, Okla., on the first Monday in October: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Shawnee are furnished without expense to the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be recalled from the House and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TERMS OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT AT WILKES-BARRE, PA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the first committee amendment to the pending Navy appropriation bill.

Mr. KING. I suggested the absence of a quorum and then withheld the suggestion.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator further withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment and yield to me?

Mr. KING. I withhold the suggestion and yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, perhaps the hour of 1 o'clock has not as yet arrived, though it is 1 o'clock by my watch, and that is what controls me. There was a special order set for today, as will be perceived from the first page of the calendar, according to which at 1 o'clock the Senate should proceed to consider the bill (H. R. 11098) to provide for terms of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania to be held at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Mr. ROBINSON. That order was made by unanimous consent; therefore, the Senate, at 1 o'clock, will proceed to its consideration.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that is 1 minute's time before the bill will be laid before the Senate. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to discuss the bill in that interval?

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Arizona wishes to proceed now.

Mr. ASHURST. If I may proceed now it will save some time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the special order the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 11098.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11098) to provide for terms of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania to be held at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the terms of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania shall be held at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on the second Monday of April and second Monday of September of each year: *Provided, however*, That all writs, precepts, and processes shall be returnable to the terms at Scranton and all court papers shall be kept in the clerk's office at Scranton unless otherwise specially ordered by the court, and the terms at Scranton shall not be terminated or affected by the terms herein provided for at Wilkes-Barre: *Provided further*, That this authority shall continue only during such time as suitable accommodations for holding court at Wilkes-Barre are furnished free of expense to the United States.

SEC. 2. That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the bill simply provides that the terms of the United States district court shall be held at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., without expense to the United States. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary added an amendment which proposes to authorize the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint two additional district judges for the southern district of New York. I now ask that the Senate reject the amendment reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the vote just taken eliminates the amendment from the bill. The Committee on the Judiciary are unanimous in their opinion that the House bill should pass. There is a real need for holding terms of court at Wilkes-Barre and such terms of court are to be held without expense to the Government. I perceive both Senators from Pennsylvania are present, and I ask them to bear me out as to the necessity for holding terms of court at Wilkes-Barre.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to say that I hope the bill will pass in its present form.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I, too, hope this bill, which is similar to the measure introduced by me in the Senate, will be passed by the Senate for the following reasons: I know that 25 percent of the population of the court district live in the county where Wilkes-Barre is located, and the holding of terms of court at that place will be a great convenience to the people who live there and at the same time will reduce expense to the Government.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation the amendment which was reported by the committee providing for the appointment of two additional judges in my city has been rejected?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. COPELAND. Then the bill in its present form relates only to affording relief to Wilkes-Barre, Pa., by providing for the holding of terms of the district court at that place?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the parliamentary situation.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Inasmuch as the Senate has rejected the amendment reported by the committee, the amendment to the title will also be rejected and the title will stand in its original form.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Copeland	Logan	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Couzens	Lonergan	Reynolds
Austin	Davis	Long	Robinson
Bachman	Dieterich	McAdoo	Russell
Bailey	Donahey	McGill	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Duffy	McKellar	Sheppard
Barkley	Frazier	McNary	Shipstead
Benson	George	Maloney	Steiwer
Black	Glass	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Guffey	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Hale	Moore	Townsend
Burke	Harrison	Murphy	Tydings
Byrd	Hastings	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Johnson	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Carey	Keyes	Overton	White
Connally	King	Pittman	
Coolidge	La Follette	Pope	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the first amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, it has been published that there was intent to resort to what would amount to a filibuster against the pending naval appropriation bill. I myself have been credited with threatening such a filibuster. Nothing of the kind was ever threatened. I have said, and I still feel, that there ought to be will in the Congress for those who so feel to stand up and speak their mind concerning a growth and development which in the end can lead to only the very situation that the proponents of large defensive order contend is to be prevented. We have an example before us at the moment in the form of the current naval appropriation bill of how futile would be an effort at this time to accomplish material reductions in the total of the appropriation.

The pending bill calls for an appropriation of $529,125,806. No other appropriation by the Government compares with the outlay that is called for by the Naval Establishment. Appropriation bills for the Commerce Department, the Interior Department, the Agricultural Department, and all of those, excepting only by chance the Military Establishment, occasion all the way from 3 or 4 days to 2 or 3 weeks of consideration before committees. I am not prepared to say how long the pending bill was considered before the House Appropriations Committee, but I know that only a single day of consideration was given to it on the floor of the House.

I know that many who wished to be heard on this bill were denied a hearing by the House committee, and I know that when the bill came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations the subcommittee appointed to deal with this measure for the Appropriations Committee spent the better part of 2 days considering the bill, and it took only a half hour for the entire committee to ratify what the subcommittee had reported, and now there is urge, or seems to be, to accomplish the greatest expedition in the passage of the bill through the Senate.

With respect to appropriation bills for other departments, we spend no end of time in quibbling about the appropriation of public funds, but it is to be observed that when it comes to dealing with appropriations for our Military and Naval Establishments there is eternally a will to proceed with all possible speed and to avoid, so far as possible, any reasonable debate upon the appropriations.

Last June the Senate committee investigating the munitions industry reported to the Senate, in part, as follows:

> In submitting this preliminary report on naval shipbuilding, the committee wishes to emphasize that it is interested mainly in two things:
>
> The first of these is that the naval defenses shall be provided for without profiteering or collusion.
>
> The second of these is that the national necessity for a purely defensive Navy shall not be confused with the private necessity of the shipbuilders for continuing profits as a consequence of the present close interdependence of the Navy Department and these private shipbuilders.
>
> The Navy is an instrument of national policy. Its growth and activities are watched abroad and take part in changing the foreign policy of the nations. Such changes work back to reshape our own national policy. The growth of a Navy contains within it the seeds of armament races and wars as well as the legitimate seeds of a purely defensive national life insurance.

Mr. President, as an example of how out of control all military appropriations have become, I think it would be well to indicate that, while we have before us at the present time the largest appropriation proposed for the Naval Establishment known in peacetime, there is very little that the Congress may do to eliminate any part of the expenditures called for unless we are ready to upset the existing order.

In other words, the pending appropriation is primarily one for maintenance and continuation of that which has already been authorized. The bill offers but one chance to accomplish anything in the way of economy. That chance is to be found on page 49, under the heading, "Replacement of naval vessels." The bill calls for appropriations to accomplish the completion of 32 vessels which have already been started by the Navy. It also calls for an immediate outlay to commence construction of 20 additional vessels. Therein, it would appear, lies about the only chance for Congress to accomplish an economy in this bill, by eliminating the item for new construction which involves approximately $115,000,000—that is, of course, unless we would prefer to disorganize what is now considered our Naval Establishment.

Mr. President, there can be no question concerning the influence and the effect of appropriations of this kind upon our international relations. I think none will deny that never yet in all the history of time has an armament race been followed by peace. We may go along generation after generation talking about the need in time of peace of preparing for war if we would make our peace secure; yet the fact remains that every large armament race has led to that which we sought to prevent, namely, war. Anyone who can view the step-by-step increase in our Naval Establishment during the last 12 or 15 years without discovering what it has caused other nations to do, and then can feel that we are pursuing a secure course, has a vision and a conception of things that is beyond my comprehension.

I read in the May 4 edition of the United States News a very interesting article under the heading "The world rearms. Uncle Sam keeps pace. Record-breaking naval fund approved by House. How nations are building up their war forces."

The opening paragraphs of this splendidly written article read as follows:

> Nations are beating their gold into battleships and their silver into cannon. Never before in time of peace has so much money been poured into machines of war, and oddly enough this same period has probably never been equaled for frequency of official proclamation of a desire for peace and good will.
>
> Compare the sums going into national defense today with those of another pre-war period, 1913–14, and what are the results? Roughly speaking, when changes in price and currency values are taken into consideration, the following is the picture.

Then follows the picture showing how virtually every power on earth has annually been increasing its outlay in preparation for war, to a point, I may add, where today the world is found spending more money getting ready for more war than was ever before spent in peacetime. Every power has been engaging in the program of increasing its military preparedness. While we may be inclined to point the finger of responsibility to other nations and blame them for setting the pace and for leading in this terrible armament race, the facts are that at this hour, this day, no

power upon earth is spending more money getting ready for more war than is being spent by the United States of America. Today we are spending in preparation for more war approximately three times as much as we were spending in the name of preparedness the year before there came to earth the war that was going to end war. This year is going to find the United States spending to maintain its Military and Naval Establishments more money than it cost to maintain every department of the Federal Government, including the Army and Navy, back in 1913 and 1914.

It is not at all surprising, in light of our own steps respecting this armament race, that able men, unprejudiced men, should be standing in their places wondering what it is all about. I have great regard, as has every Member of the Senate, I believe, for Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, now retired. A letter from him addressed to me and dated the first day of this month appeals as being most significant. I read from his letter:

> It is not possible to see what the Navy (and also the Army) authorities are driving at—unless they propose to force Japan to submission by our superior resources; i. e., to build and to mobilize, as it were, with the idea that Japan, with less gold and other funds, will cry out for mercy?
>
> That is a strange supposition of mine, but what else can they have in mind when building up such great armed forces? No proud people were ever yet subjugated by any such means. In fact, it is an excellent way to drive a proud people to a desperation—or madness—that can make but war.

I think in those two well-written paragraphs Major General Rivers thoroughly sums up the threat that seems to be involved.

What is it at which we are driving and what is it that we are aiming to accomplish through these vastly increased appropriations for our Army and for our Navy from year to year? Annually we hear in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives and upon the public platform the urgings of men that there is grave danger of war with Japan. Just now we seem to be getting a new slant. It is not only Japan. Today's newspapers and today's spokesmen are rather clearly indicating that our present fear and the immediate occasion for our efforts to obtain more capital ships is the fact that Great Britain is planning to build more capital ships, the thought being that we have to keep pace with Great Britain; that we should not for a moment think of letting Great Britain have an ounce more of naval tonnage than we have.

All of this is rather in keeping with testimony which was offered by military advisers before the House Committee on Military Affairs a year ago when they were indicating what was readily concluded to be the need for larger appropriations for trouble, if and when it came, with Great Britain; the need for additional appropriations that were going to insure our being more adequately prepared for what might come—no one expecting it, but for what might come with Great Britain. We had then even a suggestion as to 4,000 miles of international boundary, which for over a hundred years has had no demonstration of military preparedness upon it, that the United States side of that boundary should be fortified; which led, as we all remember, to rather grave conditions abroad.

In Canada and in Great Britain statesmen demanded to know why, and to answer and to allay the suspicion that seemed to have been engendered by the testimony of military men before the House Committee on Military Affairs, the President saw fit to issue a public statement in which he said in effect that the military men testifying before the House Military Affairs Committee were not speaking for the Military Establishment but were speaking only for themselves.

Then it will be remembered that in his desire to chastise someone, and to show his keen displeasure with the consequences of this testimony, the President proceeded to chastise the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee for having permitted that information to become public. The chastisement was not of the men who had given the testimony, as well it might have been.

Today we have injected into this urge for larger military preparedness the thought that we shall be unprepared in the hour when Great Britain may have more than we have in the way of an established military machine. Day after day we are told that Great Britain is planning to build two new capital ships and that we in turn must be prepared to do likewise. The provisions of the pending bill are rather clear to the effect that we are making it possible for the Navy to build these two additional capital ships if and when Great Britain, or some other power, builds its contemplated additional ships.

I believe there is little thought on the part of Americans of the possibility of trouble between Great Britain and the United States; and down underneath all this urge for larger military establishments one invariably finds the thought that we are rather unprepared for the hour that may come when we shall find ourselves at swords' points with a great nation of people across the Pacific—Japan.

Japan and the United States today are engaged in a wild, mad armament race, when I think there is pretty general conviction that if Japan's Navy were 20 times as large as it is, and we had only what we have, in this day of modern warfare and plans for national defense the Japanese Navy could not get within hundreds of miles of our shores. I think that is pretty generally agreed that if our Navy were 20 times as large as it is, and Japan had only what she has today, in this day of modern plans for national defense our Navy could not get within hundreds of miles of any part of the Japanese shoreline. Yet we are selling ourselves the conviction that our defense and our success in the future are wholly dependent upon a larger, ever larger, Naval Establishment.

When we ask those who lead in the fight for a larger Navy how many ships we must have before we may feel that our defense is adequate, the answer is never a numerical one. The answer is always and invariably, "More! More! More!" If there are persons in the United States who think the increased burden that has been sustained from year to year as a result of increased appropriations for the Navy can be indefinitely borne, if there are persons who think that such a naval race can go on indefinitely and leave America strong, they had better be taking stock of what the eventual result must certainly be.

The race between Japan and the United States today finds many in the United States declaring that we have to be looking out for Japan, while at the same time the people of Japan entertain the same degree of conviction that they have to be looking out for Uncle Sam; that there is danger of Japan being attacked by Uncle Sam. Annually the military men of Japan go forth selling the people of Japan the thought that the increased appropriations by the United States together with the speeches about the danger of war with Japan, are clear evidence that the United States is getting ready to make trouble for Japan; and the people of Japan at once are subjected to appeals for larger Japanese appropriations in the name of national defense.

I hold no brief for the element which has dominated in Japan for so long, namely, the military; and yet, if one will but take the pains to ascertain the facts, he will quickly discover that the people of Japan as a mass have little or no sympathy with the Japanese military.

It was my privilege last fall to spend a number of days in Japan. It was my privilege during that time to enjoy contact with some 15 or 20 very representative Japanese citizens, men whose names would be recognized in any capital anywhere on earth, men representative of virtually every walk of life in Japan, excepting only the Army and the Navy, but men who then declared that the Japanese military had led in a direction and had gone to an extreme where the people of Japan could not carry the burden any longer; that their frontiers had been so far-flung by the military that they could not hope to afford the kind of national-defense establishment that would be adequate or sufficient, and that the military dominance in Japan would have died of its own weight long ago except for the fact that at least once a year the United States gives the Japanese military some ground or other upon which to stand when they say, "We

have to be better prepared for the trouble that the United States is getting ready to make for us."

In my contacts with these Japanese citizens, there was prophecy last October on every hand that at the next popular election in Japan the people would show their keen displeasure with military dominance. Two months or three months after those personal contacts the elections in Japan occurred, with results which are known to us all today, results which substantiated the prophecies that had been made so early. The military in Japan were discredited, were clearly defeated, in those elections; and then we know, too, what an arrogant military establishment did in part in retaliation for its defeat at the polls. It went forth and murdered and slaughtered the public officials who had not taken so ardent a stand alongside the Japanese military as the military thought had been deserved.

Our expenditures for our Military Establishment are a constant source of concern in Japan, just exactly as the Japanese expenditures in the name of so-called national defense are a constant source of worry to the people of the United States. The race which is involved is one which certainly is not going to get us anywhere except into the very thing we are trying to prevent, except into the thing we are trying to avoid by the degree of defense we are building.

Our contribution to the establishment and to the continuation of the life of the military in Japan seems to me ought not to be overlooked. We are often apt and wont to place upon Japan the responsibility for the armament race that is going on today, when as a matter of fact we ought to be more carefully weighing what perchance may be our contribution to prolonging the dominance of the military in Japan. The race that is on between us now is a race that means much to everyone.

One hundred and twenty-five million Americans have much at stake in races which in the past have invariably led only to war. We have something else at stake. We have very largely at stake the expense that is entailed by reason of races of the present kind. But there are a few Americans who have something more at stake than do the great bulk of the American people, a few Americans whose prosperity is dependent upon a continuation of a mad armament race, with our own country a participant in the race.

Mr. President, we go forward from year to year appropriating moneys in the name of national defense when the actual preparation undertaken by reason of the expenditure of these public moneys is of plans not for national defense, but of plans for a national offensive.

The plans for the next war, under the existing National Defense Act, are not necessarily plans calling for the mobilization of forces upon acres of American soil, in our own harbors, or within a hundred miles of our own shores. In the main, our national defense plans call for the transportation again of 3,000,000 American boys across thousands of miles of deep blue ocean water in the name of national defense. And when it dawns, as it will, upon the people of America, that these appropriations are for something more than strictly national defense, the membership of this and subsequent Congresses is going to hear from home in no uncertain way. If I am not mistaken, if Members of Congress could be back at home at the present hour they would find there a degree of great displeasure with these increased appropriations.

Another thing is going to awaken the people of America ultimately. In the name of national defense we go forward perfecting armor plate, to make more secure our national defense. Within the last month in one nation of the earth there has been developed a new projectile which will pierce 12-inch armor plate, a projectile that, strictly speaking, makes every naval vessel on earth today obsolete, no longer of utility, easily subject to sinking, and to attack. It will not be long before spokesmen will be pointing out the need for substituting brand-new equipment for the present naval equipment and, of course, while we are doing that, other nations will be doing likewise.

In connection with the armor plate, we should never lose sight of the fact that all the armor plate that has gone into our present Naval Establishment has afforded a very profitable venture for the manufacturers of armor plate. They will not be displeased if there is substitution of something for the present equipment, something that will better protect against this new, powerful projectile, which can pierce the 12-inch plates.

We go on perfecting guns from year to year, and our military leaders buy these guns for our Army and our Navy. The purchase of those guns by our Government is a source of great satisfaction, of course, to the manufacturers of the guns. They want to sell more of them, and they do sell more of them. After they sell enough for our requirements, they go over the earth selling the same kind of guns to every other nation that will buy, including the same nations against which those very gun makers tell us we must be prepared to defend ourselves.

As an example, we may take the case of the Driggs Ordnance Co., producers of large ordnance, who perfected a new gun for mounting upon naval vessels, a very efficient instrument. Our Navy thought enough of it to buy a sufficient quantity to arm a limited number of our naval craft. With that sale consummated by the Driggs Ordnance Co., Mr. Driggs sent his salesmen to Europe to sell the same gun over there. The Europeans are not very quick in buying that which they do not have a chance to see, and the salesmen, without a sample of this new gun, weighing tons upon tons, decided that their best prospect lay in Turkey, and to Turkey they went, striving to sell this newly perfected American-made gun to the Turkish Government.

The salesmen wined and dined the Minister of War of Turkey and the admirals and the generals day in and day out, but the Turkish officials would not buy, feeling that they could not expend the public moneys for that which they did not see.

One day into the harbor of Constantinople came the good American battleship *Raleigh*, one of the very few equipped with this new type of gun, and onto this vessel were invited these salesmen and the emissaries of the Turkish Government. Accepting the invitation, they were shown what a fine instrument this new gun was, and before long the salesmen for this American corporation had an order for the sale to Turkey of guns like those which had been sold to our Navy in the name of national defense.

We go on perfecting gases, poison and otherwise, selling them to our Army and to our Navy in the name of national defense. Then the producers of those gases send their representatives into other lands to sell the identical gases there—of course, in the name of national defense.

Some things have been discovered by the Munitions Committee which I think reveal that the munition producers are not always the bad type they have been painted. For example, a few years ago an American gas producer desired to sell gas to the Turkish Government. The Turkish Government was considering producing its own gas, whereupon the American company offered to sell the plans and specifications for the erection of the kind of a plant suitable to the need of producing this gas. This American company was quite willing to sell the Turkish Government its formula for the production of the gas, so that they could produce their own gas. The American company's salesmen were at work striving to develop a line of business with Turkey, and during those very days and hours the same American company had its salesmen at work in Turkey undertaking to sell gas masks to the Turkish Red Cross—a very considerate lot of people; looking to the future, of course.

One must sense the motives behind a large part of this constant urge for more and more and ever more national defense with no enemy in sight. We go on perfecting our aircraft, and then selling the perfected aircraft not only to our own Army and Navy but to the military establishments of other lands, including Japan.

We go on perfecting our powder formulas, and then our private industry sells those formulas to other nations against whom we provide a national defense, to other nations, including Japan, that seems to be constantly on guard against us.

We go on perfecting radio to expedite and to make simpler the matter of communication among our naval craft in time of war, and then other powers come into possession of the same degree of improved equipment.

The fact is, Mr. President, that if there shall ever come the war between Japan and the United States, which is so much talked about just before the annual appropriation bills are acted upon, our forces, our own sons, somewhere out on the Pacific, are going to encounter their foe, and from underneath the waves the transports upon which they travel are going to be targets of torpedoes charged with explosives manufactured in the United States, or with explosives manufactured under formulas sold to Japan by producers in the United States; and the torpedoes will be discharged from submarines, which are built only because the American Electric Boat Co. sells the designs and the patent rights and specifications to other nations, including Japan.

From overhead, from out the zooming airplanes, will come bombs loaded with shrapnel that once knew its home to be the United States, sold to Japan to the great profit of some Americans.

Every one of the airplanes which attack our forces as we move across the Pacific will be powered by a motor either manufactured in the United States or manufactured in Japan under rights sold to Japan by American corporations.

Yet we continue shouting that we have to look out for Japan, and go on arming, to the profit of some few Americans, and over in Japan the people are thoroughly convinced that they have to be prepared for that war which the United States is getting ready to wage against them.

When the question is asked why they think we are getting ready to do anything of the kind, invariably they point to the increasing appropriations made from year to year, and they place the appropriations alongside the speeches which are made by Members of Congress indicating the need for a great national defense against the trouble which is coming from Japan. Here we are fooling ourselves while the Japanese are fooling themselves into believing that there is will to war between Japan and the United States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAPPER in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NYE. I gladly yield.

Mr. KING. I am sorry to disturb the Senator in the excellent presentation which he is making; but, having mentioned Japan, I am tempted to call to his attention a matter with which he is familiar; namely, that a number of years ago, when the United States announced a large naval program—one calling for several hundred million dollars—and also a program calling for several hundred million dollars for the War Department, an official of the Japanese Government who was a member of the Japanese Diet, interrogated a member of the cabinet as to the reason for such large naval appropriations being requested by the Japanese Government. In response to the interrogation, the official of the Government stated that "the United States has increased its appropriation, and we must take cognizance of the activities of the great power on the other side of the Pacific Ocean."

So, our increase in appropriations undoubtedly led Japan to demand larger appropriations. Our course caused fear on their part and precipitated their action. Lord Lothian recently said that whenever one nation arms ostensibly for the purpose of preparedness, other nations are led to arm; and he further said that these armaments led to periodic wars.

Mr. NYE. A rivalry which leads to the one thing that is most profitable to the few who engage in the production of materials for so-called national-defense requirements.

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

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have been very much interested in trying to find out if any reasonable man can explain under what circumstances we can ever have any trouble with Japan. I cannot see any reason why there should be any fear of trouble with Japan. I have never met anyone who could explain to me why there should be any such fear.

Mr. NYE. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that we have people who think Uncle Sam ought to be a policeman over in the Orient, and that when other nations do things over there which we do not like, even though toward people other than our own, we ought to be ready to move in and take a hand at straightening out unfair things that are being done. There are other people in the United States who are equally insistent that one morning we shall awaken to the discovery that the Japanese have seized the Philippine Islands. Then there are other Americans who ask the question, "If that shall come to pass, what are we going to do about it?" and I am at a loss to know what to do about it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not think there is any ground for suspicion that Japan would take the Philippines.

Mr. NYE. I entertain no such suspicion; yet I think if Japan ever were inclined to take the Philippine Islands we could not successfully defend them, even though we had a Naval Establishment five times as large as it now is. To have so large a Naval Establishment is not to be thought of. We could not carry such a load. We could not afford that kind of defense.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. My observation of the subject has led me to believe that the question is more one of interest in oil and oil markets in the Orient than interest in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. NYE. I think the Philippine controversy is little deserving of our consideration as respects our relations with Japan.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course there is propaganda going on all over the country, fostered to a large extent by persons and organizations who claim they are working for peace. They are spreading the propaganda that, of course, we cannot keep out of the next world war. They say we cannot keep out. Then there are other persons who think it is our duty to punish bad nations and help good nations punish bad nations. That propaganda is going on in this country all the time. I think it is just as dangerous a propaganda as that which brought us into the World War.

Mr. NYE. Decidedly it is. It is as dangerous, or even more so.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is fostered by organizations which say they are for peace.

Mr. NYE. That is too often true.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Such organizations supported the London Naval Treaty, the treaty which makes possible the pending naval bill. Every Member of the Senate who voted for the London Naval Treaty ought to vote for the passage of the pending bill, because it would be perfectly consistent for him to do so. The London Naval Treaty was hailed as a disarmament treaty. However, it laid the foundation for just the kind of program we are now considering.

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

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. KING. I apologize to the Senator from North Dakota for interrupting his speech. I am compelled to leave the Chamber to attend a meeting of the Finance Committee, which is trying to raise $600,000,000 or $700,000,000, a large part of which will be required to meet the $525,000,000 expenditure called for by the pending bill.

Mr. NYE. I venture to guess that it will take Congress much longer to devise ways to pay the bill than Congress will require to spend the money that has to be raised by taxation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the Senator may tell his constituents that Congress will increase the burden of taxation, now so heavily bearing upon them, and that our children and our children's children and perhaps our children's children's children will not escape some of the burden of taxation which we are now piling up.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I was making a point of the fact that a great many Americans who are eternally urging us into more adequate preparation for war are getting a large

profit out of preparations for war. I was making the point that Americans who are enjoying profits from our preparations for national defense are taking profits out of their sales of materials for national defense to other nations, including those which may some day be our foes in war. Of course, no one should conclude that I am alleging that such a practice is one which is wholly American. It is a practice which is common the world over, a practice which is as old as the game of war itself. It is a practice which 20 years ago made one European the richest man in all Europe. He went forth arming all Europe with the same identical instruments of warfare, and then, after the war was over, he was honored by all Europe for his great service to mankind during the war!

Right now, though, over across the Atlantic there is a picture which is constantly threatening the peace of the world. Right now the French are arming Germany. I have before me a very interesting item which was printed in a newspaper a month ago or less being a dispatch from Paris under the heading:

French steel trust piles up profits selling Hitler material for arms to menace France.

I read as follows:

FRENCH STEEL TRUST PILES UP PROFITS SELLING HITLER MATERIAL FOR ARMS TO MENACE FRANCE—16,000,000 TONS OF ORE A YEAR SENT TO GERMANY FOR WAR MACHINE

By Pierre van Paassen

PARIS.—France is arming Germany! Her munitions makers, like those of other lands, know no fatherland but profit.

If Herr Hitler felt strong enough March 7 to defy the world, tear the Locarno Treaty to shreds, and install himself on the Rhine with heavy artillery, monster tanks, mobile forts of steel, and bombing planes, this was made possible by the French mining trusts.

Seventy-five percent of the steel in Germany's artillery and other war equipment comes from France. Seventy-five percent of the shells and bullets which would kill French soldiers or the soldiers of nations allied with France in the event of war with Germany are of French origin.

STEEL FOR HITLER GUNS

An average of 60 freight trains loaded with iron ore left France for Germany every day in 1933, 1934, and 1935. The rate of export is even higher in 1936.

Germany has used 20,000,000 tons of steel a year since Hitler came to power to build up her gigantic war machine. Sixteen million tons of this ore came from France. If France is under the terrific pressure of a German army on her borders today, unable to maneuver and wondering if she must look on impotently as Germany attacks the allies of France in eastern Europe before turning against France herself, the French people may thank their own trust magnates. For these men are making a German victory discussable.

USE FRENCH MATERIALS

Those aerial torpedoes loaded with high explosives, those cylinders containing poison gas with which Goering's flying squadrons are loaded up, and the very bombing machines themselves which now lie ready at the ridiculously short distance of 180 miles from Paris, are made out of material that comes out of French soil. Hitler's giant Zeppelins could not be manufactured if France were not supplying the bauxite which is indispensable in the manufacture of aluminum.

The Socialist group in the Chamber of Deputies asked Premier Albert Sarraut before the adjournment of Parliament, March 18, what measure the Government intended to take to stop this colossal export which menaces the security of France. Sarraut did not reply.

USED FOR EXPLOSIVES

When I went to the Rhine recently—

The author of this article, Mr. Pierre van Paassen, said—

I saw a string of trucks being examined at the French custom station before passing over the international bridge into the Reich. These trucks contained cotton waste and silk waste, and the next day I learned that the Tourcoing mills in France exported to Germany in 1 month 1,700 tons of wool, cotton, and silk waste, 200 tons of cotton thread and 350 tons of silk waste. All this material is used to manufacture explosives.

An expert, Paul Allard, has figured out that of every two shells Germany fires off in the next war, one will be of French origin. That is to say, one out of every two shells fired by Germans to kill Frenchmen in the next war will represent a profit to the Comite des Forges, the great French Steel Trust.

The main reason why France doesn't put a stop to the export of war material is that French public opinion is dominated by great newspapers which are the property of the same Comite des Forges, the same steel and munition trusts which are piling up profits in supplying war material to Germany. And these same munition trusts gave financial support to Adolph Hitler before he came to power.

So, Mr. President, let us not assume that our American companies are the only ones engaged in the game of arming all the world with the same identical instruments of warfare which are to be used in our defense when the next emergency comes.

I think my colleagues in the Senate are not among those who have been free in declarations that there has been a purpose on the part of the Munitions Committee to undermine our own national defense. I think there are in the Senate no more insistent advocates of national defense than are the men serving upon the Munitions Committee. Yet when we stop to weigh and see what is being done in the name of national defense today, when we stop to think that the plans calling for these mad appropriations from year to year contemplate wars thousands of miles away from our own shores again, surely it is time that we exercise the liberty of criticising those things that are being done in the name of national defense.

Let us take a look at our need for national defense. Can it be said that there is any power upon the earth less likely to be attacked by a foreign foe than is the United States? I think not. I think there is no nation on earth so fortunately situated as are we with respect to having to deal with that fear and that danger; and yet here we are spending more money in the name of national defense than is being spent by any other nation on earth, leading the armament race that is with us today, a race which can hardly expect to encounter any other end than that which armament races have accomplished in the past. They are always followed by war. I do not know by what right we anticipate that another armament race is not going to be followed by the same result that has accrued from armament races heretofore. Even when set forth to wipe out depressions, as we have been trying to wipe out a depression for the last number of years, our very first consideration is our national defense. We appropriate billions of dollars, which is intended to start the wheels of industry again, which is intended to afford employment for men, and our very first allocation of public-works money to accomplish such a result is an allocation to our Navy, to be used in building more ships, getting ready for more of the same thing that gave us the depression we are fighting. And so we take the public-works money and build more ships and get ready for more war, knowing full well that, as in the case of every other war, another war will be followed by more depressions, so that we can have another public-works program, perchance, with which to build more ships and get ready for more war.

Mr. President, there is an element in this country that relishes the idea of keeping the American people fooled into the belief that they are not adequately defended, that they are not adequately prepared to defend themselves against what may come from foreign powers. Privately, among themselves, this element talks about these appropriations in terms that are unmistakable and not in the terms they use when the public is listening in. When we listen in, their urge for more ships and more men and more armament is an urge for a better and more adequate national defense; but among themselves, when they talk about such appropriations as the one now pending before us, they call it by its right name; they call it "plunder", and then they forget to destroy the letters. One such example is clearly revealed in a letter written right after the passage of one of our naval building bills by Mr. H. M. Southgate, representative of the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., and written to the president of a great shipbuilding corporation. In the letter Mr. Southgate said:

I understand the morning after the bill went through every east coast yard had its representatives in Washington with their tongues hanging out and all teeth showing, ready to fight for their share of the plunder, and the only thing that stopped the west coast yards from being here was the fact that they could not come bodily by telegraph.

Among themselves, I repeat, when they consider the thing that we call national defense, they call it "plunder"; and if other Members of the Senate, with my colleagues and

myself, upon the Munitions Committee could have followed the revelations, they would have realized how tremendous is the plunder enjoyed under the big building programs by shipbuilders and others who have that which is needed to arm our ships with that degree of armament for which our national defense, according to their estimate, calls. There is tremendous profit in keeping the world fearful of itself. There is for some people tremendous profit in these mad armament races.

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

Mr. NYE. I gladly yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. POPE. Has it occurred to the Senator as being interesting that the National Economy League, from whom we hear constantly with regard to economy in all sorts of matters, never writes a letter protesting against naval appropriation bills or Army appropriation bills?

Mr. NYE. It has never struck me as being at all strange, and I know it is not a strange thing to have been encountered by the Senator from Idaho, because the Senator from Idaho, like myself, knows who are the sponsors of these so-called economy leagues and liberty leagues. The Senator from Idaho does not anticipate that the Du Ponts, for example, who go forth annually urging great economy, great cuts in appropriations for the Labor Department, for the Commerce Department, for the Interior Department, and other departments, are going to urge any reduction in appropriations for the Army and Navy when such appropriations are what have made the Du Ponts the power and force they are in the world today.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I am wondering if my friend from North Dakota has received any protests from chambers of commerce in the United States against the size of the military and naval appropriations this year and last year?

Mr. NYE. The Senator asks a question that is nearly a repetition of one that I asked my office force this morning; and they made search for any evidence of an appeal from chambers of commerce protesting against these Army and Navy appropriation bills. There were none.

Mr. BONE. The United States Chamber of Commerce has its headquarters here in Washington, D. C., and as I read in the newspapers, in an attempt to understand the position assumed by that dignified body, I gather the impression that it is violently opposed to the prodigal expenditures, as it charges and calls them, of the New Deal, and yet we now confront the fact that this year and last year this Government will have expended well over $2,000,000,000 for preparedness. I am wondering if that has excited or is going to excite a murmur on the part of the United States Chamber of Commerce, because $2,000,000,000 is a sizable portion or part of the money we have spent in rehabilitation, feeding the poor, trying to give the average poor fellow a break in these dreadful times.

Mr. NYE. Does the Senator from Washington anticipate that there will be any protest from the United States Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. BONE. I think the Senator from North Dakota is sufficiently familiar with my frame of mind and my viewpoint to know that I do not expect even a ripple out of the United States Chamber of Commerce although we should spend $5,000,000,000 a year in so-called preparedness.

Mr. NYE. Certainly.

Mr. BONE. I am merely trying to get from the Senator some expression of opinion, if he is willing to give an expression of opinion, as to why big business, typified by the United States Chamber of Commerce, does not see fit to murmur against the size of these appropriations but snarls all the time against appropriations for the W. P. A. and other necessary remedial operations of the Government.

Mr. NYE. I thank the Senator for his observations. I have been making the point that, as a Nation, we were so fortunately located that we perhaps needed to fear less than any other power on earth attack from abroad; and yet our outlay in the name of national defense and in preparation for war is greater than is the outlay of any other nation upon this earth.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for what may be an unfriendly interruption?

Mr. NYE. I always gladly yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I am moved to make this suggestion because of an observation made by the Senator from Washington and also by the reply of the Senator from North Dakota. It seems to me the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators who are opposed to large Navy appropriations assume that the purpose of the Navy and the Army is to defend our country against invasion. Has it ever occurred to the Senator that great armament might have another use?

We have just had an illustration in Ethiopia of what can be accomplished by modern armament by going into another country and capturing it and taking it over. That glorious victory which Mussolini has obtained over the Ethiopian Government fills all his countrymen here with pride and admiration. It seems to me that victory would not have been possible had not his Government made preparation for great armament and for a large Army and Navy. We find him going into Ethiopia, winning some glorious battles without the loss of very many of his men, without meeting a single defeat, but capturing the cities of Ethiopia and subjecting its people to his rule.

Not only do we find him victorious on the battlefield, but victorious in the air. He has gone over Ethiopia by airplane without meeting a single defeat, without losing a single airplane, I understand. Not only is he victorious in the air and on the land, but Mussolini has not lost a battle on the sea in this war. He comes out of the war victorious. Ethiopia comes out without any fleet. Ethiopia has not an armed vessel left. It was a great victory for Italy. It was an ignominious defeat for Ethiopia. By means of his preparation for war Mussolini has given an exhibition of how it is possible to destroy an armed people and to murder more babies than ever before in the history of the world in the same length of time.

Is not that sufficient glory to encourage us to go on and arm and rearm and arm again and build new battleships to get ready for that kind of emergency, which may come to us at any time?

Mr. NYE. The Senator prefaced his question with something in the nature of an apology for asking what might be an embarrassing question. In answer to the Senator's question I am going to ask him an equally embarrassing one. With the terrible Ethiopians put in their place, is there any longer need for us to make preparation to do for Mussolini what he has done for us?

Mr. NORRIS. I gladly answer the question. Ethiopia is not the only "pebble on the beach." There are several other African countries. There are some countries perhaps on our own continent that we may want to conquer tomorrow.

What about Liberia? Italy has not yet taken Liberia. Could we not use our Navy to go over there and capture that country? By the way, we loaned Liberia a lot of money during the World War because she was one of our allies and helped us in the great World War to bring about a victory for peace in a war against war when we made the world, including Liberia, "safe for democracy."

Mr. NYE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. He and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] are greatly concerned about our preparation for going away from home, if need be, to wage war. The Senator from Washington is eager to know what in the world it is that keeps the United States Chamber of Commerce from violently protesting these huge and ever-larger appropriations for our Military Establishment. I would not even insinuate it, I may say to the Senator from Washington, but I wonder if by any chance the chamber of commerce contemplates that the time may come when we will want to engage in some expedition, not necessarily into Ethiopia or Liberia, but, by chance, to Nicaragua,

where some few Americans have large interests at stake? Does the Senator from Washington think that might be at all an influence in that consideration?

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

Mr. NYE. I gladly yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. I have, as has the Senator from North Dakota, rather definite notions about what some of those gentlemen would like to do if they deemed it necessary to do it. I do not want the Senator to think I am trying even to interrupt his speech. I hope he will be patient with me.

Mr. NYE. The Senator improves my speech.

Mr. BONE. I thank the Senator. I have been impelled to examine at some length some of the arguments advanced in behalf of an American merchant marine which seemed to be tied in with the argument for a national defense. I have saved not only dozens but hundreds of clippings from most highly vocal exponents of an American merchant marine. In examining and breaking them down to find the very heart and essence and soul of the argument for an American merchant marine, this one factor stands out, and I think the Senator from North Dakota might in his speech find it of advantage to the country to elaborate a little on the thought which I am about to suggest to him.

The leading argument for a great American merchant marine has this particular thought running through it like a red string through the warp and woof of a rug. It is that we must have ships capable of carrying large numbers of troops not for short distances but for thousands of miles, with a cruising radius and range running into thousands of miles. I am wondering what the American merchant marine, which is to haul troops thousands of miles, is really being built for? On the one hand is the argument for national defense. Obviously, we do not have to defend this Nation on the shores of Asia or Africa. I cannot imagine a defense of America on the shores of Africa, either the east or west coast. Therefore I am compelled to view that sort of argument with some misgivings.

Has the Senator any thought to give us in the way of enlightenment as to what this sort of argument for a merchant marine, which is to convey troops thousands of miles, might have to do with the picture he is now developing before the Senate?

Mr. NYE. I have tried to make the point during my argument this afternoon that, strictly speaking, the national-defense plans toward which we appropriate year after year are not plans contemplating war here at home. They are plans, as the Senator so well knows, contemplating the transportation of millions of American youth to other shores, to other lands, where they are to defend our homes, our wives, our sisters, our sweethearts, and our mothers from attack.

There, it seems to me, is the whole nub of the argument concerning the ever-increasing appropriations for military establishments. We are not content to plan strictly for national defense. We plan for a national offense, if need be. Our military leaders have often said that the best defense is a strong preparation for a strong offensive.

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

Mr. NYE. Gladly.

Mr. POPE. A very interesting lesson has been brought out within the last few weeks concerning the value of national defense. France spends $630,000,000 a year for national defense. A considerable portion of that amount is expended in the building of a line of forts along the French-German border, the finest forts that have ever been constructed, with long lines of corridors, electric elevators, and all modern conveniences. When I was in France last summer I talked with a number of people who said that they felt secure now that they have these forts, because they believed Germany would not again come across that line.

In an issue of Time about a week ago it appeared that Hitler, since he has been operating the Saar coal mines, has dug a channel under each one of those principal forts and has mined them so that within a minute or two he can blow up the principal forts which, over a period of years, have been built by France for her defense.

It seems to me that is a very good illustration, after all, of the so-called "defense" that may be provided over a period of years. The difficulty is that as soon as a defense is built up, some counter defense will be built up which will destroy it, and that is one illustration of it.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, to localize the same point, we have felt that today the larger part of our naval equipment, armed with 12-inch armor plate, was sufficient to withstand any modern guns that might operate against it; yet within the past month there has come the development of a new projectile which will pierce 12-inch armor plate, which at once, as I have previously today remarked, makes obsolete all of the world's present naval armaments. We shall never catch up with ourselves in these wild races. We never have done so; we never shall.

I come back to the point I was making: If we in the United States could content ourselves with providing an adequacy of national defense that would be sufficient easily to repulse a foe that might attack us, I venture to say that we could have that degree of national defense for hundreds of millions of dollars less cost each year; but we are not satisfied with that. At least, those who lead in our thought in the matter of national defense are not satisfied with that. I do not think 1 percent of the people of the United States have any fear of attack from a foreign foe upon our shores or upon our lands; and yet we go on making preparations on a scale that would let us meet a hundred wars, or a hundred attacks from a combination of foreign foes. There is no fear of attack from abroad. There has not been for many, many scores of years during the lifetime of this country.

Abraham Lincoln, in his day, asked the question:

> At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow?

Then he answered it:

> Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not, by force, take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in trial of a thousand years.

He asked the question from what source we need fear attack, and he answered the question and said it could not come from abroad; that our undoing must come from within ourselves.

There is no danger of attack from abroad; and yet, I repeat, we go on spending more than is being spent by any other nation on earth in the name of national defense. We say to ourselves we are rather forced now to make this appropriation, for example, of half a billion dollars for our Navy for the new year. We did our best to accomplish understanding among nations. We tried to get out of this mad naval race. We had our delegates over at London more recently, earnestly striving to bring about an understanding which would let us reduce our naval budgets; but Senators know what the result was. Our representatives told us Japan would not agree, and this nation and that nation would not do as we wished to do; so we signed the treaty, which I rather suspect some day will come to be known as the famous Swiss cheese treaty, for it seems to eliminate the last vestige of any effort to control or to limit naval armaments. In any event, it is because of failures like that, after we have done our best, that we are obliged to engage in these mad naval races.

I wonder, as I often have wondered, whether there was really a sincere, honest desire at London last winter to bring about anything resembling a degree of disarmament. I seriously doubt it.

Only 3 weeks ago one of the American delegates to the London Conference returned home. When he landed in New York he was met by a bevy of newspapermen and photographers, all of whom were exceedingly anxious to know what he thought of the treaty that had been signed at London, and what he thought of the results of the conference. This spokesman of ours, our delegate to a dis-

armament conference, in answer to those queries by the press, said:

I do think we haven't lost a damn thing. We've still got our 10,000-ton cruisers.

That was the statement of the American delegate. That was the spirit of his report on accomplishments at London—"We haven't lost a damn thing", to use his own expression. Who was this delegate? Admiral Standley, who yesterday and the day before appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee to support and to urge the enactment of the bill which at the present time is before us; Admiral Standley, one of our delegates at a conference which anticipated reduction in our naval force; Admiral Standley, whose training, whose whole background is one of preparation for war, whose whole background is one that dictates not disarmament but armament, one who is trained in those things. I suppose it is fair to assume that he went to London with an open mind; it is always fair to assume that; and yet I go back to a speech he made only last September at Atlantic City and also at Philadelphia in which he was deriding those who were opposed to these so-called national-defense programs; a speech in which he declared that opponents of the naval building program were—and I quote his words—

The greatest menace to the stability of our Government and to our national security.

So I take it that our national security and our stability as a government are dependent upon the prevention of any understanding that will let us get out from under these budgets which are increasing so terribly from year to year.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POPE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NYE. If the Senator will permit me to go one step further with this thought, I shall be glad to yield to him.

In support of Admiral Standley's great interest in accomplishing something that will let us get out from under this burden of naval armaments, I should like to point out, if I may, that there came before our Munitions Committee one day a character by the name of A. P. Homer, whom I am sure members of the committee will never forget. While he was before us there was produced from the files a letter which Mr. Homer, representative of the shipbuilding industry, had written back in 1933, in which he suggested to the shipbuilders that they might do well to come down to Washington and talk things over with "the gang." The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] has not forgotten that particular experience. I will read part of Mr. Homer's letter, pointing out that the public-works program which had just been enacted was going to permit large shipbuilding programs. He said:

We are on our way, and all of the nations had better watch their step, because we have found ourselves again. From what I can gather, we are going ahead to a full treaty-strength Navy, and we are going to do it quick.

I think it would be very wise for you to come down to Washington in the near future and talk to the gang.

For more than an hour our committee sought to get Mr. Homer to tell us whom he meant by "the gang", and he finally consented to tell; and among those he named was Admiral Standley, who, upon his return from representing our interests in London 3 or 4 weeks ago, declared that we did not lose "a damn thing" at the London Conference.

I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that I have no quarrel, nor have I ever had a quarrel, with the principle of adequate national defense. The statements I have made on this floor, and the questions I have seen fit to ask other Members of the Senate who were discussing the subject, I think should have suggested to them my own attitude of mind.

I listened to the testimony before the Munitions Committee, to which the Senator has adverted, the statements of the most vigorous and highly vocal proponents of national defense, and I found myself in some measure agreeing with them. I thought we ought to have plenty of purely national defense; that we should adopt those tactics and that technique which would best lead to an adequate national defense. Therefore, at all times during my connection with the Munitions Committee I suggested the necessity of making very certain that we should have an adequate national defense, particularly in the Navy; and for that reason I desired to see our navy yards expanded to a point where they could handle this program.

By the expenditure of what is now a comparatively small, even a microscopic sum, something like $23,000,000, we could build graving docks and construction facilities in our Government navy yards that would handle our naval expansion program even in a so-called naval race. For that comparatively tiny sum we could put our Government in position to handle a program of national defense; and yet, for some obscure reason which perhaps the Senator from North Dakota may make plain, although I have never yet found anyone who has made it plain or attempted to do so, the Navy Department objected to that. They were highly vocal in insisting upon an adequate national defense, and yet apparently, for some obscure reason, desired to cripple our best defensive arm, the navy yards of the country, at a time when we were told—deliberately, coldly, purposefully told—that national defense was of most vital importance to the Republic.

I assume that to be true, and I cannot understand, and I never will be able to understand, why the Navy Department wishes deliberately to cut off its right arm and destroy the efficiency, in a measurable degree, of its navy yards, where it could, under pressure, build all the new ships called for under the new naval program.

If the Senator from North Dakota has any information which would enable him to shed any light on this peculiar attitude of the Department, in one breath saying we must have and insist upon an adequate national defense, and in the next breath as definitely asking the Congress to cripple the institution which would permit us to have an adequate national defense, I wish the Senator would make that obscure position plain, not only to the Senate, but to the country, because to me it is inexplicable that the Navy would send a man to London to make a fight for the right of the United States to have an adequate Navy, and come here and suggest to me, and to other Members of the Senate, the necessity for adequate appropriations for a Navy, and then deliberately cripple the one agency, which, with the expenditure of $23,000,000, could provide a naval defense which these gentlemen insist is necessary.

I repeat, I believe in an adequate national defense, and because of that, and because of my own patriotic impulses and my own love of country, I do not like to see any man in public life deliberately set his hand in a ruthless fashion against the instrumentalities which in themselves would ensure this Republic, which millions of men have died to preserve, not only the control, but the absolute, outright fee-simple ownership of facilities where ships could be brought into existence as speedily as men could build them.

I say again, there seems to be an obscure reason why we do obeisance always at the shrine of shipbuilders, at the shrine of private airplane agencies. A bill which came over from the other House contained a provision which deliberately struck down the naval-aircraft factory at Philadelphia, and I cannot understand that. Two years ago there was a fight on this floor, and by dint of the greatest efforts we wrote into the bill then before us, which came out of the Naval Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, a provision that the Government should expand a little plant in Philadelphia which was becoming obsolete, which had gone into a condition of innocuous desuetude, that it should breathe the breath of life into that plant, so that it should become a yardstick which might prevent ruthless profiteers from rooking the Government.

The Senator will recall the statement in bold type, by men interested in a private airplane plant, that in time of peace one plant had piled up profits of 1,142,000 percent, and

those profits, the Senator from North Dakota will recall, according to the estimates then made, and under the figures that were disclosed, represented profits of 11,420 times the entire capital of that plant in 6 years, in peacetimes, made out of the Senator's Government and mine. And men call that patriotism, and under that sort of black flag of business piracy they cheat this Government mercilessly, brutally.

Men who would do such a thing in wartime would be taken before a drumhead court martial, and would not be allowed to repeat it. But when we bring those men here, we meet with opposition, and I do not like that sort of attitude toward national defense.

Mr. NYE. I wonder whether the Senator's statement that had that occurred in time of war there would have been grave consequences is borne out by the facts.

Mr. BONE. It was suggested to those gentlemen that if they were guilty of one-millionth part of that sort of treason to this Government in time of war they would be shot. Men who do such things have the blood of treason in their veins.

Mr. NYE. But the Senator knows and remembers well that there were American corporations during the war, in the most critical hours during the war, that would not respond, that would not comply with the requests of their Government, until they could have a guarantee of a certain amount of profit.

Mr. BONE. I understand that. If the people of the Republic had been privileged to hear the testimony before the Munitions Committee, of course, there would be a change here. But we need not expect to have men who have no reverence for the flag, no innate love of country in their hearts, but who have only an insatiable greed for money, and are willing to strike the Republic a blow in the face of its enemy, actual or potential, to feel any other way. The time has come when we ought to serve notice on these men that while we are ready to pay legitimate profits, we cannot stand for such things as these.

I know the Senator is too familiar with this sort of thing, perhaps, to make necessary any comments, but I hope the time is coming when the Senate and the House will put an end to that kind of business. That is why I hope that when this bill goes to conference we will not permit the destruction, what would seem to me the wanton destruction, of the airplane plant in Philadelphia, which can, in its own feeble way, set up some sort of yardstick to protect the Government against men who would rook it. That is precisely what that sort of thing means, and I think the Senator and others should join with the rest of us—and I am sure he feels that way, because he joined us in the Munitions Committee—and make provision for the Government producing some of its own munitions.

Then, in the face of that sort of a proposal, we shall see how patriotic some of the flag-waving munitions boys in this country are. They want preparedness as long as they do the preparing, with the profit I have indicated, 1,142,000 percent in 6 years, the profit, or a substantial part of it, coming out of their Government.

I hope the Senator, feeling as he does about this question, will join with us who feel that preparedness is right and proper and patriotic, but who would get the hands of these men, who are almost racketeers, out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. NYE. I do not know why the Senator from Washington refers to them as "almost racketeers." I think they are the most clearly defined racketeers there are in this country.

The Senator asks why it is that the heads of our military establishments are so violently opposed to the Government going into the business of producing its own national defense requirements. I wish I could answer his question. I entertain the same thought that is in his mind. I should like to know, I should like to be informed, as to just why they feel that for the Government to manufacture its own munitions would be poor policy. We know, of course, their arguments, oft repeated, that we need private industry when war comes because, with the emergency of war on our hands, we could not hope to meet our own needs as a government, that we need private industry. By the same token our Army and Navy spokesmen declare that it is good policy for American corporations to sell American-made national-defense machinery to other lands, including those which might be our foes in another war, because only in that way can we build up that large capacity that will make it possible for us to meet our own needs when war comes.

They might better put it another way, and say that we should go on arming other nations because only in that way can we be adequately prepared, in capacity, when and if the other countries we have armed decide to use against us that with which we have armed them.

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

Mr. NYE. Gladly.

Mr. BONE. It is obvious, from the testimony before the committee, that for approximately the price of one 10,000-ton cruiser of the modern type we can expand our own Government navy yards and install the equipment to a point where they can take care of the program which gentlemen insist is so vital. I am assuming they are correct, and I am not challenging their conclusions in that regard but I cannot understand why they object to putting their own Government in position to protect itself and to do its own work in a great crisis. They tell us that in case of war we will have to strain every nerve and have to be bilked and robbed again by profiteers, as we were in the last war, because of lack of preparedness.

I have suggested to these gentlemen that the way to get prepared is to get prepared, and for $23,000,000 we could put our navy yards in such condition that they could do what was necessary. The navy yard in Philadelphia could be expanded so as to accommodate the new welding machinery and all the other modern, up-to-date machinery necessary to replace the now obsolete machinery in the yard.

I think the one great question that stands out is why men who are so highly vocal in demanding national preparedness, in the next breath decry the efforts of Senators and others with our viewpoint who want to afford the Government means of having an adequate national defense. Let us have an adequate national defense, but let us have it in the hands of our Government, where it belongs, instead of in the hands of the gentlemen who piled up enormous fortunes during the war.

I recall one volume I read during the war which showed one outfit reporting war profits of 299,000 percent in 1 year, which was 2,999 times the capital of that firm, though probably the figures were subsequently adjusted. It was like the Government going to a farmer in a moment of great national peril and saying to him, "Sir, we want your farm for 1 year", and taking that farm and raising thereon the commodities and the products necessary to sustain our Army in the field, and then turning the farm back to the man at the end of a year and saying to him, "For the use of your farm for 1 year we are now going to give you 2,999 farms just like it." That is what that picture means. Men did that sort of unholy, unhallowed, vicious thing to their Government, a Government preserved by the blood of the boys who died on the battlefield. The profiteers did that sort of thing to the flag that waves over them and protects their business; yet apparently we cannot get a hand raised against the repetition of that sort of thing. We loaned to Europe the money which came back to the profiteers in gigantic profits. Europe never has paid those debts, and today we are laying the lash of the taxmaster upon the shoulders of every American citizen and sweating him in taxes every year to pay the debt represented by the defaulted European bonds, which in turn represent the profits which went to the American profiteers and racketeers during the war; yet apparently we cannot get any relief of a substantial nature. A cold-blooded lawyer who knew his business would build a defensive legislative technique, but it seems we cannot stop the profiteering in time of war. We

are going along blindly, possibly headed into another war stripped of national defense, stripped of the means wherewith to put an end to war profiteering.

I wish the naval appropriation bill and the Army appropriation bill provided that the Government should manufacture enough of its necessary munitions of war to make it impossible for another outfit ever to do to our Government the sordid, vicious things which the record brought before the Munitions Committee showed were done by profiteers to the Government which now protects them with its police force. I think the record of what was done during the World War by profiteers smells to high heaven; it reeks. I think the nastiest chapter in American history was what these men did to the Government which protected them.

Mr. NYE. The Senator from Washington knows that I share fully the views and wishes he has expressed; but he leaves the question not fully answered, and I am afraid it will remain not fully answered. He asked why our Military Establishment stands up so unequivocally in opposition to Government manufacture of its own national defense requirements. I cannot answer his question. I wonder, however, if the same thought lurks in the mind of the Senator from Washington that I find often playing around in my own. As the result of the inquiry into the munitions industry, the Senator recalls how often it was revealed that executives of American companies were Colonel This-or-That, or Admiral Thus-and-So, men who had been in the service of their Military Establishment in years gone by, and who are now enjoying lucrative employment with private industry. Does that mean anything to the Senator, in answer to his own question?

Mr. BONE. I assure the Senator that it does. There is more than a lurking suspicion in my mind concerning the matter to which the Senator refers.

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

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. BENSON. The Senator has partially answered the question I was about to ask; but does he not also think that possibly the economic philosophy which has been taught the young men whom we have sent to Annapolis and West Point may have a bearing upon the attitude which they now take as officials of the United States Government, whether it be at London or before Senate committees, in advocating certain ideas, and in opposing the program which the Senator proposes?

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Minnesota has put his finger upon a large responsibility for our general military frame of mind. We cannot train men in one direction and then expect them to operate in another direction. I am sure that if I had been trained at Annapolis or at West Point, one of my first desires would be to make the Navy or the Army a career, a profession as it were. I should, of course, hope for the earliest possible promotion. If I were out of Annapolis, I should hope for the day when I could command my own ship, and so would the Senator from Minnesota hope for the day of promotion which would take him up in the world. Then it follows that the man who makes the Navy his career would be destroying his own career if he by any chance argued against building more ships, because more ships always mean larger opportunity for promotion. If I were not anticipating staying in the Navy for a career, and if I felt that some day I should have to depend upon private industry to make a place for me, I think I should not oppose a private industry which might some day have a place for me when my time for retirement came. I think the Senator's reasoning is very logical.

Before the interruptions, which were altogether deserving, I was making the point of repeated failures of disarmament conferences. I told of what we received from the kind of representation Admiral Standley gave us over at London during recent months. It was not many years ago that we were undertaking the accomplishment of an understanding at Geneva.

We sent our delegation to Geneva, and while the delegation worked there our gun makers here in the United States were receiving letters from Europe, written upon stationery of the American Embassy, telling them not to worry; that nothing was going to be done at that conference to hurt their business. I think I have here one such letter. Yes; here is a letter written upon American Embassy stationery, saying:

My secretary forwarded to me your letter with enclosure relating to the Geneva Conference which I am very glad indeed to have. It appears that I am to be designated either as a technical adviser or in some other capacity to attend this conference.

Remember, this is a letter written to gun makers here in the United States.

I shall, therefore, be very glad to have any information that you may be able to give relating, either to the general subject, or to the interests of your company in particular. It is my desire to know as much as possible about the subject and I am sure that your advice will be helpful. Address me in care of the Military Attaché, American Embassy, 5 rue de Chaillot, Paris.

My appointment to Geneva has not been announced, so far as I have seen, and in the letter to me from the War Department the matter was marked "confidential"—

Confidential, it would seem, to everyone excepting the business here that stood to lose money if real progress were made at Geneva—

the matter was marked "confidential", therefore unless the publication of the matter had been made it will be best to say nothing about my connection with the Conference.

In other words, "If there is anything I can do here for you, just write me in care of the American Embassy. I am being appointed a confidential adviser to the American delegation." I suppose, for the purpose of the RECORD, it ought to be known who the man was who was going to see to it that no disarmament was accomplished. He was the leader in that day of the majority party in the House of Representatives, the leader of the Republican Party, my party, John Q. Tilson. We continue our efforts, anticipating that out of the services of such men we shall accomplish understandings in this world and break away from the increasingly terrible burdens which armaments are imposing upon us year after year.

Getting back to the immediate problems confronting us in the pending bill, I have before me a very interesting page taken from the May 4 issue of the United States News, formerly the United States Daily. I am going to read from an article appearing upon the front page of that issue under the heading:

THREE GREAT SEA POWERS RACE AHEAD IN RECORD PEACETIME NAVAL PROGRAMS

Navies of the principal sea powers are building rapidly again.

Limits on the size of fleets, established at Washington in 1922 and at London in 1930, come off next January 1.

Japan today is pressing against those limits; the United States and Great Britain are striving hard to reach them in an unprecedented volume of peacetime naval building.

To keep abreast of the race the American Congress this past week started to consider a $531,068,707 naval appropriation, the House quickly approving, and the British Parliament learned of plans to spend $396,336,200 on the British Navy. Both were without peacetime precedent for size.

How, then, do the three biggest navies stand in tonnage at this stage?

The answer is provided by the pictogram at the top of the page, with figures as of April 27, 1936.

This shows the British Empire first, with 1,388,184 tons of ships built and building; the United States next, with 1,353,085 tons; Japan third, with 866,654 tons.

Each of these navies was nearing its treaty limit, Japan barely 2,000 tons away, Great Britain and the United States, each 70,000 tons short. At this point they approach the well-known 5–5–3 ratio of tonnage that formed the basis of treaty strength. Insistence by Japan on a 5–5–5 ratio is bringing termination of the naval agreements.

I shall ask that the entire article may be printed as a part of my remarks; I am not going to bother the Senate to read it all; but I wish to move to the second column and read a little further from the article.

At the moment the United States is found to be pushing ahead fastest with new building.

Meaning naval construction—

Under construction for the Navy of this country are 3 aircraft carriers, 12 cruisers, 52 destroyers, and 13 submarines, involving a total net tonnage of 274,670 for 80 ships. * * *

The United States is preparing to build two dreadnaughts of her own if—

If—

Britain builds hers. Plans call for ships to cost $51,000,000 each. This country, too, is increasing enlisted personnel of the Navy to 100,000 from the present 93,500, and of the Marine Corps to 17,000 from the present 16,000.

I read further from the article.

What steps Japan intends to take to keep up in the procession is not revealed at this time.

I am not reading from some pacifist organ; I am reading from the United States News, which no one would charge with entertaining pacifist tendencies.

What steps Japan intends to take to keep up in the procession is not revealed at this time.

Insistence by Japan that she be permitted to build up to parity with Great Britain and the United States led to a scrapping of present naval limitation treaties.

Then as to plans for next year we find in the article:

Japanese plans are undisclosed.

But the British intend to lay down two 35,000-ton dreadnaughts, and it is to keep abreast of that move that Congress is authorizing the President to start work on two American dreadnaughts.

I now ask that the article, in its entirety, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the United States News of May 4, 1936]

THREE GREAT SEA POWERS RACE AHEAD IN RECORD PEACETIME NAVAL PROGRAMS

Navies of the principal sea powers are building rapidly again.

Limits on the size of fleets, established at Washington in 1922 and at London in 1930, come off next January 1.

Japan today is pressing against those limits; the United States and Great Britain are striving hard to reach them in an unprecedented volume of peacetime naval building.

To keep abreast of the race, the American Congress this past week started to consider a $531,068,707 naval appropriation, the House quickly approving, and the British Parliament learned of plans to spend $396,336,200 on the British Navy. Both were without peacetime precedent for size.

RANKING OF BIG THREE

How, then, do the three biggest navies stand in tonnage at this stage?

The answer is provided by the pictogram at the top of the page, with figures as of April 27, 1936.

This shows: The British Empire, first, with 1,388,184 tons of ships built and building; the United States next, with 1,353,085 tons; Japan, third, with 866,654.

Each of these navies was nearing its treaty limits, Japan barely 2,000 tons away, Great Britain and the United States each 70,000 tons short. At this point they approach the well-known 5-5-3 ratio of tonnage that formed the basis of treaty strength. Insistence by Japan on a 5-5-5 ratio is bringing termination of the naval agreements.

But figures show that today's navies do not tell the whole story of what has happened to sea power since January 1, 1919.

The British Empire, as the pictogram outlines, reduced its tonnage of ships built and building by 52 percent, as compared with January 1, 1919, or from 2,891,758 tons 17 years ago to 1,388,184 tons today.

The United States, in the same period, reduced its Navy from 2,056,276 tons built and building to 1,353,085, or by 34 percent.

Japan, instead of decreasing, actually increased her naval tonnage in the 17-year period from 642,801 tons to a present 866,654 tons—an increase of 35 percent.

The result is that the United States Navy, on the basis of official figures, is far behind both Japan and Great Britain in the number and tonnage of modern fighting craft. Almost all naval building in this country stopped in 1928 and has been revived only in the last 2 years.

Thus, the Japanese and the British each possess six times the tonnage of modern destroyers possessed by the United States. The Japanese have 50 percent more modern submarine tonnage and a tonnage of under-age cruisers approximately as large.

AMERICA BUILDING FASTEST

At the moment the United States is found to be pushing ahead fastest with new building.

Under construction for the Navy of this country are 3 aircraft carriers, 12 cruisers, 52 destroyers, and 13 submarines, involving a total new tonnage of 274,670 for 80 ships.

Great Britain is building 50 ships for a total of 164,435 tons, while Japan has 35 ships under way involving 95,257 tons.

None of these countries has built a capital ship or dreadnaught since the 1922 Washington Naval Conference. However, at this time Great Britain is planning to construct two new first-line fighters of the dreadnaught type as soon as the naval agreement expires at the end of this year.

ON WITH THE RACE

The United States is preparing to build two dreadnaughts of her own if Britain builds hers. Plans call for ships to cost $51,000,000 each. This country, too, is increasing enlisted personnel of the Navy to 100,000 from the present 93,500 and of the Marine Corps to 17,000 from the present 16,000.

What steps Japan intends to take to keep up in the procession is not revealed at this time.

Insistence by Japan that she be permitted to build up to parity with Great Britain and the United States led to a scrapping of present naval-limitation treaties.

In the matter of naval expenditures the United States is far ahead of other nations. The bill now going through Congress calls for outlays of $531,068,707, compared with planned expenditures of $396,336,200 for the British Navy and $169,000,000 for the Japanese Navy.

When the building now under way is completed the three leading navies will look like this:

	Great Britain	United States	Japan
Dreadnaughts	15	15	9
Aircraft carriers	7	7	6
Cruisers	67	38	40
Destroyers	204	251	122
Submarines	61	100	70

PLANS FOR NEXT YEAR

The above tabulation of fighting vessels covers those now built and building. It does not involve ships now in the paper stage and being appropriated for.

Congress is authorizing $168,500,000 for new construction during the next fiscal year. Involved will be 84 vessels of various types, including 12 destroyers and 6 submarines.

The British plan to build 38 new warships in the next year, including 5 cruisers, 9 destroyers, 1 aircraft carrier, 4 submarines, and a variety of smaller miscellaneous vessels.

But the British intend to lay down two 35,000-ton dreadnaughts, and it is to keep abreast of that move that Congress is authorizing the President to start work on two American dreadnaughts.

Important additions to the air strength of the navies also is called for.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, we may say that we are not in any part responsible for this armament race which is so burdensome these days, but we are playing just as prominent a part, just as leading a part, as is any other nation upon the earth. We are giving just as much cause to others to fear that their defense is inadequate as others are giving us cause to feel that our defense is inadequate.

I go back to what I read from this article:

Plans call for ships to cost $51,000,000 each.

The bill now before us provides for two such ships. The President and the Secretary of the Navy, under this bill, will be at liberty to build those ships if and when the other countries do what we know they are going to do, build their dreadnaughts. Fifty-one million dollars apiece! Yet if the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BENSON], who sits before me, when the appropriation bill for the State Department was pending, had suggested increasing the appropriations provided for that Department amounting, as I recall, to between thirteen million and fourteen million dollars, by an additional million dollars to enable the Secretary of State to further the cause of peace in the world, he would have been guffawed off the floor for daring to suggest such folly in times such as these when we cannot balance our Budget, and it would have been said, "It is no time to be throwing the taxpayers' money around like that"; but when $51,000,000 is proposed to be appropriated for one ship a Senator is unpatriotic if he does not agree that we ought to go ahead and build that ship, regardless of the cost. It indicates our frame of mind. Millions, yea, billions for preparation for war, but exceedingly few dollars for so worthy a cause as preparation for peace.

Mr. President, I think one of the finest compilations revealing what is happening to the American mind in dealing with the general militaristic question is an article written by Oswald Garrison Villard and published in the very recent issue of the Atlantic Monthly Magazine. I know it

will be felt that that might just as well be inserted in the RECORD, but a few Senators are here today listening, and to the end that they may hear and may know the facts set forth in this article, I am going to insist upon reading it, not in its entirety but some very important sections from it.

First of all, Mr. Villard sets forth a quotation from the President, as follows:

On some occasions in our history we have reduced our Army to a level unjustified by a due regard for our own safety. It was in the conviction that we had again drifted too far in that direction that I have recently approved acts of Congress to accomplish a partial restoration of the Army's enlisted strength and increasing the enrollment of cadets in the United States Military Academy.

Then Mr. Villard proceeds:

Thus spoke Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to the cadets at the graduation exercises at West Point an June 12, 1935. Let us examine the facts as to the Army and see just how much basis the President had for the statements made to the young men to whom he had just praised West Point for teaching "honor, integrity, and the faithful performance of duty."

Before the Congress met in its regular session on January 1, 1935, and passed the new military legislation, which Mr. Roosevelt signed, the Regular Army of the United States stood at 12,278 officers and 123,823 men, or a total of 136.101. These figures were naturally exceeded in the years immediately after the war—1920, 1921, and 1922—when the total of officers and men stood at 192,790, 226,116, and 144,874, respectively. In 1923 the figure fell to 129,871, rising in 1924 to 139,579. Since that time it has never fallen below 131,000. In 1934 there were 2,016 officers and men more than in 1933. Plainly there is nothing here to justify any assumption that the President's statement meant that there had been a recent reduction in our Army. He must, therefore, have had in mind the post-war figure of 1921—226,116 officers and men.

He must also have been aware that never before in the history of the Republic has it maintained a Regular Army of so great a size—more than 130,000 men.

Had he looked at the growth of the officer personnel alone he would have seen, for example, that in 1915, when the World War was raging, we had only 4,701 officers to 101,195 soldiers. Today we have two and a half times as many officers to an army which, when Mr. Roosevelt spoke, contained approximately only 124,000 enlisted men. Plainly, so far as officers are concerned, there has not only been no reduction to call for the President's "partial restoration" but an increase of 261 percent in 20 years. Two vital facts Mr. Roosevelt did not mention: The officers in our standing Army are practically at the maximum figure in our history, not excepting the World War years; secondly, we actually have more officers in our Army today than there were officers and soldiers in it during the entire peace years from 1789 to 1861—years when we were conquering the West and constantly waging our Indian wars. At the outbreak of the Civil War the Army stood at only 10,000, all told. It is true that the National Defense Act fixes the maximum strength at 18,000 officers and 280,000 enlisted men; but surely the President could not have had this maximum in mind, since it has only been approached, as previously stated, in 1921.

Since the above figures show no justification for the President's assertion that we have been in one of those periods when we reduced our Army to an "unjustified level", let us look at some of the other branches of our Military Establishment. There is the National Guard. Perhaps the President had that in mind? But when we turn to the official figures we find that the State troops have been, since 1931, larger in number than ever before in our peacetime history. Today they total 184,593 officers and men, or a 100-percent increase since the beginning of the century. Actually there were, in 1934, 13,309 officers and 171,284 men as contrasted with 8,792 officers and 119,251 men in 1914, just 20 years previously. The President knows, of course, that since the federalization of the Guard, Federal payment for each drill attended, and huge additional national appropriations for the State troops, their actual military efficiency has increased not one hundred but several hundred percent over that of the period just before the War with Spain. As to this there is plenty of official testimony. Obviously the President could not have had the National Guard in mind when he assured the cadets and the country that we had reduced our forces to an "unjustified level."

Well, when we look further over the Army organization, we come upon a startling fact—since the World War we have developed a reserve of officers and men such as never existed before in our entire history. Beginning with 8 soldiers in 1913, it comprised, in 1915, 4,648 honorably discharged soldiers willing to be recalled to the colors in the event of war, with no Reserve officers at all. In 1933 we had the astounding total of 132,773 Reserve officers and 5,028 reserve enlisted men, or just 11,000 more Reserve officers than we had enlisted regulars in that year. Now it is true that the 1934 figures showed a drop of the Reserve officers to 114,357, but this list is naturally subject to considerable fluctuation because of deaths, resignations, officers reaching the age limit, and so forth. Unusual as this decrease is, it cannot, however, be the reason for the President's concern for our military strength, since we have 114,357 more Reserve officers than in 1914, and no less than 58,267 more than in 1920, when there were so many experienced veterans to draw upon. Clearly we have not only had no recession in our military preparedness here, but a steady and amazingly rapid increase.

Mr. President, I have read enough to indicate that we, the people of America as a whole, have been fooling ourselves into the belief that we were fast receding from whatever had been a militaristic attitude of other days and getting away from it, when, as a matter of fact, as a reading of the complete article so clearly reveals, our progress year after year has been steady, just a tramp, tramp, tramp that was constant, in the enlargment of our Military Establishment. It is only fair to assume that enlargement of that establishment is but reflective of the development of our spirit of militarism in this country. While we are decrying the military spirit of other lands I wish we might cease losing sight entirely of what has been so decided a militaristic trend here in our own country.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire article from which I have just quoted may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

WE MILITARIZE

By Oswald Garrison Villard

I

"On some occasions in our history we have reduced our Army to a level unjustified by a due regard for our own safety. It was in the conviction that we had again drifted too far in that direction that I have recently approved acts of Congress to accomplish a partial restoration of the Army's enlisted strength and increasing the enrollment of cadets in the United States Military Academy."

Thus spoke Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to the cadets at the graduation exercises at West Point on June 12, 1935. Let us examine the facts as to the Army and see just how much basis the President had for the statements made to the young men to whom he had just praised West Point for teaching "honor, integrity, and the faithful performance of duty."

Before the Congress met in its regular session on January 1, 1935, and passed the new military legislation, which Mr. Roosevelt signed, the Regular Army of the United States stood at 12,278 officers and 123,823 men, or a total of 136,101. These figures were naturally exceeded in the years immediately after the war—1920, 1921, and 1922—when the total of officers and men stood at 192,790, 226,116, and 144,874, respectively. In 1923 the figure fell to 129,871, rising in 1924 to 139,579. Since that time it has never fallen below 131,000. In 1934 there were 2,016 officers and men more than in 1933. Plainly there is nothing here to justify any assumption that the President's statement meant that there had been a recent reduction in our Army. He must, therefore, have had in mind the post-war figure of 1921—226,116 officers and men.

He must also have been aware that never before in the history of the Republic has it maintained a Regular Army of so great a size—more than 130,000 men. Had he looked at the growth of the officer personnel alone he would have seen, for example, that in 1915, when the World War was raging, we had only 4,701 officers to 101,195 soldiers. Today we have two and a half times as many officers to an Army which, when Mr. Roosevelt spoke, contained approximately only 124,000 enlisted men. Plainly, so far as officers are concerned, there has not only been no reduction to call for the President's "partial restoration", but an increase of 261 percent in 20 years. Two vital facts Mr. Roosevelt did not mention: The officers in our standing Army are practically at the maximum figure in our history, not excepting the World War years; secondly, we actually have more officers in our Army today than there were officers and soldiers in it during the entire peace years from 1789 to 1861—years when we were conquering the West and constantly waging our Indian wars. At the outbreak of the Civil War the Army stood at only 10,000 all told. It is true that the National Defense Act fixes the maximum strength at 18,000 officers and 280,000 enlisted men; but surely the President could not have had this maximum in mind, since it has only been approached, as previously stated, in 1921.

Since the above figures show no justification for the President's assertion that we have been in one of those periods when we reduced our Army to an "unjustified level", let us look at some of the other branches of our Military Establishment. There is the National Guard. Perhaps the President had that in mind? But when we turn to the official figures we find that the State troops have been, since 1931, larger in number than ever before in our peacetime history. Today they total 184,593 officers and men, or a 100-percent increase since the beginning of the century. Actually there were, in 1934, 13,309 officers and 171,284 men, as contrasted with 8,792 officers and 119,251 men in 1914, just 20 years previously. The President knows, of course, that since the federalization of the Guard, Federal payment for each drill attended, and huge additional national appropriations for the State troops, their actual military efficiency has increased not one hundred but several hundred percent over that of the period just before the

War with Spain. As to this there is plenty of official testimony. Obviously, the President could not have had the National Guard in mind when he assured the cadets and the country that we had reduced our forces to an "unjustified level."

Well, when we look further over the Army organization, we come upon a startling fact—since the World War we have developed a reserve of officers and men such as never existed before in our entire history. Beginning with 8 soldiers in 1913, it comprised, in 1915, 4,648 honorably discharged soldiers willing to be recalled to the colors in the event of war, with no Reserve officers at all. In 1933 we had the astounding total of 132,773 Reserve officers and 5,028 Reserve enlisted men, or just 11,000 more Reserve officers than we had enlisted Regulars in that year. Now, it is true that the 1934 figures showed a drop of the Reserve officers to 114,357, but this list is naturally subject to considerable fluctuations because of deaths, resignations, officers reaching the age limit, etc. Unusual as this decrease is, it cannot, however, be the reason for the President's concern for our military strength, since we have 114,357 more Reserve officers than in 1914, and no less than 58,267 more than in 1920, when there were so many experienced veterans to draw upon. Clearly we have not only had no recession in our military preparedness here but a steady and amazingly rapid increase.

This is all the more striking if one recalls that that magnificent German military machine which swept into Belgium in 1914 did not have more than 45,000 reserve officers to man the large number of regiments that came to life on the day of mobilization. We have now, perhaps, twice as many for field duty (not all of the Reserve officers are to serve with troops, many being commissioned for staff duty and to be in charge of manufacturing plants in wartime).

If we total the three forces—Regulars, Reserves, and National Guard—we find that, whereas we had 212,742 men in all in 1913, we had 436,696 in 1934 and 482,000 in 1935, when the newly authorized enlistments were complete—a growth of more than 100 percent. Never before have we had such manpower in our land forces. Mr. Roosevelt apparently was ignorant of this, and forgot that this increase has been steady ever since 1898, when Regulars and National Guard comprised together less than 125,000 men.

Where is the justification for the President's assertion that we are in a position of decreased armaments and unjustifiable weakness?

II

Possibly the President had the financial aspect in mind? Perhaps Congress has been niggardly in its appropriations?

Well, in this matter, too, the facts are available. In 1913 the War Department's military expenditures (nonmilitary carefully excluded) totaled $108,382,063. With the approach of war they had risen in 1917 to $401,418,217. After 1921, when they were at $439,485,095, they began to fall off with the post-war demobilization. In 1922 they were $329,050,896; in 1924 they reached the low-water mark of $250,714,592. They then steadily rose to $309,762,555 in 1933, and dropped again to $279,122,789 in 1934. Even this drop of a mere $30,000,000, however, could not in itself warrant Presidential perturbation, especially in view of the fact that prior to Mr. Roosevelt's speech the Congress had appropriated $341,348,204 for the fiscal year 1935–36.

Although this sum is just under the appropriation for 1932 and 1933, in reality the Congress and the administration have, as we shall see later, actually assigned far more money to the military branch than in any previous normal year of peace.

Again we are thwarted in our search for the reasons for Mr. Roosevelt's belief that we have reached one of those periods in which we have carelessly neglected to keep up our military strength. If here, too, he had looked back over our history he would have found it hard to defend his thesis. In 1880 our total Army budget was only $27,322,433. Not until 1908 did it go above $100,000,000. Even in 1916, with war in the offing, it was only $122,392,316. It has since been increased by nearly 300 percent—in 19 years. Surely no one can indict Congress for niggardliness toward, or indifference to, our Military Establishment. And now Congress has added 46,250 more men.

The President must also have overlooked our air force—a new branch of the defense forces which was hardly in existence when he became Assistant Secretary of the Navy. No one can assert that we have been letting our air defense deteriorate, for, as with the Regulars and the National Guard, its growth is steady and its appropriations regularly increased. Thus in the last fiscal year it received the sum of $26,376,490. The 1936 War Department appropriation bill carries a sum which exceeds last year's appropriation by $22,000,000. More than that, a group of Congressmen called upon the President to go even further and raise the number of airplanes to the figures recommended by the commission appointed by the Secretary of War and headed by Newton D. Baker. This committee recommended an Air Corps of 2,300 planes, which, with the Navy's 2,100, authorized by the Vinson bill, will give to the United States the largest air force of any country in the world (unless Germany or Russia should go further), although we are protected by both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, and although the Baker Committee agreed with the Morrow Board of 1925 that "hostile air invasion" is "impractical." The Baker Committee felt that such an invasion might be possible in conjunction with land or naval forces, but not otherwise. The Morrow Board used these words: "Nor, indeed, is there any apparent probability of such invasion in any future which can be foreseen." Under the latest Army legislation additional air equipment is made available to the National Guard.

We still have another guess as to what the President had in mind. There are the Navy and the Coast Guard. Perhaps we have allowed these to deteriorate alarmingly? The records tell a totally different story. The Coast Guard, it is true, is only semimilitary, but is immediately taken over by the Navy on the outbreak of war, as in 1917. It has grown since 1915 from 53 ships, 255 officers, and 3,886 men, to 246 ships, 455 officers, and 8,950 enlisted men in 1935. Appropriations during that same time have risen fivefold, from $5,000,000 to $25,000,000 in 1934, going as high as $31,000,000 during the height of its warfare on rum smugglers during prohibition. It was not until 1890 that the appropriations for the Navy reached the sum of $22,000,000. No lagging here. Insofar as this force supplements the Navy and acts as a reserve, there is the same story—a steady increase in numbers and appropriations, with no basis for any Presidential complaint.

Now for the Navy. In 1913 we had 3,019 naval officers and 48,068 sailors in the service. Ten years later the figures had risen to 8,099 officers and 85,290 men. Last year, 1934–35, we had 8,087 officers and 81,411 men. This year, 1935–36, the enlisted strength appropriated for is 93,500, and for the fiscal year starting July 1, 1936, President Roosevelt has made it known that he recommends an average strength of 96,000, or a maximum of 100,000. Whereas in 1913 there were no reserves of any kind, officers or men, we have today a reserve of 9,571 officers and 33,102 men. The number of sailors actually authorized by Congress is 137,485, and 9,493 officers are also provided for. As there were only 51,500 enlisted men authorized in 1913, Congress is thus willing that the Navy should enlist two and one-half times as many today, though it has not yet appropriated pay for the total number of 137,485. If we turn to the financial side, President Roosevelt again has no cause for complaint, for the Navy's annual bill has risen from $133,262,862 in 1913 to no less than $460,000,000 in 1935, for the present fiscal year, which includes $100,000,000 for new ships and a sum sufficient to purchase 555 new aircraft.

But this is not the whole story of the astounding rise in the cost of our naval armaments. For the first time in our history, as a result of a national emergency, the Army and Navy are receiving sums from two sources—the regular appropriation bills voted by Congress and the huge sums awarded by the emergency branches of the Government which are seeking to create employment.

It is exceedingly difficult to find out just how much money has thus been ladled out. The P. W. A., for example, had in August only one copy left of its 23-page tabulation of allotments, and it is even more difficult to get figures from the $4,000,000,000 work-relief program. Moreover, the figures may be changed at any moment by additional awards of large sums. Here, however, are some figures which indicate what is happening. From June 1933 to April 1935, $279,780,459 was granted to the Navy and $100,600,755.50 to the Army, or a grand total of $380,381,214.50. Assuming that half of this will be spent in the fiscal year 1935–36, the total annual bill for the Army and Navy will reach the sum of $1,000,000,000—$190,000,000 from the P. W. A. plus the regular appropriation bills of $460,000,000 for the Navy and $341,348,204 for the Army. If anything, this is an understatement, as there are still other sources, such as deficiency bills, which grant money to Army and Navy. In 1865, the last and the most expensive year of the Civil War, the total Army and Navy bill was but little more—$1,153,936,306. It is also worth noting that the regular Budget of the Government for all purposes for the fiscal year 1916–17, during which we entered the World War, was but $1,178,908,963. The Regular Army and Navy appropriations for 1935–36, without counting in P. W. A. contributions, are higher than the total cost of running the Government in 1916.

When it comes to the Navy ships, here, too, no one can charge the present administration with failure to increase our forces, as it is building no less than 102 aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines to bring the Navy up to the treaty strength authorized by the London Conference. The first installment of this program, which is almost unprecedented in our history in peacetimes, was paid for by $238,000,000 of the sums quoted above as having been allotted by the P. W. A. In July of this year there were under construction 2 aircraft carriers, 3 heavy cruisers, 7 light cruisers, 10 submarines, 41 destroyers, and 2 gunboats. In August contracts were awarded for one light cruiser, one aircraft carrier, three destroyers of 1,850 tons, five of 1,500 tons, and three submarines. There still remain, then, 11 more vessels, 1 cruiser, 7 destroyers, and 3 submarines to be built as part of the 1936 building program. Not even the wildest jingoes can charge that this is other than rapid progress toward the jingo goal—namely, the largest navy in the world.

Finally there is the Marine Corps. This, too, has shared the growth of the other branches of Army and Navy. In 1913 it had only 342 officers and 9,921 enlisted men. Ever since 1923 it has had 27,400 enlisted men authorized, with 16,000 appropriated for, and between 1,010 and 1,074 officers, the latter being the authorized strength for the current fiscal year. The United States Marine Corps Reserve was created in 1922, and its authorized strength, both enlisted and commissioned, is one-third of the strength of the active Marine Corps. The corps cost, in 1913, $7,558,233.78; in 1923, $25,495,948; and for the present fiscal year the appropriation is $23,768,110. Here again there has been no letting down of standards to cause the President or anyone else uneasiness. As more ships are added to the Navy, moreover, the Marine Corps will naturally be increased in proportion to the increase of the Navy.

III

When one reviews the legislation passed by the Congress in its last session and signed by President Roosevelt with the excuse

already cited, there is still further ground for astonishment. Never was a peacetime Congress so ready to hand out money for military and naval purposes. It not only gave to General MacArthur and the War Department everything they asked, but more besides. The number of West Point cadets was increased from approximately 1,374 to 1,960 until the year 1941, and $5,000,000 more was given to the Military Academy to take care of them—the Naval Academy at Annapolis received a similar increase of 531 additional midshipmen from the Naval Affairs Committee, and will have 2,391 in 1937. The House Military Affairs Committee's argument was simple enough. There are a number of universities which have 10,000 students, therefore West Point should have more students. The War Department backed this up by pointing out that the enlarged Army would need a larger annual number of graduates to fill the vacancies.

But the good will of Congress did not stop there. Being told that there was a "hump", or block, in promotions in the Army owing to the large number of officers taken in after the World War and the presence in the upper grades of relatively young men, Congress promoted by one act no less than 4,355 officers, or a third of the entire commissioned force, each one grade, despite the fact that there was a very considerable weeding out of officers with many consequent promotions in 1934.

There were on April 20, 1935, 174 colonels of Infantry to 40 regiments, and 77 colonels of Cavalry to 15 regiments; the disproportion is greater now because of the recent promotions. Congress authorized the drawing in of 1,000 reserve second lieutenants to serve 1 year with the Regulars, which custom, if continued, would increase the number of Regular officers by another thousand, and will inevitably lead to a new demand for more regiments to give these officers experience. By some oversight it failed to appropriate the money therefor, but doubtless this will be remedied in the next deficiency appropriation bill.

Congress also provided an annual 14-day training period for 20,000 instead of 16,000 Reserve officers. It provided 97 more planes for the Air Corps than were allowed in the President's Budget. It increased the National Guard by 5,000 enlisted men and, as already stated, added 46,250 men to the Regulars. It then appropriated $4,452,304, an increase of $1,000,000, for many additional units of the Officers' Training Corps in high schools and colleges. In 1913 there were 57 such institutions giving military training under War Department direction. By 1933 the number had risen to 399. In 1913 there were 85 officers and men on duty in such schools and colleges; today there are no less than 1,658. The citizens' military training camps also received an extra $1,000,000 to enable them to train 30,000 instead of 14,000 for 42 days each. Congress gave more money to the Quartermaster's Department for the upkeep of military posts than was allowed under the Budget, and it revived the national rifle matches, dropped in past years for reasons of economy.

But this does not include everything. On July 31 Congress voted a new promotion bill to hasten promotion by increasing the percentage of colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors, and decreasing the percentage of company officers. The bill introduces a new principle in America, the promotion of every officer in the lower grades after a certain number of years' service. It also offers attractive retirement privileges in order that more men will retire, and it gives the President power to retire officers on their own application after 15 years' service. This means, of course, a further proportionate increase in the retired list of the Army, which, according to the latest figures, comprises 3,258 officers. Still Congress was not satisfied. It passed a bill creating six new huge air bases intended to cost $120,000,000, the money to be provided by the Public Works Allotment Board. While the location of these fields has not yet been decided, there was an immediate rivalry among various cities for the awards, which helps to explain why the enlarged Army program is welcomed in some quarters.

The first base is to be in Alaska, the second in the Pacific Northwest—both to protect us from the Japanese—a third probably in Denver, one in the Southeast—that is, North or South Carolina—one in New England, and one near the Caribbean, presumably at Miami. Could any Santa Claus have done more for the Army and Navy?

As a result of all this generosity, we get the following table of the number of Regular and National Guard soldiers and sailors in service in the current fiscal year:

Regular Army, officers and men	177,600
Navy, officers and men	103,000
National Guard, officers and men	190,000
Coast Guard, officers and men	10,500
West Point and Annapolis cadets	4,400
Total	485,500

In addition, the following table shows the number of Reserves drilled this year in schools or colleges, citizens' training camps, the Reserve officers' training camps, etc.:

Reserve officers	20,000
Citizens' training camps	30,000
School and college students, etc	150,000
Navy Reserves (estimated by Navy Department)	9,900
Total	209,900

Thus we have a grand total of 695,400 in uniform during the present fiscal year. These figures are obviously unprecedented in our history and to many will recall in these days of Facist dictatorships the warnings of George Washington and other founders of the Republic as to the dangers of a large standing Army.

So unusual was this attitude of Congress that it is no exaggeration to say that if the country were in imminent danger of war it could hardly be more lavishly determined to increase our armed strength. Why is this? There are several answers. First, accustomed to ladling out billions under the New Deal, Congress has acquired the habit of spending and accordingly authorized the new air bases, which the press reports will cost $120,000,000, with no more hesitation than it voted two or three millions of dollars a few years ago. Second, there is no question that Congress was much alarmed by the grave danger of another war in Europe. Third, all the bogies as to our "coming" war with Japan were trotted out. The minutes of the executive sessions of the House Military Affairs Committee, which by some slip were printed and published, contain all the same old yarns long since exploded. One was of a Japanese fishing fleet of 150 vessels based on an island near the mouth of the Panama Canal and being met from time to time by steamers from Japan with fresh replacements. Congressman DOCKWEILER, of California, rehashed all the familiar rumors. "Every time our fleet goes out from Los Angeles Harbor for target practice it never fails to meet in the open roadstead a Japanese oil tanker standing out there or a Japanese fishing boat. * * * It is always a Japanese boat that is out there, and one commander told me that when he went up to this [sic] craft to advise Mr. Japanese that the United States was having target practice he actually recognized a high ranking officer in civilian clothes of the Japanese Navy that he had met socially." This happens, he said, every time that our fleet goes to sea to practice; but he did not specify if it was always the same high ranking officer or the same high American officer who always met him and recognized him and whether the Japanese wore the same "civilian clothes of the Japanese Navy" or some other kind of clothes.

Mr. DOCKWEILER next told the horrified and obviously gullible committee that the Japanese fishing boats "are built in such a way that you can within a very short space of time erect a small cannon or machine gun on them", which is hardly surprising, since there is not a 30-foot yawl or tug in any American port or summer resort upon which the same thing could not be done in a couple of hours. Worse than that, he said, they "carry a pressure tank sufficient to contain pressure sufficient to launch torpedoes off those boats"; but this valiant Congressman plainly does not know that you cannot launch a torpedo from any craft without a most elaborate torpedo tube.

Mr. DOCKWEILER'S "seein' things" did not stop there. No, indeed. There is an equipped Japanese Army in California of 25,000 men "that could be under arms immediately if there was any disturbance." His authorities were not the government of California or of the United States and our Secret Service but "the American Legion and our chambers of commerce out there." The Japanese also "have gymnasiums under the German plan where at nighttime the school children may parade and go through all the motions of military training in the little halls."

Said the chairman, whose eyes were evidently starting from his head, "What do you mean by 'equipped'? Do you mean they have arms?" The dialog then continued:

"Mr. DOCKWEILER. How could we stop them from having them, Mr. Chairman?

"The CHAIRMAN. But do they have arms?

"Mr. DOCKWEILER. We think so.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well.

"Mr. DOCKWEILER. That is something that would bear further investigation.

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, living in that situation and being raised in it, I assume, Mr. DOCKWEILER.

"Mr. DOCKWEILER. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. What is your interpretation of the attitude of mind of the authorities—the controlling authorities of the Japanese?"

Mr. DOCKWEILER was not stumped. His own brother had been in the Diplomatic Service for 10 years. He was once stationed in Tokyo for a year and a half and was now able to say things he could not in those bygone years. "He has told me many of the stories that I am relating to you. The situation is this: The Japanese have never struck an enemy that was able to fight back." Which explains, of course, why the Russians never fought any battles in Manchuria in their war with Japan. And so on for pages and pages. Is it any wonder that the shocked Military Affairs Committee voted on the spot for the six new air bases?

IV

The pity of it is, from their own point of view, that these frightened gentlemen of House and Senate and the President who signed their bills never stop really to inquire (1) whether we now have an efficient Army and Navy; (2) whether we are developing our services in accordance with a well-thought-out plan for the defensive wars which every President and every Congress insist are the only ones we shall hereafter fight; we never yet have fought a defensive one; (3) whether the measures voted make for an increased efficiency; (4) whether our actual armaments (aside from men) are efficient; and (5) whether this whole procedure is compatible with American traditions and our signing of the Kellogg Peace Pact.

As to the first, there is the greatest doubt. A former instructor at Annapolis has recently published a book which is so astounding an indictment of the Navy that in any other country it would have caused an immediate parliamentary inquiry and the disproving of the charges as mendacious and malicious or the complete overhauling and reorganization of the service. It has been entirely ignored

by Congress and the service, but not answered. It was followed by Admiral Sims' frontal attack in the Atlantic for September 1935 on the Navy promotion system, which the best officers admit is not bringing to the top men adequately trained to command squadrons and fleets.

As for the Army, probably the severest critic is not a pacifist nor a disgruntled civilian nor a carping Senator, but the commander of one of our four armies, the third, Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood, whose headquarters are at San Antonio. Writing in the Saturday Evening Post, he has declared that our national-defense system could and should be four times as effective for the money we spend, which, as the figures above prove, is now $1,000,000 a day or more. Fortune, in a long study of the Army situation, has recently pointed out that the Army has no less than 67 generals to 165,000 men, where Henry Ford has 9 to 125,000 men; that there are actually only enough of the newly invented semiautomatic Garand rifles on hand to equip a single regiment; that there is only a "handful of tanks"—94 in all; and that our artillery is in large degree antiquated. Were Congress eager for the most efficient army they would certainly ask themselves why ours is proportionately the most heavily overofficered army of first rank in the world. They would inquire whether the reason given for this great superfluity of officers, who can obviously only take turn and turn about in service with combatant troops, namely, the need of suddenly officering in wartime an army of several millions, is an adequate one. As in the case of the Navy, they might also ask whether our officers are obtaining the best professional training possible.

As for the general military policy of the country, the Congress has largely been going on the theory that we must be prepared to duplicate our effort of 1917—that is, be prepared to raise, equip, and train an army of 4,000,000 men, although no competent military authority believes that even any combination of powers could launch a sudden attack upon American shores. Experts believe an attack could never take place unless England were among our enemies. Anyone who wishes can figure out how many ships it would take for the Japanese to land an army of even 500,000 men upon our shores, if there were no opposition to such a landing, by simply referring to the number of ships needed to transport the first half million of our men to France, plus all their stores, ammunition, artillery, airplanes, tanks, motor vehicles, huge motorized artillery, poison gas, and chemical-warfare utensils. Even that would not, however, give the true figure, as military men agree that the impedimenta of an army, the size of the guns, the proportion of airplanes, and so forth, have so largely increased since 1918. One of our ablest Navy officers believes that it would take one-third again as many ships as in 1917. Since the statistics of the Japanese merchant marine are quite available, anyone with a pencil and piece of paper can amuse himself by figuring out just how many troops with their necessary supplies could be transported by that entire merchant marine, and the same can be done for the French Army, or any other that our military men conceive to menace us. I have met a number of foreign officers, and I have never yet found one who believed that a large-scale invasion of the United States was practical.

Congress, which is so eager to develop our Army, ought to take heed of the remarkable statements of Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, retired, a veteran of three overseas wars and a successful commander in France. He told the Military Affairs Committee that "we do not need a great force with our self-contained country, and without powerful aggressive neighbors, and with excellent systems of communication and the Navy as our first line of defense. * * * I do not visualize any mass invasion of us by any country—overseas or elsewhere." He urged, like many, many others, a single department of national defense, headed by a secretary, with three undersecretaries of army and navy and air. He severely criticized the training at West Point and the training in the Army, saying that both are dominated by Prussian ideals inherited from Frederick the Great—the methods "which were never suited to the American disposition and character."

Since General Rivers even went so far as to suggest the abolition of the absurd West Point uniform, he can hardly expect that he will be listened to. Yet he made the extremely sensible suggestions that there should be a national-defense council in Washington to coordinate the entire defense system and supervise it, and that there should be a Federal commission of civilians to study the whole problem as to whether this Nation needs an Army, and if so, for what purposes, and what the national military policy should be.

Of course, General Rivers put his finger on the blackest spot in the Army situation, and one that could be remedied almost overnight by Franklin D. Roosevelt as Commander in Chief, with or without the cooperation of Congress. That is the historic policy of scattering the Army all over the country in small posts—"small towns", General Rivers called them—and so frittering away the strength of the garrisons and making it impossible to bring together permanently large bodies of men for the tactical and strategical training of officers as well as men. General Rivers himself, although a graduate of West Point and a lifelong soldier, testified that he never saw a brigade together until he took one into action at Chateau Thierry. This evil of the small posts is purely political and it has existed inexcusably ever since the Civil War—as, for example, the location of the post at Helena, Mont., many years ago because of the political influence of Senator Carter, when there was no sound military reason for putting it there and every reason why it should not be placed there, the only purpose being to boost the town and give the shopkeepers another source of revenue.

There are 120 of these posts, and they average about 700 men each. The 10 army postgraduate schools are scattered in 10 different places, with total garrisons of 11,000 men. Were they brought together in one, there would obviously be vast economy, after the initial expenditures for additional barracks, and so forth, and the 11,000 concentrated troops could be utilized to give to higher officers experience in handling brigades, divisions, and a corps. General Rivers quoted General MacArthur, lately Chief of Staff, as saying that of the 90,000 soldiers stationed in the United States proper, some 30,000 are not available for military duty because they are drawn off to work as laborers in keeping the grounds of these posts in order and for repair and police and other work. General Hagood has pointed all this out and so have hundreds of others over a long period of time. Yet the President, who is so concerned over our having "neglected" our defenses, is utterly uninterested in the prospect of such a saving and such an increase in the Army's efficiency. It is safe to say that if this proposition were made to the House of Representatives every Congressman in whose district a military post is situated would fight to the last the proposal to remove his garrison—even if he were told that it meant increased danger of that fanciful Japanese invasion. This is an interesting illustration of the way the Army becomes a vested interest and a commercial asset.

V

The point is that we have completely swung away from our old American opposition to militarism and large military forces. For this the American Legion is partly responsible, but so are our patriotic societies, and so are those who really believe that the Republic is so menaced by subversive elements that they wish an increased Regular Army to "assure us domestic safety." One Congressman was reported in the press as saying that the reasons the Army bill passed the House so easily were, first, the disturbed conditions in Europe and, second, the need of more soldiers to keep industrial peace and to combat the reds. Since the reds succeeded in polling only 125,000 votes out of 39,816,522 cast in 1932 in the entire United States in the middle of our worst depression, with some 12,000,000 unemployed, and have as yet caused no symptom of revolution, it is obvious that the more important reason is the possibility of the use of the enlarged Army against our laboring fellow citizens.

In part our changed point of view is due to the fact that, with our entry into the World War, we in many respects aped foreign countries in things military. We copied their Sam Browne belts, their khaki, their uniforms, their numerous decorations, their trooping of the colors, their laying of wreaths upon dead men's graves. Somehow many Americans really believe that we cannot be a great, a powerful, or a noble country, or a leader among the nations, unless we can prove that we have a Nation in arms. One of the saddest fallacies in our entire handling of the naval disarmament problems has been the belief, even of as kindly and earnest a man as Norman H. Davis, that we must have a big navy in order to have "our share of the pack at the poker table"—to which they liken the disarmament conferences. Otherwise, our rulers thought, we could not be in a position to bluff the other nations into disarming.

The net result of that policy is that we are now burdened with the largest Navy in our history, which it is alleged will soon cost us $550,000,000 a year to maintain; and disarmament, like prosperity, is still in the offing. The worst of it all is that the American people have no means of expressing their wishes in the matter, any more than they could vote as to whether their sons should be drafted to die in a war which has nearly ruined us and netted us precisely nothing, except our worst depression.

One of the most serious phases of our rapid militarization is that arming is becoming identical with increased worship of the State and the inculcation of the cult of nationalism, which has reached its finest flower in Italy and Germany. Not a few of the most patriotic defenders of our Constitution and our Republic against the "subversive elements" are, by the way, quite outspoken in their admiration for the "efficiency" of the Nazis and the Fascists—like the late Elbert H. Gary, who denounced all reds but gave an interview in which he said that America should find a Mussolini at once and put him in the White House. Nothing subversive there! Soon after the war the War Department undertook a "patriotic day" in which all the militia, reserves, veterans, and so forth, were to don their uniforms and stand for an hour or two and salute—precisely as Mussolini summoned 20,000,000 of his loyal sheep to meet and listen the day before he began his unholy war in Ethiopia. But neither our nonregular uniformed men nor our veterans responded; the whole thing was a complete fizzle. Thereupon the newspapers carried a blunt dispatch saying that, as a result of that fiasco, the War Department was determined to put a Reserve officer into every hamlet and village, and many in the towns and cities, to act as a focus for patriotic and militarist propaganda. Since then, as pointed out, the Reserve officers have grown by as many as 20,000 and more a year, and they are scattered all over the country. While they are not paid, they are told to consider themselves representatives of the Army and to cooperate with the War Department. It is frequently stated that many are acting as "observers" of all liberal and radical movements and reporting constantly to the Military Intelligence in Washington.

For 4 years, 1928–32, the Army Training Manual No. 2000–25 carried this extraordinary definition of American democracy to hundreds of thousands of young Americans who were taking military instruction:

"Democracy: A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of "direct" expression.

Results in mobocracy. Attitude toward property is communistic—negating property rights. Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard for consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy.

When this choice bit of loyalty to our American democracy and institutions was exposed to public gaze in the press, it was promptly withdrawn. When I printed it a year ago Secretary Dern wrote me a kindly letter asking, "Why pick on a sinner after he has reformed?"

The reply, of course, is that it is an alarming state of affairs when, during four years, some officers in the War Department can put such a rank piece of disloyal, subversive anti-Americanism into a widely distributed Government handbook, and that the incident must be neither overlooked nor forgotten by those who cherish their country's democratic institutions.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, something has been injected by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] this afternoon concerning opposition of our Military Establishment to any thought of nationalizing any part of the American munitions industry. I shall not take the time to read it, but the St. Louis Star-Times of recent date, April 21, 1936, carried a most interesting editorial under the heading of "The Munitions Business", which it seems to me has proper place in this consideration at this house. Accordingly I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the St. Louis Star-Times, Apr. 21, 1936]

THE MUNITIONS BUSINESS

Senators NYE, CLARK, POPE, and BONE, comprising a majority of the Senate Munitions Investigating Committee, have recommended that the United States Government take over the war munitions industry of this country. A minority of the committee, Senators GEORGE, VANDENBERG, and BARBOUR, oppose the recommendation. It is a typical division of progressives against conservatives, not a division of Democrats against Republicans. The three dissenters were hostile to much of the investigation itself, and seldom attended committee meetings.

Those who signed the majority report did so knowing that an overwhelming majority of American citizens favor Government ownership of the munitions trade. There isn't any guesswork about it. A Nation-wide poll was taken on the subject last month by the Gallup Institute, and the result was—for Government manufacture, 82 percent; for private manufacture, 18 percent.

A person unfamiliar with democratic government would naturally conclude that the proposal by the Senate committee, backed as it is by a Nation-wide majority of more than 4 to 1, would be promptly enacted into law. But here's a strange fact. The four Senators know, and all students of government know, that the chance of early action along that line is small indeed.

The forces operating against Government ownership of the munitions trade are titanic in power. The entire American business world will throw its influence against it, not because it loves the munitions trade or has an interest in its profits but because it fears any extension of Government in business. The munition makers themselves have gigantic political resources. Congressional committees dealing with military and naval affairs are loaded with friends of the gun and warship makers. The Army and Navy contain generals and admirals who are virtual lobbyists for the munitions trade.

Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, one of the signers of the majority report, does not in general favor putting the Government into business. He is in principle an individualist and a believer in private industry. His attitude in this instance is governed by the conviction that the munitions industry, in private hands, is a war-breeding institution and a corrupter of Government.

Senator CLARK has taken part in a 2-year probe of the business of making and selling guns, warships, etc., and in doing so has followed a trail of appalling intrigue and corruption, of extortionate profits, of cheating and chicanery. He has seen private firms, parading as patriotic, selling American military secrets to foreign countries. He has concluded that the incentive to profiteering is so strong and the opportunity so great that it is hopeless to look for anything else where the munitions trade is concerned.

But what chiefly concerns Senator CLARK and his associates is the warmongering spirit of the private munition makers and the financiers back of them. The Senate investigation has revealed their readiness to throw the United States into war to protect their business, without the slightest compunction. They have fought against international disarmament. They pursue trade policies which lead to war. In a choice between the munitions dollar and the lives of American youth the dollar wins and youth goes to slaughter.

When you have such an issue there is no other real issue. And that is what the American people are thinking of when they line up 82 percent to 18 percent in favor of Government ownership of the munitions business. They would much rather have the Government make its own guns, warships, and explosives than to have private profiteers drag us into another war.

So there is public opinion, experience, and common sense behind the proposal of the Senate Munitions Investigating Committee. Against it is the silly argument of the Senate committee minority that the Government would overbuild armaments to please local communities and the specious plea that munition making must be in private hands so that it can be expanded quickly in time of war. The truth is that Government ownership would be the surest avenue to quick expansion, for it would include what is now neglected, the manufacture of reserve supplies of jigs and tools for gun making. And, wasteful as Government business often is, it couldn't possibly exceed the wastefulness of Government contracts written for the express purpose of producing extortionate private profits.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I have alluded to my thought that all the talk in the world is not going to prevent the Senate pursuing its tramp, tramp, tramp of other years and enacting this appropriation bill without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i", which is precisely what our military sponsors want it to do. There is much that ought to be said. Indeed, there would be much—I think sufficient—to justify any small group of men, if they had the will to do it, to rise in their places here and resort to any and every possible means that might be available to prevent enactment of the pending appropriation bill. We know that is not going to be done. We know the bill is going to become a law. But, while we are acknowledging that to be the case, we ought to stand ready to indict ourselves, we ought to plead guilty to a course, my fellow Senators, that is going to lead your country and mine to one inevitable end. I care not how emphatically we may believe that these wild programs of appropriations for war are going to insure peace, we know that history, if it repeats itself, will find the present armament race bringing not peace but war. Such has always been the result, and I think it is reasonable to expect that it always will be. As one who wants his country adequately prepared to defend itself against any possible attack from any possible source, I say that we should be ready to indict ourselves.

A few days ago, April 5, the Philadelphia Record contained an eloquent editorial entitled "A Bulletproof Vest for the Dove?" We as Americans like to consider ourselves as the "dove" in this uncertain world. We are the leaders in the cause of peace. If the rest of the world would only follow our example there would not be any more war. Yet, knowing we are spending more than any other nation on earth in preparation for war, is it not fair to ask what would be the result if the rest of the world should actually follow our example in the matter of expenditures in the name of preparation for war?

The Philadelphia Record editorial is of such interest that I am going to insist upon reading it in its entirety, as follows:

A BULLETPROOF VEST FOR THE DOVE?

"United States delegates back from London Arms Reduction Conference with plans for bigger Navy."

That brilliantly ironic headline tells the story of the recent naval limitation parley—and the story of every disarmament parley since the World War.

Naval reduction is to be accomplished by building more battleships.

The high cost of an arms race is to be curbed by increasing our armament expenditures.

Black is white.

And we are tailoring a bulletproof vest for the dove of peace.

The question facing the American Government and the American taxpayer is this:

Can we afford any more such arms conferences?

The whole history of naval limitation treaties shows that they have increased rather than diminished the naval expenditures of this country.

The famous Washington Arms Conference rounded up its efforts in 1922. And its fruits show clearly in these figures on naval expenditures:

For 1923	$322,000,000
For 1924	332,000,000
For 1925	346,000,000

Now observe the fruits of the famous London Naval Treaty, concocted in 1930 and proclaimed effective January 1, 1931.

Naval expenditures during that period follow:

For 1931	$354,000,000
For 1932	357,000,000
For 1933	349,000,000
For 1935	467,000,000
For 1936 (estimated)	485,000,000

Of course, since the estimate for 1936 we have had laid upon our desks the naval appropriation bill calling for appropriations of $529,000,000, which considerably exceeds the estimate.

The editorial continues:

Bear in mind, too, that this monumental $485,000,000 figure was arrived at long before the delegates came home triumphant from this latest London Naval Conference.

What the actual 1936 expenditures will be, Heaven only knows.

The Record believes in a thoroughly adequate navy.

It may be that these later expenditures, high as they are, should be higher still, to give this country proper protection.

However, it is quite as likely that the figures should be lower.

The great trouble is, nobody, in Washington or out, knows whether they should be higher or lower. Nobody knows what our naval policy is. Nobody has even attempted to define it.

Without any intelligent conception of what our Navy is supposed to protect—there's no intelligent method of estimating how big our Navy should be.

At present, our policy seems to consist simply of building more ships. But are we building the right kind?

Are we building them to pull British irons out of the fire in the Far East, as Sir Austen Chamberlain suggested the other day?

Are we now in a virtual naval alliance with England, as many leading Britishers seem to feel?

Are we building new battleships to fight a "defensive" war in Japan's own waters—even though we pretend to be so strong for peace and minding our own business?

These questions are not idle. They concern the welfare and safety of 130,000,000 Americans.

Only the other day, at this very London naval parley, our naval experts, including Admiral Standley, objected to cutting the tonnage of our battleships below 35,000 tons, on the ground that lower tonnage would not make them useful for warfare in Japanese waters!

What the State and Navy Departments are thinking about we don't pretend to know.

But we do know that millions of Americans are thinking a great deal—and that their thinking will compel them to wonder why every conference to reduce naval expenditures ends up by increasing them.

Why it seems impossible to effect real neutrality legislation.

And why so many of the bigwigs at Washington are so eager to prepare for war with Japan when no sane cause for such a war is in sight today—assuming that this Nation has not been dragged into a secret alliance with England.

The London Naval Conference has been officially declared a "success."

Yet we immediately prepare to build more battleships.

Whose was the success?

England's?

Americans would like to know.

Mr. President, this editorial writer made the point that the people of America are beginning to manifest a genuine interest in these matters. I repeat what I have said earlier in the afternoon; namely, that every Member of Congress, when he gets back into his own bailiwick this summer, is going to find new knowledge, new intelligence, new understanding of these problems of national defense. I say this because I hope every Member of Congress may be prepared to answer sanely the questions that will be asked, for example, Why the appropriation of over a billion dollars this year for our Military Establishment? Why the appropriation now, in the name of national defense, of three times as much as we were spending in the name of national defense the year before we went into the "war to end wars"?

As I see it, there is but one thing the present Congress can do to accomplish any measure of economy in this bill. We have here an example of how an instrument may be built so large that it devours us and leaves us helpless.

Not more than $115,000,000 of this total of $500,000,000 involves new construction. We cannot avoid making the rest of the appropriations called for in the bill without disrupting the existing naval organization, without reducing its effectiveness. This has grown upon us in a few years. We have this to contend with, not only this year but every year to come, so long as we maintain the naval policy and the naval course that has been ours during recent years.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, in connection with my statement a few minutes ago about war profits, I wish to direct the attention of the Senate and of my friend from North Dakota to some figures of costs and profits which indicate to me the necessity of the Government fortifying itself by its own preparedness instead of the preparedness of private munitions companies.

The records of the War Department show that the administration expended for artillery during the World War a sum total of $1,191,182,850; and yet General Pershing, in his final report as commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces, states that the only guns of large type produced at home which reached France before the cessation of hostilities were 109 75-millimeter guns and twenty-four 8-inch howitzers, making a total of 133 American-made guns which reached the front and were in use when the armistice was signed.

In the matter of aviation, Mr. President, General Pershing states that—

We were entirely dependent upon our Allies. From time to time we obtained from the French such planes for training personnel as they could provide. Without going into a complete description of aviation material, it will be sufficient to state that it was with great difficulty that we obtained equipment even for training.

In testimony taken by a committee of Congress right after the war, it was shown that the War Department entered into a contract with the Standard Steel Car Co., of Hammond, Ind., for the construction of 964 9½-inch howitzer carriages. The War Department agreed to pay for the cost of the buildings, material, and machinery, and the company was to be paid a commission upon the total cost of these carriages to the Government.

I am detailing these facts because they illustrate what I suggested a while ago—that when the Government does not fortify itself to do some of its own work of preparing for war, it merely makes itself, in the light of what we now know, the willing victim of the greed of the men who attempt to provide for us in a moment of great peril.

The Government paid for the buildings that were erected upon the Standard Steel Car Co.'s grounds, and which cost $2,987,200; and after the armistice was signed the War Department sold these buildings back to the company for $600,000.

The testimony taken at that time shows that at the time the armistice was signed the company had on hand material for which the Government had paid $5,558,000. The testimony further shows that representatives of the administration sold this material back to the company as junk for the sum of $300,000. That is, they sold to the company material worth over five and a half million dollars, classified as junk, for the tiny sum of $300,000—tiny as compared to its cost to the Government—because of the Government's lack of preparedness by its own agencies; and this was done in the face of the fact that arsenals of the United States were at that time needing and demanding material of practically the same character.

The testimony taken at that hearing shows that not a single howitzer carriage had been delivered to the Government prior to the signing of the armistice, but that after the armistice was signed the Ordnance Department had the company finish 200 of these carriages, and that the 200 carriages cost the Government the sum of $18,582,428.88, which sum was paid to them out of the Treasury of the United States.

Along about this time, in August 1918, representatives of the War Department entered into a contract with the Jones-Laughlin Steel Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., for the manufacture of toluol and ammonium sulphate. It was estimated that the company could produce 24,000 tons of ammonium sulphate per year, and the War Department agreed to accept the company's entire output for a period of 2 years and to pay $90 a ton for it. It was estimated that the company could produce 810,000 gallons of toluol per year, and the War Department agreed to accept the company's entire output for a period of 2 years and pay $1.50 per gallon for it.

At the time of the signing of the armistice the company had not produced a gallon of toluol or a pound of ammonium sulphate; and, the war being over, the contract was canceled. The company put in a claim for the profits it would have earned if the war had continued and the company had

been permitted to carry out its contract. It was agreed between the representatives of the War Department and representatives of the company that the difference between the actual value of toluol and the price which the Department contracted to pay should be the profit upon each of the 1,620,000 gallons of toluol which it had been estimated the company could produce in 2 years. A board was appointed to determine the actual value of this product, and it was found that toluol was actually worth 17½ cents per gallon, leaving a profit to the company of $1.32½ per gallon upon 1,620,000 gallons of toluol which the company never manufactured because the war ended too soon. It was also found that the company was entitled to a profit of $30 per ton on each of the 48,000 tons of ammonium sulphate which the company never manufactured. It was decided that the company was entitled to profits in the aggregate sum of $3,330,040.39, and that was paid to them out of the Treasury of the United States.

The Secretary of War, at the beginning of the session of Congress at which the speech was made from which I am quoting these figures, reported that he had settled 5,000 claims growing out of war contracts. The committee of Congress appointed to investigate expenditures in the War Department declared that the examples I have given were a fair illustration of what was done to the Government as a result of its lack of preparedness on the part of its own agencies.

If I may go on for just an instant, and then I shall surrender the floor to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], when the Standard Steel Car Co. of Hammond, Ind., got through with this game of tag with the Government, it put in a claim against our Government, and I have mentioned some of the items in the claim. This is what happens to the Government when it leaves itself utterly defenseless and strips itself of the agencies with which it could protect itself, as any far-sighted citizen would do in the conduct of his own business.

Poor old Uncle Sam. We leave Uncle Sam defenseless in the face of these enemies. The boys want to rook the Government. Oh, well, it is of no great moment; it is only the Government. It is perfectly proper, perfectly patriotic, to rook the Government, and take it to the cleaner, and trim it. Nobody but the poor taxpayers suffer; and, anyway, they do not amount to very much. Nobody worries about the taxpayers when war profits are involved. It is only when we go to feed some poor devil who is out of work that some of us discover that that is very bad. The poor fellow might have gotten $2 too much.

Mr. Farley last night, in a radio speech, stated that some very amiable gentlemen rise and fairly tear their nether garments in the face of providence because, forsooth, some poor devil might have gotten $4.50 that he was not entitled to; but these amiable, flag-waving, superheterodyne patriots, in the sacred name of patriotism and preparedness, can rook our poor old Uncle Sam, and take the old boy to the cleaner, and nobody seems to think anything of it. In fact, it is considered almost vulgar for even a Senator to advert to it. Well, I risk the possible odium that attaches to saying a few perhaps unkind things about the boys who do this.

This was the claim put in against our Government by this outfit which charged the Government the amounts I have stated for howitzer carriages.

Loss of earnings due to delays	$1,000,000.00
Profits earned and accrued	2,134,215.02

The boys had a good bookkeeper. They got in the 2 cents.

Remuneration for special service rendered	$890,908.36
Reimbursement for approved commitments	1,948,837.81
Reimbursement for incidental losses	322,250.53

Purely incidental to the company's operations.

Reimbursement for depreciation of facilities	$314,019.40

Uncle Sam was paying for all the depreciation. He had to get rooked and trimmed and bilked for all this, and did not own the equipment when the war was over. It would be better if he had owned it and kept it and had been prepared, instead of allowing the boys in Pittsburgh, or wherever it was, to rook him again in case of another war.

The sad part of it is that we are paying income taxes because we got rooked. Even my good friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is getting rooked, along with the rest of us, when he pays his income tax, because some of the boys in Pittsburgh had to get their hands into the Public Treasury clear up to the armpits.

We get rooked now, and are compelled to pay in income taxes this year for all this "rough stuff" put over by the boys back at the time of the war, because it is all written into Government bonds, now outstanding, which we are trying, rather vainly, to pay off.

Let us get back to the statement, however:

Compensation for plant occupancy after June 30, 1919	$300,000.00
Reimbursement for sums expended on Government buildings	65,760.32
Interest on profit and money borrowed	99,066.18

We had to pay interest on the profit they made. It really sounds like a story from Alice in Wonderland. It is a superheterodyne form of trimming the Government which was indulged in by those who did not want Uncle Sam to do the preparing himself. That is a fair example of the shocking things that went on during the war.

There is so much of this, Mr. President, that an attempt to put it into the RECORD would be an intrusion upon the time of the Senate. I have only been tempted to say what I have said for the reason that the Members of Congress and other officials of the Government must realize the necessity of their Government—not my Government alone but their Government—fortifying itself against the possibility of men doing this sort of thing to the Government again, and the only way to make certain that these things do not happen again is to have a club over the heads of these fellows. If we get into another war and do not take some preventive measure we will have a repetition of this thing.

I surrender the floor to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have always favored reasonable and adequate national defense. I have supported every appropriation which seemed necessary to safeguard the interests of our country, but I am convinced that the pending measure, appropriating nearly $600,000,000 for big battleships and other naval defenses, is unreasonable and unnecessary. I shall vote against it. I find that the people of this country are shocked at the enormous appropriations Congress is making for war purposes. They can see no reason at all why the United States, situated as it is geographically and economically and strategically, should declare it necessary to spend more than is spent by any other nation in the world in preparation for taking part in someone else's war. We are breaking all peacetime records in making these enormous appropriations.

It cannot be maintained that we need this enormous Military Establishment to preserve order in the United States. It cannot be maintained that we need it to defend the United States against attack. It cannot be maintained that we need it for a war of conquest. I refuse to believe these huge appropriations are being made solely for the benefit of munitions makers and shipbuilders. Can it be that back of it all is the intention of being prepared to take part in the next world war?

Mr. President, the people all over this country are greatly disturbed over the rapidly increasing tax burden. We continue to pile up billions of public debt. The taxpayers cannot carry the load. I say the time has come to call a halt. These huge annual deficits must be stopped. The pending bill offers a fine opportunity for showing the taxpayers we are sympathetic to their appeal for economy in public expenditures. We cannot possibly explain why this Congress has spent a billion dollars for Military Establishment at a time when we claim to be the greatest peace-loving Nation in the world.

I wish to call attention of the Senate and the country to a recent editorial on this subject by the Honorable Charles F. Scott, of Iola, Kans. Mr. Scott is widely known as editor

and publisher of the Iola Register. He is a former Member of the National House of Representatives from the Second District of Kansas. He is well informed, patriotic, far from being a pacifist. Mr. Scott says:

MILLIONS FOR MEDDLING

"Defense Against What?" is the title to many editorials appearing these days in connection with the current appropriation of the largest peacetime fund in history for national defense. And it is a question which not a single protagonist of bigger and better armies and navies for the United States ever offers a word in answer.

There are four reasons why any country might need a military establishment; to preserve internal order, to defend the nation against attack, to carry on a war of conquest, or to be in a position to get into somebody else's war any time it might be of commercial or political advantage to do so.

The United States obviously does not need its Army to preserve internal order, at least it does not need a fraction even of its present entire Military Establishment. A well organized National Guard might always be desirable for this purpose, but that is about all.

It certainly must be equally obvious that to say our Army is needed for national defense is sheer hypocrisy. Is Canada—infinitely more American than British—going to attack us? Or impoverished Mexico? Is Japan or Germany or Russia going to sail ships across 2,000 miles of ocean to set landing parties on our shores? The line of suggestion is too preposterous to carry further. As far into the future as anyone can see now, the prospect of the United States having to carry on a war of defense from enemy attack is exactly zero.

Do we need an Army to carry on a war of conquest? We have needed one in the past for that purpose, but we certainly aren't looking forward to any such ventures in the immediate future. The United States has all the territory it wants or needs, probably for all time to come. No war of deliberate aggression need be prepared for.

That leaves one excuse for the billion dollars we shall spend on our Army and Navy this year—the possibility that we shall want it in order to get into somebody else's war. That's what we needed it for the last time and that's what we'll need it for the next time if we ever need it at all. National defense? Rubbish!

RELIEF OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POPE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4395) for the relief of the State of New Jersey, which was, on page 1, line 10, after "1934", to insert a comma and "and providing for replacement, without cost to the State of New Jersey, of like articles for reissue to and the use of the National Guard of New Jersey."

Mr. MOORE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LOUIS H. CORDIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1075) for the relief of Louis H. Cordis, which were, on page 2, line 2, to strike out "1 year" and insert "6 months", and on the same page, line 7, after the word "act", to strike out the remainder of the bill.

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

The motion was agreed to.

DAMPSKIB AKTIESELSHAP ROSKVA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3645) for the relief of Dampskib Aktieselshap Roskva, which was, on page 1, line 13, after the name "France", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

GEORGE RABCINSKI

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3685) for the relief of George Rabcinski, which were, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "Regiment", and on the same page, line 7, to strike out "being" and insert "in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for."

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

The motion was agreed to.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, found on page 3, line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Navigation, Education, and Welfare, Navy", on page 7, line 18, after "Rhode Island", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$130,000"; so as to read:

Newport, R. I., $130,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 9, after the word "literature", to insert "including such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act approved January 16, 1936 (Public Act No. 417, 74th Cong.),"; and in line 16, after the word "for", to strike out "$187,000" and insert "$190,379", so as to read:

Instruction: For postgraduate instruction of officers in other than civil government and literature, including such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act approved January 16, 1936 (Public Act No. 417, 74th Cong.), and for special instruction, education, and individual training of officers and enlisted men at home and abroad, including maintenance of students abroad, except aviation training and submarine training otherwise appropriated for, $190,379: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for or on account of any expense incident to giving special educational courses or postgraduate instruction to officers with view to qualifying them or better qualifying them for the performance of duties required to be performed by or in pursuance of law by officers of the Supply Corps, Construction Corps, or Corps of Civil Engineers, except present students and except such officers who are commissioned in such corps or who have not been commissioned in the line of the Navy more than 3 years prior to the commencement of such educational courses or postgraduate instruction.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 4, after the word "Navy", to strike out "$1,562,620" and insert "$1,570,999", so as to read:

In all, training, education, and welfare, Navy, $1,570,999: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department, exclusive of temporary services, shall not exceed the following amounts, respectively: Naval War College, $77,000; Naval Training Station, San Diego, $7,500; Naval Training Station, Newport, $10,000; Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, $14,500; Naval Training Station, Norfolk, $5,500; instruction, $26,000; libraries, $24,000; welfare and recreation, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Reserve", on page 14, line 2, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$7,868,469" and insert "$8,000,000", so as to read:

For expenses of organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve and Naval Militia, including the designing, purchasing, and engraving of trophies; pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve when employed on authorized training duty; mileage for officers while traveling under orders to and from training duty; transportation of enlisted men to and from training duty, and subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; subsistence of enlisted men during the actual period of training duty; subsistence of officers and enlisted men of the Fleet Naval Reserve while performing authorized training or other duty without pay; pay, mileage, and allowances of officers

of the Naval Reserve and pay, allowances, subsistence, and transportation with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof of enlisted men of the Naval Reserve when ordered to active duty in connection with the instruction, training, and drilling of the Naval Reserve; pay and allowances, including travel and other allowances as authorized by law (excluding clothing and small-stores issues and uniform gratuities), of aviation cadets of the Naval Reserve when ordered to active duty, including active duty undergoing training; pay of officers and enlisted men of the Fleet Naval Reserve for the performance of not to exceed 48 drills per annum or other equivalent instruction or duty, or appropriate duties, and administrative duties, exclusive, however, of pay, allowances, or other expenses on account of members of any class of the Naval Reserve incident to their being given flight training unless, as a condition precedent, they shall have been found by such agency as the Secretary of the Navy may designate physically and psychologically qualified to serve as pilots of naval aircraft, $8,000,000, of which amount not more than $150,000 shall be available for maintenance and rental of armories, including pay of necessary janitors, and for wharfage; not more than $81,000 shall be available for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department; not less than $3,125,471 shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for aviation material, equipment, fuel, and rental of hangars, and not more than $397,914 shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for fuel and the transportation thereof, and for all other expenses in connection with the maintenance, operation, repair, and upkeep of vessels assigned for training the Naval Reserve, and of such total sum $5,334,303 shall be available exclusively for and on account of Naval and Marine Corps Reserve aviation—

And so forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Academy", on page 15, line 18, after the word "librarian", to strike out "$265,400" and insert "and such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act approved January 16, 1936 (Public, No. 417, 74th Cong.), $281,193"; and in line 22, after the word "than", to strike out "$22,100" and insert "$22,300", so as to read:

Pay, Naval Academy: For pay of professors and instructors, including one professor as librarian, and such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act approved January 16, 1936 (Public, No. 417, 74th Cong.), $281,193: *Provided*, That not more than $22,300 shall be paid for masters and instructors in swordsmanship and physical training.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 1, after the word "employees", to strike out "$585,623" and insert "$590,866"; and in line 7, to strike out "$236,000" and insert "$242,000", so as to read:

For pay of other employees, $590,866: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules, in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department, shall not exceed $242,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Engineering—Engineering", on page 20, line 18, after the figures "$1,724,000", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided further, That not exceeding $600,000 of this appropriation shall be available for experiment, development, and test of diesel-type engines for ship propulsion.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading, "Bureau of Ordnance—Ordnance and Ordnance Stores, Bureau of Ordnance", on page 23, line 8, after the name "West Virginia", to strike out "$21,700,000" and insert "$22,500,000", so as to read:

For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material, for the armament of ships; for the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes and appliances; for the purchase and manufacture of smokeless powder; for fuel, material, and labor to be used in the general work under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ordnance; for furniture at naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, naval ordnance plants, and proving grounds; for technical books; plant appliances as now defined by the "Navy Classification of Accounts"; for machinery and machine tools; for accident prevention; for experimental work in connection with the development of ordnance material for the Navy; for maintenance of proving grounds, powder factory, torpedo stations, gun factory, ammunition depots, and naval ordnance plants, and for target practice; not to exceed $15,000 for minor improvements to buildings, grounds, and appurtenances of a character which can be performed by regular station labor; for payment of part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, of such scientists and technicists as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy in his discretion at a rate of pay not exceeding $20 per diem for any person so employed; for the maintenance, repair, and operation of horse-drawn and motor-propelled freight and passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes at naval ammunition depots, naval proving grounds, naval ordnance plants, and naval torpedo stations; for the pay of chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, naval ordnance plants, and naval ammunition depots, and for care and operation of schools at ordnance stations at Indianhead, Md.; Dahlgren, Va.; and South Charleston, W. Va., $22,500,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed $1,300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading, "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts", on page 32, after line 9, to strike out:

NAVAL SUPPLY ACCOUNT FUND

For transfer to the credit of the naval supply account fund, $5,000,000, and not more than $5,000,000 of the naval supply account fund shall be available for the purchase of a reserve supply of prepared and processed strategic minerals of domestic production.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks", on page 38, line 3, before the word "which", to strike out $2,990,300" and insert "$5,000,000", so as to read:

For public works and public utilities, Bureau of Yards and Docks, $5,000,000, which, together with the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made under this head, shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed 2½ percent of the aggregate amount available on July 1, 1936, shall be available for the employment of classified personal services in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and in the field service to be engaged upon such work and to be in addition to employees otherwise provided for: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commence, continue, or complete the construction of, or make provision for, by contract or otherwise, projects heretofore authorized and appropriated for under this head, and, in addition, the following-named public works and public utilities projects at a limit of cost not to exceed the amount stated for each project enumerated, respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 24, after the word "harbor", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "including plant, $2,000,000", so as to read:

Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Improvement of channel and harbor, including plant, $2,000,000; mooring facilities and accessories, $225,000; purchase of land for range light, $100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 10, after the figures "$410,000" and the semicolon, to insert "improvement of interior illumination, $270,000", so as to read:

Buildings and Grounds, Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Increased facilities for midshipmen, including building extensions and accessories, $410,000; improvement of interior illumination, $270,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 16, to strike out:

Naval Hospital, Washington, D. C.: Toward replacing, remodeling, or extending existing structures and the construction of additional buildings, with the utilities, accessories, and appurtenances pertaining thereto, as authorized by the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with certain public works at the United States Naval Hospital, Washington, D. C.", approved February 25, 1931, $295,000, to be paid from Naval Hospital fund and to be available for the expense of making necessary repairs, alterations, and moving equipment to temporary buildings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 14, to insert:

Naval operating base, Norfolk, Va.: Improvement of water front, $300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 16, to insert:

Naval Model Basin, vicinity of Washington, D. C.: Model basins, including buildings, facilities, and purchase of land, $3,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Aeronautics, Aviation, Navy", on page 42, line 21, before the word "from", to strike out "$24,000" and insert "$50,000", so as to make the further proviso read:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy, to transfer not to exceed in the aggregate $50,000 from this appropriation to the appropriations "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy", and "Pay, Marine Corps", to cover authorized traveling expenses of officers and enlisted men in connection with flying new airplanes from contractor's works to assigned station or ship, including travel to contractor's works and return of personnel to stations of duty, and the amount so transferred shall be in addition to any limitations contained in the appropriations "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy", and "Pay, Marine Corps": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coast of the continental United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 8, after the name "United States" and the colon, to strike out the following further proviso:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes or for the construction or manufacture in a Government-owned factory or plant of airplane engines, other than experimental engines, or airplanes, other than airplanes for primary training purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Marine Corps", on page 43, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$201,177" and insert "$212,427", so as to read:

Pay of officers, active list: For pay and allowances prescribed by law for all officers on the active list—pay and allowance, $4,233,706, including not to exceed $212,427 for increased pay for making aerial flights, none of which shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by nonflying officers at a rate in excess of $1,440 per annum, which shall be the legal maximum rate as to such nonflying officers; subsistence allowance, $573,123; rental allowance, $766,154; in all, $5,572,983; and no part of such sum shall be available to pay active-duty pay and allowances to officers on the retired list.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 15, after the word "men", to strike out "$783,555" and insert "$793,095"; and in line 16, after the words "in all", to strike out "$1,210,508" and insert "$1,220,048", so as to read:

For pay and allowances of the Marine Corps Reserve (a) excluding transferred and assigned men, $793,095; (b) transferred men, $426,953; in all $1,220,048.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 21, after the words "In all", to strike out "$17,713,931" and insert "$17,723,471", so as to read:

In all, $17,723,471, and the money herein specifically appropriated for pay of the Marine Corps shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 21, after the word "retirement", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$319,600", so as to read:

For transportation of troops and applicants for enlistment, including cash in lieu of ferriage and transfers en route; toilet kits for issue to recruits upon their first enlistment and other incidental expenses of the recruiting service; and for transportation for dependents of officers and enlisted men, including travel had during the fiscal years 1935 and 1936, but not in excess of from the last duty station to home, in connection with retirement, $319,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 12, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$196,775" and insert "$219,308", so as to read:

Marine Corps Reserve: For clothing, including clothing for aviation cadets, subsistence, heat, light, transportation, and miscellaneous expenses, $219,308.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 13, after the words "In all", to strike out $7,623,042" and insert "$7,665,175", so as to read:

In all, $7,665,175, to be accounted for as one fund: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civilian Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed $80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Replacement of naval vessels", on page 50, line 12, after the word "that", to insert "the President determines as a fact that"; so as to read:

Construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and machinery of vessels, including the re-engining and completion of submarines *170* and *171* (39 Stat. 616), heretofore authorized and appropriated for in part under "Increase of the Navy, Construction and Machinery", including (1) the expenses in connection with continuing the construction of 2 aircraft carriers, 1 heavy cruiser, 3 light cruisers, 20 destroyers, 4 submarines, and 2 gunboats which were commenced in the fiscal year 1934 under funds made available from the National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933, and (2) for the commencement of the following vessels authorized by the act approved March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503–505): (a) 12 destroyers and 6 submarines, and (b) not more than 2 capital ships, as replacements of over-age capital ships, to be undertaken only in the event that the President determines as a fact that capital-ship-replacement construction is commenced by any of the other signatory powers to the Treaty for the Limitation and Reduction of Naval Armament signed at London, April 22, 1930, $115,300,000—

And so forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department Salaries", on page 54, line 14, to increase the appropriation for salaries under the Office of Judge Advocate General from $117,720 to $120,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, at the end of line 18, to increase the appropriation for salaries under the Office of Naval Intelligence from $60,080 to $61,660.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 7, to increase the total appropriation for salaries in the Navy Department from $3,983,929 to $3,988,709.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, line 16, after the sum "$115,300,000", it is proposed to insert the following:

And in addition the unexpended balances on June 30, 1936, of the appropriation "Increase of the Navy, construction and machinery" are hereby reappropriated and made available for the purposes of this paragraph, and the total sum herein made available shall remain available until expended.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. On behalf of the committee, I offer another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 51, line 12, after the sum "$53,200,000", it is proposed to insert the following:

And in addition to the unexpended balances on June 30, 1936, of the appropriation "Increase in the Navy: Armor, armament, and ammunition" are hereby reappropriated and made available for the purposes of this paragraph, and the total sum herein made available shall remain available until expended.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I offer one more amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, after line 6, it is proposed to insert:

The present incumbent as attending physician at the Capitol shall hereafter receive the senior rank of his grade, with full pay and allowances while so serving and as a basis for retirement.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the committee has no further amendments to offer.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that being the case, is the Senator from South Carolina willing that the Senate should recess now until tomorrow?

Mr. BYRNES. I rose to say that, so far as I am concerned, I am willing that the Senate shall recess at this time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the understanding which was entered into earlier today, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, after which I shall move a recess until tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POPE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

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

He also, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably the following nominations:

Irl D. Brent, of Michigan, to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Michigan; and

Claude C. Hockley, of Oregon, to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Oregon.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the nominations of several officers in the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first nomination in order on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

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

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

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

IN THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gilbert J. Rowcliff to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral.

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

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 8, 1936, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 7 (legislative day of Apr. 24), 1936

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

George M. Bull, of Colorado, to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Colorado.

John Latenser, Jr., of Nebraska, to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Nebraska.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Maj. Roger W. Peard to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1935.

First Lt. John N. Hart to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of May 1936.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Jack Vaughan to be postmaster at Cuba, Ala., in place of L. W. Vaughan. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1936.

CALIFORNIA

Earle Heath Stanley to be postmaster at Cedarville, Calif., in place of T. J. Wylie. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

George P. Meek to be postmaster at Covina, Calif., in place of W. P. Nye. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Allie C. Cook to be postmaster at Montebello, Calif., in place of F. F. Darcy. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Daisy E. Platt to be postmaster at Rice, Calif. Office became Presidential April 1, 1936.

Ernest L. Finley to be postmaster at Santa Rosa, Calif., in place of J. P. Berry. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1934.

COLORADO

Richard D. Saunders to be postmaster at Alamosa, Colo., in place of J. E. Harron. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

William D. Joyce to be postmaster at Antonito, Colo., in place of C. C. Hurst. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1936.

Daniel B. Venable to be postmaster at Ault, Colo., in place of Roy McWilliams. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1936.

Anthony J. Ricci to be postmaster at Georgetown, Colo., in place of L. D. Trimble. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1936.

Bernard C. Killin to be postmaster at Kiowa, Colo., in place of C. W. Elsner. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1936.

Ernest C. Norris to be postmaster at La Salle, Colo., in place of O. L. Morris. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1936.

Palmer V. DeWitt to be postmaster at Oak Creek, Colo., in place of F. A. McDaniel, resigned.

Ray L. Ford to be postmaster at Vona, Colo., in place of W. L. Butler. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1936.

George A. May to be postmaster at Windsor, Colo., in place of M. M. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1936.

CONNECTICUT

Mary Eleanor Michaels to be postmaster at Berlin, Conn., in place of A. A. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

George B. Moroney to be postmaster at Collinsville, Conn., in place of C. B. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Thomas H. Collins to be postmaster at Farmington, Conn., in place of S. L. Ruic. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

William W. Fagan to be postmaster at Kensington, Conn., in place of S. M. Cowles. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

John J. Scanlon to be postmaster at Meriden, Conn., in place of J. J. Fitzpatrick. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1936.

Charles W. Camp to be postmaster at Plantsville, Conn., in place of W. C. Bushnell. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

FLORIDA

Wendell V. Gilbert to be postmaster at Dade City, Fla., in place of H. B. Spencer. Incumbent's commission expires May 23, 1936.

Bess W. Rowell to be postmaster at Trenton, Fla., in place of T. H. Milton. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1935.

GEORGIA

Leon DeLos Miller to be postmaster at Emory University, Ga., in place of T. J. Barfield. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1936.

Benjamin N. Walters to be postmaster at Martin, Ga., in place of B. N. Walters. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

IDAHO

James V. Hawkins to be postmaster at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, in place of G. F. McMartin. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1935. (Removed without prejudice.)

Lola H. Perkins to be postmaster at Eden, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1935.

George F. Walker to be postmaster at Hailey, Idaho, in place of A. A. Lambert. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Clyde H. Daugherty to be postmaster at Kendrick, Idaho, in place of E. H. Dammarell. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1934.

Ida J. Peck to be postmaster at Lava Hot Springs, Idaho, in place of W. W. Elledge. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1936.

Benjamin Y. Edwards to be postmaster at McCammon, Idaho, in place of C. L. Edwards, resigned.

Jesse J. Walling to be postmaster at Nampa, Idaho, in place of Ned Jenness. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Michael H. Donovan to be postmaster at St. Maries, Idaho, in place of C. W. Craney. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1936.

Frank A. McCall to be postmaster at Salmon, Idaho, in place of K. E. McBride. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1936.

Michael A. Stronk to be postmaster at Twin Falls, Idaho, in place of P. W. McRoberts. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1936.

ILLINOIS

Richard J. Ommen to be postmaster at Arenzville, Ill., in place of R. S. Beard. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Francis P. Ryan to be postmaster at Assumption, Ill., in place of E. W. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

A. Albert Moehle to be postmaster at Brighton, Ill., in place of R. S. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Edward A. Bauser to be postmaster at Bunker Hill, Ill., in place of C. M. Jacobi. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1936.

Royal E. Kern to be postmaster at Cisne, Ill., in place of C. L. Kiger. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Ellen M. Sherry to be postmaster at Congress Park, Ill., in place of G. W. Cooper, removed.

Herman H. Kattenbraker to be postmaster at Coulterville, Ill., in place of G. H. McKelvey, resigned.

Elizabeth K. Butler to be postmaster at Crystal Lake, Ill., in place of F. E. Rose. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931. (Removed without prejudice.)

Eugenia Spaulding to be postmaster at Depue, Ill., in place of F. E. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1936.

George J. Fruin to be postmaster at Dixon, Ill., in place of J. E. Moyer. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1936.

Oscar Ped Bonner to be postmaster at Fairfield, Ill., in place of E. P. Fleming. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Walter L. Reed to be postmaster at Galena, Ill., in place of W. J. Ehrler. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1936.

Tracy Earl Horrie to be postmaster at Gardner, Ill., in place of J. R. Scoggin, removed.

Henry C. Rathgeber to be postmaster at Girard, Ill., in place of C. A. Harlan, resigned.

Paul L. Wells to be postmaster at Grayville, Ill., in place of C. L. Jennings, removed.

Irwin H. Mitchell to be postmaster at Metropolis, Ill., in place of U. E. Smith, removed.

John Joseph Fedor to be postmaster at Mount Olive, Ill., in place of L. D. Fuess. (Appointee deceased.)

William H. Cain to be postmaster at Patoka, Ill., in place of B. N. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Margaret D. Drummet to be postmaster at Prophetstown, Ill., in place of Leonard Ott. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1934. (Removed without prejudice.)

John Suddick to be postmaster at South Wilmington, Ill., in place of A. J. Berta. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1935.

Ernest Hunter Reynolds to be postmaster at Tiskilwa, Ill., in place of W. M. Repine, resigned.

Rufus B. Grissom to be postmaster at Toledo, Ill., in place of J. E. Hughes, removed.

INDIANA

Alonzo L. Rogers to be postmaster at Walkerton, Ind., in place of W. J. LeRoy. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1934.

George F. Bandeen to be postmaster at Westport, Ind., in place of J. C. Stott. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1936.

James D. Arnold to be postmaster at Winslow, Ind., in place of P. B. McCord. Incumbent's commission expires July 13, 1936.

IOWA

Arthur Joseph Claeys to be postmaster at Akron, Iowa., in place of M. V. Smith, resigned.

Orren W. Swartfager to be postmaster at Ankeny, Iowa, in place of C. O. McLean. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Mina N. Umbehaun to be postmaster at Arnolds Park, Iowa, in place of H. C. Walter. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1936.

Charles E. Malone to be postmaster at Atlantic, Iowa, in place of A. A. Emigh. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Otto T. Lamansky to be postmaster at Brighton, Iowa, in place of W. W. Jamison. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Anthony N. Huber to be postmaster at Calmar, Iowa, in place of S. T. Kittlesby. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1936.

Carl E. Jones to be postmaster at Cincinnati, Iowa, in place of Ella Yeager. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

Boyd L. Yance to be postmaster at Coin, Iowa, in place of G. F. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1936.

Edith M. Reed to be postmaster at Delta, Iowa, in place of J. M. Jacobs. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Pauline K. Kraschel to be postmaster at Farragut, Iowa, in place of M. E. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Clesson E. Woodward to be postmaster at Griswold, Iowa, in place of J. F. Dicus. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

George R. Sawyer to be postmaster at Hawarden, Iowa, in place of W. F. Wolf. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1936.

Francis J. Spain to be postmaster at Kingsley, Iowa, in place of A. F. Ogren. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1936.

William E. Lovett to be postmaster at Lake City, Iowa, in place of Wesley Seufferlein. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

August Sindt to be postmaster at Lake Park, Iowa, in place of E. E. Starr. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1936.

Wallace G. Strabala to be postmaster at Lohrville, Iowa, in place of W. W. Clover, resigned.

Edward J. Rutenbeck to be postmaster at Lowden, Iowa, in place of A. L. Mensing. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Frederick E. Mulholland to be postmaster at Malvern, Iowa, in place of I. L. Donner. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1936.

Irvin W. Machamer to be postmaster at Merrill, Iowa, in place of M. G. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1936.

William H. Lucas to be postmaster at Nora Springs, Iowa, in place of C. C. Stoner. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Kathryn P. Thomas to be postmaster at Red Oak, Iowa, in place of E. A. Larson. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Ulysses G. Pedersen to be postmaster at Schaller, Iowa, in place of L. J. McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Charles Benesh to be postmaster at Toledo, Iowa, in place of F. C. McClaskey. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

August C. Soer to be postmaster at Victor, Iowa, in place of L. E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1936.

William J. Cash to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Iowa, in place of R. L. Parry. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1936.

KANSAS

John R. Neifert to be postmaster at Glen Elder, Kans., in place of L. S. Hadley. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1934.

Omar G. Beougher to be postmaster at Gove, Kans., in place of S. W. Rhine. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Goldie L. Blades to be postmaster at Independence, Kans., in place of E. C. Bittmann. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

William D. O'Loughlin to be postmaster at Lakin, Kans., in place of C. S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Glenn B. Hale to be postmaster at Mankato, Kans., in place of J. O. Rodgers. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Vernon K. Campbell to be postmaster at Merriam, Kans., in place of Ethel White. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1936.

Barton W. Wherritt to be postmaster at Montezuma, Kans., in place of N. J. Casteel. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Charles E. Canny to be postmaster at Mound Valley, Kans., in place of O. R. Linday. Incumbent's commission expires May 10, 1936.

George D. Brooks to be postmaster at Oil Hill, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1935.

Ellen Rae Silvers to be postmaster at Preston, Kans., in place of Clyde Williams, removed.

Edward G. Behrhorst to be postmaster at Sylvan Grove, Kans., in place of J. B. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1936.

Chester C. Chambers to be postmaster at Tescott, Kans., in place of Henry Christensen, removed.

Charles W. Hickok to be postmaster at Ulysses, Kans., in place of R. R. Bechtelheimer. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1936.

Clarence O. Masterson to be postmaster at Wilmore, Kans., in place of C. O. Masterson. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

KENTUCKY

Wayne Damron to be postmaster at Catlettsburg, Ky., in place of H. M. Chatfield. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1936.

J. Hampton Burch to be postmaster at Fancy Farm, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1935.

D. Lawrence Johnson to be postmaster at Owenton, Ky., in place of J. B. Hutcheson. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Philip B. Hyden to be postmaster at Russell, Ky., in place of C. S. England. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1936.

LOUISIANA

John H. Lyons to be postmaster at Lake Charles, La., in place of D. M. Foster, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired May 2, 1934.

Edgar O. Joynes to be postmaster at Newllano, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1935.

MAINE

Tobias L. Roberts to be postmaster at Bar Harbor, Maine, in place of A. H. Hodgkins. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Argie S. Henderson to be postmaster at Brownville, Maine, in place of F. E. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Natt R. Hubbard to be postmaster at Kittery, Maine, in place of T. E. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Marion Jordan Ricker to be postmaster at Lisbon, Maine, in place of Arthur Donkus. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Wesley R. Carver to be postmaster at Ridlonville, Maine, in place of C. O. Small. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Louis S. Marquis to be postmaster at Springvale, Maine, in place of L. W. Folson. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1936.

Harold T. Ricker to be postmaster at Stratton, Maine, in place of J. W. Knapp. Incumbent's commission expired April 14, 1936.

MARYLAND

Joseph F. Mattingly to be postmaster at Indianhead, Md., in place of E. W. Dement. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Cora E. Hopkins to be postmaster at Mardela Springs, Md., in place of S. E. Wilson, deceased.

Leonard Wilson to be postmaster at Millington, Md., in place of G. S. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Maude Ringgold Toulson to be postmaster at Salisbury, Md., in place of R. H. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1936.

Robert Kemp Hughlett to be postmaster at Trappe, Md., in place of N. T. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

MASSACHUSETTS

James Leo Mack to be postmaster at Ashburnham, Mass., in place of F. H. Green. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Michael J. Moriarty to be postmaster at Bondsville, Mass., in place of L. R. Holden. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Edwin C. Howe to be postmaster at Enfield, Mass., in place of E. C. Howe. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

John Robert Crowley to be postmaster at Monson, Mass., in place of W. H. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Alfred J. Peloquin to be postmaster at Southbridge, Mass., in place of E. L. Chapin. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

John J. Nolan to be postmaster at Spencer, Mass., in place of H. S. Tripp. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Thomas Leo McCarron to be postmaster at Taunton, Mass., in place of S. D. Reed, deceased.

Joseph J. Baron to be postmaster at West Warren, Mass., in place of J. H. Herbert. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

Lester J. Murphy to be postmaster at Wrentham, Mass., in place of H. W. Metcalf. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

MICHIGAN

Alva C. James to be postmaster at Central Lake, Mich., in place of William Bowers. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Bert A. Dobson to be postmaster at Jonesville, Mich., in place of R. M. Powers. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Harry A. Newcomb to be postmaster at Kalamazoo, Mich., in place of F. C. Putnam. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

George H. Walters to be postmaster at Laingsburg, Mich., in place of F. T. Swarthout. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

William H. Coffin to be postmaster at Levering, Mich., in place of E. B. Sargent. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Matthew O'Toole to be postmaster at Merrill, Mich., in place of H. L. Barber. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Thomas W. Jackson to be postmaster at Pontiac, Mich., in place of J. W. Greenhalgh. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

Nelson Joseph Coash to be postmaster at Romulus, Mich., in place of F. H. Buckberry. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Frank H. Lynch to be postmaster at Rosebush, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1935.

MINNESOTA

Henry H. Lukken to be postmaster at Boyd, Minn., in place of H. H. Lukken. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1936.

Beatrice Perrizo to be postmaster at Delavan, Minn., in place of E. C. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1936.

Herbert G. Carlson to be postmaster at Gibbon, Minn., in place of H. G. Carlson. Incumbent's commission expires July 7, 1936.

William W. O'Malley to be postmaster at Le Sueur, Minn., in place of Jacob Gish. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Carl V. Hawkinson to be postmaster at St. James, Minn., in place of C. A. Larsen. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1936.

MISSISSIPPI

Viola E. Pentecost to be postmaster at Doddsville, Miss., in place of N. A. Murphey. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1936.

MISSOURI

Georgia A. Brammer to be postmaster at Buckner, Mo., in place of A. E. Larey. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

Kelley Elza Jackson to be postmaster at East Prairie, Mo., in place of E. C. DeField. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

William W. Scholes, Jr., to be postmaster at Granby, Mo., in place of S. H. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

Anthony Westhoff to be postmaster at Marthasville, Mo., in place of E. I. Kehr. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

Elizabeth K. Black to be postmaster at Mound City, Mo., in place of H. W. Mills. Incumbent's commission expired April 14, 1936.

Theo J. Quinn to be postmaster at St. Joseph, Mo., in place of L. V. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

MONTANA

Orion A. Tellifero to be postmaster at Browning, Mont., in place of O. A. Tellifero. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1936.

Alfred T. James to be postmaster at Cascade, Mont., in place of Alfred Briscoe. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Robert S. Nicholson to be postmaster at Darby, Mont., in place of F. F. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1936.

Jeanette Ross to be postmaster at Fromberg, Mont., in place of C. E. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

William C. MacCallum to be postmaster at Geraldine, Mont., in place of A. F. Springer. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

William Alfred Brown to be postmaster at Great Falls, Mont., in place of J. R. Lloyd. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

John E. Brennan to be postmaster at Harlem, Mont., in place of J. R. Minugh. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Lewis H. Rutter to be postmaster at Hinsdale, Mont., in place of F. B. Gillette. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

George H. Hidding to be postmaster at Hysham, Mont., in place of Q. B. Lyndes. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Henry Clay Patterson to be postmaster at Lima, Mont., in place of E. K. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Ferd W. Tucker to be postmaster at Victor, Mont., in place of G. I. Watters, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Lloyd H. Bulger to be postmaster at Arcadia, Nebr., in place of L. W. Doe. Incumbent's commission expires May 23, 1936.

Harry H. Burden to be postmaster at Axtell, Nebr., in place of A. S. Samuelson. Incumbent's commission expires May 23, 1936.

Charles R. Larson to be postmaster at Bertrand, Nebr., in place of W. R. Pedley. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Eli V. Balthazor to be postmaster at Campbell, Nebr., in place of D. L. Houser. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

Alfred L. Hill to be postmaster at Ord, Nebr., in place of E. P. Clements, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Lester V. Kozel to be postmaster at Ravenna, Nebr., in place of J. H. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

George H. Woolman to be postmaster at Republican City, Nebr., in place of M. L. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Frank E. Sullivan to be postmaster at Springfield, Nebr., in place of C. H. Olderog, transferred.

Charles M. Brown to be postmaster at Sutton, Nebr., in place of C. A. MacDonald, transferred.

Fred Shimerda to be postmaster at Wilber, Nebr., in place of L. J. Bouchal. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Walter D. Cleary to be postmaster at Bennington, N. H., in place of R. E. Messer. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Fred R. Hutchinson to be postmaster at Canaan, N. H., in place of R. G. Hicks. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Thomas W. Kiniry to be postmaster at Walpole, N. H., in place of C. E. Sparhawk. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1934.

Fred L. Sargent to be postmaster at Woodsville, N. H., in place of M. E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1936.

NEW JERSEY

Edwin Douglas Hill to be postmaster at Andover, N. J., in place of E. L. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Isaac E. Bowers to be postmaster at Groveville, N. J., in place of I. E. Bowers. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

Carl Shurts to be postmaster at Lebanon, N. J., in place of R. L. Hull. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

Charles W. Nolan to be postmaster at Union City, N. J., in place of E. C. Francois, transferred.

NEW YORK

Kingsley D. Maloy to be postmaster at Clyde, N. Y., in place of J. F. Wickham, resigned.

Henry A. Stecking to be postmaster at East Northport, N. Y., in place of J. W. Cermak, resigned.

Sarah K. Gibbs to be postmaster at Glenfield, N. Y., in place of C. E. Snyder, resigned.

Wilmarth J. Tuthill to be postmaster at Goshen, N. Y., in place of Arthur Decker. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1936.

William C. McRorie to be postmaster at Milford, N. Y., in place of P. R. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1936.

Kittie M. Lundergun to be postmaster at North Rose, N. Y., in place of T. H. Garlic. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

Margaret E. Keating to be postmaster at Olean, N. Y., in place of D. W. Keating, deceased.

John V. Lynch to be postmaster at Pearl River, N. Y., in place of E. R. Harms. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1936.

Emma J. Claffey to be postmaster at Port Leyden, N. Y., in place of M. J. Coffey, deceased.

William A. Flanagan to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in place of W. H. Savage. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1936.

Amy B. Earley to be postmaster at Speculator, N. Y., in place of A. B. Earley. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Edward J. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at Troy, N. Y., in place of W. T. Williamson. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1936.

Mabel E. Fausette to be postmaster at Trumansburg, N. Y., in place of D. W. Messler. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1936.

Howard Bell to be postmaster at Woodstock, N. Y., in place of W. S. Elwyn, retired.

George M. Allen to be postmaster at Worcester, N. Y., in place of C. I. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1936.

Mary Scesny to be postmaster at Yaphank, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1935.

NORTH CAROLINA

Millard T. Eatman to be postmaster at Bailey, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1935.

John L. Cassell to be postmaster at Draper, N. C., in place of J. S. Mitchell, resigned.

John E. Creech to be postmaster at East Flat Rock, N. C., in place of R. J. Pace, removed.

Thomas Carlyle Pate to be postmaster at Gibson, N. C., in place of L. T. Gibson, resigned.

John Harmon Linville to be postmaster at Kernersville, N. C., in place of K. A. Whicker. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

Thomas Mortimer Harris to be postmaster at Louisburg, N. C., in place of M. W. Yarborough. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

James Kelly Bridgers, Sr., to be postmaster at Nashville, N. C., in place of R. J. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1936.

Lacy F. Clark to be postmaster at Raeford, N. C., in place of G. W. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Albert Lee Herring to be postmaster at Snow Hill, N. C., in place of Evelyn Hill. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Walter Marsh Cavin to be postmaster at Stanley, N. C., in place of J. E. Wallace, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

William Anderson to be postmaster at Courtenay, N. Dak., in place of Arthur Nelson, deceased.

Robert E. Milligan to be postmaster at Hannah, N. Dak., in place of Duncan McLean. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Catherine T. Albers to be postmaster at Hazen, N. Dak., in place of R. E. Itskin. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1934.

OHIO

Clifton L. D. Hartsel to be postmaster at Ashland, Ohio, in place of A. L. Vanosdall, transferred.

Robert C. Young to be postmaster at Bucyrus, Ohio, in place of C. A. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Herman J. Kightlinger to be postmaster at Caledonia, Ohio, in place of K. H. Underwood. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

William V. Goshorn to be postmaster at Galion, Ohio, in place of F. E. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Thomas C. Washington to be postmaster at Grafton, Ohio, in place of B. M. Rising. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

John Hayden Kohn to be postmaster at Grover Hill, Ohio, in place of Jennie Pfeiffer. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Earle V. Miller to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Ohio, in place of C. F. Faris. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Harry H. Hart to be postmaster at Malvera, Ohio, in place of H. V. Buel. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1936.

Ansel C. Bidlack to be postmaster at Oakwood, Ohio, in place of J. M. Harmon. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Harry C. Stratton to be postmaster at Piney Fork, Ohio, in place of Victor Ferrari. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Clara L. Hewit to be postmaster at Seville, Ohio, in place of F. O. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Julius L. Snyder to be postmaster at Tiro, Ohio, in place of O. H. Hilborn. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

OKLAHOMA

John E. Gwinn to be postmaster at Butler, Okla., in place of W. S. Wilhite. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1936.

Roy C. Grider to be postmaster at Byars, Okla., in place of F. A. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1936.

Ernest C. Morris to be postmaster at Drumright, Okla., in place of Aaron Drumright. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

Fred R. Clement to be postmaster at Haskell, Okla., in place of J. O. Dowdy. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1936.

Ernest R. Davis to be postmaster at Keota, Okla., in place of N. B. Hays. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1936.

Grace A. Phillips to be postmaster at Maud, Okla., in place of R. P. Witt. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1936 (removed W. O. P.).

Joseph A. Waggoner to be postmaster at Mounds, Okla., in place of J. H. Sisson. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

Guy E. McClain to be postmaster at Perkins, Okla., in place of J. T. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1936.

OREGON

Walter A. McHargue to be postmaster at Brownsville, Oreg., in place of W. H. Hays. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1936.

John W. Bubb to be postmaster at Huntington, Oreg., in place of J. W. Bubb. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1936.

Jay C. Freeman to be postmaster at Moro, Oreg., in place of G. B. Bourhill. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

Percy Pope Caufield to be postmaster at Oregon City, Oreg., in place of W. R. Logus. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harvey F. Ecelbarger to be postmaster at Big Run, Pa., in place of W. O. Depp. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1936.

Arthur W. Kinsloe to be postmaster at Burnham, Pa., in place of O. J. Pandel. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Michael J. Hoban to be postmaster at Carnegie, Pa., in place of T. W. Greer. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Norman B. Gregory to be postmaster at East Stroudsburg, Pa., in place of F. A. Wyckoff. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1936.

Christian A. Jansen to be postmaster at Essington, Pa., in place of C. A. Jansen. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

Earl H. Helms to be postmaster at Myerstown, Pa., in place of G. W. Schell. Incumbent's commission expires May 10, 1936.

Andrew T. Urda to be postmaster at Nemacolin, Pa., in place of A. P. Malkin. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Edward F. Lawler to be postmaster at Olyphant, Pa., in place of S. J. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1936.

Charles C. Bernd to be postmaster at Red Hill, Pa., in place of H. X. Daugherty. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1935.

Paul H. Shaak to be postmaster at Sheridan, Pa., in place of C. S. Leitner. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Annis G. Lewis to be postmaster at Ulysses, Pa., in place of W. D. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

Edward J. Quinn to be postmaster at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in place of J. J. Law, resigned.

Daniel Leger to be postmaster at Wilmerding, Pa., in place of J. M. Pollock. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

RHODE ISLAND

Raymond L. Battey to be postmaster at Greenville, R. I., in place of M. B. Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

Thomas D. Goldrick to be postmaster at Pascoag, R. I., in place of T. D. Goldrick. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert J. Aycock to be postmaster at Pinewood, S. C., in place of D. L. Tindal. Incumbent's commission expires June 15, 1936.

Mollie S. West to be postmaster at Tucapau, S. C., in place of A. H. Boiter. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Fred J. Foley to be postmaster at Olivet, S. Dak., in place of C. C. Asche. Incumbent's commission expires June 15, 1936.

TENNESSEE

Wilson L. Tollett to be postmaster at Pikeville, Tenn., in place of T. H. Hale. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1936.

Theron Myers to be postmaster at Sewanee, Tenn., in place of H. M. Ruef. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1934.

TEXAS

Peter Hilton Williams to be postmaster at Albany, Tex., in place of R. G. Sterrett. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Rena Hurst Cox to be postmaster at Bellevue, Tex., in place of H. L. Ford, resigned.

Oran L. Ferrell to be postmaster at Bullard, Tex., in place of Louise Sackett. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1936.

Alvin Henry Lohoefener to be postmaster at Burkburnett, Tex., in place of N. R. Vaught, resigned.

Emmett U. Reagan to be postmaster at Dilley, Tex., in place of F. V. Blesse. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

James H. McClellan to be postmaster at Gatesville, Tex., in place of C. W. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired April 14, 1936.

Zora Harold Bonner to be postmaster at Hamlin, Tex., in place of C. B. Rowland, transferred.

Elvis E. Wallis to be postmaster at Iowa Park, Tex., in place of C. C. Burrows. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1936.

John C. Clayton to be postmaster at Kerens, Tex., in place of C. E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Carl Little to be postmaster at Ladonia, Tex., in place of J. A. McFarland. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Alvin L. Allen to be postmaster at La Feria, Tex., in place of Harman Straub. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Owen C. Taylor to be postmaster at Lamesa, Tex., in place of J. D. Dyer. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Harry W. Moynihan to be postmaster at Miles, Tex., in place of Ewald Straach. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1936.

Cicero Harper to be postmaster at Moran, Tex., in place of J. M. Cottle. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Richard Pfeuffer to be postmaster at New Braunfels, Tex., in place of C. S. Witham. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1936.

Cephas V. Whatley to be postmaster at Palo Pinto, Tex., in place of B. E. Fairless. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Doris I. Rogers to be postmaster at Saint Jo, Tex., in place of K. R. Dort. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Floyd C. Platt to be postmaster at San Juan, Tex., in place of R. G. Hirth, resigned.

William A. Trotman to be postmaster at Trinidad, Tex., in place of B. M. Nicholson. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Jennie C. Jenkins to be postmaster at Tuscola, Tex., in place of T. W. McCormick. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Oliver Lee Lowry to be postmaster at Valley View, Tex., in place of A. S. Maddox. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Clifton Davenport to be postmaster at Weslaco, Tex., in place of M. J. Lovely. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Milton J. Gaines to be postmaster at Wichita Falls, Tex., in place of O. P. Maricle. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

UTAH

William E. Woodbury to be postmaster at Hurricane, Utah, in place of J. H. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Kenneth H. Sheffield to be postmaster at Kaysville, Utah, in place of H. J. Sheffield, Jr., deceased.

Frank D. Atwood to be postmaster at Pleasant Grove, Utah, in place of Mary Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

John Emmett Bird to be postmaster at Springville, Utah, in place of Charles Boyer. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

VERMONT

Alice C. Carr to be postmaster at Derby, Vt., in place of J. E. Kidder. Incumbent's commission expires May 10, 1936.

Charles L. Bishop to be postmaster at Johnson, Vt., in place of R. H. Royce, deceased.

Charles J. King to be postmaster at Milton, Vt., in place of C. A. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Alice G. Sheehan to be postmaster at North Troy, Vt., in place of W. W. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Lyman W. Sheldon to be postmaster at South Londonderry, Vt., in place of C. W. Landman. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Healy J. Bashaw to be postmaster at Stowe, Vt., in place of L. K. Oakes. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

James P. Gilfeather to be postmaster at West Rutland, Vt., in place of E. H. Bishop, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Frances Glassell Beale to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Va., in place of R. C. Travis. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

Claude Franklin Whitmer to be postmaster at Broadway, Va., in place of C. R. Whitmore. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

John William Duncan to be postmaster at Onancock, Va., in place of A. B. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1936.

WASHINGTON

Otto N. Sorensen to be postmaster at Edmonds, Wash., in place of E. R. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

William A. Bauman to be postmaster at Lynden, Wash., in place of C. B. Bay. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

Edward N. Blythe to be postmaster at Vancouver, Wash., in place of A. W. Calder. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

WEST VIRGINIA

Arling C. McGee to be postmaster at Elkins, W. Va., in place of T. W. Stalnaker. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

Patrick J. Burke to be postmaster at McMechem, W. Va., in place of E. M. Zimmerman. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

Alva O. Shelton to be postmaster at Peach Creek, W. Va., in place of Bonnie Hanshaw. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1936.

J. Leo Holsberry to be postmaster at Rainelle, W. Va., in place of W. T. W. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1936.

Robin A. Hood to be postmaster at Rivesville, W. Va., in place of Rex Michael. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1936.

WISCONSIN

Quiren M. Groessl to be postmaster at Algoma, Wis., in place of J. J. Jerabek. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Stephen D. Balliet to be postmaster at Appleton, Wis., in place of E. A. Greunke. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Fred V. Starry to be postmaster at Barneveld, Wis., in place of A. G. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1936.

Miles P. Tierney to be postmaster at Boscobel, Wis., in place of F. J. Scheinpflug. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1936.

John C. Kiley to be postmaster at Fond du Lac, Wis., in place of O. E. Born. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Paul W. Cornish to be postmaster at Fort Atkinson, Wis., in place of D. Q. Grabill. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Fred C. Wolff to be postmaster at Lakemills, Wis., in place of E. H. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Cora A. Thompson to be postmaster at McFarland, Wis., in place of T. B. Ottum. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1936.

Joseph R. Coyle to be postmaster at Menasha, Wis., in place of C. A. Loescher. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1936.

Kyle Sowle to be postmaster at Tomah, Wis., in place of H. G. Hoag, resigned.

Charles F. Kurtz to be postmaster at Two Rivers, Wis., in place of Conrad Baetz. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1936.

WYOMING

Orville R. Booker to be postmaster at Basin, Wyo., in place of H. E. Wise, resigned.

Cleo H. Massey to be postmaster at Parco, Wyo., in place of Frank Breitenstein. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1936.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 7 (legislative day of Apr. 24), 1936

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Maj. James Truman Menzie to Adjutant General's Department.

Capt. Harry William Miller to Cavalry.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

George Burgess Foster, Jr., to be colonel, Medical Corps.

Joseph Casper to be colonel, Medical Corps.

Gordon G. Bulla to be captain, Medical Corps.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

Gilbert J. Rowcliff to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy with the rank of rear admiral.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Owen P. Anderson, Florence.

William B. Taylor, Mobile.

COLORADO

Mildred P. Wion, Granada.

Clinton C. Bell, Limon.

William C. Lowery, Sedgwick.

IDAHO

Clarence M. Friend, Elk River.

Gilbert G. Smith, Filer.

ILLINOIS

John J. McCarthy, Rock Island.

IOWA

George O. Smither, Anita.
Leslie H. Hughes, Cedar Falls.
Herman F. Volberding, Dike.
Walter W. Jacobs, Guttenberg.
J. B. Wood, Lenox.
John W. Zike, Jr., Lewis.
Wayne A. Staton, Marathon.
John P. Delaney, Marcus.
Frank G. Ferguson, Mechanicsville.
Grace Ryan, Neola.
Stacia E. Hartley, New Albin.
William R. Schmitt, Nichols.
Irene G. Gatton, Oakdale.
Verne L. Heskett, Pulaski.
Marcella E. Roeder, Rockwell.
Lewis Magirl, Ryan.
Dan Jerolaman, Shell Rock.
George R. Shipley, Thurman.
John J. Fink, Tripoli.
Eugene T. Alcorn, West Union.

KANSAS

Harriet M. McCauley, Burlingame.
Jack Comes, Burrton.
Ellis C. Logsdon, Grenola.
John T. Dowd, St. Paul.
Daniel P. McCormick, Scammon.
George W. Lank, Solomon.
Kenneth L. Lavender, Valley Center.
Ernest H. Hillman, Wakeeney.

MAINE

Ivadell Gaddis, East Machias.
William S. Holmes, Northeast Harbor.

MARYLAND

W. George Miller, Accident.
Earl T. Kelbaugh, Thurmont.

NEBRASKA

Edgar D. Collins, Ainsworth.
Erwin E. Gardner, Curtis.
Fred W. Schuman, Osceola.
John F. Webster, St. Paul.
Russell N. Linkswiler, Winnebago.

NEW HAMPSHHIRE

Carl E. Crowley, Ashland.
Homer J. Forcier, East Jaffrey.
Ernest E. Lefavour, Farmington.

OHIO

Stanley Lawrence Smith, Ashville.
Fred J. Tank, Elmore.
Frieda M. Lappen, Laurelville.
Frank A. Griebling, Lexington.
Fred E. Surgen, Murray City.
Clyde L. Weiser, Orrville.
Orion W. Kerschner, Trotwood.
George W. Kinzey, Wayne.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jennie Moran, Braddock.

PUERTO RICO

Agustin Carbonell, Caguas.

RHODE ISLAND

Catherine Louise Davis, Portsmouth.

VIRGINIA

Martin Rosenbaum, Glade Spring.
G. Frederick Switzer, Harrisonburg.
William T. Roberts, Nassawadox.
Levi E. Stephenson, Wakefield.

WASHINGTON

Frank Bryan Collins, Camas.
William G. Meneice, Carson.
Renee Houchen, Cathlamet.
Ralph Gildea, Garfield.
Edna Smith, La Center.
Quentin D. Mitchell, Long Beach.
Milton E. Waste, Morton.
Honora M. Connor, South Bend.

WISCONSIN

Walter F. Netzel, Crandon.
Clara A. E. Manion, Oregon.
Henry F. Schumacher, Stoughton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1936

The House met at 11:30 a. m.

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

Almighty One, Thou who art all in all, as we meet in prayer may we cherish these sacred moments. Here help us to realize the highest tones and capacities of our spiritual natures. Heavenly Father, let us pass into that communion that blossoms more and more unto the perfect spring. Speak the final word, blessed Lord, that both men and nations may learn that it is right and not might by which they are to live and endure. We praise Thee that Thy love is commensurate with Thy power, Thy promises are as immutable as Thy holiness, and that humanity's hopes are to be realized in the dateless Christ. Deliver us all from that selfishness which will not stop or be warned, that disregards human happiness, and for a trustless independence of our fellow men. In the name of the Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday 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, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 6, 1936:

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Edgar H. Taber;

H. R. 2936. An act for the relief of J. H. Taylor & Son;

H. R. 4159. An act for the relief of Anchorage Commercial Co., Inc.;

H. R. 4953. An act for the relief of Doris Lipscomb;

H. R. 4999. An act for the relief of Marie Linsenmeyer;

H. R. 5625. An act for the relief of Sperry Gyroscope Co., Inc., of New York;

H. R. 5827. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Wyhowski, mother and guardian of Dorothy Wyhowski;

H. R. 5874. An act for the relief of Hugh B. Curry;

H. R. 5974. An act for the relief of Thelma L. Edmunds, Mrs. J. M. Padgett, Myrtis E. Posey, Mrs. J. D. Mathis, Sr., Fannie Harrison, Annie R. Colgan, and Grace Whitlock;

H. R. 6520. An act for the relief of Preston Brooks Massey;

H. R. 6599. An act for the relief of Florence Helen Klein, a minor;

H. R. 6669. An act for the relief of Mrs. Earl Poynor;

H. R. 6698. An act for the relief of Mae C. Tibbett, administratrix;

H. R. 6821. An act for the relief of Alfred J. White, M. J. Banker, and Charlyn DeBlanc;

H. R. 6828. An act for the relief of George H. Smith;

H. R. 6999. An act for the relief of Frank Rottkamp;

H. R. 7031. An act for the relief of Georgiana Minnigerode, widow of Capt. Karl Minnigerode;

H. R. 7529. An act for the relief of Mariano Biondi;

H. R. 7861. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. A. Joullian;

H. R. 7867. An act for the relief of Adolph Micek, a minor;

H. R. 7963. An act for the relief of J. Edwin Hemphill;

H. R. 8113. An act for the relief of Louis George;

H. R. 8301. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Marais des Cygnes River, in the State of Kansas, with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 8414. An act to provide a preliminary examination of the Yakima River and its tributaries and the Walla Walla River and its tributaries in the State of Washington, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 8486. An act for the relief of John A. Baker;

H. R. 8510. An act for the relief of John Hurston;

H. R. 8694. An act to provide a preliminary examination of Chickasawha River and its tributaries in the State of Mississippi, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 8706. An act for the relief of Frank Polansky;

H. R. 9190. An act for the relief of J. P. Moore;

H. R. 9235. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Cosatot River in Sevier County, Ark., to determine the feasibility of cleaning out the channel and leveeing the river and the cost of such improvements with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 9236. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Red and Little Rivers, Ark., insofar as Red River affects Little River County, Ark., and insofar as Little River affects Little River and Sevier Counties, Ark., to determine the feasibility of leveeing Little River and the cost of such improvement, and also the estimated cost of repairing and strengthening the levee on Red River in Little River County, with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 9244. An act providing for the establishment of a term of the district court of the United States for the northern district of Florida at Panama City, Fla.;

H. R. 9249. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Little Missouri River in Pike County, Ark., to determine the feasibility of cleaning out the channel and leveeing the river and the cost of such improvements with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 9250. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Petit Jean River in Scott and Logan Counties, Ark., to determine the feasibility of cleaning out the channel and leveeing the river and the cost of such improvements with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 9267. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of Big Mulberry Creek, in Crawford County, Ark., from the point where it empties into the Arkansas River up a distance of 8 miles to determine the feasibility of cleaning out the channel and repairing the banks, and the cost of such improvement, with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 9673. An act to authorize the recoinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held in San Diego, Calif., in 1936;

H. R. 9874. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of Cadron Creek, Ark., a tributary of the Arkansas River;

H. R. 10135. An act to authorize the construction of a model basin establishment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10487. An act to authorize a survey of Lowell Creek, Alaska, to determine what, if any, modification should be made in the existing project for the control of its floods;

H. R. 10583. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the San Diego River and its tributaries in the State of California with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 10985. An act to repeal Public Law No. 246 of the Seventy-second Congress;

H. R. 10991. An act for the relief of Harry Wallace;

H. R. 11042. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the Matanuska River in the vicinity of Matanuska, Alaska;

H. R. 11486. An act for the relief of Mary Hemke;

H. R. 11573. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain purchasers of lands in the borough of Brooklawn, State of New Jersey", approved August 19, 1935;

H. R. 11793. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of various creeks in the State of California with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 11806. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of Passaic River, N. J., with a view to the control of its floods; and

H. J. Res. 215. Joint resolution to amend Public Act No. 435, Seventy-second Congress.

JOSEPH GURNEY CANNON

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House time has been set aside for paying tribute to a former Speaker of the House, Joseph Gurney Cannon.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we have set aside a brief few minutes today to pay tribute to one of the outstanding Speakers of this House, but the time is far too short in which to pay proper and deserving tribute to his memory—that of the Honorable Joseph G. Cannon, of the great State of Illinois, whom we honor on his one hundredth birthday anniversary.

He served in this House for 46 years—a longer period than any other man has ever served. It was my pleasure and privilege to have served with him for many years; and although I belonged to the opposite party and disagreed with him on many important policies, I nevertheless admired him for his ability, astuteness, courage, and fighting spirit.

I have served under seven Speakers—Cannon; Champ Clark, sometimes referred to as "the greatest Roman of them all"; the scholarly Gillette; the suave and affable Nicholas Longworth; the diamond-in-the-rough Garner; the genial and big-hearted Rainey; and the lovable and liberal Joseph Byrns.

They were all great men, but "Uncle Joe" Cannon, beyond any doubt, was one of the most outstanding and picturesque of them all. He was resourceful, able, and, as I said, fearless and courageous. Though a strong party man, he had as many warm friends on the Democratic side as on his own. In other words, in spite of all his faults, we loved him still.

While it is true many great men served in this body with and under Speaker Cannon, I must say in passing that we have just as fine and able a group of men here today. But as we all know, it is not the custom to pay tribute to the living but to reserve the flowers of praise and appreciation solely for the departed.

Cannon possessed great power, and knew how to use it, and did use it without stint. In fact, as Speaker he was the whole House, all by himself.

"Uncle Joe" ruled always with an iron hand. He determined what legislation should be passed and what defeated. He was able to do this through his power of appointment of committees. It was his custom not to appoint any Member to a committee until he ascertained from the Member himself how he stood on important legislation that would naturally have to be considered by such committee. If the Member could not satisfy "Uncle Joe" that he could be trusted implicitly to carry out his orders, he would not be appointed to that particular committee.

During his reign as Speaker, "Uncle Joe" was ably assisted by three powerful lieutenants, who, with himself, were known as the "big four", consisting of Sereno E. Payne, of New York; Sunny Jim Sherman, of New York, who became Vice President of the United States; John L. Dalzell, of Pennsylvania; and himself. The three held the big key positions, and were ever the trusted and loyal allies of the Speaker.

Although the Nation believed it was the "big four" who controlled the activities of this House in those days, I was always satisfied that it was the great Speaker, Joe Cannon, who himself and alone controlled the House, and controlled it even before he became the Speaker.

When he determined on a policy, the most influential and powerful opposition could not sway him, as the RECORD bears testimony. He was 86 years of age when he voluntarily retired from Congress.

Joseph Gurney Cannon was one of the most remarkable men of the ages. Even at the age of 86 his eyesight and hearing were remarkable, especially during the night sessions, as I can testify. I regret some of the other Members are not here who once joined in those famous night sessions, but, alas, most of them have gone with "Uncle Joe."

No one I have ever known has displayed the resourcefulness he showed during the turbulent and historical battle in 1910,

which carried on for 2 days and 2 nights, when he held the House against his opponents on this side, supported by some Republicans, endeavoring to take away certain powers of the Speaker and to liberalize the rules of the House.

Having had a small part in that contest, I hope that I will some day have an opportunity to review that memorable battle in my humble way, and to portray his wonderful parliamentary generalship, and how finally, as he was wont to say, "Any majority can do as it pleases", even to declaring the Speakership vacant.

Even when the motion was made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to declare the Speakership vacant, it did not faze him. He then stated: "You are now in the majority and you have the privilege to declare the chair vacant"—knowing full well they would not do so. He, indeed, was one of the most remarkable and outstanding legislators and statesmen I have ever read of, heard of, or had the privilege of serving with.

Joseph G. Cannon's life was a colorful one—from log cabin to high office and from poverty to wealth and affluence.

He was born 100 years ago today in the little town of Guilford, N. C. Four years later his parents journeyed in a covered wagon to the West and settled in the town of Bloomingdale, Ind., where Joseph grew to manhood. His early ambition was to be a lawyer, and this ambition was fulfilled upon his graduation from the Cincinnati Law School when he was admitted to the bar and commenced practice in the city of Terre Haute, Ind., in 1858. Foreseeing the advantages in the development of the State of Illinois and that better fortune and opportunity awaited him there, we find the young attorney established at Tuscola, Ill., in 1859, and within 2 years he became State's attorney for the twenty-seventh judicial district of Illinois, serving in that capacity until 1868.

Resuming private practice, he gained the confidence and good will of the people of his community; they recognized his ability and determination, and in 1873 he was elected to the Forty-third Congress, and was reelected eight successive terms. Defeated in the Fifty-second Congress, he was a candidate for election to the Fifty-third Congress, and again the people of his district honored him with the Congress seat. Then followed continuous service through the Sixty-second Congress. Defeated for reelection in the Sixty-third Congress, he stood for election to the Sixty-fourth Congress, and was successful.

His service in the House ended with his voluntary retirement at the end of the Sixty-seventh Congress—a total service of 46 years as a Member of Congress.

"Uncle Joe" was several times spoken for the Presidency. The farthest he ever got in that direction, however, was that in 1908 he received 58 votes as Presidential candidate at the Republican convention that nominated Taft.

"Uncle Joe" was of a type of the western pioneer of which there are no more. He was plain, honest, rugged, and old-fashioned, and remained so throughout his life. High position did not change him in the least.

With his unlit stogie, cocked at a saucy angle so that it almost touched the broad brim of his great black hat, always with him, he presented a picture that no one who ever saw him will ever forget. He was never cartooned without that famous stogie.

Joseph G. Cannon was a pioneer of the type that has passed forever. We shall never see his like again. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SABATH). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, when after nearly a half century of service in this House, longer than that of any other man, dead or alive, Joseph Gurney Cannon came down the main aisle, leaning upon the arm of a colleague, and passed out of yonder door never to return, it was amid silence and deep regret and with the affection and esteem of his fellow Members, regardless of party affiliations.

Soon thereafter he passed into the Great Beyond. Congress was not then in session to do him honor. But upon convening on December 7, 1926, the House of Representatives, in which were many Members who, like myself, had served with Mr. Cannon, adopted a resolution which expressed the true and sincere regard in which he was held, and adjourned in his honor. It was an unusual distinction accorded to an unusual man. That resolution so truly portrayed his character and was such a just and fitting tribute to his memory that I shall here quote it:

Hon. Joseph G. Cannon died in Danville, Ill., November 12, 1926. For 46 years he had been a Member of this House; for 10 years as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; for 8 years its Speaker; and for several years chairman of the Committee on Rules. His service terminated with the Sixty-seventh Congress. Within this Chamber the scene of his life's greatest activities was laid. Here he rendered services to his country which placed him in the front rank of American statesmanship. Here he exhibited characteristics which compelled respect and won admiration. Forceful ability, intrinsic worth, strength of character, brought him popular fame and congressional leadership. In him, depth and breadth of intellect, with a full and well-rounded development, had produced a giant who towered above his fellows and impressed them with his power and wisdom. A distinguished statesman, a lofty patriot, a unique orator, an unmatched debater, a master of logic and wit, the great and representative citizen of the American Republic has gone into history.

Joseph Gurney Cannon, or "Uncle Joe", as he was affectionately called, was a North Carolina cracker, and, like Lincoln, went to Indiana, and, like Lincoln, settled in Illinois. He entered Congress when Blaine was Speaker. In his first speech in 1874 on a bill to reduce postage on books, periodicals, and papers, he said of himself that he had oats in his pocket and hayseed in his hair. In that speech he presented a standard for Congressmen, to which he always conformed. "No man", he said, "is a proper person to represent the people unless he has the honesty and the backbone to stand and do what is right and for the interest of the people, without reference to what anyone may say of him or what the action of the press may be in the premises."

This was "Uncle Joe's" creed, and he lived up to it. Courage was his dominant characteristic. He was an old-time economist. He hated and would fight any measure that looked like a raid on the Treasury. Withal he was constructive. Many governmental agencies had their genesis in his brain.

Mr. Cannon wielded greater influence upon the destiny of legislation than any other man in Congress in over four decades. But he was not an autocrat. When Speaker of the House he exercised no greater powers than had his predecessors; not as much as some. He never lost sight of the fact that he was the House's servant. The issue of "Cannonism", raised in 1910, was factious and fortuitous. "Uncle Joe" was a political target under a hot barrage of coalition fire, but he never flinched. His defy to oust him from the Speakership was magnificent and won even the admiration of his political enemies.

He was a stormy petrel throughout his long public career and loved a fight. He did not harbor animosities and was generous to friend and foe alike. Notwithstanding Speaker Clark's leadership in the memorable battle against "Cannonism", Clark and Cannon were very warm friends. Both men were much beloved for their rugged honesty and stalwart political convictions.

On the eve of his departure from Congress one of his friends said to him: " 'Uncle Joe', I am sad to think of your going." "Well, my boy", he replied, "it makes me sad, too. But I am an old man, and I ought to have gone out before, because I haven't been worth a damn around here for 2 years except to help make a quorum."

A statesman, a commanding figure, a great American, a unique character, a gentleman of the old school, a man of the people like unto Abraham Lincoln, of whom history will record:

He had the courage of his convictions and the approbation of his own conscience.

Upon the announcement of the death of "Uncle Joe" Cannon, an old employee, whose service in the House was contemporaneous with that of Mr. Cannon for many years, wrote what he styled a "parliamentary ode" to "Uncle Joe", which, in view of Mr. Cannon's eminent services upon the

floor and in the Speaker's chair, is peculiarly appropriate to one so long in the atmosphere of parliamentary struggles. The parliamentary ode is as follows:

Here the gavel fell.
The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.
The previous question is ordered.
Debate is exhausted.
The subject is closed to amendment.
Points of order cannot be made nor reserved.
The Speaker has left the chair and gone into the Committee of the Whole,
Where the point of "no quorum" is never raised,
Where the great majority rules, and
From whence no adverse report ever comes;
Where no dilatory motions are entertained, nor
Filibustering practiced;
Where minorities claim no rights,
Where rules are superfluous, decorum is preserved, and
Where politics is adjourned.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, since the gavel usually beats us to the last sentence, I want to say first what I would wish to reserve for the last.

Mr. Speaker, considering the disparity between Joseph G. Cannon and myself, at that time a disparity in age, in birth, in background, in politics, in association, in experience, a disparity in almost everything that could distinguish two men, and culminating in my induction into the House of Representatives under his iron rule, perhaps the most sincere tribute one such man can pay to another such man is to say that during the quarter century which has elapsed since I last saw him, I have always remembered him never with any feeling of rancor but always with a feeling of affection.

Emerson said that when we see a great man he explains his fame. Joseph G. Cannon was truly self-explantory. He was original, he was picturesque, he was colorful, he was dramatic, he was dynamic, he was courageous, above all things he was, as the minority leader has just said, highly courageous, and all these qualities were reflected in his personality.

To me it is a solemn and impressive thought that for a half century, one-third of the life of the Republic, with only two short intervals, these walls looked down upon the form and resounded to the voice of Joseph G. Cannon. I think it is highly fitting that the House of Representatives should pause for a half hour in its labors to pay tribute to this truly remarkable man.

I lay no claim to a monopoly of affection for Uncle Joe Cannon. It was general. What was the secret of this universal feeling toward a man who as Speaker won the title of "Czar" Cannon and made "Cannonism" a national political issue? My answer is this, that while in the chair he ruled with an iron hand, embodying in himself all the powers of the House and wielding that power as a partisan and even factional leader; out of the chair he was utterly democratic, approachable, and companionable, chatting freely with the newest and humblest Member of the House. If he was a hearty hater, he was also a hearty lover. He was a red-blooded man. He was a "natural." This, in my opinion, was the secret of his long, successful public career.

If I may, I should like to take him down out of the Speaker's station and relate an incident or two on the personal, the human, side. If I mention myself in one of these incidents, it is only for the purpose of showing that he was what I have just said he was, for certainly there was no mutual-admiration society existing between "Czar" Cannon at the height of his power and a young western Democrat serving his first term. The occasion was a House vote on the veto by President Taft of an immigration bill. The Senate had overridden the veto by 4 to 1. The House was expected to follow suit, though by a smaller margin. Debate was limited to 1 hour. I had been given 1 minute. Feeling was so high that I surrendered the minute, then, regaining my courage, I recovered the time and used it. I was for the veto; the Speaker was for it. When the roll was called, it lacked five votes of the necessary two-thirds, and the veto was sustained. "Uncle Joe" came down out of the chair, sat down beside me, placed his arm across my shoulders, and said, "Young man, your speech saved the President's veto. You knocked just enough of them off the fence."

I recall my first contact with him. I said, "Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member from Colorado." And he replied dryly, "They generally are."

Here is an instance of his tolerance and unconventionality. While it involved myself, I did not see it, as you will see. I walked into the Chamber while the House was in session, took my seat with my hat on, and sat there smoking a cigar and reading a paper. A Member on the other side signaled the Speaker, who looked down at me for a moment with an indulgent smile and then looked away. In a few minutes I got up and went to the cloakroom, where I was followed by two or three Members, who related what had happened. "Uncle Joe" overlooked a fine chance, which was not unappreciated by me.

It was my privilege once to hear an observation from him which showed his indifference to criticism. He was sitting on the Democratic side chatting with the Republican floor leader. They were just in front of my seat. A Member down in the well was flaying "Cannonism." The gentleman with Speaker Cannon said, "Mr. Speaker, you had better listen to that fellow; he is talking about you." "Oh, well," rejoined "Uncle Joe", "he might be talking about a damn sight worse subject", and continued with his conversation.

I have always remembered the little two-chair table in the House restaurant just at the left-hand side of the door. On the second morning of the historic struggle against the Speaker in 1910 I walked into the deserted restaurant and sat down at this table. In a moment the Speaker came in and sat opposite me. He knew that I was thirsting for his blood, politically speaking, but he chatted unconcernedly. I remember one thing he said, and that was that he answered every letter he received from a constituent, even if it was only two lines. Yes; "Uncle Joe" was a politician as well as a statesman.

If I could pick some one thing for every old man in the United States to read, including every man who thinks he is old, it would be this: In the Sixty-second Congress, after "Uncle Joe" had been "dethroned", and after he had lost the Speakership through change in party control of the House, and when he was 75 years of age, I saw him make a 3-hour speech in the House, during which he paced the center aisle from the Well to the main entrance many times, throwing his arms in characteristic fashion and never sparing himself. It was a truly remarkable performance.

Mr. Speaker, just before rising, I told my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that I would not have time to give more than a sentence of a story I told him the other day about the culmination of that most dramatic struggle in the history of Congress, at the time Speaker Cannon was stripped of his power, when Congress remained in session continuously for 3 days and 2 nights. After the battle was over and he had been shorn of his power, and even his tenure of office was trembling in balance, with the threat running through the House that he should be unseated as Speaker, he took the Speaker's chair and breathed defiance to his foes. He uttered one word in his characteristic manner, which was the high light of that whole dramatic struggle and the high light of his character, when he drew himself to his full height and shouted "Courage!" [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] for 5 minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great distinction to be one of those permitted to speak briefly on this one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Joseph Gurney Cannon. It is very fitting that the House of Representatives should pause from its daily routine to pay respect to the memory of one who for 46 years was such an important as well as unique figure in its life.

It is not necessary to make direct reference to his great contribution to American history; but as it is now more than 10 years since he retired from this body, those of us who were privileged to serve with him can perhaps contribute to this record by personal reminiscences.

My first contact with "Uncle Joe" was soon after his memorable fight in the House to retain his position as Speaker. He came to Massachusetts to deliver an address. It was my privilege to attend the dinner. I can see him now after the lapse of nearly 30 years, describing his experience in that disagreement with his party associates. The fire in his eye, the vigor of his speech, and the spirit of his remarks were typical of his strength here.

I first sat on this floor as a Member-elect to the Sixty-third Congress during the closing sessions of the Sixty-second when so many Members were retiring as the result of political upheavals. An ex-Speaker and a future Speaker were among that number, "Uncle Joe" Cannon and Nick Longworth. I can recount a most interesting experience during the Sixty-third Congress when "Uncle Joe" came to see us as a visitor and was a guest of honor at a dinner at the Army and Navy Club given by former Representative Chipperfield. Among the guests was James R. Mann. The dinner was about half over when Speaker Champ Clark came in, the only Democrat among 50 Republicans. The speeches that "Uncle Joe" and Champ Clark made that night are outstanding memories in my membership, both reminiscing not only of the old days here but of their days back home in Illinois and Missouri.

One other personal word about "Uncle Joe." One very hot summer afternoon I asked him to ride home with me. We drove around the Speedway. I said to him, "Uncle Joe", the time is coming when you should write your personal reminiscences of your remarkable public career. No one can do it for you, and you owe it to the country to make a record of your service." He turned to me and said, "Young man, I have always made it a rule to look forward, never backward." The wonderful impression left by that remark of a man then over fourscore years has never left me; and from it I learned a great lesson, that we should endeavor to keep ourselves young as he did and improve the future rather than have regrets for the past.

Another reminiscence is the memorable ride I had in the train from New York one day with Champ Clark, when he gave me the complete story of the effort to retire "Uncle Joe" and its failure. Many a delightful evening did I, as a new Member, spend with "Uncle Joe" during our summer sessions in the Sixty-fifth Congress.

One of "Uncle Joe's" most renowned speeches was that made in support of a bill to create the American Academy of Arts and Letters, in which he recalled the pioneer days of his youth, when he began his journey westward with his parents from North Carolina. Listen to these words, which typify his powers as an orator:

> Now, then, take art. I do not know how many of you have gone to the western end of the Capitol and seen on the wall that picture entitled, Westward the Star of the Empire Takes Its Way. A great artist, I cannot recall his name now, painted that picture on the wall. There it is. It represents the pioneer from the Atlantic coast on his way westward.
>
> There are the steer and the mule hitched up together; there is the woman with the babe in her arms, sitting in the wagon; there is the little grave by the side of the road; and there is the pioneer with his coonskin cap and the little boy with his coonskin cap, the grandson or the son, carrying a rifle, followed by the faithful dog; another stands upon the mountain and looks to the westward.
>
> Ah, Mr. Speaker, I was a part of that picture in a way, and by that I mean I experienced most of what it represented in the pioneer days; and as I looked upon that picture the first time, though I am not given much to tears, I caught myself crying. And during all the years since, I have never glanced toward it without saying to myself, "God bless the man who painted that picture."

May I close these personal remarks with a reference to the last session "Uncle Joe" attended, on March 4, 1923? Mr. Sisson, of Mississippi, made these remarks:

> It has been my pleasure to know "Uncle Joe" intimately. I have learned to love him deeply, and it will be a source of satisfaction all my life to be able to say that I have known intimately one of the greatest men and one of the greatest characters that America has produced. When the history of this House is written, as it will be, when the history of the Speakers has been written, "Uncle Joe" Cannon will stand out in bold relief as one of the greatest men who has ever occupied this position in the history of this country.

My colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. Gallivan], in the course of his remarks, inserted a story from the Baltimore Sun entitled "Shed a Tear for 'Uncle Joe' as He Is Leaving Us Today." A truthful title. Certainly there was many a wet eye in this Chamber when the good-byes were said to "Uncle Joe." How strange it is to read in that article that when "Uncle Joe" was chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Professor Langley, of the Smithsonian Institute, asked for an appropriation of $10,000 to experiment in flying. "Great heavens," exclaimed Mr. Cannon, "a flying machine to ride in the air. Whoever heard of such a thing?"

The article also contains many other interesting details, including a poem that "Uncle Joe" quoted when his length of service exceeded that of Mr. Morrill.

For the accuracy of history and the real judgment of the future, sufficient time has not elapsed in which to rate the character, personality, and service of "Uncle Joe" Cannon, but we can say that while America has produced many great men, to this day, in our judgment, it has not produced the like of "Uncle Joe." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MEEKS].

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to have been associated with Joseph G. Cannon in any official way. I knew him better as a citizen of my home town, Danville, Ill., and as a neighbor. He was the first Congressman I ever saw. I remember the incident distinctly when I looked through a window of his bank and saw him with his arms folded, standing erect and alert, looking at a map on the floor and discussing something with a caller who was interested in what was shown on the map. I was a farm lad then. I thought he represented the power and majesty of the United States Government.

Shortly after I was admitted to the bar I was a guest in his home with other members of the county bar, and I considered that a great event. It was the first time a Congressman spoke to me. I felt greatly honored by this attention. I was interested in all his later political campaigns, not as an associate, of course, but often as a participant, and I know well his political history at home. He was a unique, picturesque character, a forceful individual. I never saw another like him.

His history, however, would not be complete without the mention of an associate who always aided and sustained him in his official career until he became Speaker of the House. I refer to his brother, William P. Cannon, who was an able businessman and an astute political general who managed his campaign battles and who always rallied to his support in every contest in which Joseph G. Cannon engaged. He lost his life as the result of an accident shortly after his brother became Speaker. The association of these two men was a remarkable business and political partnership of two brothers.

Joseph G. Cannon was a man of the soil. He came to the prairies of Illinois after he had lived in Indiana. In early life he was a district prosecuting attorney riding the circuit as did the judges in those days. He was somewhat Lincolnesque in thought and spoke the language all could understand. He came to Washington at the close of an epoch and the beginning of a new. His life was identified with much of the history of this country. I suggested to him once that he write his memoirs because of their great value as a contribution to the history of this country and the intimate glimpses it would give of unrecorded official acts in our national life. I know of no other man who could have written memoirs of so great value. [Applause.] He declined to consider the subject on the grounds that he was too old for such long and exacting labor. The history of our country would have been enriched by this contribution.

At home, although we recognize the fact that Mr. Cannon was a great figure in the Nation's life, yet it was not as such

that we thought of him mostly. He was a neighbor, a friend, a useful man in the community with simple habits and tastes and one upon whom we did not look with awe.

As a young man he settled upon the prairies of Illinois and was influenced by its expanse, its hard-working settlers, men and women who made a great State in a raw country. His travelings upon the circuit, his contacts with honest, earnest folks of the countryside, and small towns prepared him for his great usefulness and achievements in national affairs. He was a part of the community. He was usually called and referred to as Joe. It was not until he had lived the allotted span of human life that he was called "Uncle Joe." He cared little for the formalities and conventionalities of social life. There was nothing of show and glamor about him. His constituents understood him. They did not expect from him sonorous eloquent utterances. They expected him to speak the ordinary language which they all easily understood. He had no patronizing ways. He felt at home mingling with farmers and enjoying in their homes the ample meals which they served. He liked to talk with them about their problems and pleasures. He knew business in its various aspects. He knew farming. He knew about coal mining. He knew the country store, the country church, the country school. He soon became a familiar figure with his big black cigar and slouch hat. He was natural for he breathed the air of the expansive prairies. He upheld the majestic woodlands which abound in his district and the glories of abundant nature. He was inspired with the interests of his people.

Of course, we were all pleased when he became Speaker. It was at this point that he lost his brother William and at which another figure of importance came into his political life, his son-in-law, E. X. Leseure, whom I knew well and who was a friend of mine. His daughter, now Mrs. Abdill, occupies the old homestead on the principal street of the town.

It was the purpose of the people of Danville who knew him so long to hold memorial exercises on his one hundredth birthday. I am a member of the committee on arrangements. It has been decided to postpone the event until later in the year.

I have heard much about his courage, his determination to pursue a course which he wanted adopted against any opposition which might arise. His character was no enigma to those who knew him on the home ground. His struggle with early adversity on the undeveloped prairies of Illinois, where malaria, milk sick, and many other disorders prevailed, and where the hardest labor was necessary to wring from the soil sufficient crops to provide clothing and shelter for the large families, made him one of them.

These were elements which developed strong characteristics in individuals and Joseph G. Cannon was not exceptional as to these influences. They marked his life. When he came to Washington it was not with a polish acquired in society nor with the cultivated speech of the orator, which in those days swayed crowds, but with the sturdy traits natural to the individual qualified by hard knocks. They were necessary to one's survival and necessary for the achievement of great things.

Joseph G. Cannon came into notice immediately following the noted characters who made outstanding history in Illinois. These were Abraham Lincoln, Stephen A. Douglas, James C. Robinson, Usher F. Linder, Leonard Swett, Lawrence Weldon, David Davis, Oliver L. Davis, and among them but not the least of them, Daniel W. Voorhees, "The Tall Sycamore of the Wabash." These men were eminent lawyers in that period before many important decisions were made by our Supreme Court. Cannon and others took up the work where the former men left off. Necessarily, his name goes along with those in the annals of old Illinois and with its place in the Nation.

The narrative of these simple facts shows whence came those characteristics in the halls of Congress to which you have listened today. I saw him when I was a farm boy, and I saw him when the people of our city tendered to him, after his retirement—and to the Honorable Joseph B. Mann, the best all-around lawyer I have ever known—a memorial dinner and tribute. They were almost the same age, both retired and looking back upon earthly careers about to end. It was a notable event and scene. It was my privilege to see Mr. Cannon as a Congressman when I was a lad and my privilege to see him in my own office shortly before his death. There were intimate conversations. Although belonging to different political parties, this, on many occasions, was not a cause of differences between us. I shall always feel that it was worth something to have known him, that it was worth much to have him an important part of our national life, and to have had him in our community as a neighbor and as a friend. This sentiment cannot be erased nor obscured by any outstanding public career. After all, the great question is what kind of a man was one of whom we speak. I have attempted in these remarks to show something of the kind of man Joseph G. Cannon was, which, I think, will tend to explain the characteristics observed in him by his colleagues in this Chamber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, if there ever served in this body a typical outgrowth of American ideals and institutions, it was the late Speaker Joseph Cannon, whom we have assembled to honor today.

This statesman whose memory we all cherish met every test and trial from his birth in North Carolina 100 years ago until the pale messenger approached his bedside at Danville, Ill., November 12, 1926.

It was my privilege and advantage to know him, to have voted for his reelection as Speaker of this House at the Sixty-first Congress, March 19, 1910. I have since served under Speakers Clark, Gillette, Rainey, and our own patient, able, and fair and esteemed Speaker, Mr. BYRNS. It was also my privilege to have served under Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, and now President Roosevelt.

To be the only Republican now a Member of this body who voted in the Sixty-first Congress to elect Mr. Cannon Speaker, is an embarrassing distinction, for I feel my weakness in attempting to render in words such tribute to the grand old statesman as his memory deserves.

Although born in North Carolina, he had his mental and physical growth in the Middle West, at a time when men of the type of Lincoln and Grant and others who drew from the forest and plain that kind of rugged manhood and burning patriotism that has shown across the pages of history ever since.

Speaker Cannon was a type possessed of characteristics that grew and flourished on the broad philosophy of common sense.

It is yet too early in the march of time and understanding of this type of men who helped build the Republic strong and enduring, to set down a correct estimate of their contributions to our progress and civilization. When it is recalled that it was 250 years after the death of Cromwell that Thomas Carlyle ventured an estimate of Cromwell's purpose and accomplishments, our task today may be better understood, for aside from decapitating Charles I and destroying or making Ireland unhappy for many years, we see nothing of special note, with the return of Charles II, upon the failure of Cromwell's son to carry on.

It has been so as to the genius of Napoleon, which in military mastery and democratic progress and the immortal code, for it has been 115 years since he died and the recent book by Ludwig is the only fair estimate we have yet found excepting in a work by Thomas Watson, of Georgia, formerly a Member of this body.

Therefore we may not expect to have the virtues of Speaker Cannon portrayed or the value of his life to his country and the world understood and translated so soon after he passed from the stage of earthly activities, swift competition, and the asperities which hedge about us all, particularly in a life of political service which an economist has declared to be only a little less violent than war, hence politics must be encompassed by stern realities.

We have evidence of the fine judgment and confidence in him, and another grand old commoner, Champ Clark, when for their good judgment and honesty these two men were placed among those who erected the first House Office Building and the Lincoln Monument.

As an evidence of Speaker Cannon's good judgment in selecting advisers he had as his counselors, in what was characterized a "kitchen cabinet", Senators James Watson, of Indiana; James Sherman, of New York; James Tawney, of Michigan; James Mann, of Illinois; and James Heminway, of Indiana. The five Jims. And three of these Jims later became United States Senators and one a Vice President.

"Uncle Joe" Cannon freely extended the hand of fellowship to new men coming to Congress in form of sound advice. I sought his counsel on more than one occasion, and he directed me aright. I recall one instance when I was anxious to have a bill passed. I spoke to Mr. Cannon and he gave directions how to comply with the somewhat different rules than I had been familiar with in the Pennsylvania Senate and Assembly, but was afraid to ask that a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed and lay that motion on the table believing such action could not possibly be ethical. But "Uncle Joe" replied that that was the practice, and in fact is now.

Probably the climaxing triumph of his life came when he completely routed an element of the Republican Party which sought to divest him of his power as Speaker. This pursuit was carried across the country, and all Republicans had to meet the issue and win or lose for or against Cannonism. Truth is, the Cannon rules were the same as the Crisp, Randall, and Reed rules used before his advent. But the showdown came on March 19, 1910, and it was a day fraught with the most dramatic and truly thrilling situations I ever witnessed in conventions and legislative bodies. I was witness to it all and followed as I could the strategy of Speaker Cannon, James Watson, of Indiana, and William A. Rodenberg, of the Twenty-second Illinois District. Every minute was tense, but the House came out of every charge straight and erect under the rules that the motion to adjourn had to be first acted upon before the resolution offered by Congressman Burleson could be voted up or down.

Here I wish to insert Mr. Cannon's short speech, which time will mark and perpetuate as a classic defense of his position under the rules.

THE FAMOUS RESOLUTION DEFEATED

After prolonged and heated discussion on the resolution introduced by Congressman Burleson, of Texas, the Speaker pro tempore said:

The yeas and nays have been ordered on the resolution. The Clerk will call the roll. As many as are in favor of the adoption of the resolution will, as their names are called, answer "yea", those opposed will answer "nay"; and again the Chair cautions the House to keep in order during the roll call.

The resolution read as follows:

Resolved, That the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby declared vacant, and the House of Representatives shall at once proceed to the election of a Speaker.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 155, nays 192, answered "present" 8, not voting 33.

The only present Republican Member of Congress who voted against the resolution was BENJAMIN K. FOCHT, of the Eighteenth Pennsylvania District.

SPEECH OF "UNCLE JOE" CANNON

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted and to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska moves to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to and to lay that motion upon the table. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. One moment. The Speaker asks the indulgence of the House for not exceeding 3 minutes to make a statement.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to withhold the motion.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Cannon). Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, actions, not words, determine the conduct and the sincerity of men in the affairs of life. This is a government by the people acting through the representatives of a majority of the people. Results cannot be had except by a majority; and in the House of Representatives a majority, being responsible, should have full power and should exercise that power, otherwise the majority is inefficient and does not perform its functions. The office of the minority is to put the majority on its good behavior, advocating, in good faith, the policies which it professes, ever ready to take advantage of the mistakes of the majority party, and appeal to the country for its vindication.

From time to time heretofore the majority has become the minority, as in the present case, and from time to time hereafter the majority will become the minority. The country believes that the Republican Party has a majority of 44 in the House of Representatives at this time, yet such is not the case.

The present Speaker of the House has, to the best of his ability and judgment, cooperated with the Republican Party; and so far in the history of this Congress the Republican Party in the House has been enabled by a very small majority, when the test came, to legislate in conformity with the policies and the platform of the Republican Party. Such action, of course, begot criticism—which the Speaker does not deprecate—on the part of the minority party.

The Speaker cannot be unmindful of the fact, as evidenced by three previous elections to the speakership, that in the past he has enjoyed the confidence of the Republican Party of the country and of the Republican Members of the House; but the assault upon the Speaker of the House by the minority, supplemented by the efforts of the so-called insurgents, shows that the Democratic minority, aided by a number of so-called insurgents, constituting 15 percent of the majority party in the House, is now in the majority, and that the Speaker of the House is not in harmony with the actual majority of the House, as evidenced by the vote just taken.

There are two courses open for the Speaker to pursue—one is to resign and permit the new combination of Democrats and insurgents to choose a Speaker in harmony with its aims and purposes. The other is for that combination to declare a vacancy in the office of Speaker and proceed to the election of a new Speaker. After consideration, at this stage of the session of the House, with much of important legislation pending involving the pledges of the Republican platform and their crystallization into law, believing that his resignation might consume weeks of time in the reorganization of the House, the Speaker, being in harmony with Republican policies and desirous of carrying them out, declines by his own motion to precipitate a contest upon the House in the election of a new Speaker; a contest that might greatly endanger the final passage of all legislation necessary to redeem Republican pledges and fulfill Republican promises. This is one reason why the Speaker does not resign at once; and another reason is this: In the judgment of the present Speaker, a resignation is in and of itself a confession of weakness or mistake or an apology for past actions. The Speaker is not conscious of having done any political wrong. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] The same rules are in force in this House that have been in force for two decades. The Speaker has construed the rules as he found them and as they have been construed by previous Speakers from Thomas B. Reed's incumbency down to the present time.

Heretofore the Speakers have been members of the Committee on Rules, covering a period of 60 years, and the present Speaker has neither sought new power nor has he unjustly used that already conferred upon him.

There has been much talk on the part of the minority and the insurgents of the "czarism" of the Speaker, culminating in the action taken today. The real truth is that there is no coherent Republican majority in the House of Representatives. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] Therefore, the real majority ought to have the courage of its convictions [applause on the Republican side] and logically meet the situation that confronts it.

The Speaker does now believe, and always has believed, that this is a government through parties, and that parties can act only through majorities. The Speaker has always believed in and bowed to the will of the majority in convention, in caucus, and in the legislative hall, and today profoundly believes that to act otherwise is to disorganize parties, is to prevent coherent action in any legislative body, is to make impossible the reflection of the wishes of the people in statutes and in laws.

The Speaker has always said that, under the Constitution, it is a question of the highest privilege for an actual majority of the House at any time to choose a new Speaker, and again notifies the House that the Speaker will at this moment, or at any other time while he remains Speaker, entertain, in conformity with the highest constitutional privilege, a motion by any Member to vacate the office of Speakership and choose a new Speaker [loud applause on the Republican side]; and, under existing conditions, would welcome such action upon the part of the actual majority of the House, so that power and responsibility may rest with the Democratic and insurgent Members who, by the last vote, evidently constitute a majority of this House. The Chair is now ready to entertain such motion. [Loud and long-continued applause on the Republican side; great confusion in the Hall.]

In conclusion let me observe that, as Shakespeare made Marc Antony say in his majestic oration that his heart was in Caesar's coffin, I believe that on this day, the one hundredth anniversary of Mr. Cannon's birth, there will be countless thousands who will recall his life with admiration and affection. Solon, the Greek philosopher and codifier of the laws of his country, admonished Croesus that nothing which

might vanish can bring perpetual joy, and our departed friend of whom we have humbly spoken was free from all vain conceit, and we believe, with Solon, that "him only to whom the divinity has continued happiness unto the end we call happy."

The last days of Speaker Cannon were spent at his home at Danville, Ill., in the peace and quietude of the sear and yellow leaf of life, drawing solace and consolation from the philosophy and spiritual glow of the Holy Bible, and passing into the shadows beloved and lamented.

CONTRIBUTION BY HON. WILLIAM A. RODENBERG, WHO REPRESENTED THE TWENTY-SECOND ILLINOIS DISTRICT IN CONGRESS AT THE TIME, MARCH 19, 1910

Today is the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of a great American, who occupied a commanding position in national affairs for half a century. On May 7, 1836, Joseph Gurney Cannon was born at Guilford, N. C. His parents belonged to the Society of Friends, familiarly known as Quakers. In 1840, when Joseph was 4 years of age, the family moved to Bloomingdale, Ind., where some years later the father, who was a practicing physician, lost his life while attempting to ford a swollen stream on his way to call on a patient. The good doctor left his family in moderate circumstances, and at an early age Joseph secured employment as clerk in a country store, thus enabling him to contribute to the support of the family.

On one occasion, as a youth of about 20, he attended a famous trial in Bloomingdale, and so impressed was he by the eloquent arguments of the attorneys in the case that he resolved then and there to become a lawyer. By practicing the strictest economy he was able to save enough to spend a year at the Cincinnati Law School. In 1858, at the age of 22, he was admitted to the bar and commenced practice in Terre Haute, Ind. Not meeting with much success, he decided to migrate to Chicago, which then gave every evidence of becoming a great metropolis. The story is told—and I am sure that it is authentic—that his funds become exhausted long before reaching Chicago and that, upon the urgent solicitation of the conductor, he was compelled to leave the train at Tuscola, which had just been designated as the county seat of Douglas County, Ill. Undaunted and undismayed, the hero of this sketch proceeded to the only tavern in the new town, explained his predicament to the proprietor, and asked for "room and board" until such time as he might be able to pay. The proprietor was impressed by the earnestness of the young man's plea and consented to the arrangement. In later years Mr. Cannon was wont to tell with much relish that his first legal fee was 50 cents for writing a deed. In 1861, or 2 years after his arrival in Tuscola, he was elected State's attorney for the twenty-seventh judicial district of Illinois, which position he held until December 1868. His incumbency of the office of State's attorney covered the exciting days of the Civil War, and no civil officer in the great State of Illinois rendered more effective or patriotic service to the cause of the Union than Joseph G. Cannon. Douglas County was one of the hotbeds of southern sympathizers, and, despite threats of personal violence, the aggressive young State's attorney did not hesitate to prosecute them fearlessly and relentlessly. His activities in this crucial time in the Nation's history established a bond of undying personal friendship between himself and the immortal Abraham Lincoln.

In 1872, at the beginning of President Grant's second term, Mr. Cannon was elected to Congress, and with two intermissions he continued as a Member of Congress from 1873 to 1923, covering a period of 50 years of the most momentous history of the world. For 46 years he was a Member of this body, which up to now has established a record for all time.

For 8 years, from 1903 to 1911, "Uncle Joe", as he was known to every man, woman, and child in America, presided as Speaker of the House. There are only seven Members of the present Congress who had the honor and distinction of serving under his Speakership: The present distinguished Speaker, JOSEPH W. BYRNS, the beloved dean of the House; ADOLPH J. SABATH and JAMES MCANDREWS, of Illinois; EDWARD T. TAYLOR and JOHN A. MARTIN, of Colorado; WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK, of Ohio; and he who is now addressing you, Mr. FOCHT, of Pennsylvania.

I account it an honor and a privilege, which I am sure is shared by the others whom I have just mentioned, to pay tribute on this centennial anniversary of his birth, to the memory of the hero of a thousand legislative battles, a man of character, of courage, of integrity, of patriotism, who had justly endeared himself to posterity as one of the Nation's idols, "Uncle Joe" Cannon, of Illinois, born May 7, 1836, and called to his reward on November 12, 1926. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who served under the former Speaker of this House, Hon. Joseph G. Cannon, I cannot refrain from saying just a word with reference to my great admiration and my very real affection for him and his memory.

When I came to Congress he had begun his last term as Speaker. In the next Congress his party assigned him as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I had the honor to be a member.

It was my privilege to sit beside him in one of the important subcommittees of that committee during the consideration of bills pending before it. Because of this close association I came to know him intimately during this time. As a member of that committee he showed the same courage, the same loyal regard for his country, the same earnest desire to protect the Treasury of the United States during this time that I am sure he had shown during the time he was chairman of that great committee before he was elected Speaker.

Mr. Cannon was one of the truly great men of his time. Some of us differed from him upon policies of government, but no one ever questioned his honesty, his sincerity, or his patriotism, and he wielded an influence second to none, not only in that committee but in the Congress. As we all know, he was known to his colleagues in the House as "Uncle Joe", a term of affection and endearment; in fact, he was so known all over this country, and when after many, many years of public service he felt it necessary to voluntarily retire, a short time before his death there was not a Member on either side of the Chamber who did not feel a sense of deep personal regret, and there is no Member who ever served with him who will not always remember him for his loyalty and his patriotism. He was one of the last of the Speakers who had the responsibility and the privilege of naming the standing committees of the House. He was the last of the Speakers who was chairman of the Committee on Rules, a committee, as I recall, consisting of five members, and the committee which shaped the policy and the program of the House. He exercised tremendous power, but he was always fair and just. Of course, he fought vigorously for those things in which he believed. He never surrendered a principle, but I feel that every man who ever served under him felt that "Uncle Joe" was anxious to see that every Member had all the privileges that he should have upon the floor of this House.

I will always remember and feel proud of the fact that it was my privilege to serve under him as Speaker for one term and then to serve with him in the Committee on Appropriations where I gathered wisdom from his earnest, patriotic, and sincere efforts to protect the Treasury of the United States and his great legislative experience. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that not only those who have spoken but that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD with reference to the late Speaker Cannon for 5 legislative days, and may I make the observation, Mr. Speaker, that one of his oldest friends desired time, but, unfortunately, it was impossible for me to yield to him and, therefore, I especially desire that he should have the privilege of extending his remarks. I refer to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MCANDREWS.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of being a Member of the Fifty-eighth Congress, when Uncle Joe Cannon was first elected to the Speakership of the House. At that time he was 67 years of age, had already served more than a quarter of a century in Congress, but there was no Member of the House who was more vigorous, physically and intellectually, than Uncle Joe. He seemed to be in the very prime of life and towered like a giant among his fellow Members. He was a master of debate, forceful, courageous, and resourceful, neither asking nor giving quarter. With a wealth of knowledge gained in the

great school of human experience, the school that has given to the Nation many of its best and greatest statesmen, Joseph G. Cannon was thoroughly equipped for legislative work. His memory was most remarkable and he could draw on his wonderful store of knowledge of men and events without the slightest hesitation. Whenever he addressed himself to any subject of public interest he always commanded the rapt attention of the House, because every Member felt that Uncle Joe would throw real light and information on the subject under discussion. He never talked simply to be talking. He believed that the time of the House was too valuable to be wasted in idle chatter.

While an intense partisan of the old school, yet he was always so frank, so fair, and so disarming in his inherent honesty that he commanded the full respect of all of us who sat on the Democratic side of the House. When Uncle Joe was elected to his first term as Speaker, the brilliant and versatile John Sharpe Williams, of Mississippi, was elevated to the position of minority leader. Upon the end of the first day of the new Congress, John Sharpe called on the newly elected Speaker and, after extending his personal congratulations, observed, "Uncle Joe, now that you are our Speaker, I hope that during your incumbency you will always treat the Democratic side fairly and justly." Uncle Joe grasped the minority leader's hand and replied: "John Sharpe, I will be as fair and just as the exigencies of politics will permit me to be." Incidentally, there was never any interruption in the cordial personal relations between Uncle Joe and John Sharpe Williams, or his illustrious successor as minority leader, the greatly beloved Champ Clark, of Missouri.

It was my good fortune to come into close personal contact with Mr. Cannon, and the memory of that delightful friendship will abide with me until the end of time. I admired and loved him for his many kindly human qualities. He was the very soul of personal and political courage and integrity. While tenacious in his political opinions, knowing him as I knew him, I feel justified in saying that Uncle Joe never knowingly did an injustice to any human being. Broad in his sympathies and always tolerant in his views, he endeared himself to his legion of friends and commanded the respect and admiration of those who were politically opposed to him. "Of such is the kingdom of the heaven that I hope to inhabit."

DIGEST OF TESTIMONY—HOUSE HEARINGS ON $1,500,000,000 RELIEF PROPOSAL, APRIL 8–13, 1936

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt sent a message to Congress on March 18, 1936, requesting an appropriation of $1,500,000,000 for the continuation of the Works Progress Administration through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937. Hearings were held on this proposal April 8–13 before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

At the hearings, the principal witnesses were: Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator of the Works Progress Administration, and Daniel W. Bell, Acting Director of the Budget. The principal points of the testimony at the hearings will here be summarized with interpretative comment.

GENERAL STATUS OF RELIEF FUNDS

The funds requested are in addition to balances from the $4,880,000,000 appropriated last year for the works program, to be available until June 30, 1937.

Mr. Bell testified that when the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 was approved on April 8, 1935, $4,576,000,000 was actually available and the remainder had been used to repay transfers previously made to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration out of former appropriations. On March 31, 1936, all of this $4,576,000,000 had been allocated to specific projects with the exception of $68,000,000. Of the $4,508,000,000 that had been allocated, $3,466,000,000 had been obligated and $2,515,000,000 had been actually expended and thus on March 31, 1936, $2,061,000,000 was unexpended, of which $1,110,000,000 was unobligated. Monthly expenditures from this fund are being made at the rate of more than $229,000,000. Mr. Hopkins estimated that something over a billion dollars of the funds appropriated in 1935 for emergency relief would remain unexpended on June 30, 1936. Mr. Bell stated that he believed that approximately $1,780,000,000 would remain unexpended from funds appropriated by Congress during the period 1933 to 1935 for the purpose of relief.

It is to be noted that with the addition of the proposed $1,500,000,000 the administration would have nearly $3,300,000,000, the amount of the original N. I. R. A. appropriation in 1933.

In his message to Congress President Roosevelt estimated that there were at that time about 5,300,000 relief cases, of which 3,800,000 were being cared for by the works program and the remainder by the States. With all the funds available during 1937—the billion and one-half dollars requested, the unknown amount, exceeding $1,000,000,000, which will remain unexpended on June 30, 1936, from the $4,880,000,000, and the funds requested for the continuance of the C. C. C. and for the construction of regular Government public works—Mr. Hopkins estimated that only 2,843,000 relief cases could be taken care of through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937. He stated also that he did not believe that the relief load would decline during the next fiscal year.

He went on to admit that he did not believe the funds requested by the President would be sufficient to carry on the work-relief program during the fiscal year 1937. He also stated that it was his personal belief that additional funds would have to be requested from Congress for the continuation of the program to June 30, 1937. Mr. Hopkins estimated that 2,000,000 people could be given work relief for 1 year with the $1,500,000,000 requested by the President. The cost would then be approximately $750 per man. At another point in the testimony Mr. Hopkins stated that at the present time work relief under the W. P. A. was costing the Federal Government approximately $792 per year per man.

All of the new funds requested are ostensibly to be utilized for the Works Progress Administration. This was not true of the $4,880,000,000 appropriated last year which was earmarked by Congress for certain classes of expenditure. Only $1,363,926,901 of that sum was allocated to the W. P. A. For the continuation of relief through December 1935, $938,530,085 was allocated to the F. E. R. A. To the Public Works Administration $447,476,447 was given. The Resettlement Administration received $230,308,400 up to March 31, 1936. Five hundred million dollars was allocated for the construction of public roads and grade-crossing elimination. The C. C. C. received $527,479,450. The rest of the sum was allocated to numerous other agencies.

NEW FUND NOT EXCLUSIVELY FOR W. P. A.

Mr. Hopkins stated on a number of occasions that all of the funds requested would be utilized for the continuation of the W. P. A. But this is not accurate, as his testimony at another point in the hearings demonstrates. He estimated that $90,000,000, or 8 percent of the requested fund would be used for rural rehabilitation and direct relief to farmers. When pressed on this point he admitted that this money would be expended through the Resettlement Administration.

(His reticence in admitting that any of these funds would be used for the Resettlement Administration is founded on an obvious reason. If the President or Mr. Hopkins made an outright admission that part of this appropriation would be used for the continuation of the Resettlement Administration there would be a very good reason for calling Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell, the Administrator of the Resettlement Administration, to take the stand. Many Members of Congress, both Democratic and Republican, would like to see Mr. Tugwell put on the stand in an investigation. This does not seem to be desired by the administration leaders.)

The complete break-down of the proposed expenditure of this requested billion and one-half dollar fund is as follows: Highways and streets, 29 percent; public buildings, 11 percent; parks, 11 percent; public utilities, water supply, and sanitation, 12 percent; flood control and conservation, 9 percent; white-collar projects, 6 percent; women's projects, 6 percent; national youth administration, 5 percent; rural rehabilitation, 6 percent; and miscellaneous work projects, 5 percent.

In the absence of earmarking in the pending bill, Mr. Hopkins could allocate to the Resettlement Administration portions of the funds covered by other items in this break-down. Or, of course, for that matter, there probably would be nothing to prevent Mr. Hopkins from entirely disregarding this break-down in the expenditure of funds.

ALLOCATION AMONG STATES

When Mr. Hopkins was asked how W. P. A. funds had been allocated among the several States, he answered as follows:

> Of course, our wage rate varies in various parts of the country, depending in part on the cost of living. Therefore, that affects, of course, the amount of money in dollars paid in a particular State for the same number of people. It takes fewer dollars to take care of the same number of people in Mississippi than to take care of them in New York. You will find that we have a larger work program in one State than we have in another with the same population, the reason being that the degree of unemployment is greater and the degree of need greater in one State than in another. The program must be adjusted to need (p. 180).

This statement does not indicate the existence of any standards that can be used in allocating funds, as the following data show: Per-capita allocation of W. P. A. funds were as follows (selected States):

New York	$20.63
Virginia	4.83
Colorado	17.25
Utah	13.71
North Carolina	3.84

These States received the following per-capita total allocations under the act of 1935:

New York	$43.61
Virginia	23.69
Colorado	56.92
Utah	56.93
North Carolina	18.28

The Works Progress Administration has allocated $1,113,271,212 to more than 80,000 works projects. Local sponsors will contribute $254,790,522 for these works projects. Thus the local contribution will average about 18.6 percent. Concerning the method used in determining the contributions to be made by sponsors, Mr. Hopkins had this to say:

> Now, the extent of their contribution was determined by the type of work to be done, the financial condition of the local sponsoring agency, and the estimate of the locality's participation in other parts of the program. In that connection you could get a higher percent of contributions for one kind of work than you could for another. Our policy in securing local contributions was a policy of insisting that the local government put up as much as was reasonable. That varies, of course, in various places, and I have no doubt that some injustices were done as between one area and another and as between one State and another. We had to take into consideration the fact that one State had put up a lot of money for Public Works Administration projects. They had put up their money, whereas in another State they may have had no Public Works Administration projects, and consequently had put up no funds. We took all of this into consideration (p. 180).

Let us see what the picture is when the sponsors' contributions are considered by States. In Wyoming sponsors contributed 43 percent of the cost of all projects undertaken, whereas both in West Virginia and in the District of Columbia such contributions were only 8.2 percent. The figures for a few other States follow: Idaho, 40.6 percent; Georgia, 40.3 percent; Rhode Island, 34.1 percent; Vermont, 31.6 percent; and Kentucky, 30.8 percent.

Sponsors' contributions varied widely with the different kinds of projects. Twenty-six percent of the cost of sanitation projects was contributed by sponsors. On the following type of projects the sponsors contributed the indicated percentages: Public buildings, 22.5 percent; highways, 22.2 percent; parks, 11.4 percent; and goods (sewing, canning, etc.), 9.2 percent.

RELIEF STANDARDS NOT CLEAR

Supposedly the program under the Emergency Relief Act of 1935 is for the purpose of giving work relief to unemployed employables on relief. Mr. Hopkins admitted that he had no accurate information concerning the number of unemployed, the number of employables who are unemployed, or the number of people who are registered as being on relief at the present time. The determination of the question of who is and who is not to receive relief is left up to the States. The W. P. A. has not defined standards of what constitutes a person on relief, and no check is exercised over the States in determining who is and who is not to be put on relief. The determination of who is or who is not employable in the last resort is determined by the United States Employment Service or the United States Reemployment Service, which are Federal agencies. The formulation of standards to determine the employable character of a person then rests primarily with the Federal Government, but Mr. Hopkins admits that no such standards have been formulated. Concerning this problem he says:

> "Employability is largely a question of the economic condition of the country. That is, when times are booming, almost everybody is employable, then all of a sudden there is a depression and then a lot of people are unemployable and all big industries change their standards of employability. The question of determining who is employable and who is not is a very difficult matter, and I think strict regulations about employability do a real injury to a lot of the people who may have slight injuries—competent, able people" (p. 225).

Yet, in another place in the same hearings, after admitting a lack of data concerning the exact number of those on relief and the number of employables on relief, he asserted that 85 percent of the employables on relief in January 1936 were being taken care of through Federal work-relief projects. How did he know? Of the 3,763,334 persons being employed on the entire work-relief program, exclusive of administrative employees, 364,928, about 9 percent, were not taken from the relief rolls, and 8.4 percent of the pay roll on work-relief projects is being used to pay persons who are not on relief. During March the total administrative staff being paid from this relief appropriation was 144,095.

ACTUAL BENEFITS TO UNEMPLOYED NOT SHOWN

Mr. Hopkins at no point states the man-years of work that will be secured from the $4,880,000,000 appropriation. In fact, no data are presented in the hearings on which anyone could compute the number of men that could be put to work for 1 year with this sum. There are no data presented in the hearings from which a person could determine how much of this vast sum of money is actually being expended for work-relief purposes and how much is being expended for such visionary purposes as land purchases.

All persons who are given employment on work-relief projects must have been on State relief rolls during the month of November 1935. Mr. Hopkins admitted that there was no logic behind the setting of the November deadline for the determination of who should or who should not be given work relief, and that probably it should be revised.

ALIENS ON RELIEF

Mr. Hopkins also admitted that aliens were receiving work-relief jobs. He did not seem to be able to see anything wrong in this situation. He could furnish no data on the number of aliens who are employed under the work-relief program. He also admitted that aliens illegally admitted to the country were being employed, and he did not appear to believe that this was an undesirable situation.

PROPORTION OF W. P. A. FUNDS SPENT FOR RELIEF LABOR

To employ one man for a year under W. P. A. costs an average of $972, of which $600 goes to the man as wages, while the additional $372 goes for materials and supervision. The Federal Government pays for approximately $192 of this overhead and the local sponsors contribute $160. This means that approximately 38 percent of all funds expended under the W. P. A. program are spent for other purposes

than for the wages of persons on relief, and it should be recalled also that approximately 9 percent of the nonadministrative staff on all works projects are persons who are not on relief.

The average monthly rate of pay on work-relief projects under the W. P. A. varies from $72.23 in New York City to $23.93 in North Carolina. The average for the entire country is $50.06. The differences in monthly wage rates supposedly is determined by differences in the cost of living, but the monthly-wage rate in Connecticut is $64.33, in Rhode Island $56.93, and in Massachusetts $59.38. Mr. Hopkins at no place stated how the cost of living is determined. The average hourly rate of pay on work-relief projects is 41.6 cents. In New York City it was 65.2 cents, and for the rest of the country it was 38.4 cents.

W. P. A. FUNDS TO BE EXHAUSTED SOON

Of the somewhat over a billion dollars that has been allocated to the Works Progress Administration, approximately $371,000,000 remained unobligated and approximately $583,500,000 remained unexpended on March 31, 1936. The W. P. A. is spending approximately $191,000,000 a month. If it is to continue in operation until July 1 approximately $150,000,000 will have to be transferred from other funds to it, according to Mr. Hopkins—but it will probably be more than that. Mr. Hopkins asserts that all projects undertaken under the W. P. A. will be completed on that date, but he did admit that many projects, such as highways, would only be partially completed on that date.

When Mr. Hopkins was asked for information concerning politics in the administration of the Works Progress Administration he assumed the general attitude that he was not responsible for such circumstances, if they existed. He seemed to feel that he had done his part when he had written to the local administrators informing them that campaign contributions were not to be solicited from employees on work-relief projects. He did not seem to realize that inasmuch as all officials of the W. P. A. are Federal employees, and not State or local officials, he was directly responsible for their actions.

F. E. R. A. COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION

These hearings brought to light some evidence previously unobtainable relative to the administration of relief under the F. E. R. A. For the first time figures on administrative expenditures incurred by the States and the Federal Government for the administration of relief under the F. E. R. A. were made public. During the entire period of 1933 to 1935, 10.7 percent of all funds expended for relief went for administrative purposes. Administrative costs were lowest in the State of Vermont, where they only accounted for 5.4 percent of the expenditures. They were highest in South Carolina, where they were 18.3 percent. The figures for the following States may be of some interest: Georgia, 17.7 percent; Virginia, 17.5 percent; Kentucky, 16 percent; Maine, 6.1 percent; and Massachusetts, 5.8 percent.

The trend of relief as shown by the figures contained in the appendix to the hearings is of some interest. In July 1933 there were 3,908,068 relief cases. By January 1935 the number had increased to 5,273,472, and in June 1935 there were 4,530,852 relief cases. (It is interesting to compare these figures with the estimates of unemployment prepared by the National Industrial Conference Board. According to these figures there were 11,809,000 unemployed in July 1933; in January 1933 the figure was 10,340,000; and in June of the same year it was 9,092,000.)

The cost of relief per family increased tremendously during the period from the inception of the F. E. R. A. to the present time. The monthly payments per family in May 1933 were $15.15, and in January 1935 the figure was $30.45.

HOW MANY COULD BE CARRIED ON DIRECT RELIEF?

When Mr. Hopkins was asked how many families could be taken care of under direct relief for 1 year through the utilization of all funds available to the W. P. A., Mr. Hopkins estimated the number to be 3,226,800. In arriving at this estimate Mr. Hopkins stated that the average cost of relief per family per month during the last fiscal year was $33.66 (p. 177).

ALLOCATION OF F. E. R. A. FUNDS TO STATES

These hearings contain no additional data concerning the method of allocating funds to the States for the purpose of relief under the F. E. R. A. In fact the data contained in appendix F to these hearings, covering pages 375 to 418, does not give even as lucid an explanation of the matter as did Mr. Hopkins in his letter to the Senate printed in Senate Document 56, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

In the appendix to the present hearings it is stated on pages 396 and 397 that the following considerations determined the size of the relief grants that were given to the several States: First. The extent of the program currently operated by the States. This supposedly meant the relief program that a State was willing and desirous of administering. Second. The general administrative policy of the Federal Government toward relief; that is, whether the Federal Government believed it desirable to raise or lower the general standard of relief for the whole country. Third. The number of relief cases in each State. Fourth. The cost of relief per case in each State. Fifth. The nature of the relief program of the State; that is, whether the State was operating on the basis of direct relief only or on the basis of direct relief and work relief. Sixth. Seasonal factors; that is, relief costs are lower in warm weather than in cold. Seventh. Emergency situations, such as floods, earthquakes, strikes, and so forth. Eighth. Administrative considerations. In a few instances where the Governor or legislature of a State failed to make adequate funds available the F. E. R. A. temporarily withheld funds or reduced grants until the situation was remedied. Ninth. The total funds available for the Nation.

It should be noted that this statement does not indicate that the financial abilities of the several States were taken into consideration when relief funds were allocated. Relative to the determination of the financial abilities of the States, Mr. Hopkins made the following remarks:

> Now, it is patently the case that we do not pay the same percentage in all States, for simple reason that the per-capita wealth in one community that may have a great deal of unemployment may be very low, while the per-capita wealth of another community with the same amount of unemployment may be twice as much.
>
> Now, obviously, one community is more able to pay than the other. We have been unable to find any criterion by which you can determine accurately and scientifically what a community can or cannot afford to pay or whether they can afford to pay a higher percentage than they have been paying.
>
> We have simply acted on the basis of the best advice and information we could get. If you will look at the figures of the money that was distributed, you will find that the most dollars were distributed to places where there was the greatest unemployment and heaviest relief program. The argument always centered around whether the percentage that goes to a State is too high and not whether the number of dollars is too great (p. 151).

Obviously, with such a long list of factors to be considered in the allocation of relief funds, and in the absence of any objective standard to determine the relative weight to be given each factor, no scientific basis seems to have been used for apportioning the funds among the States. The wide variations in Federal apportionments per relief family among the various States suggest the possibility that funds were given out arbitrarily according to the wishes of the administration.

Mr. Hopkins repeatedly said that more money is now being secured for relief purposes from States and local government than was being secured several years ago, but during the first quarter of 1933 the Federal Government paid 58.4 percent of the total cost of relief, and during the first quarter of 1935 it was paying 77.8 percent of the total cost of relief.

TESTIMONY CONFINED TO W. P. A.

Throughout the hearings on the requested relief appropriation the members of the House Committee on Appropriations were greatly hampered by the fact that Mr. Hopkins alone was called to give evidence. He repeatedly took the attitude that he was only to give evidence on the administration of the W. P. A. and F. E. R. A. rather than to give data concern-

ing the administration of the entire $4,880,000,000 appropriation of 1935.

There were a number of occasions when members of the subcommittee requested information concerning the administration of the entire work-relief fund, but to the question of these members Mr. Hopkins gave answers only concerning the Works Progress Administration. For example, he was asked for information concerning radio broadcasts. To this question he answered that the Works Progress Administration had no funds for such purposes. He did not tell the members that funds had been allocated to the Office of Education for the purpose of developing a program of radio broadcasts in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps. It was also impossible to get from Mr. Hopkins data on the costs of work relief per man in agencies other than the Works Progress Administration.

The accompanying table compares the allocations from funds appropriated under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 with the relief case load in the several States for the month of June 1935—the latest obtainable complete figures.

It will be noted from the table that there are wide differences in the total amounts allotted to the various States per relief case in those States. Over $3,600 was allotted to Wyoming per relief case while in Pennsylvania $670 was allotted per relief case and in South Dakota $548 per relief case.

The allocation of funds only for W. P. A. as contrasted with allocations for all agencies indicates similar striking differences. Allotment was made to Maryland of $291 per relief case, $132 in South Dakota, $176 in Kentucky, while in New York $479 was allotted per relief case.

Allocation of funds under the Emergency Relief Appropriation[1] *Act of 1935, compared with relief cases by States*

State	Relief cases[2] June 1935	Total funds all agencies	Total W. P. A. funds	Total funds per case	W. P. A. funds per case
Alabama	83,832	$64,446,977	$17,421,545	$768.76	$207.81
Arizona	20,387	37,921,823	5,198,424	1,860.10	254.99
Arkansas	74,160	59,820,101	14,366,301	806.64	193.72
California	241,327	269,228,356	77,061,694	1,115.62	319.32
Colorado	62,889	58,961,687	17,863,127	937.55	284.04
Connecticut	42,310	38,996,427	14,026,505	921.68	331.52
Delaware	4,149	7,043,767	1,645,972	1,697.70	396.72
District of Columbia	18,603	24,488,834	6,594,933	1,316.39	354.51
Florida	64,747	60,158,797	14,789,117	929.14	228.41
Georgia	77,003	68,423,966	19,116,876	888.59	248.26
Idaho	20,776	39,711,106	4,862,907	1,911.39	234.06
Illinois	303,936	241,365,688	85,387,356	794.13	280.94
Indiana	114,857	86,566,102	40,040,009	753.69	348.61
Iowa	49,929	46,958,400	12,968,713	940.50	259.74
Kansas	79,935	56,029,798	16,327,388	700.94	204.26
Kentucky	107,556	62,851,211	18,949,291	584.36	176.18
Louisiana	64,051	53,820,041	17,052,315	840.27	266.23
Maine	22,169	26,947,502	4,743,244	1,215.55	213.96
Maryland	38,320	53,447,970	11,179,104	1,394.78	291.73
Massachusetts	186,528	149,407,527	50,670,372	800.99	271.65
Michigan	168,785	135,751,398	45,070,145	804.29	267.03
Minnesota	104,125	95,099,363	29,677,101	913.32	285.01
Mississippi	59,169	48,107,380	11,227,113	813.05	189.75
Missouri	146,826	98,882,133	32,557,031	673.46	221.74
Montana	26,257	55,152,689	7,365,238	2,100.49	280.51
Nebraska	44,404	49,019,832	10,206,349	1,103.95	229.85
Nevada	3,030	12,103,165	1,393,762	3,994.44	459.99
New Hampshire	14,322	13,978,178	3,589,440	975.99	250.62
New Jersey	157,092	120,792,564	45,386,890	768.93	288.92
New Mexico	30,868	39,822,407	5,556,104	1,290.09	180.00
New York	541,138	548,965,954	259,734,795	1,014.47	479.98
North Carolina	70,759	57,946,689	12,174,890	818.93	172.06
North Dakota	39,944	31,639,395	5,282,211	792.09	132.24
Ohio	323,178	221,539,879	91,018,680	685.50	281.64
Oklahoma	118,526	77,516,000	26,285,339	654.00	221.77
Oregon	30,035	41,951,111	8,970,389	1,396.74	298.66
Pennsylvania	473,040	317,721,910	123,431,402	671.66	260.93
Rhode Island	18,661	16,768,548	6,658,024	898.59	356.79
South Carolina	[3] 59,573	46,413,065	9,240,333	779.10	155.11
South Dakota	59,378	32,591,453	6,019,019	548.88	101.37
Tennessee	77,208	68,939,257	15,102,526	892.90	195.61
Texas	198,316	166,310,825	34,997,881	838.62	176.48
Utah	26,798	28,910,252	6,961,844	1,078.82	259.79
Vermont	8,410	15,879,899	2,146,025	1,888.22	255.18
Virginia	52,182	57,370,734	11,695,941	1,099.44	224.14
Washington	67,394	85,206,559	17,193,235	1,264.30	255.12
West Virginia	88,642	63,957,213	21,476,388	721.52	242.28
Wisconsin	107,250	98,307,120	30,697,576	916.62	286.22
Wyoming	7,282	26,750,498	2,798,526	3,673.51	384.31
Continental United States	4,800,056	4,173,989,570	1,334,179,370	869.57	277.95

[1] Data on allotments from House of Representatives hearings on first deficiency appropriation bill, 1936.
[2] Data from F. E. R. A. monthly report for June 1935.
[3] Includes some duplication of families or individuals who received relief under both the general relief and rural rehabilitation programs.

Assigned monthly wage rates of Works Progress Administration workers by States (excluding persons not assigned at the established monthly wage schedule) December 1935

(Average monthly wage rate by States)

United States	$50.03
Alabama	28.95
Arizona	49.65
Arkansas	26.40
California	59.83
Colorado	51.75
Connecticut	64.33
Delaware	48.47
District of Columbia	47.33
Florida	27.63
Georgia	26.63
Idaho	44.25
Illinois	54.20
Indiana	51.95
Iowa	49.42
Kansas	38.13
Kentucky	25.60
Louisiana	37.92
Maine	48.76
Maryland	45.75
Massachusetts	59.38
Michigan	54.87
Minnesota	55.95
Mississippi	24.33
Missouri	44.10
Montana	46.92
Nebraska	42.00
Nevada	46.95
New Hampshire	49.83
New Jersey	56.05
New Mexico	44.98
New York City	72.23
New York (excluding New York City)	60.90
North Carolina	23.93
North Dakota	44.35
Ohio	55.45
Oklahoma	26.75
Oregon	54.50
Pennsylvania	59.97
Rhode Island	56.93
South Carolina	26.22
South Dakota	43.80
Tennessee	28.38
Texas	30.40
Utah	51.45
Vermont	44.20
Virginia	29.80
Washington	54.82
West Virginia	41.15
Wisconsin	56.33
Wyoming	46.06

Estimated cost of Works Progress Administration projects selected for operation by States, through Mar. 16, 1936

State	Total	Works Progress Administration funds	Sponsors' contributions	Percent of total cost contributed by sponsors
United States	$1,368,057,734	$1,113,271,212	$254,786,522	18.6
Alabama	19,683,918	15,687,776	3,996,142	20.3
Arizona	5,771,483	4,352,860	1,418,623	24.6
Arkansas	15,976,209	12,161,166	3,815,043	23.9
California	85,137,622	68,041,733	17,095,889	20.1
Colorado	17,436,941	14,875,510	2,561,431	14.7
Connecticut	14,058,639	11,136,750	2,921,889	20.8
Delaware	1,360,316	1,136,544	223,772	16.5
District of Columbia	4,673,153	4,287,664	385,489	8.2
Florida	16,165,630	12,476,303	3,689,327	22.8
Georgia	26,537,625	15,840,011	10,697,614	40.3
Idaho	6,723,265	3,991,318	2,731,947	40.6
Illinois	82,160,762	69,928,044	12,232,718	14.9
Indiana	49,122,303	35,410,467	13,711,836	27.9
Iowa	11,407,847	9,229,220	2,178,627	19.1
Kansas	16,032,079	12,216,269	3,815,810	23.8
Kentucky	22,544,180	13,590,901	6,953,279	30.8
Louisiana	16,890,276	14,523,816	2,366,460	14.0
Maine	3,863,508	3,135,845	727,663	18.8
Maryland	10,068,852	8,452,551	1,616,301	16.1
Massachusetts	51,797,401	40,045,680	11,751,721	22.7
Michigan	42,977,812	36,344,331	6,633,481	15.4
Minnesota	26,307,722	23,218,322	3,089,400	11.7
Mississippi	10,576,469	8,706,484	1,869,985	17.7
Missouri	32,218,306	26,306,488	5,911,818	18.3
Montana	7,090,638	5,991,359	1,099,279	15.5
Nebraska	8,609,935	6,738,730	1,671,205	21.7
Nevada	1,539,808	1,177,183	362,625	23.6
New Hampshire	3,512,347	2,579,575	932,772	26.6
New Jersey	44,657,624	36,785,129	7,872,495	17.6
New Mexico	6,535,212	5,203,237	1,331,975	20.4
New York	248,043,259	217,201,632	30,841,627	12.4
North Carolina	10,887,215	8,648,890	2,258,325	20.6
North Dakota	4,198,935	3,413,975	784,960	18.7
Ohio	99,616,912	82,129,771	17,487,141	17.6
Oklahoma	27,104,106	22,743,015	4,361,091	16.1
Oregon	8,289,194	6,701,085	1,568,109	19.2

Estimated cost of Works Progress Administration projects selected for operation by States, through Mar. 16, 1936—Continued

State	Total	Works Progress Administration funds	Sponsors' contributions	Percent of total cost contributed by sponsors
Pennsylvania	$132,899,672	$114,521,621	$18,378,051	13.8
Rhode Island	7,956,102	5,241,075	2,715,027	34.1
South Carolina	11,472,069	7,197,166	4,274,903	37.3
South Dakota	6,109,207	4,571,896	1,537,311	25.2
Tennessee	16,055,700	11,542,780	4,512,920	28.1
Texas	38,687,252	29,331,412	9,355,840	24.2
Utah	7,966,923	6,000,569	1,966,354	24.7
Vermont	2,451,043	1,677,245	773,798	31.6
Virginia	10,080,626	8,726,173	1,354,453	13.4
Washington	18,290,089	14,746,286	3,543,803	19.4
West Virginia	18,759,489	17,225,512	1,533,977	8.2
Wisconsin	34,068,639	23,980,666	10,087,973	29.6
Wyoming	3,683,420	2,099,177	1,584,243	43.0

Allocation of funds provided under Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935

State	Total all agencies	Total per capita	Total W. P. A.	W. P. A. per capita
Alabama	$64,446,977	$24.35	$17,421,545	$6.58
Arizona	37,921,823	87.06	5,198,424	11.93
Arkansas	59,820,101	32.26	14,366,301	7.75
California	269,228,356	47.42	77,061,694	13.57
Colorado	58,961,687	56.92	17,863,127	17.25
Connecticut	38,996,427	24.27	14,026,505	8.73
Delaware	7,043,767	29.55	1,645,972	6.90
District of Columbia	24,488,834	50.30	6,594,933	13.55
Florida	60,156,797	40.97	14,789,117	10.07
Georgia	68,423,966	23.53	19,116,876	6.57
Idaho	39,711,106	89.23	4,862,907	10.93
Illinois	241,365,688	31.63	85,387,356	11.19
Indiana	86,566,102	26.73	40,040,009	12.36
Iowa	46,958,400	19.00	12,968,713	5.25
Kansas	56,029,798	29.79	16,327,388	8.68
Kentucky	62,851,211	24.04	18,949,291	7.25
Louisiana	53,820,041	25.61	17,052,315	8.11
Maine	26,947,502	33.79	4,743,244	5.95
Maryland	53,447,970	32.76	11,179,104	6.85
Massachusetts	149,407,527	35.16	50,670,372	11.92
Michigan	135,751,398	28.03	45,070,145	9.31
Minnesota	95,099,363	37.09	29,677,101	11.57
Mississippi	48,107,380	23.94	11,227,113	5.59
Missouri	98,882,133	27.25	32,557,031	8.97
Montana	55,152,689	102.59	7,365,238	13.70
Nebraska	49,019,832	35.57	10,206,349	7.41
Nevada	12,103,165	132.92	1,393,762	15.31
New Hampshire	13,978,178	30.04	3,589,440	7.71
New Jersey	120,792,564	29.89	45,386,890	11.23
New Mexico	39,822,407	94.07	5,556,104	13.13
New York	548,965,954	43.61	259,734,795	20.63
North Carolina	57,946,689	18.28	12,174,890	3.84
North Dakota	31,639,395	46.47	5,282,211	7.76
Ohio	221,539,879	33.33	91,018,680	13.69
Oklahoma	77,516,000	32.35	26,285,339	10.97
Oregon	41,951,111	43.98	8,970,369	9.41
Pennsylvania	317,721,910	32.99	123,431,402	12.82
Rhode Island	16,768,548	24.39	6,658,024	9.68
South Carolina	46,413,085	26.69	9,240,333	5.31
South Dakota	32,591,453	47.04	6,019,019	8.69
Tennessee	68,939,257	26.35	15,102,526	5.77
Texas	166,310,825	28.55	34,997,881	6.01
Utah	28,910,252	56.93	6,961,844	13.71
Vermont	15,879,899	44.16	2,146,025	5.97
Virginia	57,370,734	23.69	11,695,941	4.83
Washington	85,206,559	54.50	17,193,235	11.00
West Virginia	63,957,213	36.99	21,476,388	12.42
Wisconsin	98,307,120	33.45	30,697,576	10.44
Wyoming	26,750,498	118.59	2,798,526	12.41
Administrative expense in Washington, D. C.	37,332,795		4,117,415	
Not allocated to specific States	233,778,758		25,630,116	
Continental United States	4,445,101,123	36.21	1,363,926,901	11.11
Alaska	3,621,137	61.09		
Hawaii	9,062,614	24.60		
Panama, Canal Zone	700,000	17.74		
Puerto Rico	48,738,159	31.57		
Virgin Islands	1,189,252	54.03		
Territories and possessions	63,311,162	31.14		
Grand total	4,508,412,285	36.12	1,363,926,901	10.93

Data from House of Representatives hearings on first deficiency appropriation bill, 1936.

EULOGY TO THE MOTHERS OF AMERICA

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein my personal eulogy to the mothers of America, National Mother's Day being May 10 next.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, May 10, will be the Mother's Day, and, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my personal eulogy to the mothers of America:

Perhaps the most important and widest-reaching of all influences which constantly bear upon us in this world are those which arise from the nature and relationships of our home. A combination of instincts and circumstances, some of which we hold in common with the lower animals and some of which are higher and quite peculiar to ourselves, make a home essential to our well-being and happiness. And it is home that has given unto us the goddess of love on earth, "Our Mothers." Home is the central spot on earth about which lodge three-fourths of the pleasant or sorrowful memories of life. The tendrils of the youthful heart wrap themselves around it so tightly that even the shock of years or the deadening strain of distance cannot pull them away. And there was never a home but what was spun from the gorgeous fabric of motherhood. There is no other such charmed word in the English language as that little word "mother." There is no other song that can thrill the soul with such magnetic power and can so surely melt the stony heart to tears as that song of life which has an unwritten melody in the heartstrings of us all—that song which mother sang in the crooning lisp to a babe upon her knee. God, in all His infinite majesty, sought out a monument on earth never to be destroyed by selfishness; He patterned his structure after His own beauty reflected in the garden of roses; He painted it with the iridescent colors of the mirrored lake at sunset overcome with its own serenity and reflecting the diadems of heavenly stars as they glitter their jealous sparkle into its bosom of softness.

He touches its finished texture with the sweetness of Mary Magdalene, and then to set it apart as the earthly masterpiece of things humanly divine, he added patience, kindness, and love, and no man shall ever put asunder amid humanity's afflicted masses, this monument of God erected on earth in the form of "Mother." And what is this motherly patience of which I speak? It is the angels who sit by man, holding out a full bowl of life's rich contentment. And what is this motherly kindness? It is the pleasant words, the gentle smile, the loving forethought which mothers never fail to lavish upon us and which overcomes despair to make life a dream of happiness. And motherly love—that something which knows no depth, no faltering, no conquering; that tenderness of care born of the heavens above; that pureness of care that rides the juggernauts on life's tempestuous sea as though on the calm of even'tide—in short, that which only a mother can give.

My mother, your mother, our mothers—God bless them all—sweet mother, kind mother, whose unjeweled hand smoothed the sweetness of baby fingers; whose sweet, tender voice was alike unto the echo of evening zephyrs hallowing the environment of home; with eyes in whose clear depths the love-light shone; soft, brown hair just threaded with silver, lying smoothly upon her cheek; dear old wrinkled hands, worn with toil, gently guiding our tottering steps in sickness; even reaching out in yearning tenderness to when her sweet spirit was baptized in the early spray of the river of hope. Ah, perhaps you who are listening to me, cherish with me the memory of the mother who has gone on to her great reward—a memory that floats to us now like the beautiful perfume from the flowered dells of our Southland. The music of other voices may be lost, but the entrancing memory of hers echoes to our soul forever.

Hundreds of stars in the silent sky,
  Hundreds of shells on the shore together,
Hundreds of birds that go singing by,
  Hundreds of bees in sunny weather,
Hundreds of dewdrops to greet the dawn,
  Hundreds of lambs in the purple clover,
Hundreds of butterflies on the lawn,
  But only one mother the wide world over.

And it seems so sad that human frailty causes such a serious neglect of appreciation of the living mother. I am wondering if you whose mothers are either by your side or elsewhere are fully cognizant of the tide of motherhood that is ebbing slowly but surely away—if you have considered the truth as it is, that she is the living friend who knows no end to save and sooth your pain; that bouquets and love baskets will best meet your hopes and wishes now while she might inhale the sweetness of their odor and bathe in the parental joy of your thoughtfulness? Give her that soft and caressing kiss that she so yearns for. Feed her upon the daily thoughtfulness that she so richly deserves but which most of us so negligently and carelessly fail to give her. Give her a moment of your time to listen to the sweet reminiscences of your early childhood which she holds so dear to her heart. Put aside the selfish ideas that only one day in the year is Mother's Day, because I tell you religiously that when the soft steps of her sacred feet shall have faded from earth and the shadows of death shall have enveloped her precious earthly soul, there will never be a day in your life but what will be filled with stern grief over the loss of your mother, because, when all is said and done and she has gone on to the Father of us all, you will find that—

You've lived to learn that friends grow weak
When trouble marks you for its own—
The ones you love oft turn aside
And leave the fight to you alone.

And, in the words of another:

When mother has gone, your supplications will be offered fourfold, only to find them too late.

I've stood on many scenes of strife, I've stood where care and pain assailed; and tho friends often turned away, yet, mother's hand has never failed.

As in childhood far removed, she smoothed my brow and dried each tear, still in young manhood's troubled hour with loving words she hovered near. Oh, fickle love and friendship false; Oh, glittering dreams and hopes bewailed, you weakened in life's darkest hour, but mother's love has never failed. Whatever God shall choose to do with this frail tenement of clay; whatever use he finds for it along life's dark and dreary way, that much shall be a monument to tell mankind, wher'er assailed, a mother's love, a mother's prayers, a mother's hand has never failed.

And how mortally true are these words—how many times when the tempter lures us on has the memory of that sacred hour, that mother's words, her prayers, saved us from plunging into the deep abyss of sin. Years have filled great drifts between her and us, but they may not take from our sight the glory of pure, unselfish love. And as I have said before, other faces may fade and be forgotten, but her's shall shine on until the light from heaven's portals will glorify our own. When the fitful pauses of busy feet wander back to the old homestead and cross the well-worn threshold, stand once more in the low, quaint room, so hallowed by her presence, how the feeling of childish innocence and dependence comes over us and we kneel down in the molten sunshine streaming in at the window covered by the morning glory, just where long years ago we knelt down by our mother's knee lisping:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. BUCHANAN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2591), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all points of order against the bill be considered as waived.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask a question. Just exactly what does the gentleman have in mind in asking that all points of order be waived? Does the request apply also to any amendment that may be offered to the bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It would not apply to any germane amendment. The request simply waives all points of order against any provision in the bill and the bill is to be considered under the general rules for the conduct of business in the House.

Mr. SNELL. The request applies to nothing further than what is contained in the bill at the present time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is an appropriation bill and the request is very unusual. It would be a bad precedent to establish, and I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I will reserve the objection, but unless some good reason is given I shall object. A precedent is being set with respect to an appropriation bill which would make it impossible to raise a point of order if there was anything in the bill that would be subject to a point of order, and in this connection let me call attention to the fact that the bill has just been made available to the Members and there are over 2,000 pages of hearings which no one has had an opportunity to read and I do not think we should waive all points of order against something that no one has any information about except the members of the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that we are trying to expedite the consideration of the bill as much as possible consonant with its intelligent consideration. We propose to be liberal in debate and to sit until midnight tomorrow night if necessary.

Of course, objection to waiving points of order on the bill will cause a rule to be brought in and consume that much more time. To refuse to waive them will not accomplish any good purpose, but will simply cause that much more trouble.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman mind stating the irrelevant matter in the bill that you will have to sustain by a rule?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will state to the gentleman some of them. I do not know that I can state all of them, but I may say that the principal one is with respect to relief. There is no law authorizing an appropriation for relief and this provision would be subject to a point of order. This item amounts to $1,425,000,000.

Then, there is an item of $65,000,000 for public buildings throughout the United States and every congressional district will probably get one of them. There is no authorization of law for that and on a point of order this item would go out of the bill.

The Civilian Conservation Corps paragraph is subject to a point of order and there is a number of smaller things in the bill not so important. If points of order were made and sustained under the rule there would be no use in reporting the bill.

Mr. MAPES. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. MAPES. As I understand it, the granting of the gentleman's request will have no effect whatever on amendments which may be offered outside of the provisions in the bill. The regular rules of the House will still prevail and amendments that are not in the bill will have to be germane if points of order are raised against them.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. That was stated in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. If that is all there is to it, I shall withdraw my objection, but I do want it understood that in the future I shall object to any waiving of points of order, especially on bills of which the House has no information. The majority has the votes and the power; any objection on my part could accomplish nothing but would take up time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what is the total amount to be appropriated in this bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Less than $25,000,000 of actual deficiency.

Mr. RICH. We have just now received the hearings and bill under discussion, which I hold in my hand. This is the first opportunity Members of the House have had to know anything about this bill. It seems to me the chairman of this committee and the membership of the House should know something about the bill at least a day before they bring up appropriation bills and ask the membership to pass upon them, especially one appropriating over $2,000,000,000.

I do not think it is within rhyme or good reason or good sense to do things the way we are doing them. Then the gentleman asks us in 2 days to consider and pass a bill appropriating more than $2,000,000,000. I do not think we ought to do these things in this way. The Members of this House should have such a bill at least 1 week previous to its consideration, in order to study its contents; not a bill appropriating $2,000,000,000 given us 10 minutes before its consideration on the floor. The largest business in the world, the United States Government, conducting itself in very poor business procedure. Why, Mr. Speaker, do we do it?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I simply want to say that it is not conceivable to me that Members would object to relief appropriations or public works mentioned here. If that is the only two points that are waived, it is inconceivable to me that the waiver is necessary.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes. And pending that, I would like to fix the time for general debate.

Mr. TABER. I suggest 7 hours' general debate confined to the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 7 hours, confined to the bill, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill. Pending that he asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 7 hours, to be confined to the bill, and to be controlled equally by himself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Is there objection?

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask the gentleman from Texas whether if there is to be a roll call on the bill the vote may take place on Monday next.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have no authority to do that now, but I have no objection to such an arrangement.

Mr. PARSONS. Several Members are away who will be back on Monday.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, if we happen to reach a final vote on this bill Friday night and the previous question can be ordered on the bill, as far as I am concerned, I have no objection to its going over until Monday to take the vote.

Mr. TABER. Or a final vote on a motion to recommit, provided the previous question is ordered.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12624, the deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. McCORMACK in the chair.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who will relieve me somewhat because of my physical condition.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the bill (H. R. 12624) now being presented to the Committee of the Whole, is very comprehensive. It covers a great many subjects and appropriates a lot of money. However, in the years that I have served on the Committee on Appropriations I have never known a bill to receive more careful deliberation, consideration, and scrutiny than the one we bring to you today. In spite of the fact that our beloved and distinguished chairman has not felt well, he has labored long and hard in the preparation of this bill, oftentimes over the protest of his colleagues, and he would probably be down here now explaining the bill to you had it not been for some of us insisting that he keep his seat. Also, the minority of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON], have attended the sessions of the subcommittee and have interrogated the witnesses. They have scrutinized the requests for appropriations in connection with this bill. We bring you comprehensive and voluminous hearings, 2,000 printed pages, which I believe will show that the subjects have been gone into very carefully. I say this merely as a prelude to this proposition, that we ask you to give consideration to the fact that your committee, minority as well as majority, brings you the result of their deliberations and consideration.

Very likely during the course of the bill there will be differences of opinion about certain items in the bill, but the issues have been narrowed. The facts are here, and the evidence is here, and you gentlemen will be the arbiters.

I do not want to consume a lot of time. It would be very easy to discuss this bill all afternoon. It has broad ramifications and covers many subjects. I shall hit the high spots, what I think to be the major items, and then endeavor as best I can to answer any questions that may be propounded.

The total Budget estimates sent to us for this bill amounted to $2,388,088,980.91. We bring you a bill totaling $2,364,229,712.53, after having deducted $23,859,268.38 from the estimates. Perhaps that does not seem to be a very great reduction in so large a total, but when you consider the fact that approximately a billion and a half dollars in one lump sum is the item for relief, that something like another half billion dollars goes for the social-security program, and over three hundred million for the C. C. C., I feel that we have made substantial reductions in the bill at points where it could and should be reduced. I call attention to the further fact that although this is called a "deficiency" appropriation bill, yet the real "deficiencies" carried in the bill are something like 1 percent of the whole amount, or less than $25,000,000, the remaining items being for the Tennessee Valley Authority, public buildings, and for regular

Federal activities. The following table gives a bird's-eye view of the estimates and appropriations:

Purpose	Budget estimates	Amounts recommended	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with Budget estimates
Works Progress Administration (1937)	$1,500,000,000.00	$1,425,000,000.00	−$75,000,000.00
Emergency Conservation Work (1937)	246,000,000.00	308,000,000.00	+62,000,000.00
Social Security:			
Social Security Board (1937)	195,800,000.00	187,800,000.00	−8,000,000.00
Treasury Department (1937)	270,831,860.00	270,831,860.00	
Public Buildings, Treasury Department:			
Outside the District of Columbia (1937)	53,350,000.00	63,350,000.00	+10,000,000.00
Within the District of Columbia (1937)	7,700,000.00	2,200,000.00	−5,500,000.00
Tennessee Valley Authority (1937)	43,000,000.00	39,900,000.00	−3,100,000.00
Post Office Department (40-hour week and increased business) (1936)	40,581,250.00	40,506,250.00	−75,000.00
All other purposes (supplemental amounts for 1936 and 1937 and deficiencies for 1936 and prior years)	30,825,870.91	26,641,602.53	−4,184,268.38
Total	2,388,088,980.91	2,364,229,712.53	−23,859,268.38

I shall talk now for a few minutes about the Works Progress Administration, because that is the largest item in the bill, and I have an idea it will be one of the items which will engage your interest during the consideration of the bill. The President's request for this appropriation was for a billion and a half. The committee brings it to you $1,425,000,000, and the reduction of $75,000,000 was occasioned in this wise: It will be recalled that there was a great deal of interest manifested when it was announced that a reduction in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps would be made about the 1st of April, and that many Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, were interested in seeing that part of the recovery program continue as long as possible. After conferences it was agreed that the President should allocate to the C. C. C. program a certain sum of money which would carry them along during the remainder of this fiscal year, and that there would be supplied in this bill an additional $62,000,000 to bring the amount up from $246,000,000 to $308,000,000, which would continue the more than 2,000 camps, with 350,000 enrollees, during 9 months of the next fiscal year. So we have carried here the additional $62,000,000 for the Civilian Conservation Corps for the 9-month period, which will give an average of 2,066 camps during that period, with an enrollment of 350,000.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does that mean the 9 months immediately succeeding June 30 next?

Mr. WOODRUM. It is the first 9 months of the next fiscal year.

Mr. MAY. And that begins June 30?

Mr. WOODRUM. That begins July 1. It runs from then to March 31, 1937.

Now, let me say this about the camps. We are all interested in the camps, but bear in mind that the entitlement to enrollment in the camps is that the enrollees be taken from the relief rolls, and you will find in your districts now that the camps are having a great deal of trouble keeping up their enrollments. So we feel that under this appropriation the camp work will be carried on as far as it is possible to carry it out for enrollees, so long as we keep strict entitlement to enrollment, which I think every Member approves.

So much for $62,000,000 of that $75,000,000 reduction. The Budget estimates provided for $50,000,000 for the regular public-works program under the Procurement Division. That is to say, these types of public buildings provided for which are built upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General. You will find in the hearings two lists of projects. One list totals about $59,000,000 and the other about $58,000,000. Under this bill the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, acting jointly, have a right to select from these combined lists public-building projects in the United States, to the amount carried in the bill. I say the Budget estimate called for $50,000,000. We believe it would take at least $60,000,000 to carry forward that program—that is, the regular building program—and provide as near as possible one building project for each congressional district, bearing in mind always, of course, that the congressional district would have a qualified building project that was logical and needed and appropriate. So we put $10,000,000 on to that $50,000,000, raising that to $60,000,000 for that building program, and we took that $10,000,000 from the $1,500,000,000 relief fund.

That brings us to the $1,425,000,000 for relief. Statistics vary as to how many people are unemployed. Under this program it is estimated that during the next fiscal year the Works Progress Administration will be able to keep an average of approximately 2,000,000 at work. Let me direct your attention to this: We should do well to bear this fundamental fact in mind as we consider this bill, or as we consider any possible question of ear-marking funds: I believe we all agree that the Federal Government should withdraw from the field of relief as quickly as possible, and that it should be left to communities and localities just as speedily as they are able financially to take care of the load. There is no difference of opinion about that. The President of the United States is just as heartily in favor of that as any Member of the House or any citizen of the Nation. Therefore, the relief funds asked in this bill are to take care of one particular group, the destitute unemployed. When I tell you that the entitlement to get jobs under W. P. A. is that the person shall be upon relief rolls, you will answer that we penalize a group of citizens who have not applied for relief but who need jobs just as much as somebody else. That is true. That may be said in testimony to the patriotism and courage of that person who has not applied for relief, but bear in mind that it is the duty of a citizen not to apply for relief unless he has to do it.

While it is true that there may be people upon the relief rolls less deserving than some one who has not applied for relief, the fact remains that the man who is not on relief has been able to swim so far. The only yardstick, the only measurement you could possibly have as to the people who need it most—and that is what we are trying to find, the group who must have it—and unless they do have relief of some sort they are going actually to suffer, is the relief rolls that have been established by the communities, the cities, and the counties.

Let me say to you that when some constituent tells you he does not approve of the Federal program for relief because he knows Bill Jones down in some part of your district is on relief and he has no business to be there, you may answer by saying, "If that is true, it is not my fault. It is the fault of that community, because they put him there." The Federal Government so far has not undertaken in any sense to prescribe the entitlements for this relief. The people who are on relief are put there by the authorities, the associations, and organizations of the particular communities wherein they reside. Why? Because logically they are the ones, the friends, neighbors, and fellow citizens, are the ones who are best able to determine who is deserving of relief. So there is no way you can work out a program or a formula to find these people who just must have assistance, unless you leave it to the local authorities. Even then you will find people sometimes on the outside more deserving than those who are on relief.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Right on the subject which the gentleman is discussing is a matter of vital importance in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps organization. It has been

known for some months that some of the camps were about to be retired for the reason that they were not able to fill their quotas. I believe, and I think each community would appreciate it, if it was made possible for them to employ in the camps what are known as "locals." That is, men who are idle without employment and not on the relief rolls, just the class the gentleman has been discussing, but who are not within the age limit. In that way you keep them from ultimately going on the relief rolls.

Mr. WOODRUM. Answering my friend, I want to say that the Federal Government wants to close the camps just as soon as it can be done; as soon as the need for them ceases to exist they should be closed. We could, of course, devise some formula to keep them open. We could relax the rules, but I want to say to my distinguished friend from Kentucky that once you relax the rules that a person has to be on relief to get in a camp, then your trouble begins, for any citizen in the gentleman's district who has an incorrigible boy he would like to get placed in some job for the summer will come to the gentleman and ask him to get him in. The gentleman will reply that it cannot be done, but his constituent will point to the fact that John Smith's boy got in, and he was not in need of it. Then the gentleman will come back at him with the statement that "it will only take a certain number of boys to bring up their enrollment to capacity, and we cannot get your boy in."

I may say to my friend that this situation has been given very careful thought. Neither the E. C. W. nor the President thinks this rule ought to be relaxed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman made the statement that local authorities were responsible for the type of people on relief. Does the gentleman mean by "local authorities" these social workers sent in by this relief administrator? Are they the "local people" who determine who shall go on the relief rolls?

Mr. WOODRUM. Nobody dictates to anybody who shall be put on relief, I may say to my friend from Idaho. He knows the situation—that in each community there is a committee of the welfare society oftentimes or the mayor's committee, whoever it is, a local committee passes on qualifications for admission to these relief rolls. Oftentimes they do take on social workers, who go in and assist them; but, after all, it is the local people of the community who determine it; the Federal Government does not do it. We have never done that. If there is a single person on a single relief roll who should not be there he is there because his friends and neighbors have countenanced the fact that he is there; it is not the fault of the Federal Government.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. What would be the status of a person who has been dropped from relief because of shortage of funds? What would be his status under the present law and under this bill?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is the very question, I may say to the gentleman from Oregon, that I asked Mr. Hopkins, during the hearings, and he will find in the hearings that very question brought up.

The gentleman will recall that the relief rolls were frozen about November of 1935. Undoubtedly cases of the character the gentleman suggests have arisen since then, cases where very deserving people are in urgent need. Mr. Hopkins stated to our committee that if these additional funds are appropriated it is the intention of his administration to make a careful study of that, and, in some measure, relax that rule so as to add to the rolls cases which have arisen since that arbitrary date on which the present relief rolls were frozen. I believe the situation will be reached, and that these very deserving cases will be cared for.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I notice in this bill there are additions for salary for the Department of Agriculture, $200,000; the Bureau of the Census, $200,000; for salaries and expenses, buildings and grounds, District of Columbia, $2,041,090; and increases for various other departments. Despite the remarks made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that Budget estimates were one thing, but what Congress appropriates is another, I wonder if the gentleman's committee has gone to the bottom of things to know whether these requests from the departments are absolutely necessary.

Mr. WOODRUM. I may say to the gentleman, answering generally, because his question is general, that the committee has gone into each departmental item carefully, as he will find from the hearings. In one department here the administrative expenses are reduced $8,000,000, or 20 percent, for the next fiscal year. This should gladden the heart of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I have the most profound respect for my friend the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], gentlemen from both sides of the aisle, who wield much power in the Committee on Appropriations, because I know they stand for economy; but, even so, these departments make such extravagant demands that I sometimes wonder whether we ought to give them anything more this year, whether we ought not make them get down to real bare-bone economy in the operation of their departments.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. I wonder whether when the Relief Administrator was before the committee, the committee ascertained what would happen to these people who are now on relief, and by reason of the forced reduction in relief rolls occasioned by the scarcity of funds, whether or not those people who were taken off of relief by reason of that fact would be prejudiced when they attempted to return to the relief rolls when more funds are made available.

Mr. WOODRUM. I understand what the gentleman has reference to, but I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma that the relief rolls are being restricted and contracted in every county and in every State and in every municipality. With the approval of the Federal Government, the relief rolls are being carefully scrutinized and are being purged as fast as possible of those not needing relief, not only for the purpose of getting people off the relief rolls but in order to offer an additional inducement and incentive to private industry to take up the unemployed load. In other words, we are getting out of it just as fast as we can.

The specific question was whether a person taken off the relief roll may be prejudiced in coming back. I gave the answer to that question a few moments ago to another gentleman that the Relief Administration is trying to revise and revamp its rules with reference to the relief rolls in order to take in this group of people in the most equitable manner possible.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PARSONS. On page 9 there appears an item of $400,000 for the Federal Communications Commission. May I ask the gentleman if any part of that $400,000 will be used to pay more than $3,600 a year to an attorney for the Commission, the $3,600 a year being the maximum amount paid attorneys for investigation committees at this time?

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman is asking whether any part of the $400,000 appropriated for the A. T. & T. investigation will be used to pay attorneys more than $3,600 a year?

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; I imagine it will be used for such purpose. They have a list of attorneys who are receiving more than $3,600 a year; and, of course, this $400,000 will be used to take care of the pay roll. I am not debating whether that investigation should go on or should have been started in the first place, because we have started it, and it is going on. The Communications Commission have their attorneys sitting across the table from the best lawyers in the United States, the highest priced counsel of the country, and the gentleman from Illinois knows we cannot get lawyers to

represent the Government at $3,600 a year who would have the ability, experience, training, and background to cope with these high-priced gentlemen.

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman will remember that the House decidedly defeated a bill that was brought in here sometime ago which would have appropriated $10,000 to pay an attorney for about 6 months' work.

Mr. WOODRUM. That had to do with an attorney for a special investigating committee of the Senate, and I do not think the situation is comparable to this at all.

Mr. PARSONS. This is to be used for the same purpose as provided in that bill which was defeated?

Mr. WOODRUM. No. This is an investigation of great magnitude by an executive organization, as the gentleman knows, and I may say it is showing some signs of accomplishing a great deal.

Mr. PARSONS. In order to get this thing straight, the $400,000 then is not to be used for the purpose of furnishing money or funds to cover the proposition involved in the bill that was brought in here a few weeks ago?

Mr. WOODRUM. Not at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman has made some remarks concerning relief rolls. I have received complaints, and I think every Congressman has, from parties who claim they have been removed from the relief rolls or have not been placed upon the relief rolls and requesting my assistance. As I understand it, the matter of determining who goes on or who goes off the relief rolls is not determined by a Federal agency. That is done by either a State agency or a local agency and the Federal Government has nothing to do with that matter. In other words, we simply contribute to the various States our pro-rata part of the funds as we do in connection with funds used for highway purposes, and then the State authorities determine the matter from then on.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Referring to the question of the gentleman from Illinois, I merely wanted to say that the limitation of expenditure of $3,600 per annum to employees of investigating committees applies only to the contingent fund of the two Houses and not to the agencies of the Government generally.

Mr. STUBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. STUBBS. May I make an observation with reference to the C. C. C. camps and the young men in my district? Seven young men came to my office and I took them down to see if I could get them placed. Because their parents were not on the relief rolls they were not permitted to get these jobs, even though some of them were the sons of widows. My objection is the rules and regulations that are placed upon these young men make it impossible for them to secure the jobs when the jobs are there, and my objection further goes to the administrative department that makes such rules and regulations. I think this Congress should take some notice of that very thing.

Mr. WOODRUM. May I say in answer to the gentleman that I believe he has not entirely taken into consideration the fundamental purpose of the Civilian Conservation Corps? It is not to provide jobs for people; it is not to provide jobs for estimable young men, but has one particular purpose, and that is where a family is on relief and it has a young man within the age limit, instead of giving the family cash, it permits the boy to go to work and have a useful employment and $25 a month of the funds to go to his family. Every Congressman here has had the experience that my friend has just related. There are fine young men in the community who have gotten out of school, or who have not anything to do. Time is hanging heavily on their hands, and in many cases, perhaps, the family needs the added revenue of a few dollars a month, but the family is not on relief. Somebody in the family is working, and they have been able to keep away from relief. Under those circumstances the boy cannot get into a Civilian Conservation camp. Now, that is the rigid, strict rule that the President inaugurated when he set up these camps. It is that fact that has kept the C. C. C. clean and above any scandal which we might have had if we had opened the door wide so that boys could have been jammed into the camps by some Congressmen picking them out and putting them in there.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Did the gentleman's committee give any consideration to the need for a direct relief appropriation to care for those who are on relief but who could not get work because the work funds are not sufficient and who are in just as great need of relief as those who did get work?

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman refers to the billion and a half. The billion and a half is to give work to the destitute unemployed as far as we can take care of them.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. But it will not.

Mr. WOODRUM. No; it will not; but I want to say to the gentleman that some reference has been made to earmarking this fund. If there is any criticism of the one and a half billion, it is that it is not enough. We hope it is enough, and we are going to try to make it do, because we are trying to get out of the business. We are trying to close up shop as soon as we can and not cause reputable and honest American citizens to suffer too much. We are trying to pull away from it as fast as this can be done. The billion and a half will not give jobs to all the destitute who are now on relief, but it will go as far as it can—and bear in mind that every dollar you take away from this fund and put into something else, you are keeping some man from getting a job who does need it and needs it worse than the other fellow.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. For instance, in my district, there are at least three or four thousand on relief rolls who are qualified in every way and cannot get work because the funds are not sufficient. If we cut off direct relief, they are outside the pale of all forms of public relief.

Mr. WOODRUM. If this billion and a half does not reach them, then I will say to my friend from Colorado that the State government and the municipalities will have to assume the burden.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. What developed in the hearings as to the plan of the Works Progress Administration with respect to projects that cannot be completed by June 30 next? Do they plan to carry on and finish these projects?

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman means June 30 of this year?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. The W. P. A. has just about enough money to run until the end of this fiscal year, and, of course, we are hopeful this appropriation will pass and permit them to go ahead. They figure they will spend this money in the next fiscal year.

Mr. RAMSPECK. But the question I have in mind is whether or not they will continue with projects that are uncompleted or whether such projects will have to be resubmitted and acted upon again.

Mr. WOODRUM. My understanding is they will continue with uncompleted projects as long as the relief load in such community requires them to keep it up. Of course, these projects are conducted on a cooperative basis with the local communities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Virginia 10 minutes more.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Virginia yield for a brief question in that connection?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. This appropriation will also enable the directors in the various districts to embark upon new projects that have already been approved?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; certainly.

Mr. PARSONS. Where the relief load in the community is sufficient to furnish the labor.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is correct.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think we could discuss with profit and clearer understanding for quite a little longer period this one particular matter, but I want to make this statement to my colleagues. I commend to your consideration the hearings before our committee on the Works Progress Administration or the relief item. I ask you to look at the record, and in this connection I want to make a confession. I want to say to you that, like a good many citizens and like a great many Members of the House, I went into this hearing as a member of the committee very skeptical of the program as it was being conducted by the Works Progress Administration; but I believe I voice the sentiments of the members of the committee, or certainly most of them, when I say that that Administration came before our committee with a clear, frank, and open disclosure of its activities, gave all the information requested without evasion or any effort to conceal anything and frankly admitted shortcomings and failures and frailties that may have beset their activities, and, as one member of the committee, when the hearings were concluded I came to the conclusion that the Works Progress Administration was doing the very best job it could in a very bad situation for anyone to handle under any circumstances. I ask you to read the hearings. There is the record.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had an hour to discuss with you the boondoggling propositions in the W. P. A. There are about 100 or 150 projects in the W. P. A. that have been singled out by the critics of the program in newspapers and by speeches and held up to ridicule. Of course, many of them seem utterly ridiculous and indefensible. Some of them, no doubt, are indefensible. There are between 100 and 150 of such projects. They affect probably 2,000 people out of nearly 3,000,000 people employed. If all of them were bad, if all of them were indefensible, and if each one of them had been thrown overboard and not undertaken, they would constitute one-seventeenth of 1 percent of the program, or one-seventeenth of 1 percent of the 170,000 projects carried on by the Works Progress Administration.

When you look at the matter in this light, it is so small and so infinitesimal that it is not worthy of consideration. When you look at the larger proposition and consider the fact that this program has actually put to work between two and three million people, who needed employment, you will see that it has met the load that had to be carried, and I say to you that I feel it has done a good job on the whole.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. CARPENTER. I realize there have been a good many criticisms and various aspersions cast upon the Relief Administration and upon Mr. Hopkins, and I regret that there have been a great many on this side of the House, and by certain members of the Democratic Party, but I wish to say that I believe Mr. Hopkins has had the hardest job of any one in the United States, not excluding even the President of the United States, and that all in all he has done a mighty good job. Most of these boondoggling projects have been advocated and promoted by the local communities and they are the ones that should bear the blame if any blame or criticism is due on account of them.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am glad the gentleman made that statement. Nearly all of these projects were sponsored by and paid in part by local residents.

Mr. CURLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. CURLEY. I want to call attention to the fact that the word "boondoggling" was coined originally in an investigation by the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York in 1935. It was in connection with rhythmic dancing under the administration of the city of New York.

Mr. WOODRUM. I thank the gentleman for the contribution.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman says only one-seventeenth of 1 percent is a very small matter. I am reading from the hearings:

> Mr. THURSTON. The Reedsville project was definitely turned down by Congress, but funds were allocated to that project in the face of that action by Congress.
>
> Mr. WOODRUM. That was a relatively small proposition.

Was there no policy involved there?

Mr. WOODRUM. I have said that mistakes have been made, but the gentleman from Massachusetts does not understand the situation. The gentleman is one of the group that wants 100-percent perfection.

Mr. GIFFORD. We are "too damned dumb."

Mr. WOODRUM. I would not put it that way.

Mr. GIFFORD. The man that the gentleman is defending did.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am not defending anybody. If the gentleman will read the hearings——

Mr. GIFFORD. I have just received the hearings.

Mr. WOODRUM. Well, read them tonight. Harry Hopkins was put on the stand and grilled by both minority and majority members, and asked for statement after statement.

Mr. GIFFORD. And made a statement one day and changed it the next.

Mr. WOODRUM. Nothing of the kind. There is no justification for a statement of that kind.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am glad the gentleman denies it if it is not true.

Mr. WOODRUM. It is not true. I have had an opportunity of hearing the witness and the gentleman has not. There was not a question by which Harry Hopkins was embarrassed at any time or where he refused to give a fair, honest, and definite answer. I do not say that you have to approve everything he does. The gentleman from Massachusetts belongs to that class that requires 100-percent perfection. According to his philosophy, if one-seventeenth of 1 percent is wrong, then the whole thing should be condemned.

The theory of those who criticize seems to be, if you make a mistake on a few boondoggling projects, all the rest is wrong. We, of the administration, admit that we are human and that we as human beings are liable to err. We do claim that we are trying to administer honestly and courageously and effectively.

But let us pass on. Another large item in this bill is for the Social Security Act, which appears for a full fiscal year for the first time. The Budget estimates for the Social Security Board amounted to $195,800,000 for the next fiscal year. That sounds like a large amount of money. It is a lot of money. Of that total $157,000,000 is for grants to States. Twenty-three million dollars of the $195,000,000 is for administrative expenses. The committee cut that to $18,400,000. Fifteen million eight hundred thousand dollars was the Budget estimate for securing the initial wage-record data of the beneficiaries of old-age benefits, which, of course, is the first step in that program, a step that almost staggers the imagination in its magnitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take this time. It is as hard on me as it is on the Members here, but I think this explanation should be made. This

list, it is estimated, will comprise 26,000,000 people. It is a gigantic undertaking. Our committee, without any partisanship, looked into the matter as carefully as we could and we made a 20-percent reduction in the administrative expenses. That is a substantial cut. And I say with deference to the members of that board that they took it on the chin. They believe that we have not given them enough money, but they are going ahead with what we have given them. If they need more later, that can be considered.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. Did the gentleman say that there would be twenty-six-million-and-odd beneficiaries of the Security Act?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is in connection with old-age benefits under title II.

Mr. MOTT. But there are not more than half that many in the United States who are over 60 years old.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is under title II of the act—the old-age benefits.

Mr. MOTT. There are only 10,000,000 people in the United States over 60 years of age, and our present Social Security Act takes care of only a fraction of those, and how could there be 26,000,000 people involved?

Mr. WOODRUM. I think the gentleman does not understand the provisions of title II. That is the Federal old-age benefit scheme. Taxes are imposed upon employers and employees with a view to building up a reserve fund for the payment of old-age benefits commencing in 1942. No one is eligible until he reaches age 65, but the taxes are based upon wages and commence July 1, 1937, and continue until the wage earner reaches 65. It will be a big preliminary job to take the census and get the initial information concerning everyone affected by the title. This title should not be confused with other provisions of the act that have to do with grants to States for old-age assistance under State law.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I have been under the impression that the administration of the Social Security Act in all its phases was under the jurisdiction of the State, and I am wondering why it is necessary, if that is true, to have such a large Federal Board.

Mr. WOODRUM. Title II, old-age benefits, is entirely a Federal project.

Mr. MAY. But the other features of the bill are all under the States.

Mr. WOODRUM. But the Federal Government must supervise the administration of the State plans after they have been approved to the extent of seeing that they conform to the requirements of Federal law. The total appropriation for the social security in this bill is $458,631,860. We did not make any cut in the grants to the States for old-age assistance, unemployment compensation, dependent children, or aid for the blind. We feel that perhaps in some instances the amounts were pretty liberally allowed; but, after all, if the States cooperate and comply, the money must be provided; and if they do not, the money will not be spent. So there will be no point in making an arbitrary cut in that item. We do make a cut of 20 percent in the administrative costs, which, after all, is where we have to try to save the money.

There is one other large item in connection with social security which comes under the Treasury Department. That is an appropriation of $265,000,000, which is the estimated amount of the first annual premium for payments required under title II of the act, to be placed in the old-age reserve account and to be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury for the account. The amount appropriated is based upon calculations made in connection with enactment of the Social Security Act. It is estimated that a sum adequate to provide this appropriation will be realized from the taxes imposed under title VIII of the act. The estimated collection of such taxes for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1937, is $305,000,000. Making an allowance of $40,000,000 for administrative expenses, leaves the figure of $265,000,000 as equal to the amount appropriated for the old-age reserve account for the fiscal year 1937.

I think the House will be interested in the itemization of the various appropriations on account of the Social Security Act in this bill. I will insert a table giving a recapitulation of them:

Social Security Board, salaries and expenses	$18,400,000
Grants to States for old-age assistance	85,000,000
Grants to States for administration of State unemployment compensation plans	29,000,000
Grants to States for aid to dependent children	35,000,000
Grants to States for aid to the blind	8,000,000
Securing and maintaining wage records for old-age benefits (nonrecurring)	12,400,000
Total	187,800,000
Treasury Department:	
First increment for old-age reserve account	265,000,000
Salaries in connection with maintenance and development of the old-age reserve account	31,860
Collection of taxes under titles VIII and IX by the Bureau of Internal Revenue	5,800,000
Total	270,831,860
Grand total, Social Security Act	458,631,860

I do not want to consume any more time. I have taken more than I intended already.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. And that has reference to the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. The Federal Government, the gentleman says, does not assume responsibility in the picking of employables. Will the gentleman tell us about the ruling that went from Washington on having to be on the relief roll in November in order to get a job. Was not that an edict from Washington?

Mr. WOODRUM. Oh, yes; to that extent it had the effect of freezing the relief rolls as of that date, but it has never undertaken to say who would be entitled to be on relief rolls. If more people were certified from relief rolls than could be employed on a project, the W. P. A. would exercise a judgment as to which of those certified would be employed. But that is all.

Mr. GIFFORD. But they undertook to say that unless they were on relief rolls in November they could not get a job.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is true.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Is this total for the Post Office Department, forty-million-six-hundred-thousand-and-odd dollars a customary amount for a deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. WOODRUM. Twenty-three million dollars of that is on account of the 40-hour law that was passed; the necessity for additional employees because of the 40-hour law. That law became effective October 1, 1935. This is the first appropriation made for that purpose. The rest of it is salaries for postmasters, costs of transportation, and additional employees on account of increased business. There has been a great acceleration in post-office business and that is a good omen of the progress of recovery.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. How did the committee arrive at the figure of $85,000,000 for grants for old-age pensions?

Mr. WOODRUM. It is figured out on the basis of the number of States that have qualified. Twenty-nine States have plans already approved for participation. Based on plans submitted but not yet approved and based upon sessions of legislatures that are expected to pass cooperative laws this winter, this $85,000,000 is the best calculation that can be made this far in advance. It is a pure estimate.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I figured out that only about 416,000 persons would get $15 a month.

Mr. WOODRUM. Sixty million dollars might have been enough, or it might take $100,000,000. We thought that $85,000,000 would be about the right amount. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I am only going to discuss the Works Progress appropriation item in this bill. Whatever I have to say on other items in the bill I will say as the items are reached when the bill is read. I propose to have something to say with reference to the Tennessee Valley operation, because I believe that needs considerable attention. I propose to say something about several other smaller items in the bill.

With reference to the action of the committee and the report on the bill on the question of social security items, I would say that with reference to the allotments to States and the appropriations which are required to be made for the set-up for reserves, which were described by the gentleman from Virginia, I do not see how there is any possible way of disturbing those items. Undoubtedly there will be demands for most of the funds, if not all of them, that are set up in the social security appropriations with reference to allotments. Of course, the item for reserve is an item which no one can tell about, but it is based upon estimates of the Treasury Department, largely, with reference to the amount of taxes that will be received.

With reference to the administrative expenses there is one thing to say. I think the committee has been a little liberal; but it is a new agency, and with the 20 percent below the Budget estimates on operating expenses, probably that is as well as we can do for the time being. I am in hopes that when they take their census they will take it on a basis which costs much less than the $12,400,000 which has been allotted to them.

With reference to the Works Progress Administration appropriation, those of you who have a copy of the bill in front of you will find this item on page 21. It authorizes, roughly, the use of the whole of the $1,425,000,000 for relief, or it authorizes the expenditure of not to exceed 15 percent above a definite figure which is named in the bill for different projects.

For instance, for highways, roads, and so forth, $413,250,000.

For public buildings, $156,750,000.

For parks, $156,750,000.

For public utilities, including sewers, water supply, airports, and transportation facilities, $171,000,000.

Flood control and other conservation, $128,250,000.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. What is contemplated being used in the regulation to describe "other conservation" besides the flood control? The bill reads "and other conservation."

Mr. TABER. I do not know. No one has told us.

Mr. PARSONS. What do the hearings disclose in that connection, if anything?

Mr. TABER. The hearings disclose that $45,000,000 was to be used for water conservation. Page 142 of the hearings deals with that particular subject, and the item is particularly expected to be expended in the Mountain States, such as Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, California, Oregon, the Dakotas, Montana, Texas, and Oklahoma. We have a big program of this character in Oklahoma. Those are local projects in contradistinction to the big national project, the whole idea being to raise the water level in all of those drought States.

Mr. PARSONS. There is nothing in the hearings to indicate that any part of that would be used for reforestation as a means in aid of flood control?

Mr. TABER. Nothing that I can remember.

Mr. PARSONS. Would this language, "other conservation", prevent this fund being used under the terms of this bill for the acquisition of forestry lands and reforestation as an aid in assistance of flood control?

Mr. TABER. I do not think it would. I think it would be possible to do that.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. May I say it would probably embrace soil erosion; the different methods of dealing with soil erosion.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman think it would embrace the methods of handling soil erosion? Frankly, I do not. I had never heard of that. I asked them to tell us what it would do, and that is what I got. I did not know that that was involved in this particular item.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. Where the gentleman was reading it gives $85,500,000 for rehabilitation and relief to farmers.

Mr. TABER. I have not gotten that far yet. The last item I read was "flood control and other conservation, $128,125,000."

White-collar projects, $85,500,000.

Women's projects, $85,500,000.

Miscellaneous, $71,250,000.

National Youth Administration, $71,250,000.

Rural rehabilitation and relief to farmers, $85,500,000.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman tell us in some detail what this money is to be used for, if it is to be turned over to Mr. Tugwell?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MAVERICK. Is that going to be just turned over to Mr. Tugwell or is it going to be for real assistance to farmers?

Mr. TABER. I think this is going to be turned over to Mr. Tugwell. Frankly, I do not know any other way it can be done, or else Mr. Hopkins is going to take over the Tugwellian activities with reference to that subject. We were not told in the hearings, frankly.

Mr. MAVERICK. How much has Mr. Tugwell had annually; does the gentleman know?

Mr. TABER. I do not think he has had anything annually. Mr. Tugwell has had for the resettlement outfit out of the big appropriation of 1933, $23,000,000; out of the appropriation of 1934, $3,000,000; out of the appropriation of 1935, $227,900,000. This, in effect, cuts him down to $85,500,000. I do not know, frankly. There are several items that can be used for the Tugwellian activities. The resettlement activities can be carried on under two or three different items.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The chairman of the committee just advised me this morning, in answer to a question, that there were no funds here that could be used by Mr. Tugwell for resettlement.

Mr. TABER. But there are. This item for public buildings could be used on what they call the resettlement activity, $150,750,000. This item for miscellaneous projects, $71,000,000, could be used for that. It would have to be under the direction and supervision of the Works Progress Administration, but Tugwell could be designated to take charge of it. There is nothing in the world to stop it.

Mr. MAY. And the Administrator of the Works Progress Administration would have power under this bill to allocate it to Tugwell or any other bureau he wanted to?

Mr. TABER. He could put Tugwell in charge of it, certainly; there is no question about it. Frankly, I expect to offer an amendment when we get to that stage to prevent any funds being used for the effectuation of these foolish projects.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Just a question about white-collar projects, $85,500,000. Would this cover such activities as the one known as Federal project no. 1? I have received many letters asking about that activity.

Mr. TABER. I do not know what Federal project no. 1 is, but it would cover eurythmic dancing, and it would cover this Baedeker book that the wife of the publicity agent of the Soviet Embassy has charge of, which has cost very nearly $3,000,000 and on which about 5,000 people are working.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Can the gentleman say whether it covers music, painting, and the arts?

Mr. TABER. It does.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. It is for that classification of activities?

Mr. TABER. Yes; but it might be used for other projects, too; it might be used for bookkeeping, accounting, auditing, checking up on income-tax returns, almost anything.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Is that an increase or decrease for this activity?

Mr. TABER. Oh, it is hard to tell. I would say there was not much difference.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. Even though specific items are mentioned in the bill I do not think there is anything under this heading "Works Progress Administration" that prevents this whole fund being turned over to Mr. Tugwell.

Mr. TABER. Nothing would prevent its being turned over to him any more than designating the amounts to be used by any particular type of project; but Mr. Tugwell could be put in charge of the whole performance, so far as that goes.

Mr. CHURCH. Not even a dollar could be spent for these special items?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes, and I shall be obliged not to yield during this time because there are a few things I want to say myself.

Mr. Chairman, beginning in 1933 when the Roosevelt administration came in, there commenced a direct control over relief expenditures, a direct Federal control over every operation of every Federal contractor. There has been appropriated for relief, exclusive of credit agencies in that time, $11,732,000,000.

Of this amount, in all probability about $1,200,000,000 to $1,300,000,000 will be left unexpended on the 1st of July. This estimate, of course, is more or less guesswork, and it might run up or down a couple of hundred million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the gross national debt as shown by the daily Treasury statement at the present time is $31,425,000,000. The Federal guarantees amount to $5,000,000,000. The bonus liability is $2,500,000,000. This makes a total national debt of $38,928,000,000.

The deficiency for the current year to date is $2,637,000,000. The estimated deficiency for 1936 is $6,000,000,000. At the present time there are approximately 22,000,000 persons dependent upon relief and relief employment, with a national deficit rolling up and a national expenditure for relief of three and a half to four billion dollars. The number of Federal employees on the Federal roll has gradually increased until at the present time there are 800,000 under the civil service, which does not include the numerous other agencies.

Mr. Chairman, the whole situation is a delicate one. That amount of national debt disturbs me, and it disturbs every thinking American. This should not be a partisan question. It should be a matter of American patriotism. [Applause.] Unless we get to the point where we can reduce the expenses of the Government to the point where we can meet our bills by the taxes collected we will soon get to the end of our rope, and that day will come at some time when most of us least expect it.

Frankly, I do not believe we can afford either the W. P. A. performance or any P. W. A. performance to provide employment. I do not believe that carrying folks on relief is half as demoralizing as putting them to work on these W. P. A. projects where they are supported by their shovels all day, just as that crowd is over there in front of the Supreme Court Building at this moment. The Members may go over there and look. They do not have to take my word for it. I do not believe we can pay out from $1,000 to $1,200 a year, and that is what the hearings show it costs for these W. P. A. employees, when, as a matter of fact, we can take care of a relief case for an average of $33 per month or approximately $400 per year.

This Federal contribution to relief under Federal direction has been completely demoralizing. In some States no contribution is made at all. In one State it amounts to less than 1 percent, and in 13 States to less than 10 percent. Efficient relief cannot be had in any State unless that State contributes enough toward the relief so that it will be interested in seeing that the relief money is honestly and efficiently spent. I hope it may be possible for the Congress to appreciate these problems and to realize that regardless of our desire for buildings, regardless of our desire to have fine structures and fine roads built in our respective districts, we cannot afford to go on with this P. W. A. relief or work employment for the poor people at the rate we are doing.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. If every Member of this House will just cross the Capitol grounds here and go to the Congressional Library and look at that W. P. A. job over there, which has been going on for 2 weeks, and observe that army of lazy, indifferent colored men standing on the handles of their shovels all day long doing nothing, they would get disgusted with the whole W. P. A. work.

Mr. TABER. It is completely demoralizing.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; it is completely demoralizing. They are doing nothing. They are lazy and indifferent and will not work when they have work to do.

Mr. TABER. It destroys any pride they may have.

Mr. BLANTON. I have been watching them for 2 weeks in going back and forth to the House Office Building.

Mr. TABER. That is the existing situation. When the proper point is reached in this bill, I am going to offer an amendment which will turn this money over to the States with the provision that they contribute a reasonably decent amount, the work to be administered locally by people who know the local situation, who will be required to do it honestly, and will be interested through a legitimate, reasonable, local contribution. Let us see if we cannot cut down this terrific expense of relief.

I do not see any other way out of the matter. This demoralizing work is worse than no work at all. This terrific expense puts heavy taxes on the people and demoralizes and prevents an increase in employment. In spite of the terrific taxes which have been imposed in recent years, industry has added a million men to its rolls in the last 2 years, and this in spite of every discouragement to business and industry. Why can we not give industry and the workingmen a chance?

Mr. Chairman, let us give the workingman a chance to look forward to a coming day when again the skilled workmen may receive $40 to $50 a week for his work instead of being on a dole or a dole job at $10 or $12 a week.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, when the House of Representatives passed the Social Security Act, every Member of the House believed that act meant that where a State provided payment of $15 a month pension to its aged citizens, 65 years of age or over, the Federal Government would match the sum and pay, through the State, an equal amount of $15, so that each pensioner would receive $30 per month. That was understood by every Member of the

House. If I am incorrect, I yield to any Member to say he or she did not so understand it.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. As I understand the gentleman's statement, it is with the limitation that the States would comply with the provisions of the Social Security Act.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. Now, after some of the States have changed their constitutions and are providing to pay their $15 per month, a new ruling has been made. For instance, Texas on August 24, 1935, had a State-wide election and changed its constitution by an overwhelming vote to pay a pension of $15 to its citizens 65 years of age or over, to match a like sum of $15 to be paid through it by the Government. Now, in Washington they have construed that to mean every State must pay $30 and then be reimbursed $15 by the Government. Inasmuch as the State of Texas is authorized to pay only $15 per month, under such ruling, it would be reimbursed only $7.50 by the Government, and instead of the aged people getting $30 per month, as was intended by Congress, they will receive only $15 per month, unless this Congress rectifies the matter by passing a proper amendment.

Now, is there a Member of the Congress here on the floor who understood there was to be any such interpretation as this? No; we all believed it would be a question of 50–50, $15 from the State and $15 from the Government, with such $30 paid by the State, and we ought not to allow this interpretation to stand.

Mr. PIERCE. What is the difference?

Mr. BLANTON. There is just this difference, I will say to my friend. The State of Texas, thinking that this was the proper interpretation, passed a constitutional amendment authorizing a payment of only $15 per month. It does not authorize a payment of $30. The State cannot pay a pension of $30 and then get $15 back from the Government, because the Constitution does not authorize it, but that is what the Government is demanding of the State, and after passing a constitutional amendment whereby the State has authorization to pay $15 a month, the Government now says that the aged people of Texas will get only $15 a month, $7.50 from the State and $7.50 from the Government, paid through the State, because the Government will pay the State of Texas $7.50 of the $15 it pays to its people.

This is a fraud, not only upon the people, but a fraud upon the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment, I will yield.

I understand the Ways and Means Committee is arranging now to bring in an amendment to cover this question and provide for a proper interpretation, that where a State has arranged lawfully to pay a pension of $15, the Government will come in and furnish its $15 in accordance with the understanding of the membership of the Congress. This matter ought not to be delayed. The provision ought to be brought in by the Ways and Means Committee right away and passed and signed and become a law before we adjourn.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. In view of the gentleman's rather broad question to all the Members and the fact I asked him to yield before, I may say I did not fully understand the gentleman's position when I asked him to yield before. The question which the gentleman is now discussing has been considered by some of my colleagues and myself, and I understood the matter at the time, I will say to the gentleman, as the Federal authorities are now interpreting the law—that is, that the Federal Government would contribute one-half of what the States gave, or reimburse the States one-half of what they paid out in old-age pensions, up to $30 a month, but not that they would match the amount that the States gave. This was my understanding of the law.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am sorry, but I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman addressed a broad question to the Members of the House and should yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that the few minutes I have remaining will not permit my yielding. There is one other matter that I wish to discuss.

ALIENS HERE UNLAWFULLY MUST NOT TAKE WORK FROM NEEDY AMERICANS

There has been a careful check-up by various organizations in the United States in behalf of American citizens, and it has been ascertained that there are in the United States right now at least three and a half million aliens who are here unlawfully and ought not to be here. Of this number there are at least 400,000 unlawful aliens who have been getting relief and who are now taking work under W. P. A. and under P. W. A. jobs all over the United States that American citizens are entitled to and should fill.

There is not another government in the world that would permit this except the United States. Great Britain will not allow an alien to hold a job as long as one of its nationals is without a job. The Government of France will not allow an alien to hold a job in France as long as one of its nationals is without a job. The Government of Germany and the Government of Italy will not allow an alien to hold a job as long as one of their nationals is without a job. Our country is the only one that will permit aliens to be cared for in this way when there is an American citizen wanting the job that the alien holds.

There is going to be an amendment offered from the floor to stop this, and the amendment will provide that no alien who has come here unlawfully since 1924 shall get paid out of the $1,425,000,000 provided in this bill.

I hope to see this amendment passed unanimously. Our friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] is going to offer the amendment. I am going to vote for it. It is a good amendment. It is an American amendment and one that ought to pass. The idea of taking care of aliens who have come here from other countries unlawfully when American citizens who were born here and whose families have lived here for generations are without work and with wives and little children starving! It is infamous to think of it. We ought to pass such an amendment without any hesitation whatever, and I hope there will not be a vote against it in this House. Such an amendment should become the law.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Reverting to the Social Security Act, my State has made provision for an appropriation or expenditure of $7.50 to be matched by the United States Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Then your State will get only $3.75 from the Government, and you will be able to pay only $7.50 monthly pension to your citizens unless we pass an amendment. If that is the provision of law in your State, the old-age pensioners in your district will receive only $7.50 per month and your State will get back from the Government only $3.75 on each of them.

Mr. SPENCE. Is that the ruling they have made?

Mr. BLANTON. That is the ruling, but it is not what was understood by the membership of this House.

Mr. SPENCE. No; it is not.

Mr. BLANTON. And it ought to be straightened out right away. The people of this country are entitled to have the will of their Congress put into effect and not misconstrued or misinterpreted in this way.

Mr. SPENCE. It was not understood in that way by the people of Kentucky.

Mr. BLANTON. No; it was not.

Mr. SPENCE. Because since that time they have amended their constitution so that they could make the necessary appropriations.

Mr. BLANTON. Everyone here so understood it, and the entire debate indicated there would be a matching by the Government of the $15 provided by the State, though paid through the State. It was said here a hundred times on this floor that the State would give $15 and the Government would

give $15, all paid through the State, which would make up the $30 monthly pension to our aged people.

The Ways and Means Committee should bring in a provision which should be passed by unanimous consent to straighten this out.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of clarifying the RECORD and to relieve the apparent apprehensions of my colleague from Texas.

If there is any misapprehension of the Social Security Act, it is not due to ambiguity or lack of clarity in the act. There is nothing in the language of the act which with the wildest stretch of the imagination would allow the people of Virginia to believe that if they paid $15 the Federal Government would pay $15, that whatever Virginia paid they would match it with an equal amount.

It is unfortunate if some States have adopted a constitution under a misapprehension or changed their constitution under a misapprehension, for I do not believe that there are many Members on the floor who had a contrary understanding if they paid any attention to the debates at the time.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAPES. This is a matter which has been discussed between some of my colleagues and myself. Did the gentleman speak advisedly when he said the Federal Government would match the allowance of the States?

Mr. WOODRUM. Reimburse the States.

Mr. MAPES. My understanding was that if the State agreed to pay $10 a month or $5 a month, or any amount up to $30, the Federal Government would contribute one-half of the sum, or reimburse the State to that extent.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is correct.

Mr. MAPES. But not that the Federal Government would match or duplicate the amount of the State contribution——

Mr. WOODRUM. The Federal Government would reimburse the State 50–50 up to $30 a month.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. I agree with the gentleman entirely. That is my understanding of the law. Does not the gentleman believe, in view of the fact that Texas and perhaps some other States have changed their constitutions under an apparent misunderstanding, it would be easier for the Congress to change the law so that it would conform to the constitutional provisions of the States? I think we should do that at this session.

Mr. WOODRUM. I quite agree with that, and I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means can find a way to have it carried out in the way that Congress desired, but I don't think it is fair to say that any arbitrary decision of the Security Board or somebody else has altered the will of Congress.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. KENNEY. Under the ruling is a State required to pay every month, or could it pay every 6 months?

Mr. WOODRUM. The Federal Government advances to the States on a quarterly basis on the basis that they furnish data as to what they are paying on old-age assistance on a monthly basis.

Mr. KENNEY. The State must pay out every month?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is my understanding.

Mr. KENNEY. They could not pay out 1 month for 2 months?

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not think so. It is on a monthly basis.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want it understood that my remarks this morning will be made in the performance of my duties as a member of the Committee on Expenditures. As the ranking man on that committee, I feel that it is my responsibility to help the minority members of the Committee on Appropriations. They, however, have had somewhat the advantage of me. I cannot get my committee to function.

This report came out only this morning. The latter part of it consists of tables. I have been able to skim over fairly well the rest of the report in order to get the gist of it. This will be a difficult vote for me next Monday, after the criticisms which I now expect to make and the feeling I have about it, but it is the only relief bill that we will have brought here. I recognize the problem of relief, and I want to vote adequate money therefor, and in consequence I shall probably vote for this measure. But do not misunderstand me; do not think that is any surrender of my viewpoint on the manner in which relief has been, or should be, distributed. I have often spoken on these relief measures; and if any of us dare to criticize, our words are often misinterpreted and purposely so. The opponents will take one brief sentence out of our remarks and without further explanation use it for political purposes. I realize how dangerous it is to talk about relief, but my position here will not allow me not to do so.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who spoke for the committee today, said that he was won over after listening to Mr. Hopkins; that Hopkins had a hard job and boondoggling represented only one-seventeenth of 1 percent—too small to talk about. And the Reedsville proposition—that is also a small matter, too small to talk about! He was not asked regarding resettlement, about which I have much material which I ought to have time to read. It is an unfortunate thing that we have to search through all these periodicals and newspapers to get information which we have reason to believe to be authentic, because we cannot get it from the officials themselves, who ought to have appeared before my committee. I should like to have had Mr. Rex Tugwell before my committee to explain about resettlement matters. Perhaps he would win me over, as Harry Hopkins won over the gentleman from Virginia.

Then the gentleman tells me that I have not read the report and do not know anything about relief. Come into my office and let me show you my scrapbooks, gotten together over a period of 3 years and consisting largely of editorial criticism and general information telling of the failures which you yourselves now acknowledge. I took the floor here and suffered the weariness of the struggle for the truth concerning that C. W. A., which you are now only too anxious to forget. Then you switched to the F. E. R. A., but after a year of that you were again anxious to change the whole policy. It did not work either. Now you have the W. P. A., and Harry Hopkins told you there was no politics in it. You apparently fell for that, apparently believed it, and you did not question him very much about it after he had stated, "I will put into the record here the results of our investigations." Then you dropped the subject. You say that he did not change his opinion from day to day. Why, he had to. Questioned from day to day as to how he arrived at allocating the money to the different States, he was obliged to change his statements. After 3 long years of experience, 3 long years, you are no nearer to knowing how to spend the money than you were at the beginning. But no advice is wanted. Why did you set on that committee and let him tell you there was no politics in Pennsylvania or in New York? At least one gentleman from Pennsylvania—a real Democrat—will talk about this. There are going to be a few Democrats here who will have the courage to stand up and show where, even in the matter of nominations as between Democrats, the relief rolls were used to defeat candidates. We have such an abundance of that sort of thing that Harry Hopkins' words here are but a hollow mockery.

After 3 long years what I am particularly interested in is the policy of handling funds for relief.

An amendment will be offered that half of this money be given over for direct relief. That is becoming the really approved method of using such funds. Change the present policy. It does not work. I deeply regret that our Committee on Expenditures has not been permitted to function. It

is not the policy of this administration to have expenditures investigated. The matter is left wholly with the overworked Appropriations Committee, which has but little time for it. Their business is to look into future appropriations. We have to rely on getting our information from other sources, perhaps you think in devious ways. Although General Johnson's report was suppressed, I will quote what now seems to be admitted as true. General Johnson says they purloined his report. Somebody stole it. What a pity that you have to steal reports regarding public business!

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield for a moment?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. With reference to the question of whether or not the Appropriations Committee went into the question of relief carefully, I call attention to the fact that the hearings number 490 pages, and they consumed a number of days, and we had such distinguished and able members of that committee as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON].

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, that is the entire deficiency report.

Mr. WOODRUM. Well, that is on relief.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is on your C. C. C. and different credit agencies. I am talking about W. P. A., which is this separate report.

Mr. WOODRUM. This is the investigation of relief which the gentleman condemns and is going to vote for.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not condemn relief. Let the gentleman get that into his mind. I will vote every dollar necessary for relief which is not wasteful, extravagant, and based on the wrong policy. I love my people who are poor, just as much as the gentleman loves his people who are poor, and I will match the gentleman in what I will do for those people at any time at any place.

Mr. WOODRUM. But how can the gentleman vote for such an iniquitous administration measure as he is now condemning?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Roosevelt is the only President we have. This is seemingly the only way he will do it. If I do not vote for it, I get nothing. We well understand that. Why try to put me in that sort of position?

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman puts himself in that position. I did not put him in it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no. I began by telling you why I would vote for it. The gentleman knows why he would like to put the Republican Party in that position. We disapprove of your methods; but after our futile efforts are exhausted, you in the majority will have to take the responsibility, and there is nothing for most of us to do but to go along. We recognize that. General Johnson did say, and he tacitly admitted that he said it, "that 60 percent of this inventive work is unwholesome, wasteful, and a fatuous gesture." The only argument is that it preserves pride instead of creating the humiliation of home relief; yet to get on work relief the rules require that a man must go on home relief. And to get there he must submit to the equivalent of a pauper's oath and a most humiliating inquisition. If a man on relief earns a fugitive dollar in any private employment, he risks the loss of any kind of relief. Quoting further from General Johnson:

> More than half of all this effort is pretense, justified by nothing. I note that the Government relief plans will be all work and no dole. If it is, imagination must become more fanciful, and practical results more parsimonious.

What does Mr. Ritter, the present man in charge of New York City relief, say?—

> One of the main problems we face now is trying to adjust the situation so as not to make W. P. A. so pleasant, so interesting, and so secure that people just come here and stay.

He goes on to say that their relief rolls have increased 50 percent. Hopkins has made relief work so attractive that, where people were taking care of relatives heretofore, they are now going on relief. No wonder Hopkins says it is permanent. That has nothing to do with bringing the country back to prosperity. There are a million and a half on relief as a result of the scarcity doctrine of A. A. A. Now, you say you can take care of only 2,000,000 people. There are a million and a half to be taken care of right there. You have to take care of many, even in my section. Of course, I am to vote for relief. Our people are frightened. If they have a dollar, they will not spend it. It is frozen. We used to be able to live a good deal through each other. We would hand work back and forth and get along. Now everyone hesitates to risk anything. The wheels of industry are moving, but individuals all over the country are still afraid to risk whatever they may possess, no matter what this Government has done to allay such fears. It has guaranteed bank deposits; it has thrown the whole Government behind everything; yet the individual will not employ his neighbor, lest he be not employed in return. If he has a dollar, he is hanging on to it.

As an illustration: In my section there is a little summer community of 80 homes. They have a caretaker who is a carpenter, a plumber, a painter. He can do almost anything. There are 80 homes owned by summer people, supposed to be fairly well to do. Every winter heretofore he has had considerable work. He has not had 1 day's work from December 1 to March 1 this year. Yet you say prosperity has returned. Confidence has not returned. A million and a half of sharecroppers thrown on relief and other millions still out of jobs, because of this lack of confidence. Of course, relief is here to stay, no matter how prosperous industrial business may become. This relief business, in Mr. Hopkins' opinion, seems to be permanent. Our people have been taught that the Treasury of the Federal Government is inexhaustible. They appear to believe that we have plenty of money here, an invisible supply. They do not seem to understand that the funds we are now voting them must all be paid back by themselves, even with interest added.

What a time we had last November when men who had kept off relief could obtain no recognition for W. P. A. work. They saw others, who might need aid much less than they, taken on P. W. A. projects while they, simply because they were not on relief in November, were ruled out. By whom? By the edict from Washington.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Up to about 100 years ago it was the accepted practice in surgery to bleed the patient, no matter what the ailment was. We are now trying to bleed ourselves well.

Mr. GIFFORD. Apparently. We are giving ourselves presents that we shall have to pay for.

Boondoggling! I am not criticizing it per se, but we hear even dancing masters say they are forced to close their dancing schools and themselves go on relief because the Government is competing with them and teaching dancing without tuition cost. Many such legitimate private enterprises are going by the board, because of Federal interference with private business. Boondoggling! That is only one-seventeenth of 1 percent of it, they say; it does not amount to anything. But the policy amounts to something. It is so small a part of these relief expenditures, they assert. I wonder if resettlement plans are also regarded as too small a matter to discuss?

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CURLEY. The gentleman mentioned boondoggling.

Mr. GIFFORD. I will call it "votedoggling", if the gentleman would prefer.

Mr. CURLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the word "boondoggling" was coined by a Republican administration of the city of New York, and the man who coined it came from the gentleman's own State, Mr. John Marshall. This statement comes from the official record of the investigation of relief in the city of New York.

Mr. GIFFORD. Be he Democrat or Republican, he believes, undoubtedly with President Roosevelt, that this word "is to be enshrined in the hearts of the American people."

Mr. CURLEY. I would inform the gentleman also that eurythmic dancing also originated under a Republican administration in the State of New York.

Mr. GIFFORD. But all this is a small matter. I should not criticize it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not that the only good thing about it?

Mr. GIFFORD. Now I come to a report of the situation in Pennsylvania. You must have read the criticism of the former director of relief of that State. Are we not going to be impressed by the reports of men who formerly had charge of these matters? I want a little of it to appear in the RECORD, and now I shall read an extract or two regarding Pennsylvania. There are no politics in relief in Pennsylvania, are there? Hopkins says he has investigated them and has fired anybody who played politics with relief. Of course it is now fixed up all right.

This former relief administrator of Pennsylvania stated:

I believe the sooner the present works program is given up the better it will be for President Roosevelt's political future and for the Nation at large.

Not only are the workers themselves, in the main, dissatisfied, but the taxpayers, watching thousands of workers on W. P. A. projects doing little more than killing time, are becoming embittered toward relief expenditures of that kind.

Originally, I felt that President Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins were dead right in starting the works-progress program, because I thought, as they did, that it would be possible to give municipalities needed improvements at a low cost and at the same time give workmen the self-respect that comes from earning what they are receiving.

But the sad fact is that municipalities are getting improvements that could be supplied much more cheaply under contract and with up-to-date equipment. The other side of the picture is that a workman does not gain in self-respect by knowing that he is doing with a shovel and a wheelbarrow what could be done 10 times more efficiently and economically by a steam shovel and a truck.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. FORD of California. Why is it, then, that mayors of all the cities of the country come to Washington to have the work-relief program continued?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, the gentleman knows full well that the mayors of cities, and many very wealthy cities, are very careful about the money from their own funds that they spend for relief. I know of municipality after municipality which do not owe a dollar, with a very low tax rate, that are begging for the money. Some of them say: "Why should we not take it, why should we not ask for it, we contribute largely, do we not?" Think of it! You may be assured that the people of New England, in their town meetings, watch the tax rate closely and watch very carefully how they pay money out for relief. Why should they not take the money from W. P. A. when they witnessed in 1933 the pressure put on Hopkins to spend the money by Christmas? He sent a check to every municipality, no matter how wealthy it was. You remember that. What a method of distributing funds for strictly "relief" purposes! And after 3 long years they still do not know how to spend money for real relief.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Tugwell has spent $46,000,000, but it cost $19,000,000 to spend it. Some explanation of that fact would seem to be in order. But in the hearings there seems to be none.

They spent this W. P. A. money largely for what, in your community and mine? They got us to put in water plants and all sorts of things. They baited us by stating they would give 45 percent, although in many of the States the Federal Government gave practically the entire amount.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM. My friend has been speaking of politics and relief. I am wondering what my friend would think of the proposition of severely condemning the administration of relief as is now being administered, and then voting for it? What about a little politics in that?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman seems to delight in bringing that matter up.

Mr. WOODRUM. No; but I would like to know what my friend thinks about that matter?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have to vote for relief, and this is the only relief bill that we shall have a chance to vote on. I want to provide relief just as much as the gentleman does.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. MORAN. The gentleman has referred to other States where relief has been mishandled, in his opinion. Does the gentleman intend to insert a list of projects in his own congressional district that he disapproves?

Mr. GIFFORD. I could insert a lot of them. I could name a long list, which involved our going in debt for something for which we could not afford to pay.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman who spoke on behalf of the committee, are we to blame if they bring in a skunk with a litter of kittens and we have to take them?

Mr. GIFFORD. If the gentleman from Virginia has to resort to that sort of thing he cannot get very far. That does not excuse the bill or the failures in the bill.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman's ability and earnestness, but I am wondering if he will not agree with those of us who believe in public works that now when we have great distress in the country we should engage in all possible public work which will build America?

Mr. GIFFORD. If the P. W. A. would help unemployment, all right, but it did not do that in England, and it has not accomplished its purpose here. It is too slow. We cannot seem to have projects planned and in readiness to proceed upon.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I may say that the group with which I have been associated has always advocated national planning—getting ready for adverse times in times of prosperity so that when famines and depressions come we are ready. That is the reason we have failed at this time. We were not ready when the depression came. There was no national planning in advance.

Mr. GIFFORD. You might make a report and hand it to Harry Hopkins, but he would say: "I should cry. Send that to the poor." That is what he said when he got a certain report from one group of real businessmen.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. I have been listening with interest to the gentleman's remarks, and I conclude from his remarks that the gentleman is in favor of a relief appropriation and recognizes the necessity for making a relief appropriation?

Mr. GIFFORD. I certainly do.

Mr. HEALEY. But the gentleman is criticizing the administration of the present relief program?

Mr. GIFFORD. I am.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman does admit, however, there is a dire necessity for a relief appropriation and he is going to vote for it?

Mr. GIFFORD. I would be very foolish not to do so, and there is no politics in my vote. I want to remind the gentleman who mentioned politics for voting for relief that no one can suggest that I have shown any lack of courage in my votes on the floor of this House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman, or anyone else, explain to us what justification there can be for the sum recommended in this bill while 700,000 W. P. A. employees are being thrown out and discharged? What provisions are being made to take care of them except private business?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman well knows this sum does not take care of them. In New York City unemployment has grown 50 percent, and yet the gentlemen on this side get up here and praise God for the way industry has come back.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, we love to hear those speeches on prosperity. Certainly industry is coming back. But the number on relief rolls is growing greater on account of the Soil Conservation Act, on account of the continuation of the A. A. A., and the punitive measures adopted affecting industry. What are we going to do with this army that has been deliberately thrown out of work?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it not true that while industry is coming back the dividends of many of the great corporations are constantly increasing, and that the reason for the continuance of a vast amount of unemployment is those corporations are not willing to divide their profits with the men who work in their mills and factories?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; that is not the answer. The answer is the A. A. A. and the Soil Conservation Act and other punitive measures directed at industry. With this fund we can take care of only 2,000,000. The gentleman was not here a few minutes ago when I stated the answer to his question. It is a country-wide proposition, not an industrial one. The ordinary country person will not pass his money about as he used to. That is the answer. Industry itself has to a large degree recovered, but free interchange of labor is almost entirely lacking over the entire Nation outside of the industrial districts.

Mr. WITHROW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. The gentleman criticizes spending money for rural resettlement. Does the gentleman realize that the money spent by Mr. Tugwell's department for rural resettlement in the State of Wisconsin has been money very well spent; that they have received back a dollar for every dollar that has been spent; and that there is a real demand as well as a real need for additional allocations in the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, has the gentleman read the story of Jasper County? Has he read many other stories that I could furnish him; and why should Wisconsin or any other State be picked out, or any particular locality selected, to carry on such an experiment when any relief expenditures should be universal? What right have we to select any special community to put over something of that kind?

Mr. WITHROW. There has been nothing pulled over in Wisconsin. The project is being administered properly there.

Mr. GIFFORD. All these expenditures should be used in such a way that every community would be treated according to its needs; and it should be done under State and local supervision and by direct relief. You will learn that this is the only answer, and 1 year from now you will come to it yourselves. There is an absolute demand that everybody who is now suffering shall be taken care of, and it cannot be done by trying to scheme out some form of made-work relief. Why can you not recognize this now and confess that your present plan is a failure? It is a failure, and everybody knows it. Your President said he would recognize failure and he would invite criticism, but he never recognizes a mistake and never stands for criticism.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. How would you do it?

Mr. GIFFORD. By direct relief. That would be the easiest way and would do away with all this bureaucracy. I do not know that I pronounce the word correctly, but it is a word that is causing concern in the minds of the people of the country generally.

Mr. KELLER. How would you get away from that?

Mr. GIFFORD. With respect to your people in Missouri, I do read occasionally about St. Louis, Mo., and the Pendergast machine. Perhaps politics would get into it even there, would it not?

Mr. KELLER. I do not think so.

Mr. GIFFORD. If politics would not get into it in St. Louis, then it would not get into it anywhere; but direct relief is the answer. The present method has failed to provide adequate relief to those in need thereof, because it is a wrong method.

Mr. KELLER. I am asking for the gentleman's remedy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

W. P. A. O. K., BUT SO IS PUBLIC WORKS AND RURAL RESETTLEMENT

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat in the same position as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], who preceded me. I am a little bit confused, and I am going to make a few criticisms as I go along, and, like the gentleman from Massachusetts, I am going to vote for the bill. I say nothing, however, in bitterness.

I just want to converse on this question of legislation in general for a moment. The manner in which this bill is brought to the floor has been customary, I presume, for a hundred years. But, Mr. Chairman, this bill comes in here without anybody except a subcommittee knowing anything about it. And the first thing we all do, by unanimous consent, including our opposition over here [Mr. MAVERICK indicating the Republican side], is to make a waiver by which we absolutely abandon our legislative processes as applied to all the other committees. The Appropriations Committee offers their bill, and I presume there is considerable legislation in it, and we have waived all points of order. So the result is going to be there will only be one committee of any importance in the House of Representatives, and that will be the Appropriations Committee. If this is true, I hope I get on it.

In any event, we gave up our legislative rights in this particular case, and I have no particular criticism, because I could have objected but did not. But neither did the Republicans; it is merely an example of Congress abandoning legislative processes and railroading ourselves out of our rights.

PRINT OF BILL NOT EVEN AVAILABLE TO CONGRESS

Another thing is that the bill was not available, and this is customary and has been the custom for years. But how can a man make an intelligent talk on this bill or a constructive talk when we are handed the hearings of probably 1,000 pages on which these other gentlemen have worked for 2 months, and then we are supposed to get up here and debate the bill and vote with deliberation. In fact, the bill is not even available at this time. I tried to get a bill for about half an hour, and finally I borrowed one from the courteous chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. WOODRUM], the gentleman from Virginia. This is the only way I was able to get a copy of the bill.

It would seem to me that we should adopt a policy of getting out reports at least a week ahead on ordinary legislation like this. With reports gotten out ahead we could inform ourselves and legislate more carefully, and certainly with more knowledge.

ARMY AND NAVY—DO WE DISCUSS FUNDAMENTALS?

Let us talk about legislation in particular reference to this matter, because it is more or less relevant. When we are talking about the Army and the Navy we talk about battle cruisers and cruisers and battleships, and we bandy statistics around. But we say nothing about the economic background in reference to these huge appropriations.

I come from the biggest military district in the United States and, I think, the biggest one in the world. My district probably profited financially from the World War. We suffered a break-down afterward, of course. My people are assisted, to a large extent, by military appropriations. But

I do not think that my district or this Nation can have permanent prosperity entirely by military and naval appropriations. I just do not think we can do that. We must develop our interior and our exterior, world trade, and promote peace. I think some day we ought to get down to it and discuss whether it is really necessary to have one of the biggest navies in the world, which is to go all over the world in some sort of fantastic empire.

You know civilization has always been destroyed when there is a great concentration of wealth, along with the building pyramids or nonproductive buildings of all kinds, developed side by side with a royal military force. It seems to me that we are headed somewhat in that direction. I voted for the Navy appropriation bill, and I voted for the Army appropriation bill, but I wonder if we are solving our problems in this way.

POLITICS IN W. P. A.?—NOT MUCH, BUT THEY ARE HUMAN

Now, let us get down to this W. P. A. appropriation we are debating today. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to say publicly or privately that Harry Hopkins is one of the ablest men in the United States, and he is doing a fine job. Has there been any politics? Of course, there has been politics in the W. P. A., just like there was politics in the Republican days, and just as there will be if that party comes into power again; or just as there will be if a third party comes into power.

But I will say this, that there has been a minimum of politics, and Hopkins has been doing a fine job under the most difficult conditions.

I am wondering this: Is there any permanent recovery under the W. P. A.? Are we going to put people back to work permanently by the W. P. A. appropriations? Personally I do not think so. I think the W. P. A. is absolutely necessary, but there is no permanent benefit coming from it.

RURAL RESETTLEMENT SHOULD BE CONTINUED

Let me say a word or two about the rural resettlement. That is criticized to a large extent because it is under Mr. Tugwell, called both doctor and professor, who went to college and got more than one degree. They say there is something wrong in a man that gets two degrees from college.

The rural resettlement is doing just about the most important work in the United States today. Suppose you put aside Mr. Tugwell—suppose you send him back to college—the work will have to go on just the same. Soil erosion, destruction of forests, the poverty of the rural people, tenants, and sharecroppers everywhere—something must be done about it, and we should not abandon our program.

Now, what is Mr. Tugwell, or rather the Rural Resettlement Administration doing? The Administration has taken 600,000 farmers off relief and put them back into self-respecting productive work. That is a substantial accomplishment, and more must be done, whether Tugwell lives or dies.

When you put a man on relief you have to keep feeding him forever. When you get him back on the land and back in the economic system, you have done something worth while. And that is what rural resettlement is doing.

As I understand, last year he got something like $250,000,000. This year, although his Department is not mentioned here, he is to get something like $85,000,000. If we appropriated $250,000,000 last year, $85,000,000 this year is not sufficient.

SHALL WE EARMARK $700,000,000 FOR W. P. A.?

Take the W. P. A.—there are a large number of Congressmen who want to earmark $700,000,000 of that for the Public Works Administration under Secretary Ickes.

I have been talking about that thing, and I have been studying it. One billion five hundred million dollars does not appear to be enough; at least, last year we appropriated $4,800,000,000. I make bold to say that and I am willing to vote an increase in the appropriation if the expenditure can be invested intelligently and conservatively, as I think has been done under the Public Works Administration.

MONEY PROPERLY INVESTED IS NOT WASTED

They say, "Where are you going to get the money?" When you take money and put it into permanent economic programs you get the money back, and then you are not wasting money, but you are investing money wisely. Let us say that the P. W. A. has about a billion dollars worth of work that they can start now. They make a grant on that of 45 percent, or $450,000,000. That money all practically comes back to the Federal Treasury, because P. W. A. charges a rate of interest of something like 3½ or 4 percent, and the Government borrows the money at a much lower rate. This may be stretching a point, but it is true P. W. A. is legitimate, sound business.

I believe some way should be found, if possible, to increase this appropriation for the P. W. A., because the P. W. A. is doing a permanent, high-class piece of work in this country.

P. W. A., they say, has been slow. Possibly that was for the best; Ickes is a cautious man and has been careful from every angle. But slow or not, the P. W. A. is ready now with legitimate, self-liquidating projects that run at least seven hundred million and probably a billion dollars.

P. W. A. AND RESETTLEMENT OUTSTANDING AGENCIES

In a general way the Rural Resettlement and the P. W. A. are really the outstanding agencies in the Government today that are doing work which is of a permanent nature, from the viewpoint of rehabilitating rural people and agricultural land and city people and industrial business, in an economic structure. For that reason we ought to do something about keeping these agencies going.

Ickes and Tugwell and Hopkins get a lot of criticism, and largely because they have hard jobs to fill. I asked a colleague a minute ago which he like the best, Tugwell or Hopkins, and he said he liked one just about as much as he did the other, and he meant by that that he did not like either one of them. He has never met either of them, but has had some pleasure in hating them at a distance. We get a lot of criticism from the other side of the House on our Administrators, and some from our own side. The Republicans are constantly talking about "Tugwellian philosophy" and about "boondoggling", which, in my opinion, is entirely superficial criticism, because no sensible substitute or program is offered.

Some day we must get down to the fundamental question of what we—and I here mean Republicans and Democrats, Progressives and Farmer-Laborites, all of us—are going to do. And let us discuss some of the things that we have not done. We have not even gotten the Bankhead Tenant Act on the floor, which is to rehabilitate sharecroppers, tenants, and landless agricultural workers. We have not gotten out any housing bill, and we have not gotten out any real conservation bill. All these matters concern permanent recovery, and those matters I mentioned must be faced. As far as I know, we have not any particularly well-integrated or definite plan of what we are going to do.

This is not an anti-Democratic speech. I am for the Democratic Party. I am for President Roosevelt. I am for what we are trying to do, but sometimes I am not sure that we are doing everything that we should. Sometimes I think we wince under superficial criticism of the Republicans and our reactionary enemies—and they have not any program, nothing to offer, or anything sensible to say. I have heard the Republicans talk today, and all they have done is stand in this well and criticize what the Democratic Party is doing. They make absolutely no constructive suggestions whatever. They say we are doing wrong, and that we have to stop this relief program, this, and that, with some talk of alphabets, although no more talk about the "brain trust." What the Republicans think does not seem to be much. The question is, What are we going to do?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I gladly yield to the distinguished leader of my party.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does not the gentleman have some hopes that the new Republican "brain trust" may evolve some policy for the Republican Party very soon?

Mr. MAVERICK. I am afraid not. I have found out that they have one man in the Republican "brain trust" who is a Socialist from way back, and I have walked the floor at night a great deal about that. Then there is something else that I have heard. Last night there was a red flag hung on the Supreme Court flagpole, and they found a Harvard magazine under it, and I think that must have been Professor Carver, of the Republican "brain trust", who did that. I understand that he was in the neighborhood just about that time.

TUGWELL TRADES CAP AND GOWN FOR STEEL HELMET AND RHINOCEROS HIDE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. No matter what the Republican "brain trust" does, it cannot hope to equal the Democratic "brain trust" in damn foolishness——

Mr. MAVERICK. Brains—you mean in brains. You cannot hope to equal the Democratic "brain trust" in brains. You know that you are jealous.

Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman spoke something about Mr. Tugwell leaving his office and what might or might not happen should that come to pass. Does the gentleman believe that perhaps we may be able to go to the Republican "brain trust" and find somebody to take his place?

Mr. MAVERICK. No, and I will tell the reason why you cannot. You cannot do it for two reasons. One of them is that the Republican "brain trust" has not as much brains as the Democratic "brain trust", and the second is that Tugwell has been in for 3 years now, and he has gotten a good deal of the doctorate worn off him, he has been kicked around so much, and has now become a pretty good administrator. He has traded his cap and gown for a steel helmet and a rhinocerous hide.

Mr. GIFFORD. And what the gentleman is trying to say, paradoxically, is that a "brain trust" is an asinine thing anyway.

Mr. MAVERICK. The Republican one; yes. Our "brain trust" is a good one. But I want to say in conclusion that I really believe, instead of voting for this bill as it is, that we ought to do something for the P. W. A. and the Rural Resettlement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman made one observation that I am very much interested in and I want to see if I understood him correctly. I understood the gentleman to say that Tugwell had been given $250,000,000.

Mr. MAVERICK. Last year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With which he had cared for 600,000 farm families.

Mr. MAVERICK. That is what I understand the figures show, and he has not only cared for, but has rehabilitated many of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then if that is so, if my figures are correct, that, of course, would be $411.66 per family.

Your observation startles me. It is some information I have overlooked. I want to ask where I can get the details on this statement.

Mr. MAVERICK. From the Rural Resettlement; and you can also find that there has been comparatively more permanent rehabilitation per dollar than there has been through any other agency. I cannot give statistics, but from a viewpoint of principle the idea is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know of any Republican in the House who claims any interest in that "brain trust" and who is not willing that you should take over whatever they may have down there at Republican headquarters?

Mr. MAVERICK. But you know they hired that "brain trust."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who hired him?

Mr. MAVERICK. Your own leaders, of course; BERT SNELL and your other leaders. You know very well you agreed on that "brain trust." You cannot deny that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. We do not have any "brain trust." You have a patent on the "brain trust."

Mr. MAVERICK. You have what purports to be one; the fact remains you complained of a Democratic "brain trust" for 3 years, then studied the matter over and hired one yourself.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that what Tugwell is doing is paying relief to 200,000 farmers, and that he has not taken any off of relief?

Mr. MAVERICK. No, no. Mr. Tugwell—that is, the Rural Resettlement Administration—is rehabilitating some 600,000 farmers, many of whom to all intents and purposes are rehabilitated permanently.

Now, let me conclude with a short review or with some repetitions. First, legislatively, either we are all passing the buck, both Republicans and Democrats, or giving up many of our legislative processes such as in the waiver we unanimously passed today. That is a bad precedent. Second, the idea of bringing in a bill which no one has had a chance to read seems to me to be a bad policy, and that a better one would be to bring in a bill ahead of time and give the Members a chance to study and therefore legislate intelligently. Third, W. P. A. is absolutely necessary, and we must pass at least the $1,500,000,000 bill. But, aside from that, the Rural Resettlement and Public Works Administrations are both essential to the economic set-up of this Nation and should be carried on as absolutely necessary on the part of our economic system. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAIN].

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, on January 14, 1936, I made a speech on the floor of the House in which I made some comments on President Roosevelt's message of January 3 on the state of the Union. I did not expect any reaction or comment from the President or members of his Cabinet. I did not suppose that any of them had time to read speeches of a new Congressman of the opposite political party. A portion of my speech was intended as a challenge to the members of the President's party, who constitute a majority of the membership of the House.

Under date of March 14, 1936, I received a communication from the Honorable Harold Ickes in which he calls my attention to the fact that I made the following statement in that speech:

> The misfeasance—and I may add the malfeasance—in the administration of W. P. A. and P. W. A. projects as partisan enterprises for political profit has reacted against the administration and its sponsors.

And the Secretary of the Interior concludes his communication as follows:

> If I have been guilty of anything in the administration of the Public Works program it is that I have been overzealous in my insistence that the program be administered without scandal and without regard to partisan politics. I feel so strongly on this point that I must challenge the truth of your charges and demand their proof.

Evidently the Administrator of Public Works is particular about the company in which his alphabetical symbols are found. Most of us who make up the membership of this House commenced our educational processes by learning the alphabet. Today pursuant to some strange pedagogical theory, children learn to read without learning the alphabet. Until the advent of the administration of "Roosevelt the

Lesser" there was grave possibility that our youngsters would grow up without learning the alphabet. It is an amazing but somewhat serious fact, that our young people are at quite a disadvantage in their efforts to locate words in the dictionary. They have trouble finding names in the telephone directory because of their lack of familiarity with the alphabet. Many of our youngsters are rusty on the sequence of the letters of the alphabet.

Now we have the confusion of youth complicated by the difficulties of the older generations. In the midst of this alphabetical uncertainty in the schoolrooms, along come Tugwell, Hopkins, and Ickes with 57 variations of alphabetical readjustment. Out of this maze of letters come the familiar symbols "W. P. A." and "P. W. A." As a new Congressman I am not embarrassed to admit that I was quite unacquainted with the fine distinctions connected with the order of arrangement of these mystical letters. I knew that regardless of the order of arrangement they emanated from the bureaucratic satellites of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And I was, and still am, of the opinion that any political reaction that may accrue because of the activities of any division of the governmental program will affect Mr. Roosevelt and his chances for reelection. The average voter, like your new Member of Congress from the Third Congressional District of Michigan, will be hazy in his distinction between P. W. A. and W. P. A. And if the management or administration of either department produces what may be fairly designated as "malfeasance" or "misfeasance", the reaction will be against the Democratic ticket in November. And no one will stop to consider whether Mr. Ickes is the Simon-pure nonpartisan, or whether Mr. Hopkins is to be the scapegoat for all the partisan patronage that is being dispensed under the cloak of human relief.

It is probably true that P. W. A. had nothing to do with the circumstances occurring in my district in the months of November, December, and January, on which my remarks were based and for that reason I retract the reference to P. W. A. in my speech of January 14, page 399, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and ask to have, "and P. W. A." stricken from the permanent record.

Mr. Chairman, when this Committee rises it is my intention to ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected in that respect.

As a matter of fact there were five or six projects just getting under way in my district in November, December, and January under the auspices of the P. W. A. and I am only too glad to state that the methods of administration in those particular cases appeal to me as infinitely superior to the methods adopted by W. P. A.

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist the opportunity of pointing out the very obvious fact that from the very nature of the circumstances, so long as the abbreviations, P. W. A. and W. P. A. are used, there will continue to be confusion and uncertainty as to the history, background, and responsible governmental agency connected with a given project.

The newspapers supply ample proof that there is much confusion as to whether the $25,000 municipal dog kennel at Memphis is a W. P. A. or a P. W. A. project. I understand that this particular dog house is a public building but perhaps that does not bring it under Public Works Administration, and I am of the opinion that that particular project might better be designated as a W. A. P. project. And it might even be advisable to insert the letter "S" and make it W. A. S. P., as I am quite sure somebody is going to get "stung" as a result of that item of public works.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAIN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What kind of a house did the gentleman refer to?

Mr. MAIN. A dog house.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it really true that such a house has been built?

Mr. MAIN. Yes; at a cost of $25,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman used the initials "W. A. P."

Mr. MAIN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would call that "wash all pups."

Mr. MAIN. I thank the gentleman. That is a very practical suggestion.

While I am perfectly willing to smooth the ruffled feelings of Secretary Ickes by asking to have the reference to P. W. A. withdrawn from my speech of January 14, I cannot refrain from reminding our Democratic colleagues that the President has a curious assortment of advisers and coworkers. Of course, we cannot blame Mr. Ickes for being anxious to see that his Department is absolved from all criticism. But the fact remains that the Democratic candidate in November will be Franklin Roosevelt and not Harold Ickes, and if there has been misfeasance and malfeasance in scattering the spending power of this Nation broadcast across the land, regardless of the alphabetical sponsorship under which such program is carried on, it will be the Democratic Party that must suffer the consequences.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAIN. I yield.

Mr. FORD of California. I wonder if the gentleman read the returns from California?

Mr. MAIN. I read the returns from California; yes. If the gentleman gets any particular consolation out of those returns, he is welcome to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. For the benefit of the gentleman I think there were 25,000 McGroarty-Townsend votes in California.

Mr. MAIN. Now, if the gentleman is interested in Townsend votes, I would like to know why his Townsend investigating committee is acting like the pup that I used to know about that was always chasing the cat, but he always regulated his speed so that he never quite caught up with the cat. Why this 2 weeks' postponement in completing the examination of Dr. Townsend?

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I insist on order among the Republicans.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the gentleman from Michigan, I think the RECORD should show that Mr. HOFFMAN is not responsible for the 2 weeks' adjournment, and that that should be laid at the door of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I am devoting these remarks to Mr. Ickes and not to Mr. HOFFMAN. [Laughter and applause.]

So far as I am concerned, the Honorable Mr. Ickes and his Department are relieved of any and all charges of misfeasance and malfeasance or discrimination in the selection of employables on projects in the Third District of Michigan during the months of November, December, and January last. But let it also be said that the wise and judicious spending of certain millions from the Federal Treasury under the banner of P. W. A. will not eclipse or justify the unwise squandering of other millions from the Federal Treasury, regardless of the manner in which the alphabet is juggled. It is difficult for the people of my district to comprehend any good reason for failing to approve the proposed addition to the school building in the township of Comstock, Kalamazoo County, costing less than $50,000, with the local contribution in cash ready for use, while Federal money was being spent in providing shower baths for stray dogs in the city of Memphis. The fact that Mr. Roosevelt is following the suggestions of Harry Hopkins, instead of accepting the counsel of Harold Ickes, will not satisfy the school children of Comstock who are denied the benefits of a gymnasium, even though the homeless hounds of Memphis are bedded down in sanitary kennels.

Mr. Roosevelt may be well pleased with the personnel of his official advisers, but in my opinion his administration will come to an abrupt end because of his indiscriminate and flagrant disregard for the laws of party tradition. The

performance of the party in power appears to have followed the platform of the Socialist Party for 1932 instead of the Democratic platform adopted in Chicago 4 years ago. The appointees and responsible advisers of the President lack regularity in their political ancestry and in their political outlook. Some of their program seems to bear the stamp of foreign origin. Like the Government mule, who, because of too flagrant violation of the laws of animal husbandry, can have neither pride of ancestry nor hope of posterity, so some of the political cross-breeds in the Roosevelt administration family suggest some unholy alliance of the Democratic donkey with one of the nightmare delusions from Russia. Hybrid advocates of political experimentation, like the mule, may be tough and hardy while they last, but can boast neither of political ancestry nor can they have reasonable hope for political posterity. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAIN], who just had the floor, as to the reason for the adjournment of the investigating committee, of course, as the gentleman well knows, I do not know why an adjournment was had, because I am only one member of a committee of eight, and, unlike the gentleman who just preceded me, I do not assume to know all that the others know, and I do not assume to speak for anyone but myself. However, I have learned somewhat indirectly that the adjournment was had to enable counsel for the committee to have here in Washington some of the information which they have obtained in California, so that they might accurately quote documents which were put in evidence there.

Personally, I am somewhat hasty, somewhat abrupt at times, and somewhat inclined to form quick conclusions. But I can say to the gentleman that from the day that committee first met it was my understanding that they were to meet and question Dr. Townsend and Mr. Clements on the following Friday, and I have been willing and am now as a member of that committee to go through with that examination. I did learn while up in the gentleman's district last week that it was being represented up there to the voters, to those who were asked to contribute their dimes and quarters, that if they would pay, not $1.20, because the district manager said he did not put forth that statement, but that if people would contribute $1.45 a year to the Townsend organization, which claims credit for the gentleman's election, there would be paid to everyone eligible a $2,400 annuity each year, or $200 a month.

Let me quote from the instructions to all area managers under the jurisdiction of the central regional office at Chicago.

> If every member will pay his or her 10-cent quota promptly each month during 1936, and we win the next Congress, that means the 12 monthly quotas plus the 25 cents membership fee, a total of $1.45, is all it costs to win an annuity of $2,400 a year—$200 per month and assured employment at living wages for every worker. Do you know of any investment anywhere that will yield such value that costs so little? No matter what any club member's circumstances may be, it would seem the part of wisdom to make a real sacrifice to pay this small monthly quota of 10 cents. It is the lifeblood of your organization; it is practically all we have to use in the fight against the powerful and abundantly financed groups and individuals who are spending so freely to defeat our purpose. Please, please, please get this thought before every Townsend club in your area, because we are falling behind other regions in meeting our club quotas.

Now, if it takes a little bit of time to demonstrate that that has been the course the country over, that the people have been deceived, that they have been defrauded out of their dimes and quarters, that they are to be induced to vote for someone as a candidate for Congress upon his promise that if they would give their $1.45 a year and elect him that he in return would assist in enacting legislation which would give this annuity of $2,400, I think the adjournment is a good thing, because it is well they should know that not only in Michigan but everywhere such promises have been put forth.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAIN. I wonder if the gentleman found out that a statement over my signature stating my platform in that campaign contained the announcement that I would vote for the McGroarty bill, H. R. 7154, and that was the limit of my statement with regard to promises as to Townsend-plan legislation? I am glad to stand by that promise when and if the opportunity comes to vote on that bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not inquire as to the gentleman's platform, because it was in the papers at the time of the campaign. I did not, I do not, consider the gentleman's platform conclusive on this matter. As these questions were asked of different witnesses they informed me—they volunteered the information—that the gentleman from Michigan was the standard bearer, being the first man in Congress, the first congressional candidate who had been elected by them, by the Townsend organization; and I learned that he, the gentleman from Michigan, had appeared on the platform with Dr. Townsend or Mr. Clements and with Townsend speakers during the campaign. I know also, from all the Townsend publications, the Townsend plan as set forth, for instance, in this month's issue of their paper that they, the Townsend organization, stand without compromise for $200 a month; and we know there is no such bill before this Congress at the present time. I know also that the McGroarty bill, according to the testimony of the man who was called as an expert by Dr. Townsend—I refer to Dr. Robert R. Doane—will not produce more than $33.33 per month, and he finally testified under oath that if the amount raised by the McGroarty bill was distributed among 10,000,000 pensioners it would give approximately $30 per month. These figures do not allow for any administrative costs, which, of course, would make a material reduction in the amount actually received by the pensioner.

He concluded his testimony on this subject with the statement that the pension which would be received under the McGroarty bill would purchase about $6 worth "of our present goods."

The doctor further testified that the Michigan pension law, as it now exists, would produce more in actual purchasing value to the pensioners than would the pension under the McGroarty bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of appropriating $1,500,000,000 for work relief, as provided in this measure, largely because a great deal of the money will be used in the so-called boondoggling program; and I will state my reasons: In the so-called boondoggling program the money has been spent on what type of person? On the white-collar individual. What does he comprise? He comprises a class of persons whom it would be impossible to utilize in any kind of a P. W. A. project because of the fact that they have had no training or experience with manual labor.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Is that the reason they lean on their shovels instead of using them to raise material?

Mr. FORD of California. Possibly so; but they do not do that. You see, I am talking about the white-collar people. Who are they? They are artists, singers, musicians, actors, dancers, school teachers, and persons engaged in all the finer forms of artistic endeavor. Of course, if we do not want to help the artist who has no work, we can take him out, as some of the opponents of this bill would do, and shoot him. How about the vocal artist? We would still the singer's voice; we would numb the harpist's fingers; would we leave those whose gifts are along artistic and cultural lines to starve, freeze, and go naked?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. These musicians and artists must live like other citizens; they should have an American standard of living.

Mr. FORD of California. Absolutely.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I can see no reason for not helping them. I think the administration deserves credit for doing something for them.

Mr. FORD of California. The distinguished gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution. He, of course, has a great heart, like all his progressive neighbors, and he believes in things that have for their purpose the bettering of human beings.

The gentlemen who are so much opposed to these boondoggling projects—who are they? They are the gentlemen who sit in palatial offices, who have a dozen secretaries at their command; they are the gentlemen who control the destinies of the railroads, the banks, and the great industrial corporations, and all the rest of it. They would leave the artists, the musicians, the singers, the dancers, and all that great mass of people whose aims and ambitions are concerned with the finer, the higher, the more artistic things of life—they would leave them out, they would leave out the school teacher who is unemployed to starve, the dancing teacher and any other class of people whose activities and training and background and experience disqualify them for the pick or the shovel or the maul or any other implement that is used in manual labor. That is what I like about Harry Hopkins.

Harry Hopkins has a broad comprehension of human needs, which is not confined to any one single class. He has done a courageous and splendid job.

Mr. Chairman, I would vote for adding another $700,000,000 for W. P. A., but I shall not vote to take $700,000,000 from the present appropriation. I am opposed to that from the start, and I am going to fight it with all the strength and ability I have at my command, because I want this money to use for the creation of jobs that may be started quickly and which will put the maximum number of people to work for the maximum length of time. It is beyond my understanding how Members of this House can oppose the use of this money for the type of project contemplated by the Works Progress Administration. In doing so they are unconsciously joining with the interests that oppose everything and would adopt a do-nothing policy.

The "old guard" reactionary opposition to the New Deal has been one of attack, with the only alternative a return to laissez faire. Nothing constructive, nothing that squarely faces the spectacle of poverty in the midst of plenty, of unemployment, while industrial profits mount, of the sweatshop and the slum, of child labor and the destitute aged, has come from the reactionary leadership which controls the G. O. P. But now, at last, the Republican National Committee has realized that some alternative plan must be offered, if the ever-growing tide in favor of the New Deal is to be stemmed.

Hence we read of the Republican "brain trust", headed by Dr. Thomas Nixon Carver, professor emeritus of political economy, Harvard University. Dr. Carver is noted as a dry-as-dust economist of the old school, who interprets political economy in terms of capital, wages, profits, supply and demand, and who excludes all reference to human welfare, to widening opportunity for all the people, to methods of securing a higher standard of living for the multitude. He, of course, is opposed to W. P. A.

For the Republican National Committee Dr. Carver has evolved a plan, which for cold-blooded calculation, for gross materialism, for a repudiation of every principle of democracy, cannot be matched in the known world.

Here it is, as given in the press:

1. Easing or elimination of Government regulation and restraint on business.
2. Reduction of the supply of labor by sterilization of the "palpably unfit"; widespread use of birth control; exclusion of all immigration; checks on marriage. Marriage would be barred until the parties could afford to buy and operate an automobile.
3. Organization of the "substantial people of America" in a national party to stamp out radicalism.
4. Curtailment of unemployment relief by forcing idle off rolls by "severe regulations."

The central idea of this plan is to reduce as rapidly as possible the supply of labor, looked upon not as human beings, but as instruments to create profits for the substantial people of America, who are to unite to stamp out what the pundits choose to brand as radicalism. America is thus envisioned as a closed corporation, owned and controlled by the capitalistic few, and conducted as a great industrial and business organization, producing enormous incomes for those in control. All who dare to oppose such an order, once it is established on what was once free America, are to be dealt with as radicals. There is no thought of so adjusting our almost unlimited power of production as to enable all our people to enjoy an increasingly high standard of living; there is no recognition of the fact that this is an age of plenty and that it is only a complete failure in distribution that makes want and privation, lack of opportunity, unrest, and despair rampant.

There is in Dr. Carver's document this pregnant sentence: "Possibly Mussolini and Hitler are more farseeing than the rest of us." Certainly Hitler is, if by this we mean that he is succeeding in regimenting the German people, in depriving them of the freedom of speech and of the press, of a free parliament elected by the people, of the right to worship according to their convictions, of justice under the law, regardless of race or creed or political opinion. All these sacred rights, which we Americans cherish as we do our own souls, Hitler has taken from the German people. And to this a respected professor from a university that has long stood for American ideals gives his implied approval.

I do not believe that Republicans generally approve such doctrine. It is only that small group of reactionaries, backed by limitless money, who accept these Fascist theories, who advocate such an un-American and un-Christian plan as Dr. Carver's. The rank and file of the Republican voters will repudiate it, along with all the other free-minded Americans who still insist that the welfare clause of the Constitution means precisely what it says, and that America was meant to be, and shall continue to be, the land of opportunity for the great common people, whether they be artists, musicians, actors, or writers, and not a bonanza for the money grabber.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks which I made earlier in the day and to insert a few brief abstracts from the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1936, which is presented here, I shall support in its entirety. There are, however, some phases of the bill with which I am not in entire agreement, and therefore I should like to make certain suggestions to the Committee with reference to modifications and changes.

Insofar as the W. P. A. is concerned, this agency of the Government presents certain definite problems which affect the Members of this House coming from various districts throughout the Nation. This is particularly true and applicable as far as the big cities are concerned, where larger W. P. A. projects are necessary. Where the unemployment problem is large it is natural that the individual project should be large. I have in mind, for example, an artillery armory in my district. The War Department is very anxious to locate a motorized unit in the city of Detroit because it is the heart of the automobile industry. The University of Detroit has a very fine engineering school with a campus that is very attractive for this purpose, but the W. P. A. does not seem to be able to decide on going through with the project.

In the first instance, when the application was made, the ruling of Mr. Hopkins was that the per-man-unit costs were too high. These were later restudied and reduced to conform with the general outlined requirements of the Department. Then the ruling was made that because of the size of the project it could not be finished before July 1 and, accordingly, was definitely disapproved.

The Members of the House know that the W. P. A., and P. W. A. for that matter, will not cease at the expiration of the month of June. We know that unemployment at least to a certain extent will still be with us. I fail to see why a worthy conforming project of the kind I just mentioned in a large community, such as I represent, cannot be given approval and a continuing cash allowance made for its commencement, with further allowances until it is finally completed, instead of saying: "Since we cannot start and finish the project before July 1, it must be disapproved and rejected." We know that small armories of $60,000, $70,000, and $80,000 have been and are still being built in the smaller communities and smaller cities and towns. A small project of that kind in my district would be absolutely worthless and could not be considered. It is absolutely essential in a community where the unemployment problem is greater to have a project correspondingly larger. The only way to solve that sort of problem is to have a continuing appropriation. I shall expect appropriate remedies to be incorporated in this bill before the final vote upon adoption.

Another phase of the first deficiency appropriation bill I should like to discuss has to do with the salary increases for deputy United States marshals. Here is a group of men throughout the Nation that render a splendid service. Some very fine men are connected with the United States marshal's offices throughout the United States. They receive approximately two-thirds of the amount ordinarily paid deputy sheriffs and in many instances less. The only reason the salaries of these people have not been increased commensurate with their service is because they are not an organized group and not in a position to force their demands. The Attorney General states in a written communication to me that he is willing and anxious to have these increases made. Why the Appropriations Committee does not do something about it is a matter I cannot understand. Perhaps the committee spokesman will tell me and the Members of the House that the Bureau of the Budget refuses to make the recommendation; however, regardless of who is to blame, something should be done to correct the situation. The Attorney General is favorable; Members of this body, upon whom rests the responsibility, know the claim of these faithful employees is just; so let us tell the Director of the Budget what he must do. He is the servant, not the master, of the Congress. I think it is high time that the Appropriations Committee assume its full duty and correct the situation. These men are giving of their best effort in the Government service. They work all hours of the day, serving summons as late as 10 or 11 o'clock at night. When they serve two or three summons in distant cities and towns of a judicial district jurisdiction, they receive but one fee for this additional work. When using their cars they are not even allowed an amount of money for mileage commensurate with the expenditure involved. As a consequence, it is frequently necessary for them to abandon their automobiles and use streetcars. This costs the Government a great deal more in the long run, because a deputy cannot cover enough territory or get service in as many instances as he would if he used his automobile. In other words, where they could make six or seven or more calls by the use of an auto they can only make a half of that number, using streetcars. This is false economy, and the Department of Justice knows this condition exists and is anxious to correct it.

Mr. Chairman, I should now like to refer to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MAIN]. I have heard him spout on this floor about as much as I care to without some reasonable reply. The only thing I now remember of his partisan abusive speeches is the word "wolf", which he used three or four times in every breath. Where and for what purpose that word came into his speech, I do not know, but I remember it very distinctly. He is still shouting "Wolf" or, rather, perhaps, talking about dog houses down in Kentucky.

Fortunately the gentleman has seen the light. He comes before the committee now and makes a public and abject apology to Mr. Ickes and admits having made a serious mistake in connection with his unfair attack upon the Secretary of the Interior. One thing the gentleman will learn, if he is here long enough, is if he wants to be right, he should pay some attention to what he is talking about. He had not been here long enough to get his feet wet when he started to attack the present administration.

Now, this gentleman came to the House elected as an advocate of the Townsend plan. Two hundred dollars per month and no less. Here he talks for the McGroarty bill, but he fails to make clear to his people the distinct difference between the Townsend plan and the McGroarty bill. He should have done so when my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], stated here that the McGroarty bill is different from that which our people believe is the Townsend plan.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. I advocated and worked for adequate old-age pensions long before I ever came to Congress. I have worked with the fraternal order of Eagles and with their national chaplain for adequate pensions. So there is not any question about where I stand regarding pensions. Let me point out the simple difference between the McGroarty bill and the Townsend plan. In dollars and cents it amounts to $167 per month less per individual pensioner than he expects, or has been led to expect, under the Townsend plan.

It is doubtful if the McGroarty bill could possibly pay over $33 per month per pensioner.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I cannot yield at the moment, but I will be pleased to yield in a few minutes.

We, the Members from Michigan, regardless of political affiliation, have something to work for. I was led to believe that the Michigan old-age-pension law allowed a maximum for pensioners of $30 per month. I figured that by adding the Federal allowance of $15 per month, an aged pensioner could receive a sum of $45, or $90 for an aged couple. Now I find that the Michigan law will pay the maximum of $30, including the Federal allowance. Michigan's law should be amended to pay by itself not less than $30, to which should be added the allowance from the social security funds.

I will discard all politics and work with any and all Michigan Congressmen for these and other liberalizations in accordance with a plan which I will discuss upon this floor at the first opportunity.

I invite your nonpartisan cooperation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. AMLIE].

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Chairman, according to recent figures put out by the American Federation of Labor, we have had something over 12,000,000 unemployed during the past 5 years and something over 11,000,000 unemployed during the past 6 years. Throughout the country the feeling is growing with the people that the situation we face is a chronic one; that we may expect to see a continuation of this degree of unemployment for an indeterminable period into the future. Here in the House the feeling still persists as it did 4 years ago that this is a temporary depression and that before long prosperity will return, everyone will be given employment, and the necessity for relief will end.

I do not believe there is any justification for this hope, and I believe we should begin to take general notice of the fact that what we are facing today is what we are going to face next year and the year after that.

Since the depression began we have had an increase in output per man-hour in manufacturing, generally conceded

to be in excess of 30 percent. This means we could return to the industrial activity of 1929 and still have eight or ten million people unemployed. As a matter of fact, we could return to that degree of industrial activity and instead of employing the seventeen and a half million workers that were employed at that time, we could turn out the same quantity of manufactured goods with 12,300,000 workers.

If we assume that the technological advance will go on during the next 6 years as it has during the past 6 years, we could then achieve the industrial output of 1929 with only 8,610,000 workers.

This situation, it seems to me, presents a problem that is going to remain with us a long time. These 11,000,000 or 12,000,000 people are unemployed today, and they are going to be unemployed indefinitely into the future, even though we have a return to the industrial activity of 1929. As a matter of fact, last December, January, and February we had achieved substantially the normal industrial activity that prevailed during the years 1923, 1924, 1925, and 1926.

So, in a sense, prosperity has returned, but we still continue to have 11,000,000 or 12,000,000 people unemployed.

Prosperity has returned from another standpoint. Not long ago, a financial writer, John T. Flynn, gave the figures of profits covering some 388 corporations.

During the first 6 months of 1933 these corporations earned $77,000,000.

During the first 6 months of 1934 they earned $380,000,000.

During the first 6 months of 1935 they earned $435,000,000.

I have a brother-in-law who returned recently after spending a year in England, and he tells me that the economists he met there were all talking about one thing, and that was the great American boom.

These economists are perfectly right. We are in this country having a boom through increased industrial activity and increased profits; and, as a result, the securities listed on the New York Stock Exchange have increased from $32,000,000,000 to $51,000,000,000 in the course of a year and a half.

But we still have 12,000,000 people unemployed at the present time, and barring another world war, these people are going to remain unemployed. It seems to me high time that the Congress of the United States, both parties represented here—the two major parties—ought to recognize that this unemployment will remain with us indefinitely into the future.

I recall the first session of the Seventy-second Congress. We had up to that time proceeded on the theory that if we let nature take its course, eventually we would snap out of the depression.

The philosophy was abandoned when we enacted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation law. Those of you who were here at that time remember the tremendous amount of pressure that was brought to bear by the business interests, who were unwilling, apparently, to take the same medicine which they had insisted upon for the unemployed, when they realized that the deflationary process was injuring them also. Under President Hoover the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loaned almost $3,000,000,000 to bail out "busted" bankers and businessmen.

The election of 1932 gave the answer of the American people to the effect that they did not intend to work out of the depression by following the policy of deflation to its logical conclusion.

Under Mr. Roosevelt we have abandoned the idea that we can work out of the depression by following a deflationary course. Outside of a few responsible men like Senator CARTER GLASS and H. Parker Willis, I really cannot think of anyone who at that time believed that we could go on with a program of deflation.

Since the decision was made, made with the agreement of a great majority of the American people, to embark on a program of spending, it seems to me the thing to consider is how can we spend money. The Government could, for instance, have gone ahead and built permanent buildings of one kind and another, such as is proposed by the Public Works Administration, but this kind of program of course encountered objection by business for the reason that every expenditure for permanent buildings today adds to the tax load in the future in the form of maintenance expense for those buildings. Probably 10 or 20 percent of the money expended now would be reflected in permanent carrying charges each year in the future. For that reason we find business quite generally opposed to permanent expenditures of this kind.

There is another thing which I have advocated and which I believe should be done. In February a year and a half ago, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the figures from the F. E. R. A., showing the cost of giving relief on various bases. In December 1934, it cost $165,000,000 a month to take care of the unemployed, with 42 percent of the people at made work. That was the figure of the F. E. R. A., that if we would but do away with made work and put people on the straight dole, which has now become the Republican program, the same kind of relief could be given for $130,000,000 a month; or if we were to do away with retail purchasing and buy everything on a wholesale basis and distribute it to the unemployed through a commissary system, it could be done for $92,000,000 a month, but if the unemployed were to be given the opportunity to go to work supplying their own needs, the figures of the F. E. R. A. indicated that they could then be given the same standard of living for $60,000,000 a month, that now costs $165,000,000 a month. This report went on to say that if that amount were increased from $60,000,000 a month to $78,000,000 a month, it would be possible to increase the living standard of the people on relief by 35 to 40 percent, bringing people on relief a higher standard of living than that normally enjoyed by people employed in industry.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AMLIE. Yes.

Mr. THURSTON. The gentleman made some reference to the Republican policy, which of course is not admitted or supported by the Republican organization, but I ask the gentleman if he believes that the policies and remedies of the Democratic Party of free trade, low tariff, or reciprocal tariffs will serve to employ these ten or twelve million people who are unemployed.

Mr. AMLIE. I do not believe it is possible to reduce tariffs during a period of economic retraction, regardless of what my viewpoint might be in time of prosperity. I think we are all agreed that it is impossible in times like these to do any such thing.

Mr. THURSTON. Then the gentleman is in favor of tariffs in distressed times, but not in fair weather?

Mr. AMLIE. I would want to take more time than we have now to answer such a question, but it is impossible to reduce tariffs in times like these, regardless of what my philosophy might have been 20 years ago under different circumstances.

The figures I have given were also put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator Bronson Cutting shortly before he died; in the form of a letter written by Jacob Baker, Assistant Relief Administrator.

But when the proposal is made to put the unemployed to work, business immediately objects upon the ground that it is interfering with business. The point I make is that if we can give people on relief the same standard of living for $60,000,000 that is costing $165,000,000 a month, then let us be frank and recognize that at least $105,000,000 a month is a dole to business and not to the unemployed. I am willing to defend the proposition that of the money that has been spent up to this time either as charity expenditures or in the form of loans of one kind and another, aggregating almost $20,000,000,000—some has been repaid—the great bulk of that has gone as a dole to business and not to the unemployed. Business has gotten more out of this administration than the unemployed; and if people here are really sincere in saying that boondoggling demoralizes the unemployed—and I am inclined to agree with them—none of us would get any satisfaction in going out and doing with a

pick and shovel what we know could be done for one-tenth of the cost with a steam shovel; still, if we really believe these people are willing to work, why not give them this opportunity to contribute their own labor toward their own support? I am sure the unemployed would get great satisfaction out of that, and we could reduce the amount of relief expenditures by more than half. In the meantime I think we should also recognize that most of this money is going as a dole to business and is not going as a dole to the unemployed.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AMLIE. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Beside the benefit that business is getting as a dole, would the gentleman make some observation as to the standards of living on which the unemployed are maintained today?

Mr. AMLIE. I can give a statement by Dr. Walter R. Campbell, of the department of medicine of the University of Toronto, at the American Medical Association convention at Atlantic City last year, in which he said:

> Twenty-five million of the unemployed in Canada and the United States are in danger of becoming unemployable by eating a relief diet too high in carbohydrates and too low in proteins for reasons of economy. Much emphasis has been placed on the economy of starch calories as opposed to fat calories, which are relatively expensive. Unemployment diets are tending to run high in carbohydrates. * * * The apparently inevitable degradation from unemployment to unemployable should not be accelerated by a falsely economical provision of foodstuffs.

I notice in the gentleman's own city last fall there was a report by Dr. Smith, assistant director of health education, stating that lack of sufficient food had wasted bodies and sapped the mental vigor of more than a hundred thousand school children until they can no longer keep up with their better-fed classmates in school work. In the elementary schools on Manhattan Island there are 125,000 seriously undernourished youngsters.

Incidentally I might say that the percentage of sickness among people on relief ranges anywhere from 25 to 60 percent higher than among people who are not on relief. So it is only too apparent that people are not getting enough to maintain their health.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. AMLIE] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. AMLIE. Because business objects to the spending of money for permanent public works, and objects to spending money for permitting the unemployed to contribute their own labor toward their own support, there remain only two possible alternatives, and they are the dole on the one hand and boondoggling on the other. I think it is a disgrace in the year 1936 if the American people are going to be given the opportunity merely to choose between those two alternatives represented by the Republican Party and the dole on the one hand and the Democratic Party and boondoggling on the other. As a choice between those two evils, and that is apparently the choice, I want to say that under the old deal the average relief was only $8 a month per family. By October 1933 it had gone up to $17.22. In January 1935 it had reached a high of $30.30. Then it began to slip. In September 1935 it was back to $25.90. Under the W. P. A. approximately three and one-half million people last year, during the current year, were working at $50 a month. A million and a half more could have qualified, but the appropriation was not sufficient to take care of them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make a suggestion to the Committee on Appropriations. This bill was reported today. I hold in my hand the hearings covering 2,000 pages and more. The bill itself contains over 100 pages. There is much information in these hearings. We are sitting as a jury, presumed to decide a case, and the evidence is found in 2,000 printed pages which was not available—not obtainable by a single member of the jury—until we commenced consideration.

We talk about debate, and much is said about debate not being confined to the bill. Who is going to be able to talk about what is in these 2,000 printed pages when he has had no opportunity to know what the evidence is? It seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations, which follows this custom continuously, should change the custom. In other words, a bill is brought in appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars, yet the facts which are known only to that committee, cannot be obtained by a Member of the House who must pass upon the bill before we vote.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. It does seem to me that common sense would dictate that if Congress is to render anything approaching deliberate judgment, it should at least be given the evidence in printed form, possibly 24 hours, in any event, before they begin consideration. It may be said, of course, that we will have time to read the hearings before we vote, but it is a physical impossibility to read the hearings and remain on the floor. In other words, if a Member of the House took the hearings which were delivered to us at the very hour when this bill was called up for consideration, and retired to his room and read all day and all night continuously, he might have digested, in a general way, this information.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not understand just what the gentleman's complaint is. What are we doing that the gentleman thinks we should not do?

Mr. MICHENER. I do not think you should bring a bill of this importance before the Congress without any information available to the Congress. The rules of the House and the custom of the House contemplate that the committee in charge shall hold hearings. Those hearings are printed for a purpose, and the purpose is that the House may read them and know what they are going to be asked to vote upon. The hearings are printed to be used by the House in reaching a conclusion and not to be filed away on a shelf.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman knows the bill is here by the unanimous consent of the House?

Mr. MICHENER. That is another thing. The bill is here by unanimous consent of the House. We did an unusual thing today. The chairman of the committee did a very unusual thing. He asked that all points of order be waived. When I had the temerity to suggest it was unusual, I was advised that the majority had the power, that you had the Rules Committee upstairs, and that if we did not consent to the unanimous-consent request, you would use the Rules Committee, you would use the power, and you would do it anyway. Therefore, any consideration asked for would only mean delay. Of course, not wanting to delay, I withdrew my objection, and we are here by unanimous consent.

We have a bill here that has many things in it which violate the rules of the House and we are estopped from raising points of order because we consented not to raise them under a threat of the use of power if we did not consent.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is no different from what the custom has always been. The gentleman knows the bill is here in the regular course that every appropriation bill has been introduced here for years.

Mr. MICHENER. No.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman should recall this fact——

Mr. MICHENER. I cannot yield to the gentleman, for I have such limited time.

Mr. WOODRUM. I will yield the gentleman some time if he wants more. The gentleman has colleagues on the Appropriations Committee—and we all rely on our colleagues—who are distinguished, able, vigorous, and active gentlemen. They are entirely satisfied with what is being done. It seems to me the gentleman's complaint is rather farfetched.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not agree that the distinguished, able—I forget the other adjectives the gentleman applied to the minority members of the committee—are entirely satisfied. If they are entirely satisfied, then I think it is time the House assert itself.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the gentleman know how many millions of dollars are involved in this bill?

Mr. MICHENER. No; I cannot say; and I would like to ask the chairman of this committee why it is no bills are available. Since 12:30 this afternoon, 1 hour after the House convened its session, I tried to get a copy of the bill, the bill I am to be asked to vote on and that all Members are to be asked to vote on. It is not obtainable now and has not been since 12:30 this afternoon. I do not know whether a lesser number than usual was printed—I do not know what became of the bills, but I do know that I have no bill and that other Members have been unable to get copies of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUM. Is there any doubt in the gentleman's mind that he is going to vote for the bill?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. There is doubt in the gentleman's mind?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I happen to be one of those Members who, as a rule, wants to know what is in a bill before he votes for it. I have just told the gentleman I have not seen the bill. I do not know what is in it. I cannot get a copy of the bill, yet the gentleman asks if there is any doubt that I am going to vote for it.

Mr. WOODRUM. I hand the gentleman a copy of the bill right now.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman; but I do want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that a custom has apparently grown up in the House, at least on the majority side, that majority Members are expected to follow these vigilant leaders to whom the gentleman referred; and the gentleman is surprised that I have the boldness to say I have not made up my mind whether I am going to vote for a bill which I do not know anything about. The custom of which I speak has become entirely too common. Too many Members are voting for bills they never read, bills they have no opportunity to read. They follow their distinguished leader, my good friend; and he is a very splendid gentleman, an affable gentleman, a good leader, but I sometimes pity him in the position he is in. At times he blushes, but he goes along; but the time is not far distant when the back of the gentleman will be calloused by the party Whip to such an extent that the sting will not be felt longer and he will again exert himself in the splendid manhood which he heretofore has displayed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman like a little more time?

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. I did not get a definite answer to the last inquiry I made of the gentleman from Michigan, namely, whether he knew how many millions were involved in this bill; and if he does not know, can he tell us how we may find out?

Mr. MICHENER. Answering the gentleman from Massachusetts, I would say that I have finally succeeded, through the generosity of the chairman of this committee, in getting a copy of the bill which I hold in my hand.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does it say in it how many millions of dollars are involved?

Mr. MICHENER. I do not know. I am going to retire to the cloakroom and look at the bill and find out how much is in it; and I suggest to some of the other gentlemen who have not been able to get a copy of the bill, but who want to know what is in it, if they will come to me I will lend them this bill so they can find out what they are going to be asked to vote for in a little while.

Mr. TREADWAY. What I want to know from the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Chairman, if he does not know how many millions are involved, whether it is not a fact that more millions are involved than there are Members on the floor at this moment.

Mr. MICHENER. There are about 50 Members here at the moment.

Mr. TREADWAY. No; about 25.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not know. Let us say 25 to 50.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question ?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield. I would like to look at the gentleman's bill. I have been trying since 12 o'clock to get a copy of it, but have not got one yet.

In conclusion let me remind you of the importance of this measure. It furnishes the money to carry on the social-security program. It provides relief for the destitute and the unemployed for the coming year in addition to the usual deficiency appropriation bill items. Yet as the Members of the House, we are now debating the merits or demerits of this proposed legislation; and yet as Members of the House, we are unable to secure copies of the bill. Of course, intelligent debate cannot be indulged in by any excepting the few members on the Appropriations Committee who are familiar with the facts. This whole practice is wrong, and I for one shall continue to protest against such procedure. There is no legitimate reason why hearings containing the facts, which are the basis for the appropriation, should be withheld from the membership until this late hour. Possibly knowledge of the contents of the hearing will provoke debate. Surely the Members will have more knowledge about the provisions of the bill. The responsibility for this legislation rests on the individual membership, and that membership should not be denied access to all of the facts, even though those facts are available to the committee members.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, in common with the gentleman from Massachusetts, of course, we all realize that in times like this, some provision must be made to care for those within our Nation who are unfortunate enough to be unemployed. We realize that we cannot cut off appropriations to care for those people, and I am sure that very few, if any, of us have any desire to do so. But when I look over this bill, which is called a deficiency appropriation bill, to my mind it is badly deficient with respect to that part of the appropriation which is made in order to provide work for the unemployed. It is sadly deficient in the fundamental principle which should be back of legislation of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, we all realize that under present conditions we must provide a public-works program for the relief of our unemployed. During the past 3 years we have been reemploying men at a rapid rate, but labor-saving machinery has been almost as effective in displacing labor as we are at reemploying it. We all agree that we cannot allow our unemployed to go hungry or be in want for clothing or shelter. The dole is unthinkable. We must provide work until industry can absorb our unemployed.

Mistakes are, of course, inevitable. The disgrace in a mistake is making the same one twice. We must not repeat our mistake in W. P. A. We must not make the mistake of allowing this appropriation to go as we did the last one—unearmarked into the hands of a professional spender of other people's money.

Unemployment may be a national problem, but reemployment is a local problem. To solve it requires something more than bureaucratic theory. It requires a practical consideration of the conditions in each locality. Conditions vary so greatly in different localities that no blanket set of administrative rulings can apply effectively. Spring, summer, and fall in a rural community, when farm labor is in demand, offers much more chance of seasonal employment than does

the same season in a city. In order to function effectively and economically a reemployment program must be flexible, otherwise a great deal of money will be spent for useless projects. In my district under the W. P. A. a great deal of money has been unwisely spent which should have been wisely spent. Too much of it has gone to useless projects and the taxpayers are grumbling. They have a right to grumble. Let no one believe that they do not pay their share of taxes, whether they pay them directly or not. Even the W. P. A. worker pays these taxes, and the smaller the income the greater proportion of it goes for taxes.

Gangs of W. P. A. workers were used to scrape down the slopes of the banks along the roads. In many places the sod was taken off the banks above back as far as the fence posts. The hard winter and the rainy spring brought these slopes down onto the berme. The money had been so foolishly spent as to make necessary the spending of more to repair the damage caused. If the program had been elastic enough, this money could have been applied to building roads of native stone, which would have gone a long way toward taking the farmers out of the mud. I venture to say that the money wasted upon useless projects and that which has been paid out in doles in my district would have done away with every dirt road in my district. Then it would not have been wasted and would still have furnished employment.

In another section of my district the Monongahela River is carrying away much valuable land at certain spots. Not far away are cliffs overhanging the road from which rocks fall and menace all traffic. If the W. P. A. program was as flexible, as it should be, these cliffs could be sloped back and the stone taken from them could be used to revet the river banks at those places where the serious erosion is taking place.

The ideal way to provide for relief and reemployment is to do so locally.

Mr. AMLIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. AMLIE. In 13 States which cannot raise money this would amount to a death sentence so far as the unemployed are concerned?

Mr. FADDIS. I cannot see why one State cannot raise money the same as other States. The unemployment load is practically the same within States. It is a fact that the constitutions of the States prohibit them from raising money. These States where the constitution does not prohibit them from raising money do raise their share of it. Until we put relief back into the hands of local authorities the problem will never be solved. [Applause.]

If the taxes were imposed locally, the taxpayers would be more conscious that they come from their pockets and would therefore be more vigilant in watching for racketeering and unwise spending. Every taxpayer would then be an inspector. That system under present conditions would be impossible, as there are many communities which could not raise the taxes. The next best system would be to establish a closer contact between the Federal and local administrators. The best method of doing this is to follow the system of P. W. A. Under P. W. A. we are leaving something behind in the way of permanent improvements which improvements will lessen the local tax burden of the future. The P. W. A. has been the most valuable agency of the Government when it comes to aiding real recovery. It has helped to bring back the so-called heavy industries and has assisted in putting men to work in the natural fields of employment. We are trying to get this Nation back to normal times and as soon as possible discard emergency measures. Let us, therefore, do everything possible to get the unemployed back on industrial pay rolls, where they belong and where they wish to be.

I am quite certain that there is no taxpayer in my district who objects to providing for the unemployed. They do, however, object to spending money upon useless projects, where useful ones can be provided. They, as taxpayers, have the right to object to such practices, and I, as their Representative in Congress, have the right to voice their objections. In fact, it is my duty to do so and to fight for correction of abuses. If I did not do so, I would be false to their trust in me.

This is a nation of representative government, but for years it has been drifting toward a government by bureaucracy. Representatives of the people come to this body and vote taxes to finance the appropriations which they make. The administration of the agencies which handle these appropriations is placed in the hands of bureaucracies over which neither we nor the people have any control. These bureaucracies are not the result of emergency legislation but have been steadily gaining in power for many years. We are held responsible by our constituents for the manner in which this money is spent. It is our responsibility to see that proper restrictions are imposed to insure the wise spending of this money, and if we refuse to shoulder this responsibility, our constituents should defeat us and replace us with those who will do so. [Applause.]

Mistakes will be made, of course, but let them be made by the representatives of the people. The people can talk to their Representatives and through the ballot have a check on them every 2 years. Not even a Representative or a Senator can talk to these arrogant, theoretical, bureaucratic, professional, spenders of other people's money. Drunk with power, they delight in being contemptuous and even insulting toward the duly elected representatives of the people. They are able to prostitute acts of the Congress to their bureaucratic desires and are leading us hell-bent into a bureaucratic dictatorship. If we have no voice in their appointment we have no check upon their actions. We are not legislators but mere writers of checks, with no voice as to the amount.

It is not only our right but our duty to see that, while furnishing employment for the needy, the money shall be expended in a wise manner. It is our duty to throw restrictions around these theoretical bureaucrats. There must be closer contact between Washington and the community in which the money is spent. More responsibility must be placed upon the local administrators.

The administration of the money wrung from the taxpayers must be placed in the hands of men whose training consists of something more than the administration of the affairs of relief agencies for the last 24 years. A man to be qualified to administer relief should have had experience in life which has trained him in the application of practical solutions of the problems of the Nation. To that kind of man, and to that kind only, can we look to to solve our difficulties. These theoretical professional bureaucrats are only interested in bureaucratic expansion and usurpation of more bureaucratic power. They have no notion of solving the problems of the day, because when these problems are solved their bureaucratic power and grandeur is gone.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD].

Mr. LORD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], who has just spoken, and it takes my mind back to the early days of relief in New York State before the Federal Government attacked the problem. We made appropriations for relief, and we carried on relief by nonpartisan boards. It was not made a political proposition at that time, and we received from the Red Cross flour, clothing, cotton goods, and almost all kinds of food, and with a small amount of money we were able to take care of our people very well.

When the Democrats came into power they plowed under the wheat, plowed under the cotton, and the people go hungry, or we have to borrow from the Government to take care of them.

To my mind it would have been much better if we had continued to raise wheat and cotton and had taken care of our poor people and not left them starving and cold. I believe now the Government should turn over to the States grants or allotments and let the States administer relief on a nonpartisan basis and carry on the work as we did before the Government took hold of it.

After the Government came in to take care of relief the expense was greater. In some instances as much as 50 percent went for administration. Up in my district they distributed seed potatoes in a country where every farmer had more potatoes than he needed. They brought into one village 400 cases of condensed milk where there were two condenseries right in sight of the place where they unloaded the milk. We also had a Democratic candidate for sheriff, who lost out in election, and they made him the head of the distribution of these foods. They are now paying around $2,500 a year to distribute these commodities that come from the Government, which we had distributed for nothing. I hope we may get away from this political angle and take care of these projects by local nonpartisan committees and that we may have flour distributed by the Red Cross for our people to use and that we may have clothing distributed by the Red Cross. It was always done efficiently then and without expense to the people. The partisan distribution has not been efficient or satisfactory.

Mr. GOODWIN. How about pork?

Mr. LORD. The pigs and sows were destroyed, so we cannot distribute pork any more.

A few days ago I was up in my district and I visited one of our silk mills. The man who is running that mill I have known for some time and he told me he was going out of business in about 4 days. I asked him what the trouble was and he said:

> I am the last of a number of silk mills in the city of Binghamton to go out of business, and the N. R. A. is what put me out of business. We were doing a good business up until the time when the N. R. A. came into vogue and then we raised our prices according to the N. R. A. schedule. Our customers took the orders we had on hand, but when it came to renewing them or reordering from us, we could not get such orders, because they said, "Your price is too high", and they looked elsewhere for the products.

So all of the mills in this one city have gone out of business and many more have gone out of business at other points throughout my district. The President demands that industry put more to work and then hampers and drives business to the wall with legislation like the tax bill that was just passed.

While over in Japan this past fall I visited the textile mills there and I think I found out somewhat the reason for our textile factories going out of business. Over there they work eight and a half hours a day with two shifts a day in these mills. Where they work only one shift, they work ten and a half hours. They work every day in the week, not stopping for Sunday. The wages of the girls who work in these factories amount to about 15 cents a day in our money, or about 50 cents in their money. If our girls were paid 50 cents a day for 8½ hours, it would about compare with their wages. The highest-priced man in these factories receive a yen and a half a day, which would amount to about 45 cents in our money, or $1.50 in our mills. So when they bring this product to this country, as they are doing, we have to compete with these prices, which we are not able to do. They are just flooding the country with their goods and as time goes on we will keep selling less of our goods.

I know there is great agitation in this country for a shorter work week of 30 hours. To my mind if we should establish a 30-hour week, we would be just that much worse off and our customers would buy more and more from Japan. Their business will go along better and we will have less people at work than we have at the present time, the higher prices are, the less people will buy.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LORD. In a moment.

Every time we increase the cost of an article, that article does not meet with as great a demand and there is not as much of it sold. This is the case with silks and with other textiles that come from that country.

I met a buyer for one of the large dry goods stores and he told me that they keep buyers in Japan all the time purchasing for their stores in this country, and that they could buy over there and pay the tariff and get the articles for very much less than they can buy similar goods in this country.

I am for relieving the workingmen in our Nation, but we cannot do it by shortening the hours of labor, so long as Japan and other countries paying much less wages and working nearly twice as many hours have almost free access to our markets.

In Japan everybody works, everybody is doing something. The wages are very small and we do not want our workers to come down to their level of wages; but unless we give business more than a breathing spell, textile industries will continue to go out of business and we will have more and more unemployed.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LORD. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Would the gentleman advocate some degree of greater protection against these imports? I think we should protect American industry, the American workmen against the bringing in of such a flood of imports.

Mr. LORD. The only way that I can see that we can protect American industry is by some tariff law high enough to make up the difference in wages between the countries. We have got to give our workers more protection, not shorter hours. Shorter hours increase prices. If we increase the cost of an article, we lose that much business for the trade goes to where the prices are most favorable. For the good of our workers, we should protect our own markets.

Japan is supplying us at the present time. It is only 3 or 4 years that we have been getting so large a production from that country, and it is, to a great extent, on account of the difference in exchange and living conditions.

The reciprocal agreement with Canada is affecting the farmers of this country adversely and especially the dairy farmer.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I want to say to the gentleman that I opposed the reciprocal tariff.

Mr. LORD. I realize that the gentleman opposed it. I think all of my party are opposed to it, and all those who have the welfare of the dairy farmer at heart. Reciprocal agreements that President Roosevelt has made with Canada, on dairy products, applies alike to all countries and is ruining our farmers. If we could have protection from a country like Japan, especially the manufacturers, we could protect our industry and until such time as we give protection to the farmers and manufacturers we are going to continue to lose business and will have more unemployed on the relief rolls. [Applause.]

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, three incidents closely allied in a program whose purpose is practically identical, and of menacing importance to the people, occured in Washington today.

FIRST EPISODE

Early this morning people who were awake found the red Soviet communistic flag of Russia floating over their Supreme Court Building just across the grounds from the Nation's Capitol. Of that the Washington Evening Star says:

> The red flag of Communist Russia threw its lurid reflection over America's Capital this morning as the rosy-fingered dawn tinted the eastern skies, but a swift marshaling of all the orderly processes of American Government repulsed the threatened upheavel.
>
> The unfurling, in explanation, occurred on the 80-foot mast of the new Supreme Court Building sometime between 4 and 4:30 a. m. Discovery of this subversive attempt to undermine our great Democracy came as an inquisitive sun peeped over the horizon and inquisitive newsmen responded to a mysterious telephone query as to why the emblem of the hammer and sickle should be casting its benediction over the sacred home of the Nation's highest tribunal.
>
> Decisive action followed and, after some tall climbing by a fireman armed with a blow torch, the flag went up in smoke and the Republic was returned to a sound basis.
>
> Capitol Police examined a copy of the Harvard Lampoon discovered at the base of the flagpole. In the magazine, in addition to a few jibes at Yale and Princeton, was an article entitled "Down With Capitalism."
>
> Discovery of the emblem raised a real problem as building guards found the halyards so skillfully and completely knotted that they resisted all attempts at disentanglement. As in most emergencies

of an unusual nature, reliance was placed in the fire department—and not in vain.

A careful investigation is under way, the captain said, in hopes of apprehending ringleaders of the "revolution."

That was one occurrence. That was the way Communists had of showing their contempt for law and orderly government.

SECOND EPISODE

Then the House met at noon, and shortly thereafter there was introduced a report of what is called the Sisson bill, which now is much better known as the "sissy" bill to repeal the law that prevents communism from being indoctrinated in our public schools, which Communists call the "red rider." I want you to read that report. There are more misstatements in it than otherwise. One gross misstatement in it is the assertion that the House and Senate conferees put the "red rider" in the bill in conference. Everyone who knows about legislation or about parliamentary rules and procedure know that that is untrue. That so-called "red rider" never went into the bill until the House itself on this floor by a unanimous vote voted it into the bill, after it had been offered from the floor by Chairman CANNON, and read by the clerk, and until the Senate by a unanimous vote voted it in the bill, after it had been offered from the Senate floor by Senator THOMAS, and read by the Senate clerk, and then voted into the bill by the unanimous vote of the Senate. The conferees had no right to put it in, because it was legislation, and did not put it into the bill. It had to be put in from the floor of the House and the floor of the Senate by the House and the Senate, which was done both by the House and the Senate.

That is the second occurrence. How did the Communists know that the "sissy" bill would be reported today? I did not know it. The Speaker did not know it. It could have been reported any day during the past 20 days.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a minute, if I have time. I want to show you that Communists in New York knew that the "sissy" bill would be reported today, so that you may realize just how closely allied these matters are that are happening here today.

THIRD EPISODE

Here is a mimeographed document that just reached Washington, just came here a few minutes ago, from New York City, and it is not for release until tomorrow in the press. It is "for release Friday, May 8, 1936." It is issued by "The American Civil Liberties Union, of 31 Union Square West, New York City, Roger N. Baldwin, director", at the top, and it is for the press to put in their papers tomorrow.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate is to be confined to the bill and the gentleman is not confining himself to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman from New York ought not to be so critical. I have allowed the gentleman on several occasions to speak out of order whenever he desired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I believe in free speech, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I knew the gentleman would, because free speech is one of the main things for which he stands. I will quote from this "red" document, mimeographed in New York by Roger N. Baldwin's "red" organization, and sent here to go in the newspapers tomorrow. Listen to this:

SUPPORT FOR REPEAL OF THE "RED RIDER" URGED

All organizations and individuals interested in education were urged last week by the academic freedom committee of the American Civil Liberties Union through its secretary, Ellen Donohue, to write at once to the Speaker of the House, JOSEPH W. BYRNS, urging him to permit a vote on the Sisson bill to repeal the so-called "red rider" attached last year to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and forbidding "all teaching of communism" in the Washington schools.

In other words, this was timed to reach Washington on the day that that report was put into the basket, to be printed in the press on the same day—tomorrow—that the report then comes from the Government Printing Office as a printed document available to Members. I ask again, how did these "reds" in New York know this "sissy" bill would be reported today? Who is keeping them posted? Why did all three of these episodes happen today? Communists hoisted their flag over the Supreme Court to flaunt what they call their contempt for this Government, to show their contempt for law and for orderly government, and they had the audacity in the nighttime to put up over the Supreme Court Building of this Nation their infamous red flag of communistic Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. BLANTON. These three episodes today were so closely allied that none of you can laugh them off. This is a vital question that menacingly concerns the home and loved ones of every citizen of the United States. Just this week the great Government of France was taken over by Communists, and people in France who have worked a lifetime acquiring property are turning their property into gold and money and sending it from France across the ocean as fast as they can get it out of France. Do not you think it cannot happen here.

Roger Baldwin, this man at the head of this American Civil Liberties Union, that sends out this infamous document at this time, has served his sentence in the Federal penitentiary during the war, and he is the man who appeared before your Fish committee and testified, without a blush of shame, that he is in favor of taking this Government over by force and violence. He testified that he was willing to commit wholesale murder if it was necessary to do it.

Do not slumber peacefully on in imagined security, gentlemen, until this Government is taken over sometime overnight. Do not wait until your Army and Navy can be communized, before taking action, which would cause the sacrificing of the lives of 100,000 of the flower of American manhood to take this Government back. America must awake. Let us awake, America! [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speakers who have preceded me, and I notice that a great many of the remarks have been of a political nature. Probably for that reason many Members of the House have left the floor. I regret this, not because they will probably miss a mighty good speech, but because of the facts I am about to present to them relative to the Public Works Administration and their program.

Mr. Chairman, when we voted for the first $3,300,000,000 public-works appropriation in June of 1933 we did so under the impression that most of it would be used to finance local public works in our home towns, counties, cities, and States. I know there was nothing in the law providing that the money should be used for that purpose but that is what we believed.

When we voted for the second appropriation in June of 1934 we were under the same impression.

And when we voted for the $4,880,000,000 appropriation in the spring of 1935 we still believed that a large share of it would go to make loans and grants on local public projects through the Public Works Administration; but it has not turned out that way at all.

I have been so much interested in this matter that I have given considerable time to studying the records of the Public Works Administration to determine just what use has been made of the money we appropriated in the belief that a large proportion of it would be used to aid our home communities in building the local improvements that they so badly needed.

I found that only $421,728,000, or between 12 and 13 percent, of the first $3,300,000,000 appropriation for Public Works construction was used for loans and grants on 3,925 public improvements built by cities, towns, counties, and States.

The remaining $2,878,272,000 was used for other purposes.

One-half of it, or $1,442,348,000 to be exact, was allocated to the departments of the Federal Government and used for purposes for which Congress always had in the past appropriated money in the regular appropriation bills.

Another $1,187,630,000 was divided among C. W. A., C. C. C., the Farm Credit Administration, the A. A. A., N. R. A., and many other alphabetical agencies. The Emergency Relief Administration got $114,000,000 in the spring of 1935 to augment funds appropriated to it for direct relief.

Most of the remaining $248,294,000 was used for loans to railroads.

Now, I realize that this $2,878,272,000 out of the original $3,300,000,000 public-works appropriation that was allocated to the Federal departments and for the other purposes I have named all went to create employment and increase purchasing power. I do not complain against it on the ground that it did not accomplish those purposes.

But I am complaining that only $421,728,000 of it was used for loans and grants to enable the local communities in our districts to build the things they so badly need.

I know that warships, for which $238,000,000 was allotted to the Navy Department by the President from the first public-works appropriation, are essential for our national defense. But I also know that school houses are just as essential for promoting the general welfare of my constituents as warships are necessary to provide for their national defense.

And I have found in my study of the statistics of the Public Works Administration that only $88,504,000 was loaned and granted to local communities from the first public-works appropriation to build 830 secondary-school projects.

Considering the danger of war that everybody recognizes today, I do not think the $238,000,000 allocation for warships was excessive, but I do think the amount of money loaned and granted for school construction was too small. We ought to remedy that now by making further appropriations to continue the making of loans and grants.

Lighthouses and channel markers are essential for the safety of travelers at sea and on our lakes and rivers. More than five and a half millions of dollars was allotted to the Bureau of Lighthouses of the Department of Commerce from the first public-works appropriation. But garbage and rubbish disposal plants help to promote the general welfare of our constituents. And I find that only $4,762,000 was allotted for that purpose by the Public Works Administration from the first appropriation.

In the beginning, Secretary Ickes himself anticipated that a much greater amount of the first appropriation would be used for loans and grants to our local communities to help them build the things they need and want. In a speech made shortly after he was named Public Works Administrator, he said that he expected approximately $1,750,000,000 would be used for that purpose.

But the whittling down process of allocating the money to the regular departments and alphabetical agencies of the Government went on and on. The stick got shorter and shorter. And now we find that Mr. Ickes' estimate of $1,750,000,000 for loans and grants for public-works projects for our constituents has dwindled down to $421,728,000.

When we passed the $4,880,000,000 appropriation last spring we thought that at least $900,000,000 of it would be used for loans and grants made through the Public Works Administration to the local communities in our districts. And what happened? The records of the Public Works Administration show that only $328,345,465 was used for grants on 4,110 projects in our home communities. This was about 6 percent of the total appropriation.

P. W. A. received applications for thousands of loans and grants that it could not make. Only the other day Secretary Ickes sent up to the Senate, in response to a resolution requesting the information, a list of 6,801 applications for loans and grants totaling $2,659,000,000 for which no funds are now available.

Some communities in my district are on that list. I know the need of the citizens of those communities for the projects for which they have applied for loans and grants. They made their application in good faith, believing that they had a chance to get the money. They went to considerable trouble to make up their applications, and undoubtedly have been put to considerable expense in getting up plans and making other preliminary preparations.

Other communities in my district have received loans and grants, and it looks unfair to me to say to those whose applications have not yet been acted on that we will now stop appropriating money to aid in the construction of local public works. That looks like discrimination to me.

It not only looks like discrimination to me but it is discrimination.

The first to last, out of the money made available to it by congressional appropriation and the operation of its revolving fund, the Public Works Administration has made loans and grants totaling $1,250,092,000 on 8,035 local projects in our home communities. I do not know how many communities have projects, but it is less than 8,000 because there are many projects in each of a considerable number of towns and cities. Perhaps if a count of communities instead of projects was made, there would be between six and seven thousand of our towns, cities, and counties where projects are being built.

The P. W. A. has been of tremendous assistance to industry. The construction dollar has a gigantic effect. It reaches practically every niche and corner of our country. It multiplies the business created two and a half to three times that of the original transaction and furnishes a tremendous amount of indirect as well as direct labor. The abrupt discontinuance of this program would be like kicking the props out from under a bridge before the foundation had properly set.

States, cities, counties, villages in your districts and mine demand the approval of their projects.

Besides furnishing employment for men in occupations for which they have been trained, construction work offers a great source of income to Government. You are all familiar with the revenues received from the many industries furnishing material for construction, but I wonder if you realize the large amount of taxes paid by the contractor. I know I did not until recently. For instance, I have the figures of a highway contract let by the State of Ohio on August 13, 1935, for the sum of approximately $74,000. These show that the contractor paid $4,075.86 in compensation and taxes of one form or another for that job alone. This amounts to 5½ percent of the contract. Furthermore, it does not include the levy for old-age pension and unemployment insurance, which amounts to approximately 2½ percent for the coming fiscal year and subsequently rises to 9 percent.

This represents an important income to Government from contractors which few people realize, and which would be lost if the Federal Government prosecuted the work by force account rather than the P. W. A. system on a contract basis. Assuming the same percentage applies to other States, a $700,000,000 P. W. A. program, resulting in $1,550,000,000 in construction, would result in approximately $73,000,000 income to Government agencies of one form or another from contractors alone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I notice the gentleman mentioned a figure of $70,000,000. Is that the figure that he has in mind for the P. W. A.?

Mr. BEITER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman propose that Congress at this time appropriate $700,000,000 additional funds for P. W. A.?

Mr. BEITER. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Or would he earmark the relief bill that is to come before the House this week?

Mr. BEITER. I propose to earmark the bill that is before the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I had understood that a movement was started in that respect, but that the gentleman had changed his mind and would offer an amendment to provide for additional funds instead of earmarking the relief funds.

Mr. BEITER. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement. There are several P. W. A. projects in my own district that have been tentatively approved. P. W. A. projects with which I am familiar are splendid projects.

Mr. BEITER. And probably that same community has gone to considerable expense to prepare plans and specifications, hire architects, and possibly pay attorneys to present the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true, and such communities are left in a very embarrassing position, because my people were led to believe they would get the P. W. A. funds and at least in one or two instances went to the expense and trouble of voting bonds.

Mr. BEITER. And probably in an adjoining community or town a Public Works project has been in operation and that community has already had allocation made to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, there are several such places, I would say.

Mr. BEITER. In addition to this, social security taxation for the fiscal year on direct and indirect labor amounts to approximately $32,000,000. This brings a total income from contractors and social security taxation of at least $100,000,000. This is one-seventh of the amount requested for P. W. A. and is returned indirectly to the Government. If the work were conducted other than by contract, however, most of the fund would be lost, as the Government does not tax itself.

Right along this same thought comes that of compensation. When the Government prosecutes relief work directly through force-account methods, it is responsible for personal liability and property damage. It is estimated by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission that compensation for workers alone, excluding the vast amount of claims for property damage, amounts to $1 per $100 of the estimated pay roll, or $18,000,000 for the present program. At the same rate this would equal another $15,000,000 for the proposed relief program. In contract work, however, compensation and property-damage insurance is carried by the contractor, relieving the Federal Government of all liability and incidentally creating an additional market in insurance values.

It is no wonder that our constituents and our vast industries request P. W. A. support. Particularly so because, in spite of this, the contractor, by reason of his experience, organization, and efficiency, can do a piece of work cheaper than can be done by inexperienced Government agencies. Furthermore, the savings in contract work is not lost to labor—it is passed on—making possible the construction of other jobs which in turn employ workers directly and indirectly. Instead of having one piece of work completed inefficiently and in an unworkmanlike manner, more work is done in an efficient manner. Men are placed to work in their proper trades, and projects are completed which are of great benefit to the sponsor and a credit to the Federal Government.

As a further proof of the indirect beneficial effect of public works, I have secured a break-down of the construction cost of a group of buildings for the Department of Labor, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Post Office Department, Washington, D. C. I have purposely taken these buildings as they are constructed in a community of few industries and have given rise to the question, by some who have not studied the problem, as to what material benefits the construction of these works has been to labor.

The buildings cost $21,000,000. The surprising part of this is that only $3,000,000 was actually spent in the District of Columbia; the remaining $18,000,000 went to 28 different States and placed men to work furnishing the material and equipment for these buildings, as, for example:

Indiana received	$2,500,000
Michigan received	1,100,000
New York received	1,125,000
Virginia received	1,000,000
Pennsylvania received	2,500,000

With your permission I shall include in the Appendix a complete break-down by States, showing the far-reaching facts of this local expenditure.

In addition, since these sums only represent direct orders for finished products, there were still further transactions necessary for the securing and transportation of raw materials. These transactions spread throughout the United States like the branches of a mighty river and extend back through many smaller rivers, streams, and brooks to a multitude of individual sources. And, as the water passing through these various channels does work on the way to the resultant river, so the various feeders of industry supply work in converting and transferring the raw materials to the finished product.

It is such a natural course of events that I fail to see how anyone can be unappreciative of the value of indirect employment in stimulating recovery and relieving the unemployment situation.

In regard to the employment directly on the site, I would like to leave this important thought with you. Given a definite job to do, a contractor or a Government agency can only efficiently employ a certain number of men, and in either case this number is approximately the same. The truth in this statement lies in the word "efficiency." It may be justifiable in some cases to sacrifice some efficiency on the site in order to create additional employment, but there is, or at least there should be, a definite limit to this sacrifice. Otherwise our citizens become disgusted with the manner in which the work is prosecuted and the morale of the men on work relief becomes completely broken, not only while they are on that particular work but for the future as well. They see in a force account job their fellow workers doing one-half to one-quarter of what should be done in a day. Then immediately say to themselves: "Why should I work, either? No one else is taking interest in this work. This project when completed is certainly going to be of no credit to me. They have been trifling with that rock excavation for weeks, just throwing money away, when a shot of dynamite and a power shovel for a day or two would complete the excavation and make way for us to get down to doing the real job at hand." This soon makes a shirker and a slacker out of a man; in addition, through lack of proper practice in his trade his skill is lost and a lackadaisical attitude implanted in him soon becomes a habit. The ultimate effect of this demoralization of our former industrious workers is at the present time unknown. Only the future will divulge the effects.

It is things like this which are easily eliminated in contract work. No one wants them to occur. You and I do not, and neither does the W. P. A. Nevertheless, it does happen in thousands and thousands of cases which are not under contract.

The difference of 36 percent between the sponsors' contribution of 55 percent for P. W. A. projects and 19 percent for force account work is more than adequate to care for any justifiable inefficiency in construction procedure. Certainly the evidence has been submitted to you regarding the definite benefit to indirect labor and industry warrants the purchase of additional material for durable public works.

The permanency of the projects and their future benefits to society should be an important consideration when computing the man-year cost. It is perfectly obvious that a slightly higher man-year cost for a project which is going to benefit society for 30 years is warranted over other proj-

ects, the life of which is 5 years. For example: The average life of P. W. A. projects is from 30 to 70 years. This would make the yearly amortization cost per man-year for the principal investment equal to one-thirtieth of the original man-year cost, or $615 for direct and indirect labor divided by 30, or only $20.50 per year. In order to get a comparison with this for less permanent work let us take the example of a low-class roadway. The road may be rough, graded by hand, and the roadbed built of local run-of-bank gravel obtained from a public-owned pit. The construction of this road would require practically no other material and consequently furnish no indirect labor. Eliminating foremen, the road could be built with all common labor. Now, for a simple example, assume that labor receives $50 per month, which equals an annual cost to Federal Government of $600.

The life of this project would hardly exceed 1 year. The first winter and spring thaws would probably render the surface impassable. But, for the sake of argument, say the life is 5 years. Now, by dividing 600 by 5 years, the cost per man-year is computed as equally as $120 compared with $20.50 for the average P. W. A. project. In other words, this poor-class road having a 5-year life, requiring all common labor at $600 per year, cost on the yearly basis nearly six times as much as the average P. W. A. type of construction.

That certainly is proof enough that P. W. A. projects which cost practically the same as other types of projects when direct and indirect labor is considered are ultimately vastly more reasonable. [Applause.]

The estimated cost of $21,000,000 for the architectural service, and construction of the group of buildings for the Department of Labor, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Post Office Department Building in Washington, D C. It is estimated the distribution of expenditures for the District of Columbia and various States from which the supply of material is derived and fabrication is in accordance with the following:

Alabama	$30,000
Arkansas	160,000
California	500,000
Connecticut	600,000
Delaware	40,000
Georgia	100,000
Illinois	400,000
Indiana	2,500,000
Maryland	850,000
Maine	50,000
Massachusetts	300,000
Michigan	1,100,000
Minnesota	600,000
Missouri	200,000
New Hampshire	400,000
New Jersey	890,000
New York	1,250,000
North Carolina	100,000
Ohio	850,000
Oregon	50,000
Pennsylvania	2,500,000
South Dakota	10,000
Tennessee	650,000
Vermont	300,000
Virginia	1,000,000
West Virginia	170,000
Wisconsin	400,000
Transportation (various States)	2,000,000
District of Columbia	3,000,000
Total	21,000,000

MATERIALS USED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUILDING

Structural steel, ore from Minnesota, 16,400 tons. Rolling and fabrication, Pennsylvania.

Limestone from Indiana, 2,000 carloads.

Granite, quarried in Connecticut, sawed, cut, and milled in Massachusetts, 150 carloads.

Marble from Missouri, 900 tons.

Mankato stone from Minnesota, 800 tons.

Base marble from Vermont, 470 tons.

Domestic travertine from Colorado and Georgia of which 500 tons of travertine chips from Georgia were used for terrazzo floors.

Cafeteria, serving rooms, and kitchen floors: tile from West Virginia, 35 tons.

Toilet rooms: Wall and floor tile from Ohio, 300 tons.

Common brick from District of Columbia, 10,000,000.

Face brick from Pennsylvania and Virginia: 1,500,000.

Gray brick for boiler room from Pennsylvania, 200,000.

Terra cotta from North Carolina and West Virginia, 27,000 tons.

Reinforced-concrete piling supporting the building, 80 miles or 14,000 piles, Raymond Concrete Pile Co. of New York.

Plastering on walls and ceilings, 99 acres.

Base of building, up to sill of first floor windows is of granite; balance of walls is of Indiana limestone except four courts of brick.

Roof, 95,000 square feet or 400 tons of promenade tile and 160,000 square feet or 1,200 tons of mission tile. Two tons of copper nails were used in the roof.

Bronze hardware used, 25 tons.

Structural steel:	
Pennsylvania	$1,050,000
Minnesota	400,000
Ohio	30,000
West Virginia	20,000
Total	1,500,000
Cement:	
Maryland	450,000
Virginia	450,000
Pennsylvania	50,000
West Virginia	50,000
Total	1,000,000
Limestone, Indiana	2,500,000
Total	2,500,000
Marble:	
Vermont	300,000
Tennessee	650,000
Missouri	50,000
Total	1,000,000
Granite:	
Massachusetts	400,000
New Hampshire	400,000
Total	800,000
Clay products:	
New Jersey	500,000
Ohio	400,000
Virginia	300,000
Maryland	300,000
Pennsylvania	100,000
Total	1,600,000
Lime and gypsum products:	
Michigan	500,000
Ohio	100,000
West Virginia	100,000
Total	700,000
Electrical products:	
Ohio	70,000
New York	300,000
Michigan	300,000
Pennsylvania	450,000
New Jersey	100,000
Alabama	30,000
Connecticut	200,000
Total	1,450,000
Bronze products:	
Michigan	100,000
Connecticut	100,000
Pennsylvania	100,000
Minnesota	50,000
Arkansas	50,000
Wisconsin	100,000
Total	500,000
Metal products:	
New York	100,000
Ohio	100,000
Wisconsin	100,000
Minnesota	100,000
Illinois	100,000
Maryland	100,000
Pennsylvania	100,000
Arkansas	50,000
Missouri	50,000
Total	800,000

Lumber products:	
Oregon	$50,000
Virginia	100,000
Wisconsin	200,000
Georgia	100,000
Michigan	100,000
North Carolina	100,000
Maine	50,000
Total	700,000
Glass:	
Pennsylvania	50,000
Ohio	50,000
Total	100,000
Paint:	
Missouri	50,000
South Dakota	10,000
Arkansas	10,000
New Jersey	40,000
Delaware	40,000
Total	150,000
Asphalt products:	
New Jersey	50,000
Ohio	50,000
Total	100,000
Asbestos products:	
Pennsylvania	50,000
New York	50,000
Total	100,000
Plumbing, heating, ventilating, air conditioning:	
Illinois	300,000
Minnesota	50,000
Arkansas	50,000
Missouri	50,000
Michigan	100,000
Pennsylvania	300,000
Connecticut	300,000
Ohio	50,000
New York	300,000
Total	1,500,000
Elevators:	
Pennsylvania	500,000
New Jersey	200,000
Total	700,000
Sand and gravel: Virginia	400,000
Railroads	2,000,000
Architecture:	
New York	500,000
California	500,000
Total	1,000,000

Materials used in the construction of the Post Office Department Building, Interstate Commerce Commission, Department of Labor and connecting wing building, Washington, D. C.

Combined cost	$20,000,000
Spent in Washington	3,000,000
Spent in States	17,000,000
Structural steel	1,500,000
Fabrication: Pennsylvania	850,000
Materials: Minnesota, Ohio, and West Virginia	450,000
Cement:	
Maryland	450,000
Virginia	450,000
Limestone: Indiana	2,500,000
Marble: Vermont, Tennessee, and Missouri	800,000
Granite: Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and North Carolina	500,000
Terra cotta: New Jersey and Ohio	425,000
Clay products: New Jersey and Ohio	410,000
Brick: Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania	650,000
Lime and gypsum: Michigan, Ohio, and West Virginia	350,000
Electrical products: Ohio, New York, Connecticut, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Alabama	1,200,000
Bronze and hardware: Minnesota, Michigan, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Arkansas	220,000
Hollow metal: New York, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Minnesota	270,000
Lumber: Oregon, Virginia, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and Michigan	630,000
Plumbing, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning: Minnesota, Arkansas, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Ohio	1,580,000

Materials used in the construction of the Post Office Department Building, Interstate Commerce Commission, Department of Labor and connecting wing building, Washington, D. C.—Continued

Paint: Missouri, the Dakotas, Arkansas, New Jersey, and Delaware	$110,000
Glass: Pennsylvania and Ohio	95,000
Ornamental iron: Wisconsin, New York, and Illinois	130,000
Asphalt products: Ohio and New Jersey	115,000
Metal windows: Maryland, Illinois, New York, and Minnesota	150,000
Asbestos products: Pennsylvania and New York	115,000
Elevators: Ohio, New York, Connecticut, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Alabama, and Minnesota	710,000
Sand and gravel: Maryland and Virginia	450,000
Reinforcing steel: Pennsylvania	250,000
Freight	1,300,000
Sculpture: New York	400,000
Piling, metal shells: Ohio	470,000
Bonds: New York, Connecticut, Maryland	150,000
Sheet metal: Colorado	85,000
Vault doors: Pennsylvania	10,000
Cork floors: Pennsylvania	10,000
Flagstones: Kentucky	15,000
Total	16,300,000
Balance representing money spent in Washington, contractors' profit, and miscellaneous items	3,700,000
Total	20,000,000
Total number of States directly benefited	28

Freight item of $1,300,000 of benefit to great number of railroads.

The employment population benefited covers many classes, not only those occupied in various building trades and in manufacture of building materials, but also many of the "white collar" type, such as clerks, salesmen, draftsmen, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] has expired.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, on May 1 there was laid on our desks the first report of one of the New Deal agencies which has quietly been going about its business of making over America by bringing to us the Utopia that is the promised goal of those who are most outspoken in their attacks upon the American system. Although the agency has been in existence for a full year, the report is termed an "interim report" and not a full report as many of us would like to have had and feel entitled to have received. The explanation given by the Administrator for not giving a complete report to Congress is that "we should prefer not to stop in such a busy time for reporting; we should prefer to wait until the program is more complete."

I speak of the Resettlement Administration, headed by that most energetic and well-known but impractical and visionary thinker of the New Deal, Rexford G. Tugwell. He it was, you will recall, who once wrote, "I shall roll up my sleeves and make over America" and, as recently as the fall of 1935, said, "We must make irrevocable political commitment to disciplined democracy, to calculated change of institutions." Perhaps in his latter statement he took his cue from Mussolini, who told the world 13 years ago that the first thing he would do as head of the government would be "to enforce discipline, discipline, discipline."

"Disciplined democracy"—what could Mr. Tugwell have meant when he used that expression? Being the highly educated person that he is we must believe that he uses words which will express his thoughts as accurately as our language will permit. An examination of the word discipline reveals that it is to instruct, to educate, to inform, to train the mind by instruction, and also means to regulate, to govern, and to keep in subjection. Surely if Mr. Tugwell had intended to say that our objective in government was an "instructed" or an "educated" or an "informed" democracy, he would have said so and no one would have taken exception to it. In fact, an enlightened democracy has been the goal of our people since the beginning of our Government and its achievement is one of the most wholesome characteristics of a sound and secure Government of and by the people. We have not quickly forgotten the memorable words of George Washington who said, "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened." But Dr. Tugwell did not

mean that the desired accomplishment was an informed democracy or an educated society; it was to be a disciplined democracy.

Most of us have a pretty fair idea of the meaning of democracy, although the word in recent years has been greatly abused. We understand that democracy is a system of government under which all of us have the same rights and privileges and opportunities, and we know that it is a government of persons selected by ourselves who are committed to work for us and protect our rights and interests. With this understanding of democracy, it is rather difficult to absorb in our minds the full meaning of a disciplined democracy, a regulated democracy, a subjected democracy. How, we ask, can we continue to be democratic but at the same time be regulated and regimented and controlled as Mr. Tugwell seems to say we must be? The term is self-contradictory; democracy and the kind of discipline Mr. Tugwell has in mind cannot travel along the same course, and, unless I am greatly mistaken, the American people prefer their freedom of government and in government than to live under the restrictive rules and regulations of a paternalistic government.

Let us take a look at this agency through which Dr. Tugwell is going to remake America. Certainly Congress had nothing to do with the creation of the Resettlement Administration, has no control over it, and the Administration is not accountable to Congress for any of its activities. Small wonder that the "interim report" to Congress is so full of generalities and reports so little. Even though the representatives of the people had no voice in its creation, yet we find that it directs the lives of hundreds of thousands of our people whose income and outgo and whose activities of everyday life are planned for them by the managerial staff of the Resettlement Administration.

It will be recalled that the President was given $4,000,000,000 with which to relieve unemployment by the exercise of almost unlimited powers. He in turn, by Executive order, gave to Dr. Tugwell broad and unlimited powers and a considerable portion of the fund with which to carry out Dr. Tugwell's ideas. The first Executive order, dated April 30, 1935, gave the Resettlement Administration these powers:

(a) To administer approved projects involving resettlement of destitute or low-income families from rural and urban areas, including the establishment, maintenance, and operation, in such connection, of communities in rural and suburban areas.

(b) To initiate and administer a program of approved projects with respect to soil erosion, stream pollution, seacoast erosion, reforestation, forestation, and flood control.

(c) To make loans as authorized under the said Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 to finance, in whole or in part, the purchase of farm lands and necessary equipment by farmers, farm tenants, croppers, or farm laborers.

In September of that year a further Executive order was issued repeating the paragraphs just given but adding to the second paragraph these four seemingly harmless but highly significant words, "and other useful projects." Thus Tugwell was empowered to initiate and administer almost any kind of program under the sun, and, what is more, he was given the wherewithal to do it.

According to the "interim report" the functions of the administration are segregated into six divisions. The first of these is that of land utilization designed to acquire large areas of unproductive or submarginal land which are to be devoted to recreational parks, game preserves, forests, and grazing. On April 1, 1936, there were 206 such land acquisition projects to include a total of nearly 10,000,000 acres of land, of which 2,000,000 have been bought and the Government committed to the purchase of the remaining 8,000,000 acres.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I prefer to finish my statement, and then I will be glad to yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he was opposed to this resettlement?

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman will see my position before I have concluded.

For the use of this division there was made available over $48,000,000 for land acquisition and $18,000,000 for development and conservation. The amount needed for complete development is over $40,000,000, instead of the $18,000,000, making a total cost of this one experiment approximately $90,000,000, or, roughly, $10 per acre for every acre of land thus taken out of production, a rather dear price to pay for land that admittedly is worthless and unproductive.

The second division is that of rural rehabilitation, for the purpose of lending money to distressed farmers to permit them to carry on their work. Under the established rules, any farmer is ineligible for a loan if he could obtain it from any of the commercial banks, the Federal land bank, Production Credit Corporation, or any other private or governmental agency. In other words, a farmer's credit must be absolutely exhausted before he can get relief. The total amount of public money loaned or granted and committed to be loaned and granted to these persons is $106,000,000 in the first year of activity. Of course, it is expected by those in charge that the bulk of this sum will be repaid by the farmer, including the grants he received. As it is so naively expressed by the "interim report", "it was estimated, when the program was formulated, that 70 percent of the total loans would be repaid." Considering the type of risks involved in these loans, there are few persons whose thoughts are not directed by their wishes who will agree that 70 or even 50 percent of these advances will be repaid. We can easily anticipate the procedure that will come in the future concerning these loans: First, through sympathy for those who are unable to pay, the interest on the loans will be waived by the Government; then, after a bit, the same generous attitude of those controlling the public money will cause them to cancel the farmers' obligations entirely. Indeed, the Government will be extremely fortunate if 30 percent of the principal of these loans is recouped, to say nothing of the carrying charges. Through the farm-debt-adjustment program of this division of the Resettlement Administration, a seemingly worth-while service has been rendered to the overburdened farmer. Acting as the negotiator, the Government has brought the farmer and his creditors together in an effort to not only scale down the principal but also to reduce the interest rates on the debts and to extend the dates of maturity. The adjusments that have been accomplished by his method have been estimated to amount to approximately $30,000,000 by June 30 of this year. The unfortunate part of this debt-adjustment program is that once the Government has succeeded in lightening the debt load the farmer has to carry, the Government has immediately put that same indebted farmer back into debt to the extent of an aggregate of over $53,000,000.

The next function of this "little entente" is the Rural Resettlement Division, which establishes communities of farmers who have been economically unable to make a living or who have been moved from unproductive land bought by the Government.

If all of the 196 projects were to be developed they would provide locations for approximately 25,000 families, require the purchase of approximately 1,400,000 acres of land, and require a Budget of approximately $95,000,000.

So says the report—or a cost of $3,800 per family. We are told that there are more than 500,000 rural rehabilitation families on farms that should be abandoned, who are worthy resettlement clients. At the above rate per family, the total costs of resettling these needy families will be nearly $2,000,000,000 and involve the acquisition of nearly 30,000,000 acres of land. Curiously enough, the report is strangely silent on the amount of money that has been allocated to it or the cost of its activities for rural resettlement to date. Can it be that this studied failure to give even a partial explanation of the per family costs to date is an indication that the ultimate cost of the homes far exceeded their expectations and the ability of the homesteaders to finance? From other sources we learn that the

homes of one of the projects, in Georgia, have averaged nearly $6,000 each, while, in the opinion of the management, $4,000 is the largest debt these selected homesteaders might reasonably be expected to pay off in 30 years' time and at the low interest rate provided.

Besides the management and construction divisions, which are of relative unimportance at this time, except that each of them contain hundreds of administrative and clerical positions and have but very little work to do, the final division is that of suburban resettlement, which has undertaken the construction of houses on the outskirts of industrial cities for use by low-income families whose heads work in the cities. To date, four of these projects have been inaugurated in Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, and Ohio. For this purpose $31,000,000 has been allocated. The communities are to be complete in every respect, with stores, garages, post offices, theaters, and other business establishments. Small garden areas and facilities for rearing cows and poultry are to be included for each home. Because of the feature of being located in the country with lots of green grass growing all around, these resettlements have acquired the title of Greenbelt, Greenhills, Greendale, and Greenbrook.

When one looks at the ultimate costs of the respective projects and realizes the impossibility of the Government ever recovering the investment it has in them, the conclusion is inescapable that the greenness of the name given these settlements comes not from the verdure of the surrounding countryside but the impracticability of the utopian visionaries sponsoring the program.

Greenbelt is to have 1,000 homes at a total cost of $6,950,000; Greenhills to have 1,000 families at a cost of $8,750,000; Greendale will contain 750 homes with an aggregate investment of $7,050,000; and Greenbrook 750 dwellings at a cost of $7,150,000. The average cost of these 3,500 homes and settlements will be approximately $8,500 each.

Imagine a worker of low income being able to buy and pay for a house that costs him around $8,000 and at the same time to pay taxes on it, keep it in repair, carry the necessary insurance, and with it all to feed, clothe, and educate his children! It is unthinkable that this can be done. In the report is this very significant statement:

> The question of ability to pay is a major consideration in arriving at the sales price, and it is felt the maximum amount a person may be able to pay for shelter is 25 percent of his income, and on very small incomes the percentage will, of course, be lower.

Assuming that a person from this class of workers, receiving an annual salary of $2,000, pays at the rate of 25 percent of his income, it will require 30 years in which to pay off the purchase price of the house at the very low rate of 4 percent, and when he finally completes payments on the purchase price he will have nothing but an old, worn-out house. There can be no doubt that the Government does not expect to be repaid its complete investment in these projects. That this is true is inferentially admitted by Dr. Tugwell, for in a speech at Cincinnati on February 3, in discussing suburban housing, he said:

> Let me frankly admit that there may be some element of subsidy if we are to maintain building and maintenance standing and keep rents down.

The most that the average urban worker would be able to pay for his home is from $2,000 to $4,000, and if the Government is to subsidize the worker as Dr. Tugwell says it must, the most it can be expected to recover from the cost of these four projects, alone totaling $31,000,000, is from 25 to 50 percent. Perhaps there might not be much basis for complaint if the program of suburban resettlement were to stop with the projects now undertaken, but this is not the case, for Tugwell has said that—

> If private industry persists in its refusal to exploit the possibilities which are clearly there, the pressure of public opinion may force the Government to enter this field on a very wide scale.

Certainly private industry is not going to enter this field of building houses at a cost of from $8,000 to $9,000 and selling them at a price from $2,000 to $4,000. If the public is fully informed of the nature of these projects and the tremendous loss to the Government which must be borne by the taxpayers, public opinion will demand that these experiments be not carried further.

Of all the homesteads, rural and suburban, which have been created by Tugwell, not a single one has yet been sold. True, many of them are occupied by tenants who are there under a licensing agreement, paying a rental of approximately $10 per room per month. In these licensing agreements the licensee agrees to—

> Cultivate and farm the land included within the homestead to the best of his ability, and to adopt and adhere to any cropping program and tillage practice stipulated by the licensor (the Government).

In this way the Government exacts from the homesteader an obligation to follow any program relating to the use of the homestead which the Government may see fit. Here we have the same regimentation of our people that was the basis of the popular complaint against the codes of the N. R. A. and the cropping rules laid down by the Government under the A. A. A. and the Potato Act. It will be interesting to observe how long the homesteaders of these settlements will submit to governmental dictation in their everyday life.

The costs of these various divisions of the Resettlement Administration as set forth above do not include the expense of administration. In some 19 separate buildings in the city of Washington are offices harboring the administrators of this expensive socialistic program. An employee of the Resettlement Administration says that the Administration pay roll is $2,000,000 per month, and that nearly a third of the employees are receiving salaries in excess of civil-service ratings, with hundreds on the pay roll at salaries from $2,500 to $5,000 per year. A recent series of articles in a local newspaper discloses that Tugwell has employed nearly 17,000 persons to administer his work, at an aggregate expense of over $24,000,000 per year for salaries alone. There has already been allocated to this alphabetical effort to produce "more abundant life" out of funds given the President under blanket authority over $278,000,000, and within the past month we have heard that Tugwell is asking for $200,000,000 more to complete his program, making a total of nearly one-half billion dollars for the purpose of planning and "building 20,000 new homes and work places for the people who are on the land we have purchased", and yet within the past 3 days we hear Tugwell say that—

> This—
>
> The 20,000 new homes—
>
> is the merest fraction of the numbers who would like to be relocated, but it is all we could do with our time and money.

There seems to be no bottom to the pit in which Tugwell is pouring the taxpayers' money, all for the purpose of carrying out his one-time threat of rolling up his sleeves and making over America, and this at the expense of the taxpayer who does have a home and has paid for it through his own hard work, thrift, and self-denial, and further at the expense of a broken morale and initiative on the part of those who accept the paternalism of our benevolent Government. If America needs to be "made over", it can only be done by those processes which have been tried and found true, namely, thrift, sobriety, morality, and industry, and an adherence to the true principles of a Republic under our written Constitution. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN].

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, I arise to express my regret at the remarks of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], made in yesterday's RECORD, in which he impugns the honesty, sincerity, and instincts of fair play of our most wholesome neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada. He says:

> The recent action of the Canadian Government suggests strongly that from their standpoint the Canadian agreement is to a substantial extent a scrap of paper binding still upon our Government and our people but with myriad loopholes through which they can vary their trade policies as they please.

That statement is as unfair as anything could possibly be, and is only equalled in lack of knowledge by the contents of the rest of the speech.

To understand the utter baselessness of the entire argument of the gentleman from Maine, a few remarks as to the Canadian classification of tariff schedules would be a point. They have four different types of rates. The lowest is the rate prevailing among the members of the British Empire. Next are the intermediate rates prevailing among the most favorable nations outside of the British Empire. Then the so-called countervailing rates, which cannot be lower than the intermediate rates, but equal the rates imposed by the tariff of other countries selling the same commodities to Canada which Canada sells to that country.

In other words, the countervailing rate is designed to impose the same burden on the same commodities which Canada buys and sells. The last and highest Canadian rates are the general tariffs which apply to all other countries.

Following the adoption of the Smoot-Hawley tariff and up until January 1, 1936, our trade with Canada was taxed under the general tariff schedules of that country. With the reciprocity treaty a number of our items of export to Canada received special rates, of mutual advantage to both countries and approximately 600 items not mentioned in the treaty were allowed entrance under the intermediate rates.

There was no agreement of any kind with Canada prohibiting her from changing her intermediate tariff rates at any time she desired. Our State Department made a definite effort to get these commodities bound to the intermediate rate, but without success. Canada clearly reserved her right to change these rates at will.

The State Department, in its press release dated November 23, 1935, expressly says of these items on the intermediate list:

> Although the duty reduction on these items, unlike the items in schedule I, are not bound as to duration, they become effective immediately when the agreement enters into force.

Nevertheless, the gentleman from Maine states:

> It remained for our Canadian neighbors, however, very promptly to educate our State Department and our people to some of the possibilities inherent in this agreement.

If there is anyone needing education concerning the Canadian reciprocal treaty, it is the gentleman from Maine. As another evidence of his abyssmal want of information on this subject, he says:

> Canada was left free to make any tariff concessions that might at any time seem advisable to any of the British commonwealth of nations, and the United States was left helpless.

The United States reserved to itself the right to make any change in its tariff schedules on all items not listed in the treaty just the same as the Canadian Government. It is just as helpless as the Canadian Government, no more or no less.

The increase in rates which the Canadian Government has made on potatoes, eggs, flour, cut flowers, and raisins simply raises the duty on those commodities to equal the duty which the United States places on the same commodities coming from Canada.

If the gentleman from Maine desires these duties lowered going into Canada, he ought, in all fairness then, to advocate that we reduce our duties on the same commodities. If we do, Canada will at once respond.

The Canadian Minister of Finance, in referring to these countervailing rates, states:

> This means that other countries who both buy from and sell to us these commodities have it in their own power, by reciprocal action on their part, to enable us to reduce to the level of the rates stated in our tariff * * *. May I make it clear that our attitude continues to be * * * we do not desire nor intend to raise tariffs; we do by the countervailing duties invite other countries to bring their tariffs down to the level of ours.

The apparent obsession of the gentleman from Maine that we should maintain a duty of 75 cents a hundred pounds on potatoes coming from Canada to us and then have the privilege of selling potatoes to Canada free of duty is just about as juvenile and impossible as is the theme of his whole speech to the effect that the people in Maine can prosper by high tariff duties while the rest of the country is suffering from it.

The gentleman professes interest in potatoes and uses that as a basis for his high-tariff arguments. On May 1, 1935, No. 1 grade potatoes were selling at 39½ cents a hundred. May 1, 1936, the same potatoes were selling at $2 a hundred. In 1935, on an ad-valorem basis, potatoes carried a tariff rate of almost 200 percent. In 1936 the tariff on an ad-valorem basis was 37½ percent.

The prosperity of the country will raise the prices of Maine potatoes, as well as the prices of Wisconsin dairy products, many times more effectively than any tariff duties.

Our records for 1934 and 1935 show that foreign trade increased with countries having reciprocal treaties in a ratio six times as great as with nonreciprocal countries. What an utterly asinine suggestion it is for local representatives to come before this body and attack reciprocity treaties because they imagine some of their local interests may be injuriously affected.

The gentleman seems to complain of the tariff reduction that Canada has extended to us since the treaty even as loudly as he does of tariff increases. He says:

> Canada lowered the duties on things they desired to buy from us for the benefit of their customers.

The inference is that, according to his idea, Canada ought to have lowered her duties for the benefit of our exporters. Such a contention would not be any more childish than his idea that Canada ought to submit to our potato tariff of 75 cents and let us sell in Canada duty free. Certainly Canada is interested in her own people who are buying these commodities. She realizes that it is just as desirable to make a profit in a purchase as it is in a sale. To that extent she is just a little better informed on the question of political economy than our high-tariff advocates.

Canada, in her last budget, granted us lower duties on a great many more commodities than she raised and has informed us that she will lower the duties on those raised commodities if we will do the same thing in our tariff.

Could anything be more fair and decent? And yet the gentleman from Maine accuses the Canadian Government of bad faith.

Another statement of the high-tariff gentleman from Maine reads as follows:

> We are trading a market of 100,000,000 consumers in this country for a market of 10,000,000 consumers in our neighbor to the north.

Did it ever occur to the gentleman that Canadians at the same time are submitting their market to the pressure of 100,000,000 producers, while we are only subject to that of 10,000,000 producers? As long as the people in a foreign nation pay their bills they are good customers, regardless of the population involved. They can only consume in proportion to what they produce, and if they are few in number with low production they will sell just that much less to us.

The Canadian people have been excellent customers of ours under reciprocity. In the first 3 months of this year we sold them $14,299,000 in commodities more than we purchased from them. Their increased purchases per capita from us during reciprocity has amounted to 72 cents, while our increased purchases per capita from them has amounted to but 14 cents.

If anybody has any basis to complain, it rests with the people of Canada—not with us.

The struggle of a high-tariff group of antiadministration forces is so utterly impotent that it has taken on a somewhat humorous stage. The great majority of the Republican press has deserted them; the leadership of the United States Chamber of Commerce has seen the light; and even their "brain trust", which they have recently been forced to employ, has backed up on them in their efforts to strangle foreign trade. At least three members of that learned organization—the Republican "brain trust"—Prof. Niles Carpenter, of Buffalo; Prof. Frederick Bradford, of Lehigh; Prof. Rufus S. Tucker,

of Harvard; were all signers of the original protest against the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

Colonel Knox, one of their Presidential aspirants, has openly approved reciprocity. Even the irreconcilable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has recently become mysteriously silent.

Another outstanding member of their advisory board is Prof. Asher Hobson, of Wisconsin. He is generally credited with having been responsible for a large part of the Canadian reciprocal treaty. Yet as a "brain truster" he is now trying to inject enough intelligence into the antiadministration groups to keep them from being ridiculous in the coming campaign.

The unfortunate part about this whole business is that foreign nations cannot get the humor generated by the feeble remarks of the high-tariff bloc, and when a Member of this body spreads on the record ill-advised, baseless, and unfair charges against one of our friendly neighbors there is a danger of these remarks being taken as having some weight, and therefore they ought not to go unanswered. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, we seem to be without a plan. We came into this panic without intelligent planning. We, in Minnesota, in the midst of prosperity and during the years when things were riding high, told the folks that a panic and a depression was impending. Now, in this bill we are appropriating millions of dollars and we seem to have no real plans. Are we ever going to do intelligent national planning in this country? This experience we are now having ought to teach us that.

I think it is all right to have this rural resettlement. Why not build these homes for the people? Let us have resettlement in the rural areas. They are tearing down a slum area in my home city, in my district, and building houses there. I cannot see anything wrong with that. Why should not homes be built there? Why should not folks be given an opportunity to live in better homes and pleasant places? Why not?

I believe in these T. V. A.'s. I voted for Muscle Shoals during the War, and I see some distinguished gentlemen before me who were here at that time and who voted for that project. Now, why not continue that? I cannot see why we should just put out money for relief. Why not furnish self-respecting work of some kind. Why not put it into public works of some kind, so that a man is not just given a certain sum of money to enable him to eat today when he will be just as hungry tomorrow. Why not have some work done at union wages, giving an American standard of living—something constructive that adds to the capital of the country. That is what we believe in; that is what we want; that is intelligent national planning.

A lot of folks find fault with the administration. I am not an administration spokesman. I am probably critical of both major parties, but it seems to me some errors are bound to be made no matter who handles the work. I believe we should have an American standard of living at all times, and where the American standard of living has not been adhered to I do find fault; but where they are seeking to build in this crisis, and construct, and resettle, certainly there the administration ought to be encouraged.

I want to see more construction. I want to see the streams harnessed in order that we may afford light, current, and power to the whole country of the United States. I want to see a blaze of electric light and power throughout these United States of ours so that electric current becomes available at cost to every American home. I want to see woman emancipated from the slavery of the kitchen. I want the farmer lifted from his back-breaking toil. We have the resources, we have the men, we have the money to do this; and if we would only forget this saving of the world and this nonsense about going to war to end war and stop spending money in absurd foreign adventures, and build our own resources for our own people in this America of ours, we would get along better. We should spend our money here on something for our own people. That is constructive statesmanship, proposed by our Farmer-Labor Party; that is good Minnesota doctrine, and I ask your attention now before it is too late.

I have not written my speech; I am just talking straight from the shoulder and right out of my heart, just the way I feel about these things. So far as the administration is moving along these lines I say it deserves credit. Where the administration makes mistakes it should be corrected. I have no sympathy with those who just criticize and criticize and want to save some money for millionaires and billionaires. There are plenty of men who have huge incomes in this country. Let them be patriotic and pay this bill without whining. Let this money be expended for the people. And now there is talk about investigating the Townsend plan—a few thousand dollars spent for salaries and expenses in the interest of old-age pensions. Why do they not investigate J. P. Morgan and Eugene Grace, or some of these men who have billions of dollars and millions of income every year. Investigate them. That would be more to the point. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCCORMACK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow; and in explanation, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I will say it is the hope of those in charge of the bill, as well as of the minority members of the committee, that if we finish debate tomorrow, we may proceed with the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule, and take it up to the point of the motion to recommit, in which event it will be the purpose to adjourn over until Monday.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate no. 58 to the bill H. R. 12098, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 9, 20, 25, 29, 35, 42, and 45 to the bill H. R. 11035, entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill S. 3789, entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the city of Charleston, S. C.", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COPELAND, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. JOHNSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill S. 381, entitled "An act for the relief of the Confed-

erated Bands of Ute Indians located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico."

ALBERT THESING, JR.

Mr. DUFFY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3823) for the relief of Albert Thesing, Jr., with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the parents of Albert Thesing, Jr."

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CENTURY OF PROGRESS CELEBRATION OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of The Century of Progress Celebration of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

THE CENTURY OF PROGRESS CELEBRATION OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA

The founding of the first American chapter of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the memory of its members who defended old St. Patrick's Cathedral, Prince and Mulberry Streets, in New York City against the Know-Nothings mob in 1844 were commemorated in that city on Saturday and Sunday, the 2d and 3d of May 1936.

"Be ever patriotic and live by the Constitution," Cardinal Hayes declared in an address to more than 2,500 persons of Irish birth or ancestry gathered at St. Patrick's Cathedral on May 2, 1936, for a pontifical Mass in celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

"The flag of our country stands very much in need of loyalty today," the cardinal said, "and I feel that the men of this order will lay down their lives for this country."

The cardinal addressed the gathering after a sermon in which the Most Reverend James A. Griffin, bishop of Springfield, Ill., praised the religious courage of the Irish spirit. Referring to the bishop's sermon, Cardinal Hayes said the Irish spirit in this country and in this city was "the very spirit for which the cathedral stands. The Irishman has a reputation for being a good soldier. It springs from his faith—fighting for God first, last, and always."

The one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the order in the United States was observed with a 2-day celebration. More than 1,600 persons attended a dinner at the Hotel Astor Saturday night, at which Gov. James M. Curley, of Massachusetts, was the principal speaker.

Every State in the Union was represented in the gathering of the order for the ceremonies in the cathedral. The delegates marched to and from the cathedral escorted by a uniformed contingent of the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry—old Sixty-ninth—and a band that played Irish airs. A color guard carried the emblem of the order, gold over green, with the Irish and American flags crossing and two hands, representing the two countries, clasped firmly in a gesture of friendship.

Irish music filled the cathedral. Cardinal Hayes presided on his throne. The opening march, played by Pietro Yon, organist, was O'Donnell Aboo.

A bronze tablet commemorating the founding—near the site of St. James' Church in May 1836—of the New York chapter of the A. O. H. was installed at St. James' and another tablet at St. Patrick's. The dedication ceremonies closed the order's centennial celebration, which started Saturday.

One thousand members marched from St. James' Church and then to old St. Patrick's. More than 10,000 other persons lined the route of march. An escort of six mounted policemen was followed by the green and tan costumed County Tyrone Pipers' Band.

Speaking of old St. Patrick's, Monsignor McIntyre recalled how a band of Know-Nothings had came to New York in April 1844 to burn that edifice. Members of the New York chapter of the A. O. H. assembled there, however, and repelled the invaders.

Monsignor McIntyre also spoke of the gifts of religion and patriotism that Irishmen have brought to other lands, notably to the United States.

John J. Sheahan, chairman of the St. Patrick's Day committee, said that religion and patriotism had been inextricably joined through Ireland's history, and that these qualities had been handed down to Irish-Americans.

In his sermon, Bishop Griffin recalled the spirit displayed by the early members of the Hibernians and pointed to their courage and that of the Irish race as an example of endurance that might be emulated now in countries where religious freedom is threatened.

President Roosevelt sent a letter to Edward J. McCullen, secretary of the centenary committee, in which he praised the contribution made to New York and the United States by persons of Irish blood.

"In peace and war they have been in the forefront of all activity", the President wrote. "New York has not forgotten, nor can ever forget, the old Sixty-ninth Regiment of Infantry—the 'fighting Irish' of song and story. With deep appreciation do we recall the services of the successor of the old Sixty-ninth, the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment in the Rainbow Division. And that brings to mind a gallant figure whose name is forever associated with the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Regiment. I counted him among my dearest friends. He was in our midst but a few short years ago; his passing brought sorrow to all hearts; his memory is in benediction.

"Father Duffy was characteristically Irish in the apostolic zeal of his ministry, in the fervor of his patriotism, and in his love and good will toward all men. I know he will have a place in the hearts of all who take part in this celebration. I like to think of Father Duffy as typical of the great race which has given so much to America."

The Ancient Order of Hibernians claims descent from the Ancient Irish Orders of Knighthood, from the Knights of the Golden Chain and the Bardic Order, the Feni Erin of Leinster, the Knights of the Red Branch of Ulster, the Clan Deagha of Munster, and the Clanna Morna in Connaught.

The modern organization traces its beginning to Rory O'Moore, who revived the ancient orders in the Catholic Confederation of Kilkenny in 1642.

In penal times as defenders of the priests, in the celebration of the holy sacrifice of the Mass in secret hiding places in the mountains and in the bogs of Ireland, the members of the order preserved the faith of their fathers for their posterity.

The priest and the schoolmaster alike were proscribed and a price was set upon their heads, and the Hibernians of that day provided shelter and protection and transport from village to village so that the national ideal and the national religion would not perish. For almost 200 years these bands of men were necessary for the protection of priest and people against religious persecution.

The lodge system which had existed in a loose form for generations was perfected in the latter years of the eighteenth century, and the method of collecting funds for the burial of the dead was in use.

In May 1836 a charter was sent from Ireland to New York City authorizing the organization of the order in America. One of the members, who was employed on a sailing vessel engaged in trade between America and British ports, was delegated to bring the charter to America. The charter they received was from the chief officers in those counties which had been hallowed by generations of conflict for faith and fatherland. This beginning of the order in America cannot be better described than by using the words of the late Bishop Shahan, rector of the Catholic University, who so eloquently said, "The first page of the order in America is beautiful for its simplicity and straightforwardness, touching for its candid Catholicism. It is as good a patent of nobility as was ever conferred by king or kaiser, for there is wanting in it no element of our liberal modern humanity. I can almost see these honest and sturdy representatives of the Irish race in Ireland, England, and Scotland handing over to ship-worn and tearful exiles of Erin the sacred sparks of liberty and faith, of chivalry and tolerance, of kindly humanity and large brotherly charity that, thank God, have ever since been cherished by the members of this organization."

The charter sent from Ireland reads as follows:

"From the Brethren in Ireland and Great Britain to the Brethren in New York, Brothers, Greeting:

"Be it known to you and to all it may concern, that we send to our few brothers in New York full instructions with our authority to establish branches of our society in America. The qualifications for membership must be as follows:

"First. All members must be Roman Catholics, and Irish or Irish descent, and of good moral character, and none of your members shall join in any secret societies contrary to the laws of the Catholic Church, and at all times and at all places your motto shall be 'Friendship, unity, and true Christian charity.'

"You must love without dissimulation, hating evil, cleaving to good. Love one another with brotherly love, without preventing one another; let the love of brotherhood abide in you, and forget not hospitality to your emigrant brother that may land on your shores, and we advise you, above all things, have natural charity among yourselves.

"Also be it known unto you that our wish and prayer is that when you form your society, in many cities and towns, you will do all that is in your power to aid and protect your Irish sisters from all harm and temptation. As the Irish woman is known for her chastity all over the world—some of them may differ from you in religion—but, brothers, bear in mind that our good Lord died for us all. Therefore be it known unto you that our wish is that you do all that you can for the Irish emigrant girls, no matter who they may be, and God will reward you in your new country, and in doing this you will keep up the high standing and honor of the Irish in America.

"We send these instructions to you, hoping that you will carry them out to the best of your ability. Be it known unto you that you are at liberty to make such laws as will guide your workings

and for the welfare of our old society, but such laws must be at all times according to the teachings of the holy Catholic Church, and the obligation that we send you and all your workings must be submitted to any Catholic priest when called for.

"We send you these instructions, as we promised to do, with a young man who works on the ship and who called on you before. Send a copy to our late friend whom you spoke of and who is now working in Pennsylvania. Hoping that the bearer and this copy will land safe, and that you will treat him right, we remain your brothers in the true bonds of friendship, this 4th day of May, A. D. 1836.

"Patrick McGuire, County Fermanagh; Patrick McKenna, County Monaghan; Patrick Reilly, County Meath; John Farrell, County Meath; James McManus, County Antrim; Patrick Dunn, County Tyrone; Daniel Gallagher, Glasgow; John Reilly, County Cavan; Patrick Boyle, County Sligo; John Derkin, County Mayo; Thomas O'Rorke, County Leitrim; John McMahon, County Longford; Patrick Hamill, Westmeath; John Murphy, Liverpool."

Division no. 1, of New York County, met in the basement of old St. James' Church, at New Bowery and James Street. Every parish had at least one division, and their chief beneficence was in aiding the newly arrived immigrants to find work, in comforting the bereaved, and in extending every kind of helpfulness to the sick and destitute. The emigration contributed greatly to the membership of the order, for in 1838 the Irish Catholic population of New York City was about 70,000, while in 1840 it was 90,000.

From New York City the order spread to Philadelphia, Newark, the coal-mining regions of Pennsylvania, and westward with the tide of Irish emigration.

In New York the order was encouraged by the great John Hughes, first archbishop of New York, who saw in the sturdy catholicism of its members a source of strength to the church and a wall of defense against its enemies.

The early years were stormy. These were the days of anti-Catholic, and particularly anti-Irish bigotry. There were small riots throughout the city, windows of Catholic churches were broken, and ignorant and intolerant anti-Catholic mobs had attacked Catholics in the streets of the city.

In 1844, when the Know-Nothing fanatics held a meeting in city hall park, after the election of their candidate for mayor of the city, to welcome the church-burning Know-Nothing Party from Philadelphia, the members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians were summoned to the defense of the churches of the city by Archbishop Hughes, and, armed, they garrisoned the churches of the city, ready to defend them with their lives.

Again, in 1855, it was necessary for a brief time for the members of the order to guard the churches of the city, and at that time the members of division 1, of Brooklyn, who were guarding St. Paul's Church, at Court and Congress Streets, were threatened by a Know-Nothing mob, but the defeat of the Know-Nothings in a fight at the Catherine Street Ferry ended forever the threat of mob rule and the destruction of church property in New York.

It might be well to mention that the first St. Patrick's Day parade in the city was held under the auspices of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in 1838, and in 1853 there were 12,000 men in line and Mayor Westervelt and the common council reviewed the parade from the steps of the city hall.

A military company was organized chiefly from among the members of the Hibernians which later became the Ninth Regiment of the State militia. A second regiment, the Sixty-ninth, was organized soon after, and its first colonel was Charles S. Roe and its lieutenant colonel Michael Doheny.

In 1861, with the outbreak of the Civil War, whole divisions of the Ancient Order of Hibernians joined the Army in defense of the Union.

The Hibernians of New York, after the Battle of Chancellorsville, equipped a hospital tent and ambulance and offered it to General Meagher, and they were delivered to the Irish Brigade at Warrenton, Va., by Dr. E. D. Connery, the coroner of New York County, who was one of the most prominent Hibernians in the city.

At the close of the war the members of the order lay on every battlefield, and the Civil War, with its sacrifice of Catholic Irish blood, showed the Know-Nothing fanatics that the members of the order, which had defended the churches from the attacks of mobs, were just as willing to defend the flag of their country.

In the 1890's when the American Protective Association, commonly known as the "A. P. A." raised its head, the Ancient Order of Hibernians again led in stamping out this revival of the bigotry of the Know-Nothing.

It should be remembered that through the observance of St. Patrick's Day by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, through the veneration offered the patron saint of Ireland through the ritual and other customs of the order over a long period of years, that this national Irish feast has become a day of universal celebration in all parts of the United States. These celebrations have made popular the Irish customs and the Irish themselves among the varied races which have flocked to America.

Since my father was a member of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and since I had the honor of taking part in this wonderful celebration, with pride I call the attention of the House of Representatives to the Century of Progress Celebration of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

LETTER FROM A FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter which I received from a former Member of Congress, a Republican.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Hon. Montague Lessler, a former Member of Congress from the State of New York:

NEW YORK, *February 13, 1936.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELANEY: The death of Charlie Curtis brought to mind that on the 2d of January 1902 (34 years ago) I was elected to the House from the then Seventh New York District. The election was the result of a special election held to fill the vacancy upon the resignation of Nicholas Muller, who had been a Member of Congress from the downtown and Staten Island district for a number of years. It was an interesting, lively campaign, conducted without the aid of the usual party management, and was, if I may use the term, a "solo" affair.

The district ran on the west side of the city from about Fourth Street, embraced the Battery, and curved around to go up the east side to somewhere in the neighborhod of Canal Street. It also included Staten Island.

Of course, in the Wall Street section there were not many voters. However, the election took place, and in a section that had never been represented before by a Republican, gave me 7,677 votes to 7,283 votes for my opponent. Some other time the story of that canvass may be of interest. At present I just want to tell you of some of the men I met in my brief term and some of the matters of interest viewed in the light of 34 years after the events.

The final canvass by the State board was not completed, but, nevertheless, on the motion of "Bill" Sulzer that was waived by the Democratic minority, and accompanied by him on the one side and Lucius Littauer on the other, I took the historic oath from Speaker Henderson in the Well of the House. I had been accompanied to Washington in a special car by a collection of politicians, saloonkeepers, ward helpers, ladies, and gentlemen as could be gathered; men and women who had helped me and who had been good to me, and so I felt that it was a kind of noble gesture to wind up the campaign by bringing them with me to Washington, where they were a noisy aggregation in the gallery and had a grand time at the old Arlington Hotel. I may add in passing that it is a sort of grateful recollection to me that my mother and father were both there to witness the swearing in. Of course, there was a great mass of flowers to mark the occasion. What to do with them was a problem, until it was finally suggested that they be sent to the hospitals, which was done. As a further mark of distinction, the House adjourned at once, and so I had a job, drawing a salary and nothing to do.

It is of interest to remember the men who were in the House and in the Senate when I came there. I do not think there is any man remaining today who was in either body in 1902.

I was promptly assigned to seat 399 in the back row. Each man then had a desk. I sat next to Beidler, of Cleveland, Ohio, and on the other side my nearest neighbor was Sutherland, of Utah, now Supreme Court Justice. There was a very interesting set of men at the House at this time. The New York delegation was headed by Senators Platt and Depew. Among the Republicans in the House were Tompkins, who has lately retired as justice of the supreme court; Littauer, who was later to make such a place for himself as chairman of Appropriations; Sherman, of Utica, who became the Vice President with Taft; George Ray, of Norwich, N. Y., who became United States district judge; Payne, of Auburn, N. Y., head of the Ways and Means Committee; General Wadsworth, of Geneseo, N. Y., a delightful gentleman of real influence in the House and father of the present Congressman; James Breck Perkins, of Rochester, N. Y., a scholar, litterateur, and historian whose books on the Louis XV period of French history are still read and remain standard; Colonel Alexander, Buffalo, N. Y., whose work on the political history of New York State is as fine as anything that has been written on the subject. He was also the author of a work on parliamentary law. On the Democratic side were a number of men it was a delight to know and remember—Fitzgerald, of Brooklyn, now judge and then, while in the minority, usually recognized as one of the best parliamentarians in the House; Goldfogle, of New York City, a delightful little man who died in harness as one of the tax commissioners of the city; Amos J. Cummings, of newspaper fame, recognized as outstanding among journalists and a real figure in the history of journalism in New York; William Sulzer—what can one say about him except that he became Governor of New York State and thereafter faded away; George McClellan, of New York City, later professor of Princeton, who was twice mayor of New York City; dear Jake Ruppert, a kindly, sweet, helpful man, who has continued his public career as head of the Yankee baseball team.

I wish I had time to tell you more about the New York men—Storm, Bristow, Hanbury, George Lindsay—but you must remember that New York had 37 men, and I want to speak of other men.

The general focal point of all the young men in the House at that time was Jim Sherman, called usually "Sunny Jim." There was a kindness to the man, a helpfulness that can be remembered better than described. He had been in the House so long and was so acquainted with everything connected with it that it seemed the natural thing to turn to him and ask for his help in any predicament. He was head of the Indian Affairs Committee. The committee room was the meeting place of a number of men, and all their work was done there under the efficient supervision of the secretary of the Indian Affairs Committee, dear Harry Devendorf. Sherman, Knapp, Littauer, Emerson, Stewart, New York Congressmen, made their headquarters there, and by some sort of arrangement had their work done there also. It was in that room among those men that I first met Charlie Curtis, who was then the Member from the First District of Kansas and serving his fifth term in the House. I remember him very well. Of course, I got to know him and kept my acquaintance up after I left the House and went down to Washington to dinners and other celebrations. He was courteous, kind, helpful, and interested. Everybody, as I look back at it now, and especially on the Republican side, was keenly interested in my progress with the thought that possibly there might be a chance of a return from that district and a fooling of the constituents once more.

There were a number of other interesting men in the House on both sides of the Chamber. To me, the veteran Uncle Joe Cannon seemed a survival right out of the Lincoln antebellum days. There was a quaintness about him that certainly appealed. He had a power of expression in public, on the floor and in private, that made a lasting impression on those who came in contact with him. You must remember that at that time Mr. Cannon was 66 years of age, and had been in the House since the Forty-ninth Congress. He had been head of the Appropriations Committee for many years and had gradually become the leader of the majority. His main opponent was John Sharp Williams, later Senator from Mississippi, a man of extraordinary educational achievement, a fine scholar and a splendid linguist. It was indeed a treat to hear Uncle Joe and "Sharp" as Joe called him, in the center aisle fiercely encountering each other and then when it was all ended, to see them go out arm in arm. They not alone had a respect but an affection one for the other, and they were two outstanding men it was a joy to know. There were so many men in the House of real worth that it is difficult to try and remember all of them in the confines of this rambling letter and do credit to their many excellencies. It was a time of real debators. Hepburn, of Iowa; Tawney, of Minnesota; De Armond, of Missouri; Champ Clark, of Missouri; Grosvenor, of Ohio; and Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, were men who took the greater burden of the political debate. In fact, it was currently believed that Clark and Grosvenor used to stage a debate preliminary to their excursion on the Chautauqua circuit. There were several others who were really powerful speakers. A new man, Littlefield, of Maine, always got the ear of the House by his earnestness and beauty of delivery and speech. It was said of him at the time that his name never disgraced a majority report and that he was always in the opposition.

We had a couple of humorists, too. There was a man, Cushman, of Washington, whose speeches brought together a full House, and who had the power of saying witty things without hurting. This was also the case with Bob Nevins, of Dayton, Ohio, a magnificent talker and really a sound lawyer.

There were two men in the House and it was a real rough-and-tumble to debate. One was De Armond, of Missouri, and Hepburn, of Iowa. They were afraid of nothing and had a blistering invective that took the hair and hide off the fellow who opposed them. There were some really charming gentlemen in the House. I recollect with real pleasure Adams, of Philadelphia, and Morrell, of Torresdale, Philadelphia, and, above all, Gillett, subsequently Speaker of the House and Senator from Massachusetts.

The man who was most attractive to me and whose knowledge of his work on the committee was monumental was Burton, of Ohio, who later became Senator. Congressman Burton was head of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. Everyone left the work to him. He gave to this work all his attention so that it was impossible to tell him anything about any mud creek in the United States, to say nothing of the great rivers and harbors, and, with it all, he was kindly and helpful with the thought in mind that he wanted to do the right thing to every man who had a creek for which he hoped to receive an appropriation.

Of course, the same kind of human beings were in the House then that are there now. We divided very sharply on politics. We had our man who did nothing but talk and who could not be shut up. We had the great objector and we had a man who knew everything and we had others who looked upon a seat in the House as a pleasant extension of their home success, possibly along business or banking lines. A great deal of hard work was done, and some play went on too. I think I should like to tell you about that sometime. But, all in all, it was without any doubt the finest aggregation of men that could be brought together. It represented every shade of variance in our great country. All races, conditions, and beliefs were there, and while intensively they were Democrats and Republicans, with very rare exceptions, I should say they were gentlemen. I have not been able to discover why a man cannot be a gentleman as well as a politician or statesman.

I wish I could tell you more of other men I got to know and how interesting Southern Democrats were. I think the man who charmed me most, outside of Williams, was Oscar Underwood. There was something so charming about this man; there was such a bonhomie about him; he looked so much the gentleman that it was a pleasure to know him and a real treat to listen to him.

While I seemingly have omitted a great number of men, not with any idea that they were not fully worth remembering, because I hold every one of them very dear insofar as I got to know them. Some of these men made a great impression on me. Their weaknesses—and we knew that they were there and what they were—endeared them to us to an extent, and yet there was always a courtesy and a pleasant relation established. Rarely, if ever, did the men become vehement to each other. I only remember one such episode.

It was a great training to have had contacts of this kind as a very young man. While living in the past brings very little, yet I think to hold recollections of the men I met in the Fifty-seventh Congress is something to retain. I have no doubt that it was a training and experience that was the equal of any college course that a young man might have. Not the least of those memories were my contacts with Curtis, and as I really started out with that in mind more than anything else, I have always had the feeling that it was his generous pleasantness with a crowd of youngsters who commenced in the House and then in the Senate who brought to him allegiances which in the end made him Vice President of the United States. This was true of Sherman as well, and remains true of any man who pledges himself in the generous desire to lend his experience to others coming into this great arena and to be a delightful personable gentleman in every sense of the word.

With kindest personal regards and apologies for this long letter, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

MONTAGUE LESSLER.

Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker: Amidst the strife and turmoil of national problems and international conflict, we pause to pay our respect and our solemn tribute to God's noblest creation.

The second Sunday in May is at hand, and we forget the differences that divide us in every field of human activity and join in a general, world-wide observance of Mother's Day.

MOTHER'S DAY WAS FOUNDED BY MISS ANNA JARVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mother's Day was founded by Miss Anna Jarvis, a native of my neighboring State of West Virginia and now a resident of my own State of Pennsylvania. She inaugurated this day of thanksgiving, remembrance, and of gratitude. It is one day that has not been commercialized and has continued to be a day wholly devoted to tributes of gratefulness and remembrance—a day of rededication to the spiritual forces that inspired our mothers to teach us to follow the right, to seek the truth, and to act humbly and justly.

It is beautiful to set aside one day to an ideal, one day apart for generous deeds, for good will—for who can think of mother without being kinder and more generous? It is a day in which we are absorbed with the thoughts of mother and unmindful of the shadows, rains, and storms of life; for when we remember mother, we remember the sunshine and happiness of youth; we forget ourselves and think kindly and lovingly of others. We recall our mother's abiding faith in our inherent goodness and her inspiration to us to go forward to better and nobler things. For the opportunity to observe such a glorious day and the fulfillment of such a noble and inspiring ideal, we are thankful to Miss Jarvis.

MOTHER'S DAY RECOGNIZED ALL OVER THE WORLD

Her devotion to an ideal has helped to bring more joy and sunshine to the lives of millions than any other idea born in the mind of any of our noblest citizens. From a modest beginning it is now universally observed; in every climate and in every language the message of Mother's Day is heard around the globe. It is given official recognition by England and her colonies. Mexico, Brazil, and numerous South American countries observe this solemn day. Even Asia and Africa lend their tributes to the mothers of the world.

Since May 1914 Mother's Day is officially recognized and proclaimed by the Government of the United States. For nearly a quarter of a century, through proclamation by the President of the United States, the American flag has been displayed on all Government buildings in tribute to the mothers of America. American consulates throughout the world are ordered to unfurl the Stars and Stripes in honor of American homes and mothers. Official orders of the State and Army and Navy Departments decree that the flag be displayed and proper observance be held of the solemn annual tribute to motherhood.

MOTHER'S DAY IS OBSERVED BY THE MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES

Commanding officers of the military and naval forces of the United States regard the observance of Mother's Day as a potent force for strengthening the morale of the enlisted personnel. They realize that when soldiers and sailors, many, many miles from their native land, think of home and mother, they cannot help but be overwhelmed by the noble sentiments, and then and there resolve to be a great and glorious force for home and country.

OLD GLORY IS PROUDLY DISPLAYED

It is a rare exception for Old Glory to be displayed on Sundays, but on the second Sunday in May this general rule is disregarded, and the national emblem displayed on the Nation's Capitol and on all other Federal buildings. For, on Mother's Day, Old Glory takes on a new significance as it waves heavenward in its solemn tribute to the American home—the foundation of American society and presided over in queenly fashion by the great American mothers.

Annually, Miss Jarvis cooperates with Cabinet members, the military and naval forces, and other governmental dignitaries in making the Mother's Day celebration esteemed as a day of tribute to our mothers and as a day of rededication to those motherly virtues of righteousness and truth.

THE CELEBRATION OF A DAY DEVOTED TO OUR MOTHERS MAKES US A BETTER NATION

No other country in the world anticipated this country in thus recognizing our homes and mothers as the national standard bearers of patriotism. America not only leads the world in resources and material wealth but in patriotism, sentiment, and those spiritual resources that make of this country the glorious world leader that it is, and has been for a generation.

It is indeed most fitting that this annual Mother's Day which originated in America should be acclaimed by the American Congress as a day of gratitude to the beloved living and as a day of remembrance for the honored dead. Miss Jarvis originated this day in her earnest and sincere desire to serve her home and her community. May God bless her and watch over her for many, many years to come.

WRITE HOME TO MOTHER

"Write home" is the injunction to all sons and daughters who have wandered far from home and whose daily lives are filled with material cares. This is an appeal that is answered by every son and daughter in every walk of life. On Mother's Day they forget all the cares and worries of the daily grind and write a letter home to mother, or send a telegram in which in a few words they convey those endearing sentiments of love and devotion. Some send a gift of flowers; others a gift for the home, or candy, or some other token of love and esteem. But, whatever the form or substance, the hearts of millions of mothers are made glad. They rejoice that their efforts have not been in vain. Every one remembers his mother in a special, particular, and even selfish sense. But here selfishness becomes a virtue, for the nobility of selfishness is in making others happy. Here they repay a debt of gratitude in remembering that their mothers took a selfish pride in making them better and happier.

"ALL IS WELL"

"All is well" is heard from far and wide as the children of mothers of the world send their message of cheer and hope. Mothers everywhere are thrilled and inspired by these messages of hope, for hope still springs eternal in the human heart—in the hearts of mothers as well as children—hope in the future and its blessings. "All is well" is a divinely sweet melody that cheers the hearts and souls of motherhood; it is like a shaft of sunshine that gilds the rugged mountain peaks of life. Happy are those children who can send a cheery message to mother on Mother's Day and most divinely happy are they who can look at their mother's silver hair and say that not one single silver hair had been caused by a misdeed of theirs.

As the years roll by Mother's Day takes on greater importance and added significance to those still fortunate in having the guidance of their "gray-haired" mother. But to those whose mothers have gone to their eternal reward, the day is heightened and their devotion to the ideal of mother is increased.

WE REMEMBER THE MOTHERS OF THE WORLD, LIVING AND DEAD

As on Memorial Day, our hearts blossom in gratitude and we remember the brave men upon whom fate placed the laurel wreath of patriotism and sacrifice, so on Mother's Day we lovingly remember those dear departed mothers who, too, had made the supreme sacrifice so that the family and its noble institutions may be perpetuated and enriched. When we place a wreath on the grave of mother on this solemn day, the rich, fresh flowers and the green grass carry us off in fancy where we know that those mothers are serenely walking in green pastures by the calm blue waters. As we gaze heavenward through sapphire skies we feel certain that mother has seen, that she knows we did not forget. For there is nothing nobler than to remember the mothers of the world—living and dead.

Honor thy father and mother stands written among the laws of the most revered righteous. It is the very essence of life and the keystone of human relations. It is the commandment that is dutifully accepted by every creed. Mother's Day thus makes of the sacred commandment a living, throbbing reality.

THE RESOLVE TO GO THE RIGHT WAY

"For all her sorrows and her tears; for all her pains and fears, there's an overpayment of delight, when mother hears—that sons do right." Mother's Day would not have the universal appeal were it merely observed as a day of tribute and gift giving to mothers. Its real importance and value lie in making mothers happy by our doing right—in realizing that mothers would not want us to do otherwise. Its real achievement lies in dedicating ourselves on Mother's Day to so conduct our daily lives throughout the year that we should not cause mother an anxious moment, an unjust fear, or a needless tear. On Mother's Day we resolve to do everything mother's way, which is always the right way, through honor, justice, and humility.

OUR MOTHERS WANT PEACE ON EARTH

In this world of strife and turmoil, Mother's Day is also a day of dedication to the ways of peace. While mothers are not on the fields of battle nor in the trenches, they suffer more than their sons in the shell holes. War's greatest indictment lies in the suffering, agony, and fears endured by the mothers of the world. She had gone down to the valley of the shadow of death to bring forth the son who is perhaps being ruthlessly slaughtered. She had endured untold agonies in bringing the child safely through the helpless years of childhood into manhood. She had bestowed upon him all of her energies, love, and devotion. It breaks her heart to see him torn from her side and sent forth to be maimed or killed. No gift on Mother's Day, no tribute or manifestation of love and devotion to the mothers of the world, can have a fraction of the significance to mothers as the gift of universal peace—the resolution that every mother's son dedicate his very all to the advancement of peace.

THIS CONGRESS HAS MADE THE LIFE OF OUR MOTHERS EASIER

This Congress has done more than any other legislative body in the world to bring peace, comfort, and contentment to the American home and mother by its passage of the Social Security Act. Mother's Day is real and vibrant to us. We have recognized our obligation to the mothers of America

in making available adequate appropriations for maternity care. Mother is the holiest thing alive, and motherhood is the holiest of all divine gifts. We have made motherhood for the poor less agonizing and have made it easier for these noble women to raise their children.

THIS CONGRESS HAS BROUGHT SECURITY AND PEACE TO OUR AGED MOTHERS

"Over the hill to the poorhouse" was the usual epilogue to the drama of motherhood. But this, too, has been changed since we have recognized that our tribute to mothers must also take a more material form, and that our mothers are deserving of a better fate than the county home or some charitable institution. The Social Security Act which this Congress enacted has taken a great step forward in abolishing the despicable poorhouse. Its appropriations for pensions for the aged will make it possible for all mothers in America to spend the evening of their lives in their own homes which they cherish—among the children they love.

Mr. Speaker, this is the tribute to mothers that I wish to leave with you on Mother's Day. It is a recognition of our solemn obligation to our mothers, not only on this day but every day of the year. Not only gifts, flowers, telegrams, and letters on the second Sunday in May, but peace, comfort, contentment, and security for mothers every day.

LET US BE WORTHY OF OUR MOTHERS

It is impossible to measure the boundless love of a mother for her child; it is impossible to repay, in a material way, a son's or daughter's debt to a mother. It is needless to give water to the sea or light to the sun; we can never repay for mother love, for it gilds the cradle and illumes the grave. All we can do is hope constantly and pray fervently that we may be worthy of such boundless love and devotion; that all of mother's energies and cares shall not have been spent on us in vain; that we shall have followed her footsteps and leave this world far better and happier than we found it.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the permanent RECORD in accordance with the specific language inserted in my speech delivered on the floor of the House this afternoon.

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

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I heard the speech the gentleman mentions and, of course, I have no objection to the gentleman's changing his remarks in the manner indicated, but the thought occurs to me that such correction as can be made has already been made. The gentleman in the speech he made today retracted certain remarks he made in another speech. I do not understand that a Member can correct the RECORD by taking out things actually said. The gentleman made the speech that is in the RECORD on the other occasion, and I do not understand that you can correct the RECORD by going back and changing a speech previously made.

Mr. Speaker, the point I make is that the speech which appears in the permanent RECORD was actually made by the gentleman. There is no denial of that fact. Now, he says he made the statement under a misapprehension. It seems to me, under the circumstances, the RECORD is complete.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman has the right to correct the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not think so.

Mr. SNELL. Of course, he cannot correct what is already in the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is what the gentleman is asking to do.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am asking to strike out one word and three letters in the speech made on January 14, which appears on page 399 of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the request of the gentleman comes too late for that purpose. The speech referred to is already a part of the permanent RECORD.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF ELGIN, ILL.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8234) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Elgin, Ill., and the erection of a heroic pioneer memorial.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Elgin, Ill., and the erection of the heroic Pioneer Memorial, there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint (not more than) 10,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size and weight, and of a special appropriate design containing a replica of the "Pioneers" to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par and only upon request of the chairman of the coinage committee, Elgin Centennial Monumental Committee.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by said committee, and all proceeds shall be used in furtherance of the erecting of the Pioneer Memorial.

SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for the security of the coin; or for any purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued at such times as they shall be requested by the chairman of the coinage committee, Elgin Centennial Monumental Committee, and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "ten" and insert "twenty-five."

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.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech recently made by me.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at a luncheon of the United States Chamber of Commerce on April 30, 1936:

At the outset it must be borne in mind that communism is not merely a school of political or economic science. In its fuller aspect it is a philosophy of man. It is materialistic in its concept and impracticable in its operation. The purpose of communism is the establishment of a dictatorship of the so-called proletariat—through the medium of class appeal and class groupings. It seeks control of government and then, through the medium of a dictator, to put into operation the principles and policies of communism.

It is unnecessary to discuss in detail the manner in which they are attempting to accomplish their objective. They openly admit the use of any and all means, legal or illegal, or a combination of both, to bring about the objective that they seek. Their efforts in this country are not confined to mere expression or academic discussion. Practical efforts are being made in every conceivable way to create dissatisfaction and discontent and to capitalize on it wherever it exists in order to produce emotional results that will aid them in furthering their cause. They employ the "boring in" policy in labor, educational, religious, fraternal, and other organizations in order to obtain a position of advantage therein so as to influence the policies of such organizations. They employ the "united front" policy, where they join with other organizations in the agitation or furtherance of some program. They are not interested in any such program except as a means of using such organizations in the furtherance of their cause. They join with others, not because they believe in what others fight for, but to use the strength of their organizations for their own advantage. To them, anything in which they engage is simply a means to the end that they seek—the overthrow of government, not through the Constitution, but by force and violence.

At the present time they have a school in New York City with over 2,000 students in attendance each night, receiving instructions in the philosophy of Marx and Engels, and particularly being trained for the practice of sabotage and the exploitation of emotional situations. They are also taught methods which will prolong strikes that might properly be started in an effort to obtain higher wages or better working conditions or shorter hours of labor. In such cases they step in, not to assist in a fair settlement, but to prolong them as long as possible and then abandon the cause, leaving behind them misery and suffering. They are not interested in settlement; they are interested only in prolongation of a strike, exploiting existing conditions as a part of the means to an end. Their training is to enable them to induce others with whom they have nothing in common, to unctiously play their game. They are enemies of all existing governments, except sovietism. They do not owe allegiance to any flag but the red flag of revolution. They are unscrupulous in their demands and in their consideration of the rights of others. They have been making a determined effort for years to bore in on the American Federation of Labor. In one or two cases they have been successful in obtaining control of a union. I have in mind a union in New York City. The leadership of the American Federation of Labor, under President Green, are militantly fighting such efforts. President Green realizes the danger. In the past, little outside attention has been given to the great fight that he and his colleagues have been waging against communism. His great work should receive the attention and praise to which it is entitled. Businessmen should cooperate with President Green. It is to the advantage of business, when dickering with unions, to deal with men of the type of Green—men who stand for his kind of leadership in meeting this problem.

I have referred to a Communist union, originally a part of the A. F. of L., located in New York City. The special committee of which I was chairman investigated this union and found that it forced certain businessmen of New York City to pay tribute to them in order to continue in business. The union imposed a so-called unemployment tax of 3 percent of the total pay rolls of over 200 businessmen in the furrier business, also exacting a similar amount from the employees after forcing them to join the union. This money was used for communistic purposes. This evidence was the sworn testimony of businessmen who had paid the toll. We also received evidence that employees were forced to join this union, and when they resisted force was employed. American businessmen were then forced to pay tribute to this un-American union, and such money was and is being used in an effort to destroy the American Government, including the very business of these men. Some who had resisted testified that their goods were destroyed, their employees attacked and assaulted, finally compelling them to capitulate to the terms imposed. The evidence also shows that no employee had ever received a penny from this fund. The head of the Communist squad of the New York Police Department testified that this union maintained out of the funds received a gangster squad to intimidate employer and employees. Whenever any one of them was arrested, the same attorney always represented them. The lieutenant testified about many attacks on employer and employees, and also that there are at least two murders unsolved of employees who refused to join this union, being killed by the gangster squad of this Communist union. The police know who did it, but they cannot obtain the legal evidence.

Persons of this type should be shown no consideration. They know only the policy of force and violence. Their idea is to instill fear in the minds of others. Whenever such efforts, which disregard the rights of others, are employed, action by the police and courts should be rapid. About a year ago, in a city just outside of Boston, similar methods were employed. The police acted quickly, arresting those involved. The district attorney in charge acted quickly, prosecuting the cases and sending the offenders to jail. Raising of various funds for lawbreakers is simply a part of their program.

They are not interested directly in such persons or their cases, but simply in using a particular situation as a medium of exploitation. They are not interested in legislation except as a means to an end, to agitate and induce good Americans to become confused, or to exploit them, and to have them unconsciously play their game in politics. The Communist movement is not a political party. That is where the Columbia Broadcasting Co. made its mistake recently in allowing Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party of the United States, to use their facilities. If a Communist should be elected President of the United States, he could never take office. I have noted their recent statements about a Farmer-Labor Party, urging others to join with them in this movement. There are persons in this country who believe in such a party but who are opponents of communism. To them such a party is intended as a means of obtaining changes in the Government by the enactment of legislation in a constitutional manner. That is not the purpose of the Communists. Their purpose is to use such a political party as a part of their revolutionary program. This fact should be borne in mind by Americans interested in the formation of such a party. They should not permit themselves to be deceived by the Communists. The Communists' purpose, so far as such a party is concerned, is to obtain control of and use it as a means of furthering their objective. It is simply a part of their scheme. While under our law one can become a member of any political party that he desires to join, such action is voluntary. Nevertheless, the organizers and leaders of a Farmer-Labor Party, if one is organized nationally, either now or later, should not permit Communists to obtain control or even obtain a position of influence therein.

The Americans are a patient people. We have been for years the fertile field of foreign propagandists. However, when we awaken, we act, and usually, effectively. I remember several years ago when a European country was spreading propaganda in this country. We tolerated it for some time, and then became disgusted. An aroused public opinion asserted itself, in consequence of which the State Department acted. If it had not, a congressional committee would have been appointed to make an investigation. That kind of propaganda stopped.

Only a few years ago the committee of which I was chairman was appointed to investigate the Nazi, communism, and other un-American activities in this country. We obtained and gave to the American people such evidence that an aroused public opinion demanded that the efforts emanating from abroad cease. They have ceased.

For years we have listened to the prattle of these avowed haters of our country and their ideals, blasting the peace and quiet of our land with their advocacy of communism, by force and violence, as a panacea for all economic and social ills. We are getting tired of it. It is about time that we passed legislation that will make the members of this antisocial movement respect the rights of American citizens. It is about time that we passed legislation making it a crime to knowingly and willfully advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence. Such a bill is pending in the House of Representatives, having been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. It is now before the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee should report a rule in order that this bill might be considered by the House. I have tried to obtain such a rule, but have not been successful to date. That bill will pass overwhelmingly if brought out on the floor.

The people of the United States should demand that the Rules Committee bring this bill before the House. I urge all who are listening to demand the members of the Rules Committee to bring out this bill. Legislation should also be passed this session providing for the deportation of alien Communists. Over 50 percent of the members of the Communist Party are aliens. They advocate the destruction of our Government, and at the same time claim its protection. They earn their living under the protection of the Government that they hate and seek to destroy. They are not entitled to any sympathy or consideration. Drastic legislation along such lines should be passed at once. While this malignant theory of communism can never find any substantial support among the liberty-loving people of our Nation, nevertheless we must work to eliminate the evil results which proceed from their doctrine of force and violence. I do not recognize the advocacy of force and violence as constituting freedom of speech. It is license. One might just as well argue that the offering of human sacrifice as a part of a religious belief constitutes freedom of religious conscience.

I recently read a book written by Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, who is the leader of the movement in this country, wherein he admitted that such conditions as would constitute a revolutionary situation do not exist in this country. Despite that fact, he urges his followers to direct their efforts toward effecting such a situation. That shows completely their insincerity, their duplicity, their hypocrisy; that demonstrates that their philosophy cannot stand up under the light of reason. That is why they appeal to the unfortunate who is distressed; to those who are discontented; to those who are emotionally moved. They are trying to use those who can be swayed through emotion to obtain their objective. It is a sinister plot. They dare not resort to the constitutional method for bringing about changes. They have the opportunity under the Constitution to try to obtain their end, if they desire. They can advocate communism within the law by appealing to the people to vote for candidates pledged to the changes they advocate. If they are successful in influencing the people and electing enough legislators, they can change the Constitution. That is the constitutional way. But they dare not employ the method created by the framers of the Constitution. To do so they must appeal to reason. Lacking logical principles for an appeal to reason, they resort to the use of force and violence.

To again show their hypocrisy and the insincerity of their position, the same author, in an attempt to defend the use of force and violence, very blissfully states that the Communist Party advocates such drastic action only when the existing Government refuses peaceably to transfer to them control of its functions. He emphasizes the fact that force and violence are unavoidable in the United States because the people of this Nation do not desire communism. Therefore, they must be forced to accept it. They admit that the Government cannot be made into a soviet nation under the present constitutional processes which require the sanction of the people. Hence the great majority of our people who are peace-loving citizens must endure the wild and irrational acts of a small anti-American, antisocial group.

Earl Browder, in his recent book, What is Communism?, presents one of the best arguments against communism that I have ever read. In his attempt to further communism he exposes its hypocrisy—its weakness—he presents its true picture.

Of course, everyone knows that communism is opposed to every ideal that we stand for. It is opposed to the family life as it exists among religious people. It is opposed to religion in any form. It openly advocates the destruction of religion. It is opposed to religious freedom; to the freedom of speech and of the press; to the right of trial by jury. It stands for the confiscation of property. It is opposed to personal liberty in every form.

Yet Browder, in his book, What Is Communism, urges Communists to associate with religious groups and to organize them under the guise of the "united front." He states in no uncertain language that prospective Communists need not sever their religious affiliations before joining the movement, but after they join they will be subjected to a very rigorous educational process, in which the author expects the novice to see, as all Communists should, that religion must be destroyed. He talks about liquidation if the objective should be obtained. By liquidation he means what happened in Russia—the murder or imprisonment of all who oppose. In his book he also boasts of certain ministers who are cooperating with Communists under the "united front" policy. He ridicules and scorns them. I wonder how those he mentions feel after reading his book in the realization that he boasts of their use and then condemns them for believing in God and a hereafter. If such men have any judgment at all they will at once withdraw from any "united front" alliances that they now have with the Communists. Their efforts are to obtain the changes they advocate and which they believe are for the best interests of the people and to continue as ministers their work of God as their religion dictates. That is not so with the Communists. To them their "united front" efforts with others are simply a means to an end, using others in any way that they can, but intending to suppress them as well as all others if communism should be successful. How can they work with such men as Browder? Although I do not hold the same religious beliefs as these minorities, yet my respect for the freedom of religious worship urges me to warn them of the pitfalls to which their association with the Communists will inevitably lead. They are jeopardizing their own freedom of religious worship along with the freedom enjoyed by all others by permitting these scoffers and enemies of all religions to masquerade under their banner. What I have said also applies to a small group of professors.

In his book, Browder admits that Communists owe no allegiance to the United States. He states that Communists will not serve in any conflict in which our country might be engaged. He attempts to justify such action by declaring that communism is opposed to all wars. However, he boasts of the allegiance of Communists to the Soviet Union, urging all to join with Russia in defense of the Soviet Union. In other words, Communists will not fight for the United States but will fight for Soviet Russia. His hypocrisy is exposed. This is a valuable lesson to real Americans who believe in peace and who are doing all that they can to bring about permanent peace, but who will fight in the defense of our country. I warn you not to become allied with Communists under another phrase of the united-front policy. I particularly refer to the League Against War and Fascism, a communistic organization, and to certain college-student organizations.

The Constitution of the United States provides for any kind of a change the people desire. But communism is not content to proceed in the way provided for by the Constitution.

Under communism, personal liberty, which can exist only in a democracy, would be destroyed. It is suppressed under all forms of dictatorship. It is not necessary to mention history to support this statement. I call your attention to the countries of the present day wherein dictatorships exist. Personal liberty has been destroyed; persecution, fear, and force exist. The state is supreme. The individual has no rights. This is what communism stands for. It goes even further than most forms of dictatorship in its destructiveness of human rights. It does not even tolerate the existence of religion in any form. In fact, it makes war on religion and religious freedom—one of the great cornerstones of personal liberty.

Let the Communists renounce their advocacy of force and violence in trying to obtain their objective, a dictatorship of the proletariat, with its destruction of every ideal that America stands for. Let the people decide the issue in the manner provided by the Constitution; and while I will disagree with their objective and oppose their efforts, as is my right, I will fight to preserve their constitutional rights. In this way they will be acting within the Constitution and the law. I do not recognize the right of any movement to willfully and deliberately advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence.

We have plenty of problems confronting us. Fortunately, we have the means of peaceably determining our problems. They will not be solved by dictatorship of any kind, particularly of communism, nazi-ism, or fascism. This movement, guided and directed from abroad, international in its character, claiming the protection of our institutions and at the same time hating them, and trying to destroy them, should be exposed for the alien, un-American movement that it is.

Communists are using a new line of defense by branding those who attack their activities or who make speeches along American lines as Fascists.

The passage of legislation making it a crime to willfully and knowingly advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence, and the strengthening of the deportation laws relating to alien Communists will, from a legislative angle, meet their efforts. No American fears such legislation. Such legislation does not affect the right of anyone to advocate any change that they believe in, provided they do so within the law. Society is justified—in fact, it is its duty—to protect itself and its law-abiding people against those who disregard the Constitution and the existing law.

VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—CAPT. PERCY WRIGHT FOOTE (H. DOC. NO. 489)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 7092, a bill for the relief of Capt. Percy Wright Foote, United States Navy.

Briefly stated, this bill provides that in recognition of his having been wounded in line of duty and of his exceptionally meritorious service in combat with the enemy during the World War, the line-selection board of the Navy in its consideration of officers eligible for consideration for selection for promotion to the grade of rear admiral may base its recommendation in the case of Capt. Percy Wright Foote upon his comparative fitness for the shore duties of the grade of rear admiral; that he shall remain on the active list of the Navy in his present rank until the report of the next senior selection board of the Navy shall have been approved; that if selected for promotion he shall be retained in his present rank on the active list until promoted to the rank of rear admiral; and that in the event of his selection and subsequent promotion he shall be carried as an additional number in grade.

The records of the Navy Department show that Captain Foote was appointed a naval cadet on May 20, 1897; commissioned ensign from June 6, 1903; promoted to the grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and lieutenant from June 7, 1907; promoted to the grade of lieutenant commander from March 10, 1914; promoted to the temporary grade of commander from August 31, 1917; commissioned regular a commander from July 1, 1919; and promoted to the grade of captain from January 1, 1924, in which grade he is now serving.

In 1916 the system of promotion by selection was initiated in the Navy, with the object of insuring that only those officers deemed best fitted would reach command rank. Captain Foote has failed of selection before three selection boards, namely, those convened in 1933, 1934, and 1935, and under existing law he will be retired, because of service ineligibility for promotion, on June 30, 1936. Because of the provisions of the act of March 4, 1925, as amended by the act of March 3, 1931, the terms of which permit retirement in the next higher grade of those officers specially commended for their performance of duty in actual combat with the enemy during the World War, Captain Foote would, if retired on June 30, 1936, do so in the grade of rear admiral.

On September 27, 1934, a special board of medical examiners pronounced Captain Foote physically qualified to perform all his duties at sea; and on his annual physical examinations on January 15, 1935, and December 19, 1935, he was found physically qualified to perform all his duties at sea or on shore. Because of the terms of the bill specifying that he shall be considered by the line-selection board of the Navy on a basis of comparative fitness for shore duty, approval of this bill would result in his being singled out for special consideration, as the other officers under consideration by the board would be competing on a basis of ability to perform all the duties of the higher grade.

At the present time the Navy is operating under a promotion system considered necessary to its efficiency. Medical records indicate Captain Foote's physical qualifications to perform all the duties of his grade, and he has been afforded ample opportunity for selection. In the absence of special circumstances sufficient to warrant his being placed in a class by himself the Navy Department feels that this legislation tends to break down the laws relating to promotion by selection. In the judgment of three selection boards Captain Foote was not one of those best fitted for promotion to the grade of rear admiral, and the Navy Department has never had reason to question these recommendations.

Justification for the enactment of this bill is based on the recital in the bill that it is "in recognition of his having been wounded in line of duty and of his 'exceptionally meritorious service' in combat with the enemy during the World War." It follows that the bill is calculated to bestow upon Captain Foote a benefit in addition to that to which he is entitled by virtue of the law providing for his retirement in the next higher grade.

The Navy Department is of the opinion that his service was not of such outstanding character as to warrant the unusual preferment this bill would extend to him alone, and to the exclusion of other officers whose records of service are equally meritorious; and that existing law is adequate to fully reward Captain Foote for his service during the World War.

For the above-stated reasons and because of the effect this legislation would have on existing law governing promotion by selection, I do not feel justified in approving this bill. I have come to this conclusion with great personal reluctance because of my knowledge of Captain Foote's war service.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 6, 1936.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RODMAN CHEMICAL CO. (H. DOC. NO. 490)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, House Joint Resolution No. 223, entitled "Joint resolution conferring upon the Court of Claims jurisdiction of the claim of the Rodman Chemical Co. against the United States."

This resolution is designed to accomplish a fourfold purpose, to wit:

(a) It would confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain a suit against the United States by the Rodman Chemical Co., of Verona, Pa., assignee of Hugh Rodman, for recovery of compensation for the use (prior to the issuance of a patent) of an invention by Hugh Rodman, covering a process for making activated carbon, notwithstanding the Commissioner of Patents had issued no order to keep such invention secret under the provisions of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 394; U. S. C. 35–42), entitled "An act to prevent the publication of inventions by the grant of patents that might be detrimental to the public safety or convey useful information to the enemy, to stimulate invention, and provide adequate protection to owners of patents, and for other purposes."

(b) It would entitle the Rodman Chemical Co. to claim reasonable compensation for the alleged use of the Rodman process, made by the United States prior to issuance of the patent thereon, to the same extent as if the Commissioner of Patents had issued an order to keep the invention secret, prior to such use; and further, such compensation would begin from the date of such use by the United States.

(c) The transcript of record of the interference proceedings between John C. Woodruff, appellant, and Hugh Rodman—No. 46630, District of Columbia Court of Appeals, April term 1925, Patent Appeal Docket No. 1815—would be made competent and admissible evidence before the Court of Claims on the issue of use by the United States of the Rodman inventions.

(d) The statute of limitations would be waived, provided the suit in question is brought within 1 year after the date of the passage of this resolution.

Proceedings in such suit are to be similar to claims filed in the Court of Claims under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended. The Government may plead any defenses set forth in title 60, Revised Statutes.

The relief that would be afforded by this resolution extends to the Rodman Chemical Co. and not to the inventor of the subject matter of the patent as an individual. The Rodman Chemical Co. has heretofore filed suit in the Court of Claims based on the provisions of the act of October 6, 1917, or, in the alternative, under the act of June 25, 1910, as amended by the act of July 1, 1918. The latter statute gives patent owners the right to sue the United States for infringement of their monopoly. The act of October 6, 1917, relates to the publication of inventions during the war and the granting of compensation under certain conditions for wartime use of inventions tendered to the United States. The court held that the case did not fall within either of the acts relied upon by the claimant, and dismissed the petition on February 20, 1928. The plaintiff's petition for a writ of certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court on May 14, 1928 (277 U. S. 592; U. S. C. Cls. 772).

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that awarding relief in this case would constitute a discrimination which would be unfair to other potential claimants in a similar situation. It would, in effect, tend to nullify essential provisions of the act of October 6, 1917. It would encourage a multiplicity of similar bills and result in the revival of many old war claims in that class of cases, heretofore dismissed by the Court of Claims because of failure to comply with certain express provisions of the act of October 6, 1917. For the above reasons, I do not feel that I would be justified in giving my approval to this legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 7, 1936.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

"THE PLOW THAT BROKE THE PLAINS", RESETTLEMENT FILM, LAUDED HIGHLY, SHOWS NEED FOR CONSERVATION

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LAGS IN MOVIES—RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION MOVIE SETS NEW STANDARD

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I have just had the pleasure of seeing a number of documentary films arranged in a program by the Museum of Modern Art Film Library. On this program was a film The Plow That Broke the Plains, which tells the story of the destruction of natural resources in the grasslands.

The headlines of the Washington Post say this morning, front page, double column, right on top, "Tugwell farmers' lot is sad compared to Soviet film ideal." It is true that a Russian film was shown, but so were films from France, Great Britain, and Germany. The tone and statement of the Post article omitted the fact that other countries were represented. Moreover, the article virtually snubbed the Film Library as well as the Embassies of France, England, and Germany.

GERMAN, ENGLISH, RUSSIAN, AND FRENCH FILMS

The Russian film showed immense cooperatives and hard-working people, smiling faces. The German film showed its work camps for men; solemn faces. Whether Stalin had ordered a smile or Hitler had demanded solemn looks, I do not know. It may all have been propaganda.

England was shown as being once a country of hills and beautiful farmlands; then its process of industrialization and uglification was depicted, with its present policy of slum clearance and cheap public power. The French film showed the beauty of the country, and the progress of its railroads;

handsome waiters passed out cool drinks to up-and-coming tourists. Trains slid through the French countryside at 200 kilometers an hour. The American film showed the tremendous waste of natural resources in the United States of America, principally of the Great Plains, which is the Middle West of the United States, starting in Montana and going through the Panhandle of Texas.

The American film showed a most important phase of American life: It showed that in this plains country 40,000,000 acres are now completely destroyed, with topsoil gone; another 200,000,000 acres are badly damaged and likely to be lost, unless something is done at once—and this out of only a total of 400,000,000 acres in the whole area.

The Film Library in arranging this program of documentary films from five nations is doing a real service. I think that as many of the foreign films should be shown as possible. For instance, certainly Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish films should be shown. Especially of Sweden, if Marquis Childs' book is correct—and I am sure it is correct in most of its factual aspects. Sweden has made tremendous advances in planned villages, in its cooperatives, in slum clearance, and in bettering life in general. Hence, a Swedish film would have been instructive.

MEN AGAINST DUST

While criticisms may be made of the Resettlement film because it shows the horrible waste of our natural resources, I think that films of that character must by all means be shown to awaken our citizens to the necessity for immediate steps in conservation. Moreover, the whole field of documentary films, which show the real problems of American life, offers a tremendous opportunity of development on the part of private companies.

Personally, however, I think a picturization of our forests, lands, waters—everything we have which is natural—also showing the hideous waste that we Americans have practiced should by all means be done. I do not object to the private film corporations, and it is entertaining to see Groucho Marx do his stuff; it is sometimes stimulating to see a love affair; while Walt Disney's Silly Symphonies and Mickey Mouse are outright grand. But thus far there has been no private film devoted to a serious treatment of saying we must be thrifty in the preservation of our own natural resources. Why do not the private film companies show unemployment, poorly planned cities, lack of sanitation—something about the plight of the sharecroppers and farm tenants who have no purchasing power?

It takes all kinds of people to make a world—and it takes all kinds of films to show what is really going on. We can sit around and gaze at love films and gasp and groan; we can shed a few tears and bust loose with lots of laughter—but we should also use our brains.

UNITED STATES LAGS IN EDUCATIONAL MOVIES

Mr. Speaker, this country is the furthest advanced of all nations on earth in movie technique, production, and equipment. But that is not true of the Government. In the production of films some progress has been made, but not much in comparison to other nations. In England the General Post Office has completed over 400 documentary films. In France the finest musicians and technical workmen are employed by the Government to dramatize its work. Even in smaller nations, such as Mexico, the motion picture is recognized as an important medium for Government information. We are the most backward government of any civilized, first-class nation in our utilization of the motion picture.

As a government, we are far behind and we might as well face the fact that it is a perfectly proper thing and quite desirable to have the best type of movies to be used for educational and informational purposes by the Government. I favor the full development of the movies by the United States Government for the purposes mentioned.

I wish to make it clear that I do not believe in Government competition with private industry, but the Federal Government should produce its own educational films.

FAMOUS DIRECTORS PRAISE

The Resettlement picture has aroused highly favorable comment not only from public officials but from high figures in the motion-picture industry. I should like at this point to read telegrams from two of the leading directors in Hollywood. One is from King Vidor, who produced Our Daily Bread, awarded an international prize for producing the finest picture of 1934; he also directed The Big Parade, The Crowd, The Champ, and is now doing The Texas Ranger. Mr. Vidor says:

> Please accept my congratulations for the splendid picture you have made The Plow That Broke the Plains. Not only does it drive its point forcefully and graphically but it utilizes the motion-picture medium in its purest form; something that pictures made solely for entertainment purposes barely have an opportunity to do. I feel that in spite of its moderate length, no one who sees this picture can help but be impressed by the broad scope it embraces.

Lewis Milestone, who has praised the Resettlement picture, is also one of the top directors in Hollywood. He directed The Front Page, All Quiet on the Western Front, and is now doing The General Died at Dawn, which was written by Clifford Odets. Mr. Milestone says:

> I saw The Plow That Broke the Plains, Resettlement Administration production written and directed by Pare Lorentz. I have also seen a great many documentary films of all nations and regard Mr. Lorentz's by far the best. It has more emotion and drama without the use of human characters than most plays can provide with living beings, because it is based on the truth. In my opinion the Government would gain its aims for the people with much more surety by releasing this and other such intelligent documentary films for general public education.

CRITICS PRAISE FILM

The newspaper critics and commentators who have no ax to grind have been unequivocal in their praise.

Bob McCormick, of the Scripps-Howard Washington News, says, among other things, in lauding the film:

> The photography is indescribable. It is a series of magnificent scenes, flowing together in continuity sufficient to carry the story. It may have been equaled in other pictures shown in Washington, but it is doubtful if it has been excelled. * * * Movie experts in the Federal service here say the production, a three-reeler, is perhaps the finest ever turned out by a government. This includes the artistic efforts of the Russians and the Germans.

Betty Hynes, dramatic critic for the Washington Herald, says, in commenting on the entire program of documentary films:

> Most dramatic of all was the contribution of Mr. Lorentz, who took America's tragic dust storms and graphically told their history. * * * An amazing, stirring picture. * * *

Under the headline "The New Deal's First Major Movie Effort Packs a Terriffic Punch", Mr. Fredrick C. Othman, United Press staff correspondent, says:

> Before the final fade-out it had diplomats, Congressmen, and New Dealers holding to the edges of their gilt chairs. It may have been preaching a sermon, but it surpassed many a Hollywood epic for sheer drama and technical excellence.

OFFICIALS LAUD PICTURE

A number of public officials have praised The Plow That Broke the Plains in no uncertain terms. Time will not permit quoting all of them, but I should like to give just a line or two from each one:

Secretary Wallace has said:

> * * * It is a moving record of what happened where farmers encouraged by their Government plowed lands which should never have been taken out of grass. * * * The combination (musical score and photography) is a thrilling example of what is almost a new art. The picture is an astonishingly graphic portrayal of land use history of the Great Plains. * * *

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, says:

> The Plow That Broke the Plains is one of the finest pictures I have ever seen. Simply, yet dramatically, it tells the story of the havoc wrought by the improvident use of our soil resources. I wish every one in this country could see it, because to do so is to

be impressed with the urgent need for national action to restore the balance nature demands in the use of her resources.

Senator PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi, says:

This film in my opinion is an agricultural Cavalcade.

Senator ALVA ADAMS, of Colorado, says:

The film is a vivid dramatic presentation of the unplanned cooperation of land-hungry men, war, drought, and wind in the destruction of the grasslands of the West. It is a remarkable film production.

THE PROGRAM

At this point I should like to include a copy of the program of the documentary films shown at the Mayflower last night.

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART FILM LIBRARY PRESENTS A PROGRAM OF DOCUMENTARY FILMS

May 10, 1936, Grand Ballroom, Mayflower Hotel

Color Box, 1935–36. Designed and executed by Len Lye. Produced by the General Post Office Film Unit (Great Britain).

Harvest Festival, 1935. Directed by M. Kapchinsky. Photographed by Alexander Lavrick. Produced by Ukrainfilm, Kiev, U. S. S. R.

The Face of Britain, 1934–35. Directed by Paul Rotha. Photographed by George Pocknall, Frank Bundy. Produced by Gaumont-British Instructional.

The Triumph of the Will (excerpt only), 1934. Directed by Leni Riefenstahl. Produced by the German Government.

Midi, 1935. Supervised by Marcel l'Herbier. Directed by Jean Gréville. Produced by the French State Railways.

The Plow That Broke the Plains, 1936. Written and directed by Pare Lorentz. Photographed by Ralph Steiner, Paul Strand, and Leo Hurwitz. Musical score by Virgil Thomson. Produced by the Resettlement Administration.

THE PLOW THAT BROKE THE PLAINS

An American musical documentary movie produced by the Resettlement Administration

PRODUCTION CREDITS

Written and directed by Pare Lorentz.
Supervised by John Franklin Carter.
Photographed by Ralph Steiner, Paul Strand, and Leo Hurwitz.
Narrated by Thomas Chalmers.
Special score composed and arranged by Virgil Thomson.
Conducted by Alexander Smallens.
Technical supervision, Leo Zochling.
Musicians from the Metropolitan Opera Association and the New York Philharmonic Orchestra.

FOREWORD

The Plow That Broke the Plains is a saga of the land of the Great Plains area of the United States. Dramatized in 10 principal sequences, the film traces the story of the plains country during the last 50 years. This panorama of American history surveys the successive movements in the Great Plains area—the passing of the buffalo, the successive invasions of range cattle, the homesteader, and the large-scale wheat farmer. Dramatized, too, are the disastrous dust storms which whip across once fertile acres, carrying away rich topsoil and bringing tragedy to the Great Plains. The production also shows in pictorial and graphic detail the work which the Resettlement Administration is doing in the Great Plains area.

THE SCENARIO BY SEQUENCES

Sequence 1. Grass: "First there was grass * * * a treeless wind-swept continent of grass * * * a country of high winds and sun * * * without rivers, without streams, and with little rain."

Sequence 2. Cattle: "Then came the cattle. Up from the Rio Grande * * * in from the rolling prairies. * * * Down clear from the eastern highways the cattle rolled into the old buffalo range. * * *

"An empty, inexhaustible pasture—an unfenced, uncharted range, a thousand miles long. * * * With the southern plains for winter grazing and the mountain sweeps for summer grazing it was a cattleman's paradise. * * *

"Fortunes in beef! Railroads brought the markets to the edge of the plains * * * land syndicates poured cattle into the grasslands from the world over. * * * Cattle syndicates and land speculators followed the steers into the grasslands * * * by 1886 not an acre was unclaimed. * * *

"More cattle * * * the railroad brought the market closer and it brought the sheepman and dirt farmer * * *."

Sequence 3. The Homesteader: "* * * the plowman followed the herder * * * and the pioneer found the plains.

"Land in the West! * * * land in the last frontier * * * new land for new populations.

"* * * 160 acres of Government land * * * free homesteads for farmers—by steamship, rail, and wagon trains they poured in * * *.

"The first fence—and the last of the free range."

And came the reaper as the plowman harvested. "Free land in the West * * * 320 acres of Government land * * * 100,000 new farmers in a year—a half million settlers in a decade. * * * Progress came to the plains." And with rains the harvests were bountiful.

Sequence 4. Warning: "Many were disappointed * * * as the rains failed and the sun baked the light soil * * *.

"They fought the loneliness and the hard years—but the rain failed them and they moved on.

"There was fresh land in the West * * * there was more grass farther on—new homesteads—new land for the taking * * * and there was a new day coming * * * a golden day for the plains—a day of new causes—new profits and new hopes."

Sequence 5. War: "Wheat will win the war! Plant wheat! Plant the cattle ranges * * * plant your vacant lots * * * plant wheat! Wheat for the boys over there! Wheat for the Allies! Wheat for the British! Wheat for the French! Wheat for the Belgians! Wheat will win the war!"

Sequence 6. Speculation: "Then we reaped the golden harvest * * * then we really plowed the plains. We had turned under millions of new acres for war wheat. We had the manpower. We invented new machinery. The world was our market! And the rains held on. By 1923 the old grasslands had become the new wheatlands * * *."

But speculation led to a crash, while * * *.

Sequence 7. Drought: "* * * once again the rains held off and the sun baked the earth. But this time no grass held moisture against the winds and the sun * * *. This time millions of acres of plowed lands lay open to the sun.

"1930—the worst drought in the history of the plains!

"1931—the rains held off—and the machinery rusted * * *.

"1932—no seed to plant—no land to put it in * * *.

"1933—and still the rains held off * * * and then the high winds and the sun took toll from the plowed acres turned to the sun * * * and then the high winds came."

Sequence 8. Dust storms: "High winds whipped across once fertile acres, bringing death and disaster * * * bringing havoc to farms, tragedy to human beings."

Sequence 9. Devastation: "Baked out—blown out—and broke! For 6 years the cattleman, the sheepman, and the dirt farmer fought the worst drought in the history of the country * * * their cattle starved on the barren land—or died in sandstorms. Their homes turned to a nightmare of swirling dust day and night—their farms were buried under tidal drifts and their lands turned to desert wastes.

"Many left, but many stayed until stock, machinery, homes, credit, food, and, finally, even hope were gone.

"For 6 years they fought sun and wind and watched their homes blow away until finally they left the plains by thousands. * * *

"Once again they headed west—in 1935 over 30,000 refugees hit the road out of the drought country every summer month and headed for the last border—the Pacific. * * *

"Nothing to stay for—nothing to eat—nothing to hope for. Homeless—penniless and bewildered—looking for a stopping place * * * they joined the great army of the highway.

"No place to go—and no place to stop—no more frontiers—no more land—their homes on four wheels * * * their work in the fields—in the towns—along the highways.

"No more frontiers—except the great new frontier of reconstruction. Frontier of rehabilitation for damaged lands and for damaged lives.

"* * * 400,000,000 acres—the Great Plains seemed inexhaustible, but in 50 years we turned the grass lands into the dust bowl * * *."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RAMSEY, for Monday and Tuesday, on account of important business.

To Mr. HARLAN, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HENNINGS, indefinitely, on account of personal illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4524. An act to provide a permanent government for the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 158. An act authorizing the President to present a medal in the name of Congress to Johannes F. Jensen;

S. 427. An act authorizing the reimbursement of Edward B. Wheeler and the State Investment Co. for the loss of certain lands in the Mora grant, New Mexico;

S. 1494. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims", approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 555);

S. 2040. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, and acts in amendment thereof;

S. 2517. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Walter M. Graesser, a lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, retired;

S. 2611. An act to authorize the Utah Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association to construct and maintain a monument on the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Salt Lake City, Utah;

S. 2849. An act to provide funds for cooperation with Wellpinit School District No. 49, Stevens County, Wash., for the construction of a public-school building to be available for Indian children of the Spokane Reservation;

S. 3241. An act authorizing adjustment of the claims of F. L. Forbes, John L. Abbott, and the Ralph Sollitt & Sons Construction Co.;

S. 3372. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school district at Hays, Mont., for construction and improvement of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children;

S. 3460. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the persons entitled to compensation on account of private claim 111, parcel 1, Nambe Pueblo grant;

S. 3516. An act for the relief of Alice D. Hollis;

S. 3544. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Texas Pacific-Missouri Pacific Terminal Railroad of New Orleans;

S. 3581. An act for the relief of Henry Thornton Meriwether;

S. 3687. An act to validate payments and to relieve the accounts of disbursing officers of the Army on account of payments made to Reserve officers on active duty for rental allowances;

S. 3688. An act to validate payments and to relieve disbursing officers' accounts of payments made to Reserve officers promoted while on active duty;

S. 3737. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire, by donation, land at or near Newburgh, in Orange County, N. Y., for aviation field, military, or other public purposes;

S. 3747. An act for the relief of Maizee Hamley.

S. 3748. An act to authorize the Bureau of Mines to conduct certain studies, investigations, and experiments with respect to sub-bituminous and lignite coal, and for other purposes;

S. 3769. An act for the relief of Marcellus E. Wright and Lee, Smith & Vandervoort, Inc.;

S. 3797. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing certain tribes of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes", approved May 26, 1920;

S. 3859. An act to authorize the procurement, without advertising, of certain War Department property, and for other purposes;

S. 3932. An act for the relief of Ann Rakestraw;

S. 3950. An act to aid in defraying the expenses of the Sixteenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1937;

S. 3977. An act to authorize the Washington Gas Light Co. to alter its corporate structure, and for other purposes;

S. 4135. An act for the relief of Helen Curtis;

S. 4214. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Sabine and Neches Rivers, with a view to controlling their floods and regulating, conserving, and utilizing the waters thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 4416. An act for the relief of Josephine Russell; and

S. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Swedes in Delaware.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 567. Joint resolution to provide an additional appropriation for expenses of special and select committees of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1936.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, tomorrow, May 8, 1936, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1391. A bill to authorize and direct the United States Commissioner of Fisheries to undertake fish-cultural and related activities in Puerto Rico, making appropriations therefor, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11375. A bill to repeal a proviso relating to teaching or advocating communism in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and appearing in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936; without amendment (Rept. No. 2593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TERRY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 212. Joint resolution to investigate corporations engaged in the manufacture, sale, or distribution of agricultural implements and machinery; without amendment (Rept. No. 2596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 681. A bill for the relief of James Philip Coyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 2594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. House Joint Resolution 504. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance to Sekigo Takahashi of a permit to reenter the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936 and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 12625) to amend paragraph IV, Veterans' Regulation No. 9 (a), promulgated by the President pursuant to Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 12626) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Ada, State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12627) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Crestline, Crawford County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HEALEY: A bill (H. R. 12628) to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of Public Works Administration slum-clearance and low-cost housing projects, to authorize payments to States and political subdivisions in lieu of taxes on such premises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFARLANE: A bill (H. R. 12629) to provide the Congress with information on the state of the development of the aerial war craft of the United States in comparison with that of other nations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 12630) to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of Public Works Administration slum-clearance and low-cost housing projects, to authorize payments to States and political subdivisions in lieu of taxes on such premises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEFAN: A bill (H. R. 12631) to amend section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270); to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 582) granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 12632) granting an increase of pension to Florence A. Clarkson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12633) for the relief of George J. Zeigler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 12634) for the relief of M. Leslie Martin; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 12635) granting a pension to Milka N. Robbins, and minor child; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12636) for the relief of Harry Francis Zeller; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LUCKEY: A bill (H. R. 12637) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Westbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 12638) for the relief of Patricia Swan; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 12639) for the relief of Marcello Milani; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 12640) for the relief of Harold King Boyce; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12641) granting a pension to Joseph Dion; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12642) granting a pension to Bertha C. Keith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12643) granting a pension to Ida B. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 12644) to refund income and profit taxes erroneously collected on storage batteries; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 12645) for the relief of David Leo Lieb; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10846. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the United Upholsterers' Union of New York, Local No. 44, U. C. L. M. I. U. of N. A., endorsing and requesting the enactment of legislation for the creation of a court of appeals for civil-service employees with a set-up of national and local machinery and with employee's representation thereon through his recognized union representative as outlined in the Pearson bill (H. R. 9258); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10847. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Housing, urging the enactment of Senate bill 4424 and House bill 12164; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10848. By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of the Associated General Contractors of Minnesota, urging Congress to take such steps as may be necessary to provide Federal-aid funds sufficient to conduct Federal-aid highway work during the fiscal year 1937 without interruption; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10849. Also, petition of the Central Labor Union, Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 8293, pertaining to the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10850. By Mr. MILLARD: Petition signed by residents in Rockland County, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 5051, which proposes the repeal of section 213 of the Economy Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10851. By Mr. NICHOLS: Petition of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress; to the Committee on Flood Control.

10852. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, petitioning the President of the United States and Congress to maintain the Civilian Conservation Corps at its present quota of 500,000 men for another year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10853. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the conference of mayors and other municipal officials of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., concerning the George bill (S. 2883); to the Committee on Education.

10854. By Mr. TERRY: Petition of the northwest district of the Catholic Union of Arkansas, in the interest of the program of the Arkansas Valleys Association for the construction of flood-control reservoirs on the Arkansas and White Rivers, tributaries of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1936

(Legislative day of Friday, Apr. 24, 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, May 7, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3823) for the relief of the parents of Albert Thesing, Jr.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8234) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Elgin, Ill., and the erection of a heroic Pioneer Memorial, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore: