Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 2647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 12701. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of soldiers of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 2648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 12702. A bill granting increase of pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 2649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 12703. A bill granting pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 2650). 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. DOXEY: A bill (H. R. 12693) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for the classification of cotton, to furnish information on market supply, demand, location, condition, and market prices for cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AYERS: A bill (H. R. 12694) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew for the term of 10 years a lease to the Chicago, Milwaukee, & St. Paul Railway Co. of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 9, 1926; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHANDLER: A bill (H. R. 12695) relating to sales and contracts to sell in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL: A bill (H. R. 12696) authorizing the Postmaster General of the United States to issue a series of special postage stamps in commemoration of the services of Commodore John Barry in the Revolutionary Navy; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PATMAN: A bill (H. R. 12697) to establish the monetary policy of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM: A bill (H. R. 12698) relating to the establishment and operation of grazing districts in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 12699) to amend section 4900 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 49); to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BARRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 587) to extend the time within which applications may be filed under the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LESINSKI: A bill (H. R. 12700) granting pensions to certain soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12701) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12702) granting increase of pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12703) granting pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWE: A bill (H. R. 12704) granting a pension to Isaac A. Chandler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULKIN: A bill (H. R. 12705) for the relief of James Wood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12706) granting a pension to Millard Mitchell Sapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12707) for the relief of W. A. Merrill Sons & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 12708) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Hoyt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12709) granting an increase of pension to Euphemia Trumbull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UTTERBACK: A bill (H. R. 12710) to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Frederick D. Powers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12711) granting a pension to Glennie Edwinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHELCHEL: A bill (H. R. 12712) for the relief of Hoyt G. Barnett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12713) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Martin Tow; 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:

10880. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of Henry Cowall and 90 residents of Shiawassee County, Mich., relative to issuance of currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10881. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Vicente Perrin and others; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10882. Also, petition of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

10883. Also, petition of the Southern Cotton Shippers' Association; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10884. By Mr. RISK: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Most merciful God, in this stillness while we bow, forgive us our sins. O bless the Lord all ye people and make the voice of his praise to be heard. He ruleth by his power; His eyes behold the nations; let not the unrighteous exalt themselves. Let us learn to trust Thee, our Heavenly Father, and to fill our places and enjoy goodly things in the spirit of unquestioning faith and gratitude. O lead us in upon the certitude of the soul and help us to a more restful and calming prospect. Inspire us, blessed Lord, with the redeeming love that saves, with the strengthening grace that sustains, and with the providential guidance that keeps us in the way. The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting and his righteousness unto children's children. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

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.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 8940. 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.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2665. An act to change the name of the Department of the Interior to be known as the Department of Conservation; and

S. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Commodity Credit Corporation to facilitate the liquidation of loans to cotton producers.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2953) entitled "An act to provide for the inspection, control, and regulation of steam boilers and unfired pressure vessels in the District of Columbia", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KING, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. CAPPER 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 Senate to the bill (H. R. 8599) entitled "An act to provide for a change in the designation of the Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection, to create a marine casualty investigation board, and increase efficiency in administration of the steamboat-inspection laws, and for other purposes."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, following the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HANCOCK], I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts withhold that a moment?

Mr. TREADWAY. I withhold it for the moment, Mr. Speaker.

H. NEWLIN MEGILL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MAY 14, 1936.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Desiring to be temporarily absent from my office, I hereby designate Mr. H. Newlin Megill, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers for me which he would be authorized to sign by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III, of the House.

Yours respectfully,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I now renew the point that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 96]

Andrew, Mass.	Cross, Tex.	Fitzpatrick	Lehlbach
Arends	Culkin	Gassaway	McGroarty
Bell	Daly	Gifford	Maloney
Berlin	Dear	Goldsborough	Marshall
Bolton	Dempsey	Gray, Pa.	Maverick
Brennan	DeRouen	Green	Merritt, Conn.
Brewster	Dingell	Greenway	Montet
Brooks	Dorsey	Harlan	Moritz
Buckler, Minn.	Doutrich	Harter	Nichols
Buckley, N. Y.	Duffey, Ohio	Hartley	Oliver
Bulwinkle	Duffy, N. Y.	Hess	Palmisano
Caldwell	Eagle	Hoeppel	Parks
Cary	Eaton	Hope	Patton
Casey	Edmiston	Jenckes, Ind.	Perkins
Cavicchia	Ekwall	Jenkins, Ohio	Risk
Chapman	Englebright	Kee	Sabath
Claiborne	Fenerty	Keller	Sanders, La.
Collins	Ferguson	Kennedy, Md.	Sandlin
Connery	Fernandez	Kerr	Sears
Crosby	Fish	Larrabee	Secrest
Smith, Conn.	Sweeney	Thomas	Wilson, La.
Smith, W. Va.	Taylor, Colo.	Utterback	Withrow
Steagall	Taylor, S. C.	Wigglesworth	Zioncheck

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-five Members are present, a quorum.

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

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HANCOCK] for 10 minutes.

HOUSING CONDITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to direct your attention to and elicit your interest in House Resolution 466, which I introduced on March 26 and which is now pending before the Rules Committee.

Briefly, this resolution authorizes the Speaker of the House to appoint a select committee consisting of seven members to investigate housing problems in the United States and Great Britain. This study and investigation will include problems of home ownership, home building, home financing, and public housing, and will involve a careful survey of the activities of the present agencies of the Government having to do with housing in all its phases. The resolution in question requires that after this investigation and survey has been completed the committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the House during the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress. Fifty thousand dollars is authorized and will be requested from the Committee on Accounts to cover the actual expenses incurred by members of the committee and to employ such technical and clerical assistance as the committee deems desirable to complete a comprehensive study and inquiry and prepare a report and legislative program for the consideration of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

I think all of us will agree that it is high time the legislative branch of our Government really knew something about the housing problem. In my opinion, in its proper and effective solution will be found the key to the present staggering unemployment situation. Unemployment is admitted by all to be the crucial problem of America, and there must be a way to solve it. For several years now, under the impact of the depression and the desire for recovery, we have started in a dozen different directions to build apartments, to insure mortgages, to conduct resettlement operations, to refinance mortgages, to lower interest rates, to support community home-financing institutions, and the like. All have been initiated in good faith under a general desire to do something for better living conditions and for home ownership.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that a thoughtful investigating group should survey the whole problem, take testimony, and develop a coordinated plan which can be followed by our Federal Government, even though that plan may mean the withdrawal from some of the activities upon which we have hastily embarked. The Congress should do its own broad studies on these questions and not depend solely on the guidance of experts and proponents from the departments of the Government, who are always legislative competitors for the expansion and development of their particular activities and spheres of influence.

The great changes and forward steps in the development of national operation with regard to the national-banking system, the Federal Reserve System, and the farm land bank system were made only after extended inquiry and study by Members of the House of Representatives, which was done either through special committees or through regular established committees of the House. In contrast, we are embarking upon an extended program of public housing—and when I say "public housing" I mean the building of thousands of apartments and homes, to be rented by the Government to our citizens—and we are, to use another illustration, placing the credit of the United States behind millions of dollars of private mortgage obligations, held by financial institutions, particularly banks—all without that

extended study and discussion and observation and the hearing of all interests involved which so vast and comprehensive a program deserves to have. The public policies in regard to housing in a country so vast as ours cannot be developed in the necessarily hurried hearings of a legislative session. It is my judgment that such a responsibility should have months of undivided attention from a group of this House, supported and advised by competent experts and impartial advisers.

The British experience in public and private house building is frequently cited as a major factor in their recent business recovery. On several occasions, in the development of their governmental housing policy, they have had the benefit of the study and judgment of commissions composed of representative citizens and experts. It seems to me that, with our dozen-plus Government operations dealing, in one way or another with the housing problem, some with moderate success and others without particular effectiveness, we should, as a legislative body, seek information and develop a program.

It is customary to say that reports of such bodies are not read. Of course, they are not read by tens of thousands of citizens, but such reports, if well done, are read by the men who have the responsibility of determining the housing policies which affect or touch the tens of thousands.

Construction can be our most important industry in business recovery and stability, and home ownership is basic to governmental loyalty and stability. We should, therefore, take extraordinary measures to so inform ourselves that we can legislate wisely on these subjects. There would be less occasion for such a suggestion if the housing problem had been one with which the National Government had been concerned for decades and upon which we had committees of the House who had spent years in studying and dealing with the question. The Federal housing problem is an innovation to the Congress, and should be treated by special attention in order that we may do the greatest good for the renting and home-owning citizens of the country. [Applause.]

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3483) to provide for rural electrification, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the statement for this reason: There were three vital differences between the House and Senate on this bill, which I can explain, I think, in 3 minutes, and therefore I do not believe it is necessary to read the statement.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. This report was not on the desk when the House convened this morning and the Members do not know a thing about it.

Mr. RAYBURN. I can explain all the differences between the conference report and the House bill in about a minute and a half.

Mr. RANKIN. This will save time.

Mr. RICH. It may save time, but while we are saving time we are wrecking the Nation, and we ought to know more about this legislation than we do now.

Mr. RAYBURN. As I have just stated to the gentleman, there are three main differences between the House bill and the conference report, and I can explain them in a minute and a half.

Mr. RICH. I wish the gentleman would explain the differences before he asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the statement.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have got to have unanimous consent in order to dispense with the reading of the statement.

Mr. RICH. Cannot that be withheld? I do not want to object if the gentleman will explain the bill, but in some of these bills and conference reports there are "niggers in the woodpile", and we are going to try to get these niggers out, if possible.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that unanimous consent has already been given for the reading of the statement in lieu of the report. Of course, it will be necessary to read the statement if someone objects to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RICH. I do not want to object to anything that is reasonable, but I have just this very second obtained a copy of the report, and I do not know a thing in the world about it, and the majority of the Members are in the same boat.

Mr. RAYBURN. If the gentleman will allow me, I can tell him something about it.

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

Mr. RICH. I am going to object until I hear the statement read.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. 3483]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3483) to provide for rural electrification, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That there is hereby created and established an agency of the United States to be known as the 'Rural Electrification Administration', all of the powers of which shall be exercised by an Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of ten years, and who shall receive a salary of $10,000 per year. This Act may be cited as the 'Rural Electrification Act of 1936'.

"SEC. 2. The Administrator is authorized and empowered to make loans in the several States and Territories of the United States for rural electrification and the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service, as hereinafter provided; to make, or cause to be made, studies, investigations, and reports concerning the condition and progress of the electrification of rural areas in the several States and Territories; and to publish and disseminate information with respect thereto.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon his request approved by the President, not exceeding in aggregate amount $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, with interest at 3 per centum per annum upon the security of the obligations of borrowers from the Administrator appointed pursuant to the provisions of this Act or from the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration established by Executive Order Numbered 7037: *Provided*, That no such loan shall be in an amount exceeding 85 per centum of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *And provided further*, That such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines, or systems shall be fully amortized over a period not to exceed twenty-five years, and that the maturity of such obligations incurred for the purpose of financing the wiring of premises and the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment shall not exceed two-thirds of the assured life thereof and not more than five years. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make all such endorsements, to execute all such instruments, and to do all such acts and things as shall be necessary to effect the valid transfer and assignment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of all such obligations.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for each of the eight years thereafter, the sum of $40,000,000 for the purposes of this Act as hereinafter provided.

"(c) Fifty per centum of the annual sums herein made available or appropriated for the purposes of this Act shall be allotted yearly by the Administrator for loans in the several States in the proportion which the number of their farms not then receiving central station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service. The Administrator shall, within ninety days after the beginning of each fiscal year,

determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving such service.

"(d) The remaining 50 per centum of such annual sums shall be available for loans in the several States and in the Territories, without allotments as hereinabove provided, in such amounts for each State and Territory as, in the opinion of the Administrator, may be effectively employed for the purposes of this Act, and to carry out the provisions of section 7: *Provided, however,* That not more than 10 per centum of said unallotted annual sums may be employed in any one State, or in all of the Territories.

"(e) If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this Act shall not be loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which such sums are made available, such unexpended or unobligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator in the following year or years without allotment: *Provided, however,* That not more than 10 per centum of said sums may be employed in any one State or in all of the Territories: *And provided further,* That no loans shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator after June 30, 1937.

"(f) All moneys representing payments of principal and interest on loans made by the Administrator under this Act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except that any such moneys representing payments of principal and interest on obligations constituting the security for loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator shall be paid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in payment of such loans.

"SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized and empowered, from the sums hereinbefore authorized, to make loans to persons, corporations, States, Territories, and subdivisions and agencies thereof, municipalities, peoples utility districts and cooperative, nonprofit, or limited-dividend associations organized under the laws of any State or Territory of the United States, for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service: *Provided, however,* That the Administrator, in making such loans, shall give preference to States, Territories, and subdivisions and agencies thereof, municipalities, peoples utility districts, and cooperative, nonprofit, or limited dividend associations, the projects of which comply with the requirements of this Act. Such loans shall be on such terms and conditions relating to the expenditure of the moneys loaned and the security therefor as the Administrator shall determine and may be made payable in whole or in part out of income: *Provided, however,* That all such loans shall be self-liquidating within a period of not to exceed twenty-five years, and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of ten or more years after the dates thereof, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued: *Provided further,* That no loan for the construction, operation, or enlargement of any generating plant shall be made unless the consent of the State authority having jurisdiction in the premises is first obtained. Loans under this section and section 5 shall not be made unless the Administrator finds and certifies that in his judgment the security therefor is reasonably adequate and such loan will be repaid within the time agreed.

"SEC. 5. The Administrator is authorized and empowered, from the sums hereinbefore authorized, to make loans for the purpose of financing the wiring of the premises of persons in rural areas and the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment. Such loans may be made to any of the borrowers of funds loaned under the provisions of section 4, or to any person, firm, or corporation supplying or installing the said wiring, appliances, or equipment. Such loans shall be for such terms, subject to such conditions, and so secured as reasonably to assure repayment thereof, and shall be at a rate of interest equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of ten or more years after the dates thereof, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued.

"SEC. 6. For the purpose of administering this Act and for the purpose of making the studies, investigations, publications, and reports herein provided for, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as shall be necessary.

"SEC. 7. The Administrator is authorized and empowered to bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale, or otherwise to acquire, property pledged or mortgaged to secure any loan made pursuant to this Act; to pay the purchase price and any costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith from the sums authorized in section 3 of this Act; to accept title to any property so purchased or acquired in the name of the United States of America; to operate or lease such property for such period as may be deemed necessary or advisable to protect the investment therein, but not to exceed five years after the acquisition thereof; and to sell such property so purchased or acquired, upon such terms and for such consideration as the Administrator shall determine to be reasonable.

"No borrower of funds under section 4 shall, without the approval of the Administrator, sell or dispose of its property, rights, or franchises, acquired under the provisions of this Act, until any loan obtained from the Rural Electrification Administration, including all interest and charges, shall have been repaid.

"SEC. 8. The administration of loans and contracts entered into by the Rural Electrification Administration established by Executive Order Numbered 7037, dated May 11, 1935, may be vested by the President in the Administrator authorized to be appointed by this Act; and in such event the provisions of this Act shall apply to said loans and contracts to the extent that said provisions are not inconsistent therewith. The President may transfer to the Rural Electrification Administration created by this Act the jurisdiction and control of the records, property (including office equipment), and personnel used or employed in the exercise and performance of the functions of the Rural Electrification Administration established by such Executive order.

"SEC. 9. This Act shall be administered entirely on a nonpartisan basis, and in the appointment of officials, the selection of employees, and in the promotion of any such officials or employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency. If the Administrator herein provided for is found by the President of the United States to be guilty of a violation of this section, he shall be removed from office by the President, and any appointee or selection of officials or employees made by the Administrator who is found guilty of a violation of this Act shall be removed by the Administrator.

"SEC. 10. The Administrator shall present annually to the Congress not later than the 20th day of January in each year a full report of his activities under this Act.

"SEC. 11. In order to carry out the provisions of this Act the Administrator may accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services of Federal, State, and local officers and employees as are available, and he may without regard to the provisions of civil-service laws applicable to officers and employees of the United States appoint and fix the compensation of attorneys, engineers, and experts, and he may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such other officers and employees as he may find necessary and prescribe their duties. The Administrator is authorized, from sums appropriated pursuant to section 6, to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services; supplies and equipment; lawbooks and books of reference; directories and periodicals; travel expenses; rental at the seat of government and elsewhere; the purchase, operation, or maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding) as are appropriate and necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 12. The Administrator is authorized and empowered to extend the time of payment of interest or principal of any loans made by the Administrator pursuant to this Act: *Provided, however,* That with respect to any loan made under section 4, the payment of interest or principal shall not be extended more than five years after such payment shall have become due, and with respect to any loan made under section 5, the payment of principal or interest shall not be extended more than two years after such payment shall have become due: *And provided further,* That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any obligations or the security therefor which may be held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under the provisions of section 3.

"SEC. 13. As used in this Act the term "rural area" shall be deemed to mean any area of the United States not included within the boundaries of any city, village, or borough having a population in excess of fifteen hundred inhabitants, and such term shall be deemed to include both the farm and nonfarm population thereof; the term "farm" shall be deemed to mean a farm as defined in the publications of the Bureau of the Census; the term "person" shall be deemed to mean any natural person, firm, corporation, or association; the term "Territory" shall be deemed to include any insular possession of the United States.

"SEC. 14. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

And the House agree to the same.

SAM RAYBURN,
GEORGE HUDDLESTON,
CARL E. MAPES,
Managers on the part of the House.

E. D. SMITH,
BURTON K. WHEELER,
G. W. NORRIS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 3483) to provide for rural electrification, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the Senate bill, the House amendment, and the substitute agreed upon by the conferees are noted in the following discussion, except for clerical amendments and incidental changes made necessary to harmonize various provisions affected by the agreements reached.

Sections 1, 3 (c), 3 (d), 6, 12 (sec. 11 of the House amendment), and 14 (sec. 13 of the House amendment of the Senate bill are included in the text of the conference agreement without change in the wording (secs. 1, 3 (c), 3 (d), 6, 12, and 14).

Section 2 of the Senate bill authorized the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration to promote rural electrification by making loans, and to make studies and reports as to rural electrification and to publish information pertaining thereto. The House amendment authorized the Administrator to make loans for rural electrification, and retained the provisions as to studies, reports, and publications. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

Section 3 (a) of the Senate bill authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to the Administrator, not exceeding $50,000,000 in the aggregate for each of the fiscal years 1937 and 1938. The House amendment authorized such loans in the amount of $50,000,000, but only for the fiscal year 1937. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

Section 3 (a) of the Senate bill also limited wiring, appliance, and equipment loans to maturities "generally not more than 5 years." The House amendment struck out the word "generally." The conference agreement omits the word "generally."

Section 3 (b) of the Senate bill authorized appropriations of $40,000,000 annually for 8 years, beginning with the fiscal year 1939. The House amendment authorized an appropriation in like amount annually for 9 years, beginning with the fiscal year 1938, to correspond with the change in section 3 (a). The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

Section 3 (e) of the Senate bill by a proviso prohibited the making of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to the Administrator after June 30, 1938. The House amendment made the prohibition effective June 30, 1937, to correspond with the change in sections 3 (a) and 3 (b). The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

The House amendment added a new subsection 3 (f) to section 3 of the Senate bill to provide that repayments on loans made by the Administrator should be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except that repayments on loans put up as security for advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator should be paid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be applied in payment of such advances. The Senate bill contained no corresponding provision. The conference agreement adopts the House provisions.

Section 4 of the Senate bill authorized construction and operation loans to States, Territories, municipalities, utility districts, and cooperative corporations and associations. The House amendment added persons and corporations to the list of such eligibles. The conference agreement adopts the House provision on this point but adds a provision directing the Administrator, in making such loans, to give preference to States, Territories, and subdivisions and agencies thereof, municipalities, people's utility districts, and cooperative, nonprofit, or limited-dividend associations, the projects of which comply with the requirements of this act.

Section 4 provided that such loans by the Administrator bear interest at a rate not exceeding 3 percent per annum. The House amendment required that such interest be at a rate not less than 3 percent per annum. The conference agreement provides that the interest rate shall be equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of 10 or more years after the dates thereof, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued.

The House amendment added at the end of section 4 of the Senate bill a proviso prohibiting the making of any loan for the construction, operation, or enlargement of a generating plant unless consent of the State authority having jurisdiction in the premises was first obtained, and also prohibited the making of loans under the act unless the Administrator certifies that the security therefor is reasonably adequate and that the loan will be repaid within the time agreed. The Senate bill contained no similar provision except that loans under section 5 be so secured as reasonably to assure repayment (sec. 5 of Senate bill). The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

Section 5 of the Senate bill authorized the making of wiring, appliances, and equipment loans to individual consumers as well as to borrowers under section 4 and to the persons installing the wiring, appliances, or equipment. The House amendment eliminates loans to individual consumers unless the consumer is a person making a loan under section 4 or is the person installing the materials. The conference agreement adopts the House provision on this point.

Section 5 of the Senate bill also provided that the loans under such section should bear interest at a rate not exceeding 3 percent per annum. The House amendment required such rate of interest to be not less than 3 percent per annum. The conference agreement provides that the interest rate shall be equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of 10 or more years after the dates thereof, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued.

The second paragraph of section 7 of the Senate bill prohibited a borrower under section 4 of the Senate bill from selling property acquired under the act to any private corporation or person until the loan was repaid, and thereafter only with the approval of the Administrator. The House amendment extended the prohibition against sale to forbid sale in any case until repayment of the loan, without the approval of the Administrator, but required no approval in respect of a sale after repayment of the loan. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

Section 8 of the Senate bill (last sentence) made section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (requiring advertising in purchases of supplies, etc.) applicable to purchases made in expending funds loaned under the act if the aggregate amount involved was more than $500. The House amendment struck out this provision. The conference agreement eliminates the provision.

Section 9 of the Senate bill provided for a nonpartisan administration of the act and for appointments and promotions of officials and employees on the basis of merit, and for removals by the President and by the Administrator in case of violations of this section. The House amendment struck out this section. The conference agreement retains the Senate provisions.

Section 10 of the Senate bill required a report to Congress from the Administrator as soon as practicable after the 1st day of January in each year. The House amendment (sec. 9) required the report to be made not later than the 20th day of January in each year. The conference agreement (sec. 10) adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

Section 11 of the Senate bill (relating to the power of the Administrator to hire personnel and to make expenditures) was modified by the House amendment (sec. 10) to provide that expenditures for the enumerated purposes were not to be made except out of appropriations made pursuant to section 6. The conference agreement (sec. 11) adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

Section 13 of the Senate bill (containing definitions) was amended by the House amendment to include a definition of "Territory" in order to extend the application of the act to insular possessions of the United States. The conference agreement (sec. 13) adopts the change made by the House amendment.

SAM RAYBURN,
GEORGE HUDDLESTON,
CARL E. MAPES,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RICH (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that if we dispense with the reading of the statement that the gentleman from Texas will give us the information and therefore save time. So I withdraw my objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the bill as it passed the Senate and as it passed the House, I think there are but three differences that amount to a great deal. As the Senate passed the bill there was no provision for lending money to private companies, but only to public bodies and quasi-public bodies.

The House passed the bill allowing loans to private corporations.

We compromised on this sort of a provision, that the provision for loans to private companies was retained in the bill and that municipalities and nonprofit organizations should receive preferences at the hands of the Administrator in lending money. That is the difference.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I will.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the same provision that is contained in the T. V. A.

Mr. RAYBURN. The same.

Mr. RANKIN. It gives preference to municipalities and cooperative associations.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is right.

Another difference was that the Senate bill provided that the loans should be made at not more than 3 percent. The House bill provided that loans should be made for not less than 3 percent. We compromised by striking out both of these sentences and inserting a provision that the money should be loaned by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification at the price that it cost the Government to get it.

Mr. RANKIN. And what would that amount be at the present time?

Mr. RAYBURN. At the present time it would be less than 3 percent, but it is to go up and down as it will cost the Government.

Mr. RANKIN. So it would be now, and for the last 10 years, substantially 3 percent or less?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Now, the House struck out a provision in the Senate bill which I did not know was in the T. V. A., and that was that the administration should be nonpartisan. So the House yielded on that and it was restored.

Mr. RICH. It is to be nonpartisan? How can that happen?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not know, but the bill provides that it shall be. I am not the Administrator. But let me say that 97 percent will be under civil service.

Mr. RICH. In figuring out the rates of interest which they charge for this money do they figure any cost, as far as the Government is concerned, for the people they have in their employ for insurance, taxes, office rent, and all overhead figured by private business?

Mr. RAYBURN. This is conducted like any other Government institution, just like the Interstate Commerce Commission or any other commission of the Government. The administration is paid for out of the Treasury.

Mr. RICH. They do not figure any overhead costs in trying to determine what the rates of interest are going to be? They simply use the rate we borrow money for, and the average rate of interest charged is the amount we charge, without any overhead expenses being figured. That is the way the Government fools the people of this country. That is the political way of doing things.

Mr. RAYBURN. It will cost the borrower what it costs the Government.

Mr. RICH. In other words, you will have to lay taxes on some part of the Government in order to get enough money to carry on the organization that is seeking the low rates of interest. All that expense will have to be borne by some other branch of the Government?

Mr. RAYBURN. If there is any other expense, it will; yes.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. In view of the fact that the statement was not read, it might be well to call attention to another amendment in addition to the three which the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. RAYBURN. I said three main points.

Mr. MAPES. Some of the Members were interested in a fourth amendment, known as the Walsh amendment, put on in the Senate, requiring the recipients of these loans to advertise for bids on all contracts over $500. The Senate receded on that amendment?

Mr. RAYBURN. The House struck that out, and the Senate receded on it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is that provision which was in the House bill which fixed the term of office of the Administrator at 10 years still in the bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not think that was disturbed; no, sir. It is still in the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a further question or two upon a matter which I confess I discussed when the bill was before the House?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I read the report, there has been no change in this particular provision, but I want to ask the gentleman from Texas a question or two about it. I think the gentleman will not deny that in all its loaning activities the Government in no case has proceeded to loan 100 percent on the value or cost of the property which is put up as security for the loan. Even on yesterday, when the Frazier-Lemke bill was before us, and surely that was a most generous bill, the sponsors of that bill offered an amendment to the effect that the farmer might receive a loan only up to 80 percent of the appraised value of the farm. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Agricultural Credit Administration, the Federal land bank, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in all their loans—in fact, all loans by Government agencies—always maintain some cushion for the Government. I ask the gentleman from Texas if it is not a fact that this is the only measure of all the measures proposing to loan money which authorizes a 100-percent loan?

Mr. RAYBURN. I think that is correct.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I thought so.

Mr. RAYBURN. And I think it is absolutely necessary if we are going to make a success out of this.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Is it not a fact that the conference agreement does adopt the House amendment authorizing the administration to make loans for rural electrification, as shown in the House amendment?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is correct.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. What are the conditions of repayment? Are they made on a monthly basis?

Mr. RAYBURN. That has not been determined yet. They can pay them, and they will be handled under whatever law is in operation in the States, or rules and regulations.

Mr. COLDEN. In case they are based upon monthly payments, the whole amount will only be loaned for the first month, and the principal will be reduced every month after that, will it not?

Mr. RAYBURN. It could be.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. I did not understand what the gentleman said regarding the so-called Norris amendment, regarding the loaning of money to private corporations. What was done with that?

Mr. RAYBURN. It was retained in the bill—the provision to loan to private corporations, utility companies. But we have a provision that preference should be given to municipalities and others, such as cooperatives, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table 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 Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman a question. This is the Navy Department appropriation bill. What is the status of that bill as to an increase this year over last year?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I will answer the gentleman's question by making this statement: There is no conference report before the House at this time. I am simply now asking unanimous consent that the bill be taken from the Speaker's table, disagree with all of the amendments placed on the bill by the Senate, and ask for a conference.

Mr. RICH. You are going to disagree to all those amendments?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I so stated very clearly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. UMSTEAD, Mr. THOM, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. MCLEOD, and Mr. DITTER.

NAVAL AIR STATION SITE, MIAMI, FLA.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8372) to authorize the acquisition of lands in the vicinity of Miami, Fla., as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8372]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8372) to authorize the acquisition of lands in the vicinity of Miami, Florida, as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

CARL VINSON,
P. H. DREWRY,
GEORGE P. DARROW,
Managers on the part of the House.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
FREDERICK HALE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8372) to authorize the acquisition of lands in the vicinity of Miami, Fla., as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report; namely:

The House text prevails. The House bill provides for the acceptance of a donation of lands on North Biscayne Bay, in the vicinity of Miami, Fla., and the establishment thereon of a naval air station. The Senate struck out the whole of the House text and made provisions for acceptance of donated lands merely in the vicinity of Miami, Fla., and for the development of the property for such naval necessities as the Secretary of the Navy may consider to be warranted, the property to be returned to the grantors if not used by the United States as contemplated by the amendment within 10 years.

CARL VINSON,
P. H. DREWRY,
GEORGE P. DARROW,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was adopted.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10919) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10919) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 16, 19, 21, 23, 35, 37, 46, 55, 56, 57, and 58.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 10, 12, 15, 18, 20, 24, 31, 33, 39, 40, 41, 47, 50, 51, 53, 54, 62, and 64, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$1,050,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$155,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$1,373,210", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$475,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$17,566,458", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "or for the permanent enlargement of the capacity of any existing aviation shore station", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$22,690,788", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$1,320,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "not exceeding $1,000 for expenses of educational exhibits, specifically approved by the Secretary of the Treasury,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$365,135"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$569,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$769,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$447,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$206,240", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$104,930", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Salaries of inspectors: For salaries of fifteen inspectors in charge of divisions and five hundred and seventy-five inspectors, $2,219,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$586,500", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$6,775,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$186,900,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$134,900,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$7,125,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$12,875,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$14,900,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$4,675,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$625,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 26, 48, 49, and 52.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
JOHN J. BOYLAN,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JOHN TABER,
CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
FREDERICK STEIWER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10919) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

On no. 1: Appropriates $1,050,000, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,099,140, as proposed by the Senate, for the Bureau of the Mint and the mints and assay offices on account of additional work incident to the Gold Reserve and Silver Purchase Acts.

On no. 2: Appropriates $520,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $529,720, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries, office of Chief Clerk and Superintendent.

On no. 3: Appropriates $155,000, instead of $150,300, as proposed by the House, and $160,000, as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses, Treasury Department.

On no. 4: Appropriates $279,520, as proposed by the House, instead of $285,920, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries, office of Commissioner of Accounts and Deposits.

On nos. 5 and 6, relating to the Division of Disbursement: Appropriates $1,373,210, instead of $1,473,210, as proposed by the Senate, and $1,273,210, as proposed by the House, for salaries and expenses, and makes provision, as proposed by the Senate, for the transfer of funds from the Railroad Retirement Board and the Social Security Board for the performance of work by such Division of such agencies.

On nos. 7 and 8, relating to the Public Debt Service: Appropriates $2,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,073,000, as proposed by the Senate, and fixes the limit on the amount that may be expended for personal services at $1,975,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,048,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 9: Appropriates $48,512,980, as proposed by the House, instead of $49,768,830, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

On nos. 10 and 11, relating to the Federal Alcohol Administration: Appropriates $475,000, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House, and $550,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the House limitation upon personal services in the District of Columbia; and makes a technical correction in phraseology.

On nos. 12 to 17, inclusive, relating to the Coast Guard: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the number of enlisted men on duty at Coast Guard Headquarters in connection with the Commandant's office shall not exceed 10, instead of limiting such details to 10 "in the District of Columbia" as proposed by the House bill; appropriates $17,566,458, instead of $17,512,000, as proposed by the House, and $17,580,933, as proposed by the Senate, for pay and allowances—the addition to the House amount of $54,458 being on account of rations; the Senate struck out of the House limitation on the use of certain funds for aviation shore stations that part prohibiting construction of any "permanent extension" at any such station—the conference agreement restores that part of the House limitation modified so as to make it applicable "to the permanent enlargement of the capacity of any existing aviation shore station"; appropriates $180,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $175,000, as proposed by the House, for contingent expenses; appropriates $1,800,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,900,000, as proposed by the Senate for repairs to vessels; and adjusts the total to correspond to the conference agreements.

On nos. 18 and 19: Appropriates $53,160, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House, for salaries, Secret Service Division, and appropriates $850,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $906,575, as proposed by the Senate, for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes.

On nos. 20, 21, and 22, relating to the Public Health Service: Increases, as proposed by the Senate, from $24,500 to $27,740 the limitation on personal services in the District of Columbia in the Division of Mental Hygiene and appropriates for such Division $663,220, as proposed by the House, instead of $666,460, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $1,320,000 instead of $1,155,160, as proposed by the House, and $1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for diseases and sanitation investigations.

On no. 23: Strikes out the appropriation of $22,000, inserted by the Senate, for reestablishment of the assay office at Helena, Mont.

On nos. 24 and 25: Makes the appropriations for the Procurement Division, Public Building Branch, available, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of educational exhibits modified so as to limit such expenses to not to exceed $1,000.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

On nos. 27 to 34, inclusive, relating to salaries in bureaus and offices in the District of Columbia: The following tabulation shows the amounts, respectively, in the House bill, the Senate amendments, and the amounts agreed upon as the result of the conference:

Office	House amount	Senate amount	Conference amount
Office of First Assistant	$360,000	$372,270	$366,135
Office of Second Assistant	566,040	573,580	569,810
Office of Third Assistant	766,440	771,860	769,150
Office of Fourth Assistant	442,800	452,200	447,500
Office of Solicitor	81,000	81,280	81,280
Office of chief inspector	201,380	216,000	206,240
Office of purchasing agent	40,880	42,000	42,000
Bureau of Accounts	103,000	106,860	104,930

On no. 35: Appropriates $81,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $85,000, as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses of the Post Office Department.

On nos. 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40, relating to the office of chief inspector: The following tabulation shows the amounts and personnel, respectively, in the House bill, the Senate amendments, and the conference agreement:

	House bill	Senate amendments	Conference agreement
15 inspectors in charge and 560 inspectors	$2,176,000		
15 inspectors in charge, 15 assistant inspectors in charge, and 625 inspectors		$2,425,000	
15 inspectors in charge and 575 inspectors			$2,219,500
Traveling and miscellaneous expenses	573,000	650,000	586,500
Clerks, division headquarters	446,100	465,000	465,000

The increase of 15 inspectors above the number provided in the House bill are allowed at rates as follows: 5 at $3,200 each, 5 at $2,900 each, and 5 at $2,600 each.

On nos. 41 to 45, inclusive, office, First Assistant Postmaster General: The following tabulation shows the amounts of the House bill, the Senate amendments, and the conference agreement:

	House bill	Senate amendments	Conference agreement
Compensation to postmasters	$47,500,000	$48,000,000	$48,000,000
Assistant postmasters	6,750,000	6,800,000	6,775,000
Clerks, first- and second-class post offices	186,500,000	187,500,000	186,900,000
City delivery carriers	134,500,000	135,300,000	134,900,000
Special-delivery fees	7,000,000	7,250,000	7,125,000

On no. 46: Appropriates $207,245, as proposed by the House, instead of $450,000, as proposed by the Senate, eliminating the increase proposed of $242,755 for expansion of air-mail service in Alaska.

On no. 47: Increase from $31,550 to $33,050, as proposed by the Senate, the amount which may be used for cost ascertainment of postal activities.

On nos. 50 and 51: Increase the limitation on the amount to be used for carrying foreign air mail from $7,962,500 to $8,230,000, as proposed by the Senate, the additional sum of $267,500 being for an additional weekly schedule on the east coast of South America.

On nos. 53, 54, and 55, relating to domestic air mail under contract: Appropriates $12,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $12,250,000, as proposed by the Senate, and increases, as proposed by the Senate, the limitations on the amounts thereof which may be used for administrative expenses in the District of Columbia and in the field.

On nos. 56, 57, and 58, relating to the salvaging and reconditioning of post-office lock-box equipment: Strikes out the increase of $35,000 and the authority inserted by the Senate to provide for such work.

On no. 59: Appropriates $12,875,000, instead of $12,750,000, as proposed by the House, and $13,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for rent, light, etc., for first-, second-, and third-class offices.

On no. 60: Appropriates $14,900,000, instead of $14,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $15,300,000, as proposed by the Senate, for operating force for public buildings.

On no. 61: Appropriates $4,675,000, instead of $4,650,000, as proposed by the House, and $4,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, for operating supplies for public buildings.

On nos. 62 and 63: Appropriates $625,000, instead of $600,000, as proposed by the House, and $650,000, as proposed by the Senate, for furniture, etc., for public buildings, and makes the appropriation available, as proposed by the Senate, for "safe and vault protective devices."

On no. 64: Inserts section 4, proposed by the Senate, prohibiting the use of any money appropriated under the bill for payment to any person for the filling of any position for which such person has been nominated after the Senate upon vote has failed to confirm the nomination of such person.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments of the Senate:

On no. 26: Providing for the transfer of funds to the office of Treasurer of the United States and to certain other Treasury appropriations from various agencies to cover expenses performed by the Treasury in clearing of checks, servicing of bonds, handling of collections, and rendering of accounts for such agencies.

On nos. 48, 49, and 52, relating to appropriations for transportation of foreign mails under contracts authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1928.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
JOHN J. BOYLAN,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JOHN TABER,
CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman, with the exception of Senate amendments 26, 48, 49, and 52, how much the bill has been increased over what it was when it left the House?

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the total increase is $2,851,063. The Senate increased the House bill in the sum of $7,438,723. The House conferees were able to induce the Senate conferees to recede to the extent of $4,587,660, which leaves a net increase of $2,851,063.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. TABER. It is a fact that the House conferees fought over every dollar of difference between the two Houses.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is absolutely correct; and I must say that we have brought to this House a report that is unanimous. So far as the House conferees are concerned, we are agreed as to every item, and the orderly parliamentary procedure is to adopt the report and then proceed to the amendments in disagreement between the House and the Senate.

Mr. RICH. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on trying to keep these amounts down, but hard as you gentlemen worked you need some help, for the items have not yet been cut down to the bone. As I read the conference report, the House conferees recede on 13 amendments and the Senate conferees recede on 13 amendments, yet 21 of the amendments carry increases as they now stand.

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say to the gentleman that, of course, a conference implies a yielding on both sides to a certain extent, and they did three-quarters of the yielding. We won, I think, a great victory in the conference between the two Houses.

Mr. RICH. I am behind the gentleman. He is doing good work; so is the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I see, however, four amendments in disagreement, nos. 26, 48, 49, and 52. These amendments will require more money. Is it proposed to ask us to disagree to these amendments?

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is mistaken. If we yield to the Senate on these four amendments, it will make the amount less instead of more. These involve the controverted item of ocean-mail contracts.

I think the orderly procedure would be for the gentleman to permit the conference report to be adopted. Then we can consider at length each amendment in disagreement.

Mr. RICH. Maybe I do not quite understand the situation, but the last sentence of the conference report reads: The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments nos. 26, 48, 49, and 52.

These amendments, when finally disposed of, will represent another increase.

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say to the gentleman that if we adopt all of them the amount carried by the bill will not be increased.

Mr. RICH. The conferees did not agree to these amendments?

Mr. LUDLOW. No, we did not; and we do not intend to.

Mr. RICH. Then, the conferees did a good job.

Mr. LUDLOW. Let me say to the gentleman that I believe he and I think alike on a great many lines; and I am sure it will be comforting to his economic soul to know that this bill, as it now stands, is $16,743,068 below the actual appropriation for these two departments for the fiscal year 1936, which is a very substantial reduction.

Mr. RICH. I agree on that point, but do not forget that Congress has asked the Committee on Appropriations to do a lot more for the Post Office Department which has increased the bill very materially. The fact of the matter is that the Post Office appropriation bill this year is some $29,000,000 or $30,000,000 more than it was a year ago.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, but, as a matter of fact, we have been able, by the most assiduous attention to effect this reduction, nothwithstanding statutory requirements like the 40-hour week, which we could have no control over but which had to be provided for in the bill. So that we have really accomplished quite a material reduction.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman, and I think it should be driven home to the membership of the House that we ought to be careful in connection with the legislation we pass so that we do not increase all of these appropriations year after year.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Is it not true, if we adopt Senate amendments 48, 49, and 52, it will result in an additional saving of $20,000,000?

Mr. LUDLOW. It will result in a reduction of $22,000,000, but there is a question whether we ought to do that or not. There is involved a question of moral standards and obligation of contracts.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I want to make it clear, for the benefit of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the adoption of Senate amendments 48, 49, and 52 will bring about a saving of $22,000,000.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCREYNOLDS). The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 48, line 16, amendment no. 26:

"With the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, there may be transferred to the appropriations, 'Salaries, office of Treasurer of United States, 1937', 'Contingent expenses, Treasury Department, 1937', 'Printing and binding, Treasury Department, 1937', and 'Stationery, Treasury Department, 1937', from funds available for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Farm Credit Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation, such sums as may be necessary to cover the expenses incurred in clearing of checks, servicing of bonds, handling of collections, and rendering of accounts therefor: *Provided*, That a statement of any transfers of appropriations made hereunder shall be included in the annual Budget.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment no. 26 and concur in the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "With the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, there may be transferred sums (not exceeding a total of $450,000) to the appropriations, 'Salaries,

Office of Treasurer of United States, 1937', 'Contingent expenses, Treasury Department, 1937', 'Printing and binding, Treasury Department, 1937', and 'Stationery, Treasury Department, 1937', from funds available for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Farm Credit Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, farmers' crop production and harvesting loans, Federal land banks, and other banks and corporations under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, Railroad Retirement Board, Soil Conservation Service, including soil conservation and domestic allotment, Social Security Board, Federal Housing Administration, and Emergency Conservation Work, to cover the expenses incurred on account of such respective activities in clearing of checks, servicing of bonds, handling of collections, and rendering of accounts therefor: *Provided*, That funds transferred hereunder from the appropriation for Emergency Conservation Work shall remain available until June 30, 1937, any provision in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided further*, That a statement of any transfers of appropriations made hereunder shall be included in the annual Budget."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, we have now reached the point where all amendments are disposed of except amendments 48, 49, and 52. Amendment no. 49 is partially dependent on amendment no. 52, and amendment no. 48 is wholly dependent on amendment 52; therefore, in the interest of expedition and clarity of action, I ask unanimous consent that amendment no. 49 may be passed over for the time being, and that amendments 48 and 52 may be considered together at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 1 hour usually allowed under the rule be extended to 2 hours for the reason that this is a controversial matter and numerous gentlemen have applied to me for time. I should like very much to be able to oblige all of those who desire to speak on this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to the request of the gentleman, but does he not think it may be possible to conclude the debate in less than 2 hours? We have some matters we are anxious to dispose of today.

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say to the gentleman that, of course, I have no desire to prolong the debate. I have quite a list of Members who desire to speak, and they very earnestly wish to be heard. I should like to accommodate them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall not object.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the majority leader what is coming up after we finish this matter?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we had a resolution that we wanted to present this afternoon. I think we have reached an agreement with reference to the correction of the RECORD in connection with the remarks which the gentleman from Colorado made some days ago. We also have an omnibus private pension bill that we had hoped to pass today. We are hopeful we may get through with the program this afternoon and adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. RICH. Those are all the matters coming up this afternoon?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; that is all we expected to call up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the two amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, line 6, amendment no. 48: Strike out, beginning in line 6, "(exclusive of mail carried under contracts awarded under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928)."

Page 61, line 4, amendment no. 52: Strike out, beginning on line 4, down to and including line 11, which reads as follows:

"Foreign Mail Service, Merchant Marine Act: For transportation of foreign mails under contracts authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 861–889; title 46, secs. 886–891x), including the cost of advertising in connection with the award of contracts authorized by said act, $26,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be paid on contract no. 56 to the Seatrain Co."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments nos. 48 and 52.

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WEARIN moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment no. 52.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit a unanimous-consent request. The motion just made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN] covers only one amendment. I understand unanimous consent was granted that amendments 48 and 52 may be considered together. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's motion be corrected to read that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments nos. 48 and 52.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, if this motion is agreed to, we will effect a saving of $22,000,000. However, the issue involved is not necessarily a saving of $22,000,000. The issue raised by the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN] goes deeper. It goes into the question of ship subsidies. It goes into the question of subsidizing a merchant marine which today, Mr. Speaker, needs overhauling and drastic reformation.

The present American merchant marine is a disgrace to the flag it carries. The American merchant marine today cannot, in any manner, pretend to grant safety at sea to any of its passengers. Any such pretension is a fraud. The facts speak for themselves. The treatment of the crews, the equipment, the general condition of these ships, and especially the construction, proves one thing conclusively, and that is that they have given us a ginger-bread top and down below these ships are not fit for either habitation or sailing.

About 3 weeks ago I submitted to the Secretary of Commerce 110 statements, each statement made by a seaman—110 written statements by seamen who had won medals for bravery at sea. These men had first-hand knowledge of safety-at-sea conditions, and these 110 statements were submitted by 110 seamen, I repeat, who had won medals for bravery at sea, and these statements revealed horrible conditions on these ships, not only as to working conditions but actually as to safety-at-sea conditions.

The Secretary of Commerce promised to investigate this situation. Up to now absolutely nothing has been done and no action has been taken on this memorandum containing 110 charges, charges giving the names of the ships and charges giving the names of the companies involved.

Mr. Speaker, I charge right here and now that these shipping companies outdo Al Capone by millions of dollars. They are racketeers of the lowest order. They are not giving the American passengers safety at sea, and what is more, they are mistreating the crews, submitting them to the worst form of living and working conditions. I wish you gentlemen had an opportunity to examine these ships. Do not look at the upper deck, do not look at the decorative portions of the ship, but go down and see where the men are living, and you will realize that these ships are a disgrace to our country. They are a disgrace to the merchant marine of a great country such as ours.

Today, in New York City 4,000 American seamen are out on strike. They are conducting a heroic strike. These men are American seamen, seamen who have dedicated their lives to safety at sea, and ships today are going out to sea being manned by W. P. A. workers. Get that! Ships going out to sea carrying passengers are being manned by W. P. A. workers. Take your steamship *California*, for instance.

When it went out the other day and had to come back, a recheck of the shipping crew showed that the ship crew was composed mainly of W. P. A. workers and that it did not have the number of able-bodied seamen required by law.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman does not contend that a person who is on W. P. A. should be barred from honest work?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I contend that a person who is on W. P. A., if he is not an able-bodied seaman, should not be allowed to do the work of an able-bodied seaman, because unless you have able-bodied seamen on a ship you are imperiling the lives of the passengers on that ship. Remember the *Morrow Castle*.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman knows that a boat that is not fully manned by able-bodied seamen would not receive clearance papers.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is just it. They are receiving clearance papers every day, and I make that charge, and we have submitted proof of that to Secretary Roper.

Mr. KNUTSON. That would be murder.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Well, I am not going that far. I am not entering into that at all. I am pointing out the facts. I am interested in the facts, and I am not interested in arriving at any political conclusions. The facts are that ships are today being manned by W. P. A. workers from the city of New York, none of whom are qualified as able-bodied seamen.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. MORAN. Of course, there are plenty of qualified, able-bodied seamen in this country to man the merchant marine.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Of course, there are plenty of them.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman state to the House the reason they are not manning them?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will tell you why they are not manning them. It is because these men have been insisting on two things. They insist on decent wages, decent living and working conditions, and, second, real safety at sea. The companies do not want to comply in either respect. All they are interested in is money. They are racketeers, racketeering on the Government, on the seamen, and on the passengers. Hence, in order to break the strike, they are using W. P. A. workers, who are not able-bodied seamen, as scabs to work the ships, thus exploiting labor, cheating the Government, and imperiling the lives of passengers. Withhold this appropriation and you will force these companies to come to terms. We owe them nothing. They have broken repeatedly their contractual obligations. That releases the Government from any obligation to them.

Yesterday we had a letter read by the Speaker of the House from the president of the American Federation of Labor. We are the Congress which is supposed to protect labor. Yet we are asked to turn over $22,000,000 to a gang of labor exploiters who refuse to give decent wages or decent living quarters to the seamen, but employ W. P. A. workers as scabs.

If we agree to concur in the Senate amendment and refuse to give the $22,000,000 to the shipping companies, we may force out of Congress a real bill, with provisions protecting both labor and the passengers. How can any friend of labor consent to give this money without any provision to protect labor and passengers?

I am in favor of a merchant marine. I want a merchant marine, as all of us do. But before we turn over $22,000,000 to anybody let us, at least, turn it over by means of a bill that will protect American seamen and American passengers.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The strike in New York is being fomented by Communists, and it ought to be stopped.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman from Minnesota is making the same mistake that tories make when a strike exists. They send up a camouflage of red in order to conceal the real issues.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is an outlaw strike.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is no more an outlaw strike than the gentleman is an outlaw Congressman. [Laughter.] I brought these men down to Washington. I brought them here and took them before the Secretary of Commerce. Who were these men? Every single man had won a medal for bravery. They gave the Secretary facts straight from the shoulder.

The Secretary of Commerce said, "Make memorandum of that" and "make a memorandum of this", and we gave him the memorandum. Three weeks have gone by, and we have received no communication from him. He promised he would investigate. To date no sign of any investigation. Whenever workers ask for a decent wage or decent living conditions they are called "reds." These men are good Americans, and the man who questions the Americanism of these men is not a good American himself.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. MORAN. The gentleman realizes that the subsidy was allowed because of the increased cost of operating American ships, and that since that time they have cut wages.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Exactly; they received the money and then they cut wages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McREYNOLDS). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY].

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, the motion of the gentleman from Iowa is to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The effect of that motion would be to cut $22,500,000 off the ocean-mail subsidy contracts from the Treasury-Post Office Department appropriation bill as it passed the House. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Iowa will be adopted. First, it is about time we stopped, once and for all, this system of subsidy to a few privileged ship operators who happen to stand in the political and financial good graces of certain bureaucrats. We have had it a long time. The Democrats least of all can stand in favor of such a system of subsidies. Last year we tried for 3 days to get a roll call on the ship-subsidy bill. Nobody seemed to want to go on record as to whether or not we should continue that system of graft, which usually has the American flag wrapped around it so it can be disguised as patriotism.

At that time I called the attention of the Democratic Members of the House to the expressions in their own party platform on this question of ship subsidies and ocean-mail contract subsidies. Of course, it may be a unique thing in these days to remind anybody of a campaign platform, but another campaign platform is probably in the making, and I believe I can safely predict that both parties will have the same opposition to subsidies in their platforms that the Democratic Party has had for a long time. I will read what the Democratic platform said about these ship subsidies:

> We oppose as illogical and unsound all efforts to overcome by subsidies the handicaps to American shipping and commerce imposed by Republican policies.

Of course, I would not be at all surprised that the Republican side of the House voted to keep this $22,000,000 subsidy in effect. It started under their policies and was most viciously consummated under Hoover, but I think the people would be surprised if the Democrats should vote to keep up a racket which was a national scandal under Republican rule.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'MALLEY. I do not have the time. If the gentleman will get me more time, I will yield.

That twenty-two and a half million is not a very great saving, but it is an indication of the attitude of this House toward ocean-mail contracts. Those contracts have been as great a scandal as the Teapot Dome scandal ever was. The American people know that only a few privileged ship operators make anything out of it. One ship operator got a

million dollars for carrying 1 pound of mail. The record will sustain that. If we adopt the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, we take twenty-two and one-half million dollars away from these racketeers. We do not have to pass the buck to either the President or Postmaster General. We should do our duty and cancel these contracts by refusing this appropriation.

I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama, the majority leader.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, in years past I have opposed subsidies very bitterly. I was on a select committee in 1922 to investigate those subsidies.

Mr. O'MALLEY. There was an investigation made of the ship subsidies; yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But here is the proposition as it appears to me in the pending measure, and I am inclined to support the recommendation of the subcommittee upon it: Here is a commitment by the Government to the ship operators, under existing law, entered into in good faith, that the evidence tends to show is most essential, at least at present, for the continued operation of these merchant lines. Now, when we have a contract, ought we not carry it into effect, whether it is a good one or a bad one?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Those contracts were entered into under the Merchant Marine Act in 1928, and the very reason why this amount is in this bill is because this House last year passed the merchant marine subsidy bill by only eight votes, so small a margin that the Senate has not seen fit to consider it yet. The advocates of subsidies for profiteers and millionaires are attempting to carry through here a continuance of what this House has termed fraudulent contracts and were entered into without competition as far back as 1928.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a very few short quotations from public documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCREYNOLDS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is whether the House will concur in the Senate amendment to strike from the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill the appropriation for the foreign ocean-mail contracts or whether the House shall adhere to its original position of including that appropriation in the bill. There are several pertinent points which merit consideration.

First let us consider the cost of ocean-mail contracts. I quote as follows from pages 8 and 9 of House of Representatives Document 118, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session:

MAIL PAY

Mail pay has constantly increased since the enactment of the 1928 act. The mail contracts for the fiscal year 1929 amounted to approximately $9,000,000; in 1930 they were $13,000,000; in 1931 they were $18,000,000; in 1932 they amounted to $22,000,000; in 1933, $26,000,000; and in 1934 they were $29,000,000. For 1935 they are estimated at $28,850,000. For 1936 the amount would have been $32,851,954 if the contractors were to receive the amounts due by reason of reclassification of ships, new ships, and full performance of the service, but the Budget Director disapproved of the increased allowance and recommended that the appropriation be continued as for the fiscal year 1935.

If the present contracts continue, there will have been paid thereunder the approximate total of $308,095,160.30. There has already been paid by the Post Office Department under these contracts the sum of $119,257,756.63 up to June 30, 1934, leaving the estimated amount for the balance of the terms of the present contracts at $188,837,403.67.

If the mail had been carried on a foreign poundage basis up to June 30, 1934, the cost would have been $6,802,434.90, and if carried at the American poundage rate the cost would have been $15,534,509.10. The difference between the American poundage rate and the amount actually paid could be called nothing except a direct subsidy paid with the expectation that it would be properly used in the building of a merchant marine. This has already amounted to more than $100,000,000, and during the life of the contracts the excess cost, or subsidy, will amount to around $268,000,000.

From the above quotation it will be readily seen that the decision on this question is a very important one and means millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the United States.

The second point to consider is the result of these foreign ocean-mail contracts. A careful reading of House of Representatives Report 1277, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, will convince anyone that our present policy is not producing an adequate merchant marine. All informed persons on this subject, regardless of what views they may have as to the proper remedy, agree in the position that our present system is most unsatisfactory. This fact should be borne in mind when we realize that the question before the House is to continue to pour millions of dollars into a system which admittedly is not producing desired results.

Third. We should not forget that in the President's message to Congress, dated March 4, 1935, that he specifically stated that "the Congress should provide for the termination of existing ocean-mail contracts as rapidly as possible." The President, of course, asked for a new system but agrees that the existing contracts should be canceled.

Fourth. It should be borne in mind there actually was no competitive bidding for these contracts as required by law. Following is a quotation from pages 11 and 12 of Senate Report 898, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, clearly demonstrating that there really was no competitive bidding for these contracts.

NULLIFICATION OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING

It was contemplated by the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 that the Postmaster General should first determine what ocean-mail routes should be established and certify them to the United States Shipping Board. The Shipping Board was then to determine and certify to the Postmaster General the type, size, speed, and other characteristics of the vessel which should be employed, the frequency and regularity of sailings, and all other facts bearing upon the capacity of the vessels to meet the requirements of the service stated by the Postmaster General. Upon receipt of this certificate, the Postmaster General was to advertise and secure competitive bids for furnishing the service in question. What actually happened was this:

The agents, lobbyists, and representatives of steamship lines descended upon the Post Office Department, which, acting in startling harmony with these alert and affable spokesmen of privilege, speedily reached decisions as to the "mail route" to be established, the character of service to be demanded (always a service then being operated by the prospective contractor, or which it was fully prepared to operate and which, in many instances as will be pointed out, it was then bound by guaranteed contract with the Government to operate for a term of years without additional aid in the form of mail pay), and the amount of compensation it was to receive. This procedure is in striking contrast to the expectation of Congress that this compensation was to be fixed by free competition between prospective contractors.

Having accomplished this preliminary spade work, the result of these cooperative labors was transmitted to the Shipping Board in the form of a "certification of the Postmaster General." This certification was accompanied by the representatives of the prospective contractors, who were equally at home in both places. Instantly and pliantly the Shipping Board "determined and certified" to the Postmaster General those things which the interdepartmental subcommittee and the prospective contractor had agreed upon in advance that the Shipping Board should certify. The route was then advertised and the contract let to the company, which had arranged in advance the service it was to render and the compensation it should receive. The Postmaster General has advised the President that 42 out of 43 active contracts are subject to cancelation, 40 of them because let in open defiance of the legal requirement for competitive bidding. This advice by the Postmaster General is based upon the transcript of evidence adduced before him, which is replete with proof that these contracts were regarded as the personal perquisites of favored shipping interests, considered as "pie" and parceled out as such.

This was "competitive bidding" as practiced under the Merchant Marine Act of 1928. In fact there was no competitive bidding. Officials and contractors combined to and did prevent it.

Fifth. I addressed a letter to the Comptroller General of the United States—which appears on page 1806 of the February 10, 1935, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—making it clear that these contracts are voidable ab initio because of the fact that they were let without competitive bidding. I quote his reply, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 5, 1936.

Hon. EDWARD C. MORAN, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MORAN: I have considered your letter of February 10, 1936, with further reference to payments under foreign ocean-mail contracts suggested as voidable ab initio under the Merchant

Marine Act of 1928 (45 Stat. 694) because not awarded to the lowest bidder on the basis of competitive bidding.

Your letter quotes provisions of sections 406 and 407 of the cited Merchant Marine Act, setting forth the basis upon which ocean-mail contracts should be advertised for and entered into. Also, your letter refers to and quotes from the report of the Postmaster General to the President under date of January 11, 1935, the quoted excerpts indicating that the Postmaster General suggested to the President that practically all ocean-mail contracts entered into under the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 might be canceled for the reason that they were negotiated instead of being awarded to the lowest bidder after competitive bidding.

Section 406 of the Merchant Marine Act provided that before making any contract for carrying ocean mails the Postmaster General should give public notice by advertisement as therein directed and that—

"* * * Such notice shall describe the proposed route, the time when such contract will be made, the number of trips a year, the schedule required, the time when the service shall commence, the character of the vessels required, *and all other information deemed by the Postmaster General to be necessary to inform prospective bidders as to the character of the service to be required.*" (Italics supplied.)

It is provided in section 407 of the act that each contract for the carrying of ocean mail under the act "shall be awarded to the lowest bidder who, *in the judgment of the Postmaster General,* possesses such qualifications as to insure proper performance of the mail service under the contract." (Italics supplied.)

It will be noted that section 406 vested in the Postmaster General discretion with respect to "the character of the vessels required" and "the character of the service to be required." Consequently, it may be possible the specifications for such service were restrictive and confined the bidding to one or two steamship concerns operating on the proposed ocean-mail route. The provisions of section 407 place within the discretion of the Postmaster General the matter of determining whether the lowest bidder "possesses such qualifications as to insure proper performance of the mail service under the contract."

In view of those provisions of the law there is no basis for this office to question the action of the Postmaster General in selecting the bidder to whom any particular contract would be awarded in the absence of a showing of fraud or collusion in the advertising for bids and the awarding of the contracts.

The report of the Postmaster General to the President under date of January 11, 1935, was made pursuant to Executive Order No. 6792, of July 11, 1934. This Executive order was issued by the President under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 305), in which it was provided:

"Whenever it shall appear to the President, in respect of any contract entered into by the United States prior to the date of enactment of this act for the transportation of persons and/or things, that the full performance of such contract is not required in the public interest, and that modification or cancelation of such contract will result in substantial savings to the United States, the President is hereby, upon giving 60 days' notice and opportunity for public hearing to the parties to such contract, authorized, in his discretion, on or before April 30, 1935, to modify or cancel such contract. Whenever the President shall modify or cancel any such contract, he shall determine just compensation therefor; and if the amount thereof, so determined by the President, is unsatisfactory to the individual, firm, or corporation entitled to receive the same, such individual, firm, or corporation shall be entitled to receive such portion thereof as the President shall determine and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such further sum as, added to said portion so received, will make up such amount as will be just compensation therefor, in the manner provided for by paragraph 20 of section 41 and section 250 of title 28 of the United States Code: *Provided,* That where any such contract makes provision for settlement in the event of modification or cancelation, the amount of just compensation as determined hereunder shall not exceed such amount as is authorized by said contract. Any appropriation out of which payments upon the said contract were authorized to be made is hereby made available for the payment of such just compensation."

The time for action under that provision of law was extended to March 31, 1936, by joint resolution of August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 991).

It will be noted that under the statute last above quoted there is provided a specific procedure to be followed, including compensation to be paid when contracts are modified or canceled pursuant to the provisions of the statute. In accordance with the provisions of said section, the President, in the Executive order of July 11, 1934, authorized and directed the Postmaster General and such officers of the Postal Service as might be designated by the Postmaster General to hold public hearings with respect to any ocean-mail contract under the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 entered into prior to June 16, 1933, to consider all the evidence adduced at such hearings and to report to the President within 6 months their findings and conclusions as to whether such contracts, or any of them, should be modified or canceled; and if so, in what respect, with substantial savings to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of law herein quoted. The first step under the law has been taken; that is to say, the Postmaster General has made a report as to his findings and recommendations in connection with the several ocean-mail contracts included in such report. However, there appears to have been no further action in modification or cancelation of the contracts. The fact that in the report there are contained statements to the effect that the ocean-mail contracts involved were entered into without unrestricted competitive bidding would not of itself be sufficient to authorize discontinuance of payment of the compensation provided under such contracts. Apparently it is conceded in your letter that the contracts are not void, it being suggested only that they are voidable. The mere fact that a contract may be voidable does not authorize this office to withhold, or disallow credit for, payments thereunder. Before this office can take such action there must be some Executive or administrative action to cancel, terminate, or modify the contracts, and there is no authority in this office to require that such Executive or administrative action be taken.

Even if this office should refuse to allow compensation for service under these contracts, the contractors could bring suit in the Court of Claims or in the appropriate district court of the United States for the compensation under the contracts. The contracts were entered into on behalf of the United States by the official authorized by law to make such contracts, and the fact that said official, in the exercise of the discretion vested in him under the statute, may have exercised poor judgment or failed to best serve the interests of the Government in awarding the contracts is no legal basis for this office to withhold payments under such contracts.

In the event action is taken pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 16, 1933, supra, in modifying or canceling any or all of the contracts concerning which recommendations were made in the report of the Postmaster General, this office will, of course, take cognizance thereof in the settlement of accounts and claims under said contracts.

Sincerely yours,

R. N. ELLIOTT,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

It is contended that this appropriation should be passed because the Government should provide funds for contracts legally entered into and not violate such contracts. My reply to that statement is that we should not consider ourselves bound by star-chamber agreements arrived at in the manner employed in these cases. These contracts were obviously merely handed out to preferred persons, without any pretense whatever of competitive bidding, and on account of that fact we should not force the taxpayers of America to pay hundreds of millions of dollars more on such a specious argument. In order to prevent the recipients of these ocean-mail contracts from continuing to enjoy the fruits of such illegal arrangements, and in order to begin a constructive policy to rehabilitate the American merchant marine, this Congress should stop this appropriation today and pass an honest merchant-marine bill before the close of this session. I am fully convinced that if this appropriation is stopped that the holders of these contracts will be more cooperative than they now are to arrive at a real merchant-marine policy which will be fair to taxpayers as well as equitable to the shipping interests. If we continue this appropriation, I fear that there will be no new merchant-marine bill at this session of Congress; and if I am correct in that belief, then the American merchant marine will continue its present downward course, which means its practical elimination in a very few years.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. TABER. The President was given authority by law to cancel contracts, but he has not canceled any.

Mr. MORAN. I realize that is true. The President was given authority to cancel, and he did not cancel. The President also, in his message to Congress, said that Congress should cancel them, and I personally lean to that theory. I think it is the Congress of the United States that ought to cancel these contracts instead of leaving it to the President.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Are not those contracts entirely dependent upon congressional appropriations; and is not the denial of an appropriation practically the same thing as cancelation of them?

Mr. MORAN. A denial of the appropriation would, of course, prevent carrying out the contracts.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. The gentleman quoted the President as saying the contracts ought to be canceled. The President said, however, that before they were canceled the Congress ought to provide other means for an American merchant marine by passing this subsidy act.

Mr. MORAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. He did not think it right to cancel the contracts without making some other provision to aid the American merchant marine.

Mr. MORAN. Let me say to the gentleman I have very little time, and I did not want to have any misunderstanding regarding my statement. That is why I said we should read the President's message. The President himself told us in his message, for what it may be worth for the Congress to consider, that he felt the foreign ocean-mail contracts should be canceled.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman dare make an expression as to why the other body has not enacted a ship-subsidy bill?

Mr. MORAN. I have a firm opinion. I doubt the propriety of commenting on the actions of the other body. Perhaps I had better not do it, but I have some positive ideas about the subject. The question has been asked: "Are these not contracts?" Why should we take a contract that is in existence which the Government has made, and then turn around and by the subterfuge, you might call it, of denying the appropriation for same thereby, in effect, stop a contract this Government in all good faith has entered into with the contracting parties? This, in brief, is the proposition presented by my very good friend the distinguished majority leader, and I know some other Members feel the same way. My answer is that the Postmaster General has stated, as a result of his exhaustive investigation of these contracts, and the special committee of the body at the other end of the Capitol which investigated this subject also has reported that 40 of the 43 contracts were awarded in violation of the requirement of the law providing for competitive bids; and, therefore, they are voidable ab initio. Certainly we should not take the position that contracts voidable ab initio should not even be considered or reconsidered, or even canceled. In further answer to the argument that we should not deny an appropriation for Government contracts actually in existence, this very bill does that very same thing in one instance. On page 61 of this bill appears this language:

Provided, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be paid on contract no. 56 to the Seatrain Co.

Is that not a case of denying money to a contract in existence? Was not that a contract legally entered into by the United States? The very same reason for canceling the Seatrain contract exists for canceling 40 of the 43 contracts.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman has studied this question closely, as I know. Does the gentleman believe we can continue an American merchant marine without substantial subsidy either for carrying the mails or by differential in building operation?

Mr. MORAN. I believe we must have an American merchant marine. I will state, in answer to the gentleman's question, that we cannot have an American merchant marine without some aid.

Mr. CULKIN. Does not the gentleman know that if something is not done at this session of Congress either by way of continuing these mail subsidies or by differentials in building operation that the American merchant marine will receive a death blow from which it will never recover? And may I say in this connection that I am in sympathy with many of the statements the gentleman has made. Is not my general contention correct, however?

Mr. MORAN. I think the gentleman is fundamentally correct in his position that our merchant marine is in such a condition that if some remedial action is not taken—and it should be taken at this session of Congress, and I have always advocated it—that we have a very dangerous situation confronting our merchant marine.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Whatever we may do in the matter of subsidies, does not the gentleman think it is only proper that Congress lay down certain specific rules and regulations for the protection of passengers and the crews of these ships?

Mr. MORAN. The gentleman is exactly right so far as the labor and safety-at-sea conditions are concerned. What I object to is that no matter what forced or labored arguments may be presented, it is an absolutely proved fact that these ocean-mail contract people sat around the table and schemed with our officials to divide up these contracts among themselves, and the bids were issued and worded in such a way that no one else could bid against them. This is all a matter of public record. Some contracts exactly fitted the fleet of the person who got the contract and fitted no one else. It is inconceivable to me how the Congress of the United States will continue to stand for this situation. Talk about honesty in government; here is the right place to begin. The people are getting sick and tired of "invisible government", and if we do not change it, they will. I would like to see a "new deal" in the American merchant marine, and all I ask for is common honesty as a foundation for such new policy.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to be quite popular on the part of some Members of this House to belittle and deride everything that is American. I happen to know something about the American merchant marine, and I can assure the Members of this body that there is nothing about the American merchant marine that we need to be ashamed of except possibly that it is woefully weak.

This great country of ours should have the greatest merchant marine of any country in the world. In fact, a strong merchant marine is absolutely essential in time of war and in peacetimes to carry our commerce to other lands. They talk about this subsidy or assistance that we are voting to the American merchant marine as though it were an out-and-out gratuity that is unnecessary. If by contributing $22,000,000 toward upbuilding our merchant marine we may succeed in placing it on the level where it rightfully belongs, it is money well spent.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'MALLEY. We have already contributed $300,000,000 so far, and they seem to be in worse condition now than they were before.

Mr. KNUTSON. That may be true, but if we would lift some of the restrictions that now rest upon our shipping we would not have to appropriate so much money. As it now is, our merchant marine is unable to compete with the merchant marine of other countries.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The history of the *Morro Castle* shows that there are not very many restrictions.

Mr. KNUTSON. We have accidents at sea just like we have accidents on land, including railroad accidents, automobile accidents, and the like. Of course, we want to do everything we can to reduce these accidents to a minimum, but I am satisfied that Mr. Roper is doing everything he can to protect those who travel on ships flying the American flag.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. American goods ought to be shipped in American bottoms?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; certainly. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this policy of subsidizing the merchant marine was inaugurated under the Shipping Act of 1916, at which time Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States and the gentleman's party controlled both

Houses of Congress. I would suggest to the gentleman that he inform himself.

Mr. O'MALLEY. But the gentleman will have to admit that some of us Democrats are willing to profit by our mistakes, which is more than may be said about the Republicans.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman should inform himself before he addresses the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask a serious question, and I am serious-minded about it. It is my understanding that the subsidy which we grant is supposed to cover the difference in operating expenses and the cost of building the ships. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. KNUTSON. It is supposed to cover the differential; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am serious about this matter, and I am not trying to trip him up. If I came to him as a shipbuilder and laid down my comparative operating costs with foreign competition, including both operation and cost and the cost of the building of the ship, and you, the Government, grant me my operating differentials, wherein am I handicapped in competing with other foreign shippers?

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say that the cost of building ships in this country is one-third greater than in any other country in the world?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I included capital cost and other costs.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is for Congress to determine whether we are to have a merchant marine that will make us independent of all other nations in carrying on our foreign commerce. We know that financial help from the Government is necessary to keep it on a sound basis. England subsidizes her shipping, so does Germany, France, Italy, and Japan. The subsidies given by those countries greatly exceed that given by this Government, which should convince the House that such help is absolutely necessary if we are not to see the American flag driven from the high seas. That would be a national calamity.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has challenged my assertion that the seamen's strike in New York is being fomented by Communists and is an outlaw strike.

The facts are easily obtainable by anyone who cares to look for them.

The International Seamen's Union of America is the only bona-fide seamen's union in our country. It has been in continued existence since 1892 and is duly chartered by the American Federation of Labor.

In the early part of this year the International Seamen's Union held a convention here in Washington, D. C. That convention anticipated just such an outlaw strike as is now fostered in New York. The convention had from day to day received clear and positive proof that notorious fomenters of strife were at work seeking to bring about a tie-up of shipping along the Atlantic coast for any reason or no reason whatever.

It was because of this clear understanding of the situation that all the delegates at the convention, including the radicals, voted for the adoption of a resolution warning the membership against the poisonous propaganda that emanated in the main from the publicity bureau of the Communist Party. The resolution, unanimously adopted by the convention, follows.

Resolved by the Thirty-third Convention of the International Seamen's Union of America in regular session assembled at Washington, D. C, on February 13, 1936, That we hereby warn the district unions, members and seamen generally, of the Atlantic and Gulf against the danger of yielding to the subversive propaganda now being circulated from anonymous sources by irresponsible persons intended to stampede the seamen into a strike under circumstances leading straight to disaster, it being the opinion of the convention that strike action on the Atlantic and Gulf under existing conditions will not only result in defeat for the men in that district but will also seriously endanger the district unions and membership in the Pacific district.

Notwithstanding this emphatic expression by the authorized spokesmen of the organized seamen, a self-appointed committee in New York has attempted by the use of divers questionable methods, including gangster tactics, to tie up ships under a trade-union agreement with the International Seamen's Union.

It is no secret, and Mr. MARCANTONIO cannot deny that the Communist press is soliciting funds on a Nation-wide basis for this disruptive element in New York City. Nor can he deny that the notorious alien, Harry Bridges, who has kept the San Francisco water front in a turmoil for the last 2 years, is lending aid and assistance to the New York wrecking crew.

That these abortive efforts have been unsuccessful is due to the common sense and the inherent loyalty of the rank and file of the International Seamen's Union of America. Ships are sailing out of New York Harbor on schedule and they are manned by loyal union members.

I have referred to a trade-union agreement between shipowners and seamen. This agreement has been effective since January 1, 1935, and contains a clause granting preference in employment to union members when obtainable.

The same agreement provides for joint boards of conciliation and arbitration "to adjust any grievance, dispute, or difference which may arise or exist."

On March 15, 1936, the agreement was renewed and improved by the addition of this proviso:

All ratings increased $5 per month above existing scales.

With this change the agreement will remain in effect to December 31, 1937.

The shipping companies which signed the improved and extended agreement with the International Seamen's Union of America are American Merchant Lines, Baltimore Insular Line, A. H. Bull Steamship Co., Export Steamship Corporation, Grace Line, Inc., Luckenbach Gulf Steamship Co., Inc., Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc., Munson Steamship Line, Panama Mail Steamship Co., Panama Pacific Line, Shepard Steamship Co., United States Lines Co., Inc., Columbian Line, American Foreign Steamship Co., Waterman Steamship, Pan-Atlantic, Calmar Line, Isthmian Steamship Line, Baltimore Mail, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Sinclair Navigation Co., Mooremac-Gulf Line, New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co., New York & Porto Rico Line, Newtex Line, Savannah Line (Ocean Steamship of Savannah), Sword Steamship Co., Clyde-Mallory Lines, Argonaut Line, American France Line, American Hampton Roads Oriole Line, American Republics Line, Mississippi Steamship Co., Black Diamond Line, American West African Line, Lykes Bros., Lykes Bros. Ripley, Tampa-Interocean.

For further clarification of these outlaw attempts to tie up the port of New York, I quote herewith an editorial under the caption "I. S. U. Honors Agreements", from the current issue of the Seamen's Journal, the official paper of the International Seamen's Union of America:

I. S. U. HONORS AGREEMENTS

The Atlantic agreement was arrived at by collective bargaining, and this process is recognized by custom and by law as the most logical and effective method of maintaining just and peaceful relations between shipowners and seamen.

No one claims that this agreement, or any other agreement arrived at through collective bargaining, is perfect or even bordering on perfection. For 14 long years American ships sailed the seven seas without any trade-union agreement of any kind whatever. They paid wages ranging from a total blank (received by the work-a-ways) up to such meager amounts as circumstances and necessity required.

Where were these self-appointed leaders who are now trying to kick over a trade-union agreement which definitely recognizes the union and provides for wages twice as high as formerly paid by many shipowners? Where were they and why did they not raise their voices during those lean and bitter years?

Let us bear in mind that only once before, for a comparatively short period, beginning during the World War and ending on May 1, 1921, have union conditions prevailed on American ships sailing from Atlantic ports. At that time, however, there was no negotiated or signed agreement. Union conditions were reluctantly conceded because of the exigency created by the war and the Nation-wide scarcity of men.

Needless to state the present signed pact between shipowners and seamen is not based either upon an emergency due to war or upon a scarcity of seamen. It is no secret that there are considerably more than enough seamen available to man every ship afloat.

The Atlantic agreement, therefore, spells a voluntary concession on the part of America's biggest shipowners toward a "new deal."

And for that new attitude, that expressed desire to have the seamen's cooperation in developing the American merchant marine, the shipowners deserve full credit.

In but few of the great basic industries of the United States has collective bargaining been established. The "right to organize" guaranty under section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act has been declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. Certainly the hair-splitting interpretations of labor's rights by the courts can never be as satisfactory as the voluntary recognition of those rights by the employers.

The agreement now in effect on the Atlantic places a grave responsibility upon all the members of the Atlantic district unions. Every right has a corresponding duty, and every privilege is necessarily balanced by an obligation. Only by due restraint and frank recognition of our own responsibilities can we demonstrate that the International Seamen's Union will in the future as in the past honor and respect an agreement duly executed by its authorized representatives.

Recognition of the International Seamen's Union and collective bargaining seemed far away a couple of years ago. The promises of a shipping code faded away into thin air. And yet, due to the loyalty and cooperation of the International Seamen's Union membership—new and old, east and west—our union is now recognized everywhere except on the Steel Trust controlled fleet on the Great Lakes.

If we use our heads, if we frown upon internal strife and personal animosity, the days ahead will enable us to consolidate our forces and perfect in America a union of seamen that will be an example and inspiration to seamen the world over.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to hear these fresh-water sailors talking about cutting the legs off the merchant marine and the Navy. They are ensconced safely only about 1,500 miles from the coast. I do not suppose there is any battleship or any gun yet developed that can throw a shell from either the Atlantic or the Pacific coast into the State of Iowa.

Mr. WEARIN and Mr. MORAN rose.

Mr. BOYLAN. Wait just a minute, please.

Now, they might be familiar with paddling canoes up and down the little tributaries that go to feed the mighty rivers that sweep on to the great Atlantic or to the great Pacific, but we who are living along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts want to have a little protection. We have no storm or cyclone cellar to go into when these ships shell our coasts.

Now, what is there about this subsidy? The House itself is on record. We do not favor, as a general proposition, subsidizing the mail carriers, but we say that until a subsidy bill is passed we must follow this course; we have no other alternative. The House expressed itself and passed the bill proposed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] at the last session. Unfortunately nothing has yet been done relative to it in the Senate.

In the meantime, what are we going to do? Are we going to destroy our merchant marine? Are we going to break faith with the men who bought these ships with the provision of a mail contract, and by one fell swoop are we going to destroy the property value that they have in this contractual obligation of the Government?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman refers to a lack of familiarity with these ships in the fresh-water country. We have no coast line, but neither have we any shipbuilders or ship operators.

Mr. BOYLAN. What better evidence is there that you do not know anything about it? You have no shipbuilders and you have no ships. You yourself confess you know nothing about it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from New York must be aware of the fact there is a certain element in this House that will not be happy until the American flag is removed from the seas.

Mr. BOYLAN. Oh, I pray that that day will never come. We have enough patriotic Americans here to maintain the flag on the seas that was put there by the daring mariners of Revolutionary era and maintained during all the years. What a glorious history the American Navy and the American marine have—a history unparalleled in daring and enterprise by that of any country in the world.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. MORAN. The gentleman, in his general accusation about the people on this side of the question being fresh-water sailors, rather fell into the difficulty that most people fall into when they state a generalization.

Mr. BOYLAN. All right; what is the question?

Mr. MORAN. The gentleman will admit, for example, that some of the opposition, particularly the gentleman who is now speaking, has quite an acquaintance with the Atlantic coast and is not a fresh-water sailor.

Mr. BOYLAN. Well, really, knowing as I do the splendid history of the old State of Maine and the magnificent keels laid down there and the exploits of the old Maine sailors, who went to every part of the world and displayed our flag, I am mystified and, indeed, I am at a loss to account for the position of the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, the House has made known its decision on these matters and the Senate has not. Then, until a subsidy bill is passed by the Congress, we have no alternative. We must remember that these ships were purchased by many corporations now operating them with the proviso that they would have a mail contract. If you abrogated these contracts, if you denied appropriations, our flag would not be seen in many parts of the world where it is now flown. Therefore we have really no choice in the matter.

Some of the gentlemen now advocating that we do not continue in disagreement on this amendment have not hesitated to vote for subsidies for farmers. They believe that the farmers should be subsidized, and in many cases I believe so, too; but, if we want to carry on our merchant marine, why not apply the subsidy to the merchant marine as well as to the farmers?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. If the people who operate the ships upon the seacoast are such fine sailors and such wonderful businessmen, why do they need to reach into the taxpayers' pockets of my section of the country to help them get along?

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman knows enough about the question to know that the construction cost of ships' keels laid down in American yards is more and the materials cost more and we pay more for labor. Our mechanics work a shorter number of hours, and what is the result? The result is that a ship laid down in American yards is going to cost very much more than a ship laid down in foreign yards, where the wages of the mechanics are, perhaps, only 50 percent of our wages and where the cost of materials is less. As the gentleman well knows this immediately brings a differential. The cost of foreign labor is less and their seamen work longer hours and are paid less and are not fed as well as our boys are fed, and this makes another differential. Does the gentleman understand that?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Yes; the gentleman understands that; and that is why he wonders why one ship line, like the Bull Ship Line, could build a million dollar ship this year out of their profits and without a subsidiary, while these other ship lines that the gentleman is so worried about have to get subsidies. Why can one do it when the other cannot?

Mr. BOYLAN. The answer is, the line mentioned by the gentleman is not engaged in the foreign trade. I ask my colleagues to support the position of the committee and vote down the motion of the gentleman from Iowa. [Applause.]

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I am not disturbed about any subsidy that we grant to ships that fly the American flag. As a matter of fact, our merchant marine is the weakest in the world. I should like to see us build up a merchant marine that would be able to compete with every maritime country in the world, so that the seagoing

trade of the United States could be adequately carried on by American-manned ships flying the American flag.

When we build up a merchant marine we ought to start right, and to start right it is my thought we should as a Government policy provide subsidized facilities for expert training of American citizens in the duties on board ship. We should provide trained men to serve as American seamen on merchant ships which may be subsidized by American money.

You will find that every ship that is being subsidized today has 90 percent aliens that represent the League of Nations. Especially is this true on such ships when arriving from foreign ports into American ports.

There is not a real American crew on American ships that are being subsidized in the merchant marine. If we had a merchant marine today we could be proud of, we would not have enough Americans to run the ships; we would have to go to other countries to find sailors to operate those ships.

Some years ago when our efforts to establish a merchant marine reached low ebb, one of the natural results was that the younger generation of American citizen boys failed to turn his energies toward a sea-faring life. A natural consequence has been that shipowners, and ship captains, too, have been compelled to seek nationals of other countries for dependable crews. This increasing foreign make-up of the ships' crews only served to make the service on sea, even on American ships, less and less of an occupation encouraging to American youth.

It seems to me the first thing this Congress should do toward the permanent strengthening of our merchant marine is the definite establishment of an official school of equal standing with West Point and Annapolis for the primary purpose of selecting and training American young men for a sea-faring life on our own merchant-marine ships.

This Government spends vast sums annually to train selected men for officers in our Navy and Army and Coast Guard in order that this Nation may be assured of leaders of our armed forces. This is money spent in the nature of an annual premium on our own insurance policy against aggression and other emergencies involving our national welfare and our self-defense.

We have recently entered upon a most worthy policy of taking selected unemployed young men and placing them in C. C. C. camps under trained instructors in practical outdoor occupations. These young men are being trained to take their places in the useful, worthwhile activities of civilian life; and when they complete their camp life and camp training, they will find themselves better fitted to cope with their problems and will develop into more useful citizens and businessmen.

The permanent establishment by an act of Congress of a Merchant Marine Academy with sufficient financial support permanently assured by the Federal Government will be a forward step in the direction of creating an incentive for able-bodied young Americans to become sea-minded. The men selected to receive this Government training for the merchant marine service could be required to agree to a definite period of service at sea after graduation on ships under the American flag for guaranteed rates of compensation agreed upon by shipowners who receive a Government subsidy for the operation of our merchant marine ships.

A natural result of this policy would be that as time goes on, the seamen on our ships will be selected from American citizens by trained men graduated from our Merchant Marine Academy, not because of any Government coercion to employ citizens but because the American point of view of the trained American citizen would naturally as a line of least resistance seek and secure American seamen.

In the examinations conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities, while in search of propaganda activities, we found on one vessel 350 aliens in the steward's department, all brought from foreign countries, some of them held certificates of United States citizenship, but told us frankly that they did not owe allegiance to the United States, that they maintained in foreign countries their families, that they paid taxes in their own countries, and that they were on the American ships only for the job.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And some of them voted in the countries of their birth.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; voted and paid taxes in their own countries, but were holding jobs on American vessels—jobs that belonged to American citizens.

Our investigation of another ship indicated clearly that the members of the crew were almost entirely aliens picked up at foreign ports, although in some instances we were convinced a fraudulent citizenship certificate was used to conceal the large alien make-up of the crew. These aliens deserted the ship when an emergency arose, leaving American citizens to perish with the ship.

Nothing like that could have happened if the crew had been made up of American citizens with the viewpoint and spirit of American justice and fair play and trained in the traditions of the sea.

A very frequent complaint from the shipping interests whenever any kind of restrictions are proposed upon them in the matter of selecting their crews is that it is impossible to select a full crew from American seamen.

Without agreeing that the complaint is correct, nor denying that such a condition prevails, I say to you, my colleagues, that the Government should do everything in its power to make the work and life on board our American merchant-marine ships, whether operating under subsidy or not, so promising as a career that the rising American generation of young men will be attracted to service on the sea under the American flag.

High wages alone will not bring about the respect for service in American merchant marine which is needed. We must create prestige for seamen in the American merchant marine service which will fix it definitely in the minds of young American citizens as an honorable and desirable career worthy of the best men to build for themselves.

We need to restore to sea service the romance of achievement that urged the old-time seamen to follow the sea, notwithstanding the hardships of the life; but our modern young man should be led to see the romance of the sea from the viewpoint of our own American shipping interests and achievement for himself in an honorable career in the American merchant marine service.

All of our seaports have a great many unemployed American seamen anxious to get any available ship job. Many ship captains and shipping companies will still give a preference to an alien seaman if possible, because the alien as a rule will accept lower wages and can be more easily compelled to take what he finds on board in the way of food and quarters.

The owners, operators, and captains of ships, either ocean going or in coastwise trade, of American registry, flying the American flag, whether they enjoy a Government subsidy or not, should be under legal restraint to employ only American seamen on shipboard when American citizen passengers or American merchandise is being transported in international travel.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is not that the fault of the shipping companies who are discriminating against the people of our own country because these companies insist on employing cheap labor?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think it is the fault of Congress that it does not put a provision in the bill that will employ all American seamen.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman must know that in the present bill it is provided that 66⅔ percent shall be American citizens.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. But they are not. That does not apply to ocean-going vessels arriving from foreign ports, but only upon departure from an American port carrying mail under an ocean-mail contract.

Mr. BLAND. It applies to ocean-going vessels.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Furthermore, many of the men on these vessels who hold certificates of citizenship still say they retain their allegiance to their own native country. I called the gentleman's attention to it.

There is another point in that connection to which I wish to direct your attention.

As I understand the present law, every ship holding an ocean-mail contract is required at each departure from an American port for an overseas journey to have a crew made up of not less than 66⅔ percent of citizens of the United States, either native-born citizens or fully naturalized citizens.

The weak point of this provision of law, as repeatedly shown during recent investigations, is that the citizenship of the crew is based upon the entire crew.

The Committee on Merchant Marine should agree to certain amendments to this, or some other, bill on this subject, so as to require that not less than 80 percent of the members of the crew in each department of the ship, namely, the deck department, the engine department, and the steward department, should be either native-born citizens or fully naturalized citizens, and further that not more than 20 percent of the members in each department of the crew on board may be unnaturalized aliens, but with a strict preference given to aliens who have valid declarations of intentions to become citizens when filling this 20-percent alien quota. The point I make is that the crew in each department on board, rather than the total crew on the ship, should be the basis for requirement of citizen-crew members.

Finally, I would direct your attention to the three primary objectives we should endeavor to reach: First, a merchant-marine academy operated and financed by the Federal Government and with a national standing and importance to that now possessed by West Point, Annapolis, or London (Conn.)—Coast Guard—Academies; second, an awakened American spirit among the younger men upon which to establish an honorable prestige for the American merchant-marine service as a career; and, third, a new requirement upon captains of American-registry merchant ships that they maintain their ship crews at all times to a standard of 80 percent either native-born or fully naturalized citizens in each of the three departments of the crew, and that in filling the balance of 20 percent in each department of the crew strict preference be given to aliens who have declared their valid intention to become citizens.

Such a program, when put into effect, will do much to give the American merchant marine a place in international commerce that all patriotic Americans will be proud of and will mean a new day for the American citizen who may choose the American merchant-marine service as his life work. The American seamen will find their lot at sea and in port more of a career than just a money job.

Such a program will also operate to the financial and business improvement of every phase of the shipping interests concerning American operators. An able citizen crew trained to regard his sea service as a career and serving under men trained to uphold the prestige of an wholly American merchant marine service will tend to improve service, profits, and continuity of contracts.

Such a program will operate to the benefit of the Federal Government by reason of improvement of American shipping business and international commerce with attendant actual increase of revenue from taxes, export and import duties, and improvement of general welfare and employment conditions.

I believe the constructive features of this three-point program will appeal to the common sense of every fair-minded American citizen who is interested in increased employment opportunities for citizens and in a logical method of improving the personnel and the prestige of the American merchant-marine service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Was the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] referring to the provisions of his own bill, or to this contract?

Mr. BLAND. Oh, no. The provision of my bill is 75 percent. The provision of the existing law is 66⅔.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is aware that under the present contracts that provision is being grossly violated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE].

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, my interest in this bill is purely incidental. If residence by the sea is a qualification to say anything for or against this bill, I surely would be disqualified, because I live a thousand miles from it.

About 3 or 4 weeks ago I got into this thing just by accident. The House was almost deserted. There was up for consideration an item in this bill providing for $26,500,000 to be paid to some ship company that was drawing it illegally, as I understood from statements made by gentlemen who were piloting the bill. Nobody did it, so I picked up a pad and wrote out an amendment to take that $26,500,000 out of the bill. I think probably I am the only man in the House who voted for the amendment. It was defeated. When it went over to the Senate, I took enough interest to telephone over there and call somebody's attention to it, and the Senate cut that $26,500,000 out of the bill, and I think they should have done it. Having taken a little interest in it in the way I did, I read the arguments that were presented in the Senate both for and against the idea of excluding this $26,500,000 from this bill, and the Senate came to the conclusion that it was a steal. You read the arguments. Such men as Senator GLASS and Senator BLACK investigated it, and they said, in effect, that the Government of the United States was being filched not out of $26,500,000, because they said that after the investigation, Mr. Farley advised somebody that four and one-half million was really necessary to take care of these contracts. These contracts that were entered into were given to men who owned ships that had never come up to the specifications required by the Government of the United States.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASSINGALE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Has not the President of the United States the authority to cancel any contract that may contain such a provision?

Mr. MASSINGALE. I understand he has, but that is not the question. The question in this case is, Is this Congress going to take the position that it is not going to stop spending money by the millions to fulfill unlawful and illegal contracts?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MASSINGALE. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The question is whether or not this Congress, because the President has not done anything, will not do anything itself?

Mr. MASSINGALE. Yes; that is the idea. As I understand it, the President has put this up to the Congress.

Mr. O'MALLEY. And the question is whether the Congress will pass the buck to the President?

Mr. MASSINGALE. That is the idea. Now, if we do not put up the money, they are not going to get any contracts. They do not want them.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASSINGALE. I yield.

Mr. MORAN. Does the gentleman realize that these contracts were lined up on the basis of speed of the vessel?

Mr. MASSINGALE. That is the idea.

Mr. MORAN. And that this summer speed contests have been conducted at several points, one of which is in my fresh-water harbor in Maine, and most of them were found to be wrong under the speed test.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN].

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard considerable discussion this afternoon with reference to ship subsidies, much of which is entirely irrelevant to the question under consideration; namely, whether or not this House should recede and concur in the Senate amendment to strike out

$26,500,000 from the House appropriation bill for payments on fraudulent contracts.

One would think from some of the speeches that have been made, that the attitude of those who oppose this appropriation is such that we are about to sweep the American flag from the high seas and that we are going to destroy the American merchant marine, when many of us have been laboring for weeks and months to prepare an honest, fair, decent, respectable ship-subsidy bill that will give America the merchant marine that she demands and protect the taxpayer's Treasury.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEARIN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is that not just what they do not want?

Mr. WEARIN. Exactly.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEARIN. I yield.

Mr. MORAN. In the report of the House committee on the so-called Bland subsidy bill that was brought in last session there is this statement on page 2:

> The reports of the Postmaster General and shipping-policy committee showed that the financial condition of the operators will not permit them to refinance the replacement program.

Mr. WEARIN. Exactly. In other words, we do not have an American merchant marine on the high seas at the present time adequate to carry American trade, and those who have received the subsidies now say they do not have any money with which to give us a merchant fleet. I want to call to your attention a very important matter that was raised by the majority leader of this House, which is a justifiable question, as to whether or not this House has the right to refuse to appropriate funds for contracts which are already in existence and with which I have already dealt to some extent. I have gone into this thing very carefully and have consulted the best of legal advice. I want to give you a careful picture.

It has been suggested that unless we appropriate this money to make the payments falling due in the next fiscal year on the existing ocean-mail contracts, the Government will be in default on its obligations and will be liable to suit in the Court of Claims for breach of contract.

Let us examine this suggestion in the light of the facts.

These ocean-mail contracts were awarded by the Post Office Department during Mr. Hoover's administration under authority of the Jones-White Act passed in 1928.

Title IV of that act authorized the Postmaster General to enter into contracts with citizens of the United States whose bids were accepted for carrying the ocean mails—section 404—and the act prescribed in detail the manner in which the competitive bids should be invited by public advertisement and the manner in which the contracts should be awarded—sections 406, 407. Congress did its part in laying down the rules that were to be followed by the Post Office Department and also by the Shipping Board in administering the generous ocean-mail subsidies which were to build up and maintain an American merchant marine.

Let us see what happened. Instead of carrying out the mandate of the act and following the direction of Congress that the ocean-mail contracts be let to the lowest bidder after due notice, adequate public advertisements, and under competitive bidding, these contracts carrying enormous subsidies to private shipping interests were awarded to favored interests without any real competition whatever. The advertisements for bids were so framed that there could be no real competition, and the compensation carried by the contracts was, in each instance, the highest compensation allowable under the act.

This scandalous abuse of the law was investigated by a special committee of the Senate. I invite the Members of this Chamber who are not familiar with the background of these ocean-mail contracts to glance through the nine volumes of printed testimony produced before the Senate's investigating committee. You will be amazed to read how a little group of officials from the Post Office Department, the Shipping Board, and the Commerce Department sat around a table and calmly passed out "the gravy", as one of them termed it, to the shipping company they had selected for a particular ocean-mail route.

These ocean-mail contracts were all made during the Hoover administration. Some of them were not signed until just before the 4th of March 1933. They just got under the wire. None have been awarded under this administration. These contracts are a legacy from our Republican friends.

As soon as this scandalous state of affairs was brought to the attention of President Roosevelt, he directed the Postmaster General to make an investigation and submit a report. Mr. Farley's Department devoted months to this task. All of the holders of ocean-mail contracts were notified to appear and defend the legality of their contracts. They did appear with the witnesses and with their high-priced lawyers. They were given every opportunity to establish the legality and the bona fides of their contracts. They had their day in court. They were given a fair hearing. And with what result?

After weighing all the evidence and upon the record submitted, Postmaster General Farley reported to the President that all of the ocean-mail contracts except one had been awarded without any real competition. I invite you to read his report. It is printed as a Senate committee print.

The Postmaster General recommended that the contracts be canceled, and the Congress gave the President express power to cancel these contracts in the Independent Appropriation Act.

Upon receiving Postmaster General Farley's exhaustive report, the President sent a special message to Congress on March 4, 1935, in which he recognized the abuses brought to his attention and recommended that we end this method of extending Government aid to private shipping interests.

So we have this situation: The Senate, through its special committee, has made a record showing that these ocean-mail contracts were surrounded by fraud and chicanery in their making. The Postmaster General, in an independent investigation, has reached the same conclusion. The President has condemned the system of paying these subsidies. He termed it a "subterfuge."

Yet, on this record, it is suggested and proposed to this body that we should approve another appropriation of $26,000,000 to go into the pockets of these special interests on these alleged contracts.

I am not a lawyer, but many of the Members of this Chamber are learned in the law. I ask you gentlemen who are lawyers this question:

If a contract with the Government is obtained in violation of statutory requirements, and if there is favoritism—crookedness—in its inception and execution, is the Government bound by such a contract?

I have been told there can be only one correct answer. Fraud taints every transaction. A contract obtained through fraud is voidable at the election of the injured party, even between private persons. Moreover, when the Government is a party, a contract made by the Government's agent is illegal unless all statutory requirements have been followed.

I also understand that when a contract is tainted with fraud or illegality, and this is particularly true of Government contracts, that no recovery can be had against the injured party if he refuses to further perform the fraudulent or illegal contract. If that is not the law, I invite correction of my statement.

No one dares challenge the statement, because it is true. I cite you to these facts in support of my contention—on page 386 of part 2 of Postmaster General Farley's individual reports to the President, afterward submitted to a committee of another body investigating air-mail and ocean-mail contracts, I find the following statement with reference to foreign ocean-mail route no. 54 involving the Waterman Steamship Corporation:

> This contract may be canceled without any offer of compensation for the reason—
>
> (a) The contract was a negotiated one and was not awarded as a result of competitive bidding, as required by law.

(b) The Shipping Board entered into a contract for the sale of ships on this route prior to the date of the contract, and the contract was signed on the same date of the mail contract, and under the terms of the Shipping Board agreement the purchaser of the vessels, the Waterman Steamship Corporation, was obliged to operate these vessels purchased over this identical route for a period of 5 years, and it was, therefore, contrary to public policy.

(c) The contract was not established as an essential mail route and is not now of any value as a mail route.

The same investigation on the part of Postmaster General Farley disclosed the fact that all other contracts, with the exception of one or two, and including such offenders as the American Diamond Lines; the Baltimore Mail Steamship Co.; the Tacoma Oriental Steamship Co.; the Pacific Argentine Brazil Line; the South Atlantic Steamship Co.; United States Lines, Inc. (Delaware), contractor, and United States Lines Co. (Nevada), subcontractor; the Dollar Steamship Lines; the Gulf Pacific Mail Line, Ltd.; the Grace Steamship Co.; the Panama Mail Steamship Co.; Eastern Steamship Lines; Colombian Steamship Co.; Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.; Tampa Interocean Steamship Co.; Lykes Bros.-Ripley Steamship Co.; and a number of others, were all recipients of graft to the extent of negotiated contracts, in express violation of the law as enacted by the Congress. These conclusions were arrived at through Mr. Farley's investigation as a result of information obtained from representatives and officials of the various companies submitted under oath. When such evidence is compiled indicating negotiated contracts and the law specifically provides that they shall be let on the basis of competitive bids it is childish for layman or lawyer, and much less the latter, to call them other than fraudulent. Let us refrain from hiding behind technicalities in this matter and face the facts. Certainly the Members of the United States Congress are not going to appropriate money to make payments under the terms of contracts that were entered into in violation of law.

My contention is that we should vote aye on my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments 48 and 52 striking the subsidy item of $26,500,000 from the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, which also provides for the continuation of the carriage of mail on a poundage basis.

The fact of the matter is the gentlemen who are lamenting that our merchant marine may be destroyed in the event that this money is not appropriated fail to recognize the fact that all such similar subsidies appropriated by this Congress have been paid to the same shipowners to which this will be paid under the terms of the 1928 act without securing an adequate merchant marine or even a respectable one. The gentlemen who follow me will probably ring the changes until one might expect to see American flags dotting the high seas like stars in the heavens. In reality the shipowners who have been recipients of these appropriations have broken faith with us, as was evidenced by testimony introduced before Mr. Farley's investigation and the fact that the same subsidized shipowners have been here in Washington all during the seventy-fourth session of Congress wailing for more subsidy and stating before the House Committee on Merchant Marine, of which I am a member, that they do not have any money with which to build new ships for those we practically gave them a few years ago that are now obsolete and unpaid for. In view of the fact that they have not produced a merchant marine with the aid of former appropriations similar to this one, the proponents of this appropriation have little to talk for in that respect. If we appropriate another $26,000,000 plus to continue payment under the fraudulent contracts now in existence for the maintenance of a merchant marine that has not been properly maintained by the subsidized shipowners, we will, in addition to becoming parties to the crime, be throwing that much more money into the pockets of attorneys, highly paid officials of shipping companies, and subsidiary institutions with no prospects of results.

By way of substantiating my statement that the subsidized ship owners have failed to build up a merchant marine in accordance with the intent of Congress allow me to quote you this paragraph from part I, page 202, of the Postmaster General's individual reports to the President, as published in a Senate committee print, and obtainable in four small volumes that you should read from cover to cover:

The Lykes Bros. have, as a result of operating Shipping Board vessels, and through their several ocean-mail contracts (routes 23, 45, and 57) made large profits on a small original capital investment. The record shows that in their dealings with the Shipping Board and the Post Office Department they have been actuated largely by a desire to obtain as much from the Government as possible upon minimum commitments looking to the upbuilding of the American merchant marine.

Mind you the above is from the conclusions of Postmaster General Farley's investigation of the subsidized shipowners themselves.

To further substantiate my position that this appropriation is fruitless with respect to accomplishing anything in building up a merchant marine that is rapidly becoming obsolete in spite of the payment on the part of the United States Government of over $160,000,000 in mail subsidies since 1928, plus the merchant fleet that we practically gave them along with trade routes developed under Government operation at the expense to the taxpayers, allow me to quote this paragraph with reference to the Lykes Bros.-Ripley Steamship Co. on page 202, part I of Postmaster General Farley's individual reports to the President:

In view of the reluctance of the contractor to obligate itself to build any ships and, in view of the interpretations placed upon the replacement provision by its agent who negotiated it, as hereinbefore shown, it is possible that the contractor may elect to forfeit its $300,000 performance bond if it is unable to persuade the Post Office Department when the time comes for it to begin replacements that traffic conditions do not warrant the expenditure.

You will find by reading the reports quoted from above that similar attitudes toward building a merchant marine are to be found in connection with the other subsidized lines. Now, in order to keep this discussion straight, let us remember that in the first place the inference of the proponents of this appropriation that we have a great merchant marine which is about to be destroyed through our failure to appropriate this money is not based on the actual facts. We have nothing to talk about in that respect. Furthermore, let us remember that the money is to be used in making payments upon contracts admitted by the owners to be negotiated, which would certainly be a fraudulent contract in any court of law when the statute under which it was drawn specifically states that the same should have been let upon the basis of competitive bidding.

Now I want to call your attention right here to some situations that exist in this Congress at the present time. This House passed the Bland-Copeland ship-subsidy bill at the last session by a bare majority of eight votes, sent it to another body for action, and what happened over there? It was held up because of the fact that we pointed out on the floor some things that were not in accordance with the suggestions of the President, and that bill has not been passed to this date. These shipowners are hoping the bill will not pass, that no bill will pass, but that the 1928 act will be left in existence, with the result that we will appropriate $26,500,000 to go toward paying these fraudulent contracts.

If the House insists upon taking such action, I venture this prediction: The ship-subsidy crowd, who have been hauling away the taxpayers' money from the Public Treasury without giving them back an adequate merchant marine that the country needs from coast to coast, will fight any decent subsidy bill, if one can be devised by this Congress or any Congress, and urge a continuation of payments under the Jones-White Act of 1928; and that goes for fresh-water sailors or sidewalk sailors of old New York. If the lobby representatives of the shipowners are thus successful in defeating a respectable subsidy bill, granting that one can be drawn, and the Seventy-fourth Congress adjourns without further action, the President will be forced to cancel the contracts without having a merchant-marine program to offer as a substitute, or else continue payments that some of you want to provide for today, and thereby place the administration's stamp of approval upon a corrupt system of

ship subsidies that he has already branded a subterfuge in a special message to Congress. I do not want to be a party to placing our leader in that kind of a position, especially when he asked the Postmaster General of his Cabinet to investigate the mess and followed up by specifically asking us to do something about it.

If the House will defeat this appropriation of $26,500,000, as it should do upon the ground that it is not obligated to make payments on fraudulent contracts, you will see some action in another body in an effort, and it will be successful, to get out some respectable merchant-marine legislation. If we fail to take the above action, we will simply guarantee payments regardless of the advent of a bill, which is exactly what the shipowners want and which will, as I said before, place President Roosevelt in the embarrassing position of having to cancel the contracts without having a program to offer in place of them or continue payments and commit the administration to the corruption exposed at his request by his own Postmaster General, Mr. Farley.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEARIN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. In regard to the ship-subsidy bill that was passed by eight votes, after we got a roll-call vote that was not expected, is it not true that on the floor in the debate it was said this was an administration bill and that it was represented on the floor as being such, but that the President the very next day repudiated it?

Mr. WEARIN. That is correct. Of course, the proponents of that bill were careful not to state specifically on the floor that it was endorsed by the White House, but they did what to my mind was just as bad and almost as misleading; they inferred in an evasive manner that the proposal was an administration measure.

So I say to this House, that if you refuse to concur in the action of the Senate in striking out this appropriation for these ocean-mail contracts, if you insist upon appropriating the taxpayers' money to continue these contracts in force for another year, you are in effect placing this House on record as approving the fraud and the collusion surrounding these shady transactions, as well as the entire Democratic administration, unless the President sees fit to cancel them.

If you vote for this appropriation you are repudiating the recommendations of Postmaster General Farley, you are ignoring the President's message of March 4, 1935, and you are in effect saying to the Senate that you approve of these illegal transactions and intend to ratify them after having a full knowledge of the facts.

More than that, you are saying to your constituents, you are serving notice on the taxpayers of this country, that you are indifferent to their interests, that you are unwilling to oppose the shipping lobby that is urging this appropriation. I cannot believe that a majority of this House will allow themselves to be placed in such a false position. I urge you to concur in the action of the Senate in striking down this improvident use of the public's money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this matter is of sufficient importance for us to approach it free from feeling, free from bias, free from prejudice, with the sole desire of doing that which is best for the country. It is unfortunate that in the heat of debate, statements are made which frequently cannot be justified by the facts. A gentleman just a short while ago, I know with sincere honesty, made the statement that it was represented upon the floor of this House that the bill that was passed last year was an administration measure. Such a statement never came from me and I do not believe it appears in the RECORD. If it does, I never made it.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I cannot yield.

Mr. Speaker, I said that I did not know what an administration measure was unless the President of the United States wrote to me and said, "I want this bill;" and I said that if the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, under whom merchant marine matters come, saying that he approved that subsidy bill, with the exception of two particulars, would make it an administration measure, then it was an administration measure. This should appear in the RECORD.

Another Member says that 90 percent of the sailors are aliens. I call your attention to a provision in the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 requiring that two-thirds of the crews shall be American seamen. It was avoided in the case of the *Morro Castle* because we had been trying in this Congress for years to get through legislation that would prevent those aliens who had 3-year certificates and who had applied for admission into the United States from being classed as American citizens. We thought the Jones-White Act would not permit those men to be classed as American citizens, but the Attorney General ruled against us. Under the leadership of Mr. Davis this House passed a bill repealing the old law under which these men were classed as citizens. The bill went to the Senate, but not until after the *Morro Castle* disaster was that law repealed. The gentleman surely recalls that.

So far as the situation in New York is concerned, I will take my stand with the International Sailors' Union, with Sharenberg and Furuseth, rather than with the men who are represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I call attention to the fact that last week the Supreme Court of New York County decided in favor of these men and against the leadership which, incidentally, has been repudiated by an overwhelming majority of the union. Mr. Sharenberg has been kicked out by his own union.

Mr. BLAND. That is all right; I still take my stand with Sharenberg and the union that has been fighting for the Americans. But let us get to the bill. We have been told that the Postmaster General has said these are fraudulent contracts.

I deny that. I read the conclusions of the Postmaster General as given to the President of the United States in the report which he made. He said:

> Proceeding upon the sound theory it is necessary that this Government must have an adequate merchant marine, I am definitely of the opinion that decided changes must be made in the administration of the subsidy. The reports on each contract, which are sent herewith, do not contain positive, definite recommendations as to what treatment I would advise being given in each case.

If these had been fraudulent contracts, would Postmaster General Farley have made that statement; and if the recommendations were shown to be fraudulent, do you believe that the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who would not stand for any fraud, would have permitted 15 months to have passed and not have canceled any of these contracts? The question answers itself.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to a broader proposition. What will be the effect of the elimination of this $26,000,000? What does it mean? The gentleman from Indiana has received a letter from Mr. Peacock, Director of the Shipping Board, in which it is stated that unless this money is appropriated approximately $53,000,000 of a total of $85,000,000 loaned and still owing for the construction of ships will go into default, and that the owners would probably find it necessary to turn their fleets back to the Government unless subsidies were provided. These ships will come back into the hands of the Government. What will the result be? Instead of paying $26,000,000 for the operation of ships, we will have to pay $30,000,000 to $50,000,000 to have the Government run them, and we will have no ships in the end. That will be the ultimate result.

The letter of Mr. Peacock to the gentleman from Indiana also tells you that the elimination of this amount from the deficiency bill has already done immense damage. American ships are in contest with the most competitive conditions in the world. We spent $148,000,000 in loans to our shipowners

for the construction of these ships. In the same time, or from 1922 to date, Great Britain, through the Trade Facilities Act, has lent $206,000,000, and is continuing to lend for the building and modernization of her ships, because she knows that it is to her interest that while we are holding down the merchant marine on this side of the water she should put into service modern, up-to-date, speedy, fine, economical ships in service in order to get the business.

Let one of our shipowners go to you or to anyone who may have automobiles or grain to ship and ask for your contract. You would say to him, "Upon what terms will you carry it?" He will reply, "I will take it for so much." "How long will you carry it at that rate?" "I will take it for a year." "Look at your subsidy bill, look at your deficiency bill; can you tell me that your ships will be operating all that time?" "No." The answer of the shipper inevitably will be that he must contract with carriers who can give assurance of permanent service.

The foreign shipowner can make a contract whereby he will carry these automobiles and the grain which is offered indefinitely, and, of course, the shipper will contract with him. Do you think the shippers of automobiles and grain or other commodities are going to contract with the American ships under those circumstances? The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] will tell you that Mr. Peacock in his letter states that the elimination of the appropriation has already been made "sales talk" by our competitors and they are taking the business from our ships, driving them off the seas. What are other nations doing? Look at the *Queen Mary*, which will come over here in a little while, with an appropriation from Great Britain of about £3,000,000, and another £5,000,000 appropriated for another ship, and additional funds for the operation of the ships. Look at the *Normandie*, which was built by France with French money and operated with French money. Look at the budget of France for 1935, with over $28,000,000 to be paid as their contribution to their own ships, $27,000,000 of which is going to four lines in France alone. Can we maintain a merchant marine without the support of our Government? Mr. Speaker, in a little while we will be called upon to vote upon this matter. If the Members want to deny our merchant marine this amount, if they want to do that, the inevitable result will be that American ships are either going to be tied up to the dock or else we must appropriate, as we did formerly, thirty, forty, or fifty million dollars, to continue the ships upon the seas. [Applause.]

Extending my remarks under permission granted, I desire to present additional salient facts.

The question before Congress for decision is whether an American merchant marine shall be continued, or whether we shall make abject surrender to foreign-flag ships. No subsidy legislation exists. No aids other than ocean mail is provided. Is aid essential? Let the President of the United States answer. In his message of March 4, 1935, he said that a subsidy for the American merchant marine must be based upon providing for American shipping Government aid to make up the differential between American and foreign shipping costs. He said:

> It should cover, first, the difference in the cost of building ships; second, the difference in the cost of operating ships; and, finally, it should take into consideration the liberal subsidies that many foreign governments provide for their shipping.
>
> Only by meeting this threefold differential can we expect to maintain a reasonable place in ocean commerce for ships flying the American flag and at the same time maintain American standards.
>
> In setting up adequate provisions for subsidies for American shipping, the Congress should provide for the termination of existing ocean-mail contracts as rapidly as possible, and it should terminate the practice of lending Government money for shipbuilding. It should provide annual appropriations for subsidies sufficiently large to cover the differentials that I have described.

The contracts under consideration involve 43 ocean-mail contracts and trade routes, many, if not all, of which, are essential to the commerce of the United States. Cancelation or modification may involve the United States in lawsuits for damages amounting to millions of dollars with counterclaims on the part of the Government. Termination of these contracts without some alternative measure which may form the basis of adjustment will result in a chaotic condition for the Government so far as its merchant marine is concerned and for the merchant marine as well.

The President has said emphatically, affirmatively, and unequivocally that aids are necessary, and that Congress should provide annual appropriations for subsidies large enough to cover the differentials mentioned by him. He has distinctly recognized the need for a gradual transition, through negotiation, from ocean-mail pay to direct subsidies. Until subsidies are provided by law, the only legal way aid can be provided is by an appropriation for ocean-mail pay under the Mail Pay Act.

To cut off that pay is to destroy the American merchant marine, since no aid is provided even though the President has said that without aid the merchant marine cannot continue.

Failure to provide such aid is notice to foreign-flag owners and shippers of our intent to abandon the American merchant marine.

If any bill is passed providing subsidy in accordance with the suggestion of the President, provision must be made, says the President, for the termination of existing ocean-mail contracts as rapidly as possible.

The appropriation in the pending bill continues the ocean-mail pay, thereby providing funds for the continuance of aid to ships while the change is being made from ocean-mail contracts to such subsidy as may be provided.

Without aid the merchant marine cannot continue. If a subsidy is provided, the change from the present method to the new will require time, and the ocean-mail pay will be needed to bridge the gap. Changes cannot be made immediately.

What is the situation as the Director of the Shipping Board Bureau sees it?

Under date of May 1, 1936, the Director answers the inquiry of Mr. LUDLOW as to the probable effect of the Senate amendment which eliminates the appropriation for ocean-mail contracts. The letter will be found in the record. He said that with relatively unimportant exceptions, most of the 28 companies which hold the 43 existing ocean-mail contracts are indebted to the Government on construction loans or ship-sales mortgages or both, and that at the close of business on April 30, 1936, 17 companies holding 21 of the most important mail contracts owed the Government construction loans aggregating $83,387,904.73. Mr. Peacock's best estimate, based upon long acquaintance with financial, tariff, and other conditions affecting those operations, is that within a very short time after the termination of the ocean-mail contract payments, 11 companies holding 13 of these contracts, representing approximately $52,500,000 of the above-mentioned indebtedness, would be in default and would probably find it necessary to turn their fleets back to the Government unless the mail payments are replaced by some other substantial subsidy. The current indebtedness of ocean-mail contractors on ship-sale mortgages is $12,984,773.07, and on the same basis it is estimated that a large part of this amount would also be defaulted, and that several additional holders of mail contracts would be forced to turn back their ships.

Mr. Peacock said that it appears inevitable that if the mail-contract payments are terminated in this way, a very large proportion of the privately owned and operated fleets which have been built up under the Merchant Marine Acts of 1920 and 1928 will revert to the Government within a short time thereafter.

Concerning the injury already done, Mr. Peacock said that the proposed elimination of this appropriation, even though it be not carried through, has already caused injury to the American merchant marine. The Bureau has received several reports of its being used as sales talk in the solicitation of traffic for foreign lines. Bookings are often made for a considerable period in advance and foreign lines have apparently not been slow to capitalize the doubt which has thus been raised as to the possible continuance of the operation of certain of our lines.

Attention was also directed to the fact that the possible enactment of new subsidy legislation which would replace the ocean-mail contracts with more direct subsidies affords no reason for discontinuance of the appropriation in question for the coming fiscal year. It is generally recognized in all the proposed bills that the transition would take a number of months which, in any event, would carry over until well after June 30 of this year. Omission of this appropriation would, therefore, seriously endanger at the very outset a successful transfer to the new system of subsidies. Furthermore, both the subsidy bill which was passed by the House at the last session and that which was recently reported to the Senate would make this appropriation available for the purposes of the new act. Its continuance is, therefore, highly desirable, entirely irrespective of whether the ocean-mail contract system is or is not replaced by more direct subsidies.

A little less than $85,000,000 remains unpaid. Unless the ships can continue operation, companies owing about $53,000,000 are in danger of immediate bankruptcy. If receiver-ships follow, the ships must be tied to the docks, unless the Government continues them in operation at its own expense. They cannot obtain credit. The Government must lose the routes it has spent millions to establish and maintain, or it must continue their operation at Government expense. If Government operation is to follow, an appropriation equal in amount must be provided.

APPROPRIATION IN DEFICIENCY BILL WILL NOT SUFFICE

The contention has been made that if a subsidy bill should fail, an appropriation may be made in the deficiency bill. In the meantime, irreparable damage has been done and will continue. Ships depend upon shippers. Shippers contract months in advance. They demand certainty and stability of service. Uncertainty as to continuance of operation requires them to protect their interests by making contracts with foreign-flag ships on whose operation they can depend. They have no assurance that the American lines will continue. Self-protection demands that they turn to foreign-flag ships. The loss of business makes continued operation of American-flag ships more uncertain. One of the greatest obstacles to the establishment and maintenance of an American merchant marine has always been, and is now, lack of confidence in its permanency. Greater doubt is inspired by the failure at present to make an appropriation. The situation is more critical in the South than in the North. It is probable that there will only remain three or four companies, if that number, and they will be in the North or on the Pacific.

In the absence of an appropriation, agents soliciting cargo at home and abroad can give no assurance that the service will continue. They can only express the hope that Congress will provide the necessary funds. This assurance gives no certainty either to domestic or to foreign shippers. In self-protection they must turn to foreign-flag lines which can give assurance of continued service. No business of any kind could survive such uncertainty. Patronage and connections secured by years of service and at immense cost will be lost. Once lost, their recovery will be impossible. The continuance of an appropriation, with some assurance of permanency of operation, is imperative.

MERCHANT MARINE VITAL TO NATION

The merchant-marine problem is one of the most vital now facing the Nation. It is a problem involving the commercial and military security of the Nation.

The Nation is now without any shipping policy. We have been going from bad to worse. As a result, there has not been a single vessel built in several years in this country for overseas trade. Under the stimulus of the 1928 legislation 366,000 tons of new ships costing $145,000,000 were constructed for our foreign-trade fleet.

Much has been said about the number of companies which are in arrears to the Government on loans from the construction-loan fund. The fact is a comparatively small amount is in arrears. Out of a total cost of $214,800,000 for the building and reconditioning of ships, on which $148,000,000 was loaned by the Government, less than $3,000,000 was in arrears on March 1 of this year. Considering the period over which these loans were made—the worst slump ever experienced in the history of shipping—this is a remarkable showing, compared with defaults in other industries.

The terrific effect of this depression may be realized more fully when it is considered that water-borne commerce of the United States—excluding traffic on the Great Lakes and tanker tonnage—declined from 62,113,000 tons in 1929 to 35,156,000 tons in 1935. Yet during this period American-flag ships were able to maintain a percentage practically uniform, the percentages being: 1929, 31.5; 1930, 31.7; 1931, 31; 1932, 29.2; 1933, 31; 1934, 32; and 1935, 30.5.

American shipping in the foreign trade, despite the unprecedented depression in world commerce, has demonstrated that even though seriously handicapped by a high degree of obsolescence, our ships competing in that trade have succeeded in carrying throughout the slump a higher percentage than in previous years, except in 1922. It has been able to do this only through Government assistance rendered the industry under the ocean-mail contracts provided for in the 1928 act.

It is true that the financial standing of this industry is precarious. American shipping is not alone in this difficulty. Shipping of practically all the principal maritime countries has been able to survive the world-wide slump only through the liberal financial support accorded by their governments during the past 7 years. Not only have the governments of these countries assisted their nationals financially in completing their ships on the ways but have helped them in the building of new ships, and when necessary have furnished them with working capital. Despite the unsatisfactory conditions in world trade and shipping and the financially weak position of many of their lines, none of these governments has been willing either to abandon, take over, or curtail their shipping activities. We alone among the nations have hesitated and delayed action in formulating a strong shipping policy, and at this late date actually propose to deny them the assistance promised and written into law and in the contracts between the Government and the shipowners for operation over a fixed period of years.

The item of $26,500,000 which has been stricken from the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill will deny our shipping industry the aid which enables it to survive the keen competition now prevailing and offset strong support given to foreign shipowners by their governments. This is a comparatively insignificant sum when compared with the generous aid given other domestic industries to enable them to survive.

While we have been without any definite policy for shipping, our competitors have been making the most marked progress. Other nations have lost no time in building up their sea strength for both commercial and national-defense purposes, and in doing so they have materially helped in meeting their unemployment problem. It will prove interesting to consider our present condition.

THE STATUS OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE IN THE INTERNATIONAL CARRYING TRADE

On January 1, 1936, there were in our foreign-trade fleet 3,057,000 tons, in which ships with speeds between 10 and 11 knots predominate. Over 85 percent of the total tonnage is 14 years old or over, averaging 17 years, with nearly 11 percent, or 281,000 tons, 20 years old or over.

In our domestic-trade fleet, which consists of about 2,000,000 tons, ships with speeds between 10 and 11 knots again predominate, but to a greater extent than in our foreign-trade fleet. Over 92 percent of the total tonnage is 14 years old or over, averaging 19 years, with nearly 27 percent, or 489,000 tons, 20 years old or more.

In our tanker fleet, of 2,377,000 tons, 92 percent of this tonnage are vessels with speeds of less than 12 knots, 88 percent of the total tonnage being 14 years old or over, averaging 18 years, with 14½ percent, or 303,000 tons, 20 years old or over.

These figures disclose the imperative need for the prompt modernization of our foreign, domestic, and tanker fleets, of

which nearly 88 percent, or about 6,528,000 gross tons, is 14 years old or over, and of which nearly 16½ percent, or over 1,000,000 tons, are already 20 years old or over.

The foregoing figures illustrate the high percentage of old and slow ships and the lack of modern and suitable types to serve as efficient commercial, naval, and military units.

The prime purpose of Government financial aid to American shipping is to place it upon an economic parity with our foreign competitors whose capital and operating costs are on a lower level. The rendering of such aid will not accomplish the purpose for which it is intended unless our ships are on an equality in type, speed, and economy of operation with those of our competitors. Five million dollars a year could be saved in fuel consumption alone if the present obsolete ships operating on foreign ocean-mail routes were replaced with modern types. It is difficult to meet competition successfully with such a handicap.

The last ships contracted for by the Government during the war were delivered in 1922. Since then and up to June 1935, nearly 13,000,000 tons of ocean-going ships, 2,000 tons and over, were built for the six principal maritime nations, which included the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, and Japan. Of the 13,000,000 tons of ships constructed during that period, the United States built about 800,000 tons, averaging approximately 65,000 tons per annum. No cargo or combination cargo and passenger vessels have been built or contracted for during the last 3 years for the foreign trade, while during the same period five of the principal maritime countries have built or are building over 1,500,000 tons of such types.

DIFFERENTIALS IN CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

Great Britain is the world's largest shipbuilding nation, and shortly before the World War tonnage built in Great Britain was more than half of the world's total. Great Britain is still the largest producer of ships and is able, even today, to underbid some countries abroad which have lower labor costs. This may be attributed to the availability of native raw materials, the volume of work, and an abundant supply of skilled shipyard workers. The estimates on construction differentials will therefore be confined to American and British costs. Construction differentials will vary according to the type of vessel under consideration and the condition of the yards which are bidding on the vessel. On the assumption that comparable conditions prevail in both American and British yards and the bids are based on identical plans and specifications, the construction differentials will vary approximately as follows:

For a plain specification cargo ship corresponding to a modern tramp vessel the construction differential will range from 40 to 50 percent of the American cost, for a first-class, cargo-liner type of vessel from a third to 45 percent of the American cost, and for a combination freight and passenger liner from 20 percent to a third of the American cost.

The differentials between domestic and foreign ship operation are caused mainly by the higher wage, subsistence, and repair costs on American ships. For example, the average monthly wages on a cargo vessel of 5,000 gross tons or over, reduced to percentages, will vary as follows:

	Percent
United States	100
France	74
Germany	68
Great Britain	64
Italy	58
Japan	25

On vessels of the combination freight and passenger types and passenger vessels the wage differential against the American ship is somewhat less than on cargo vessels, due to the increased numbers of foreigners employed in the stewards' department on American ships at wages more nearly comparable to those of foreign-flag ships. The subsistence cost on American cargo ships, compared with those operating under foreign flags, would vary approximately in the same proportion as the wage differential, while in the case of the combination freight and passenger types and passenger vessels the subsistence costs would be more nearly in proportion to the wage differential on such ships.

The differential in repair costs between American and foreign ships would vary in about the same proportion as the construction differential, since the same kind of labor and material is used in repairing vessels as in the building of them.

MERCHANT SHIPBUILDING THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

It appears from Lloyd's Register of Shipping Report that there has been a decided increase in merchant shipbuilding abroad during 1935. No such improvement has taken place in the United States. At the end of the year no less than 75 merchant vessels, above 4,000 gross tons each, were under construction in Great Britain, and only 4 such vessels—all tankers—were being built in American shipyards. Twenty-eight large vessels were under construction in Germany and 15 in Japan.

During the past 4-year period figures show a consistent improvement in British yards. Take, for example, ships of 4,000 gross tons each: What is the comparative situation as between Great Britain and the United States at the close of the past 4 years?

Let Lloyd's Register of Shipping answer:

Merchant vessels under construction

[Each of 4,000 gross tons or over]

Date	Great Britain	United States
Dec. 31, 1932	18	4
Dec. 31, 1933	32	2
Dec. 31, 1934	56	2
Dec. 31, 1935	75	4

What was the situation throughout the world?

At the close of 1935 there were under construction 157 merchant vessels of above 4,000 gross tons. At the end of 1934 there were 120. At the close of 1932 there were 62.

Consider the progress in other countries as compared with the United States. Look at the record supplied by Lloyd's Register of Shipping:

Merchant vessels, each of 4,000 gross tons or over, under construction at the close of the past 4 years

Country where building	Dec. 31, 1935	Dec. 31, 1934	Dec. 31, 1933	Dec. 31, 1932
Great Britain and Ireland	75	56	32	18
Germany	28	13	1	6
Japan	15	16	14	8
France	5	5	3	3
United States	4	2	2	4
Other nations	30	28	23	23
Total	157	120	75	62

What do these figures reveal? That the United States has been decidedly outbuilt by Great Britain, Germany, and Japan. These figures show the extent of last year's improvement in Great Britain and Germany. At the end of 1933 there was only one merchant vessel of 4,000 gross tons and over under construction in Germany, at the close of 1934 there were 13, and at the close of 1935 there were 28.

At the close of 1935 there were no merchant vessels between 2,000 and 4,000 gross tons each under construction in the United States. There were 21 such vessels being built in Great Britain and a total of 51 throughout the world. No such tonnage has been reported for the United States during the past 4-year period.

Again, let the detailed figures answer:

Merchant vessels from 2,000 to 4,000 gross tons under construction at the close of the past 4 years

Country where building	Dec. 31, 1935	Dec. 31, 1934	Dec. 1, 1933	Dec. 31, 1932
Great Britain and Ireland	21	11	9	9
Germany	5	3	4	
Japan	4	1	1	1
France	3			3
United States	None	None	None	None
Other nations	18	8	6	11
Total	51	23	20	24

Consider the 157 vessels above 4,000 tons under construction at the close of 1935, the 4 under construction in the United States were tankers, and these are the only vessels reported as being under construction in American shipyards at that time.

The large volume of merchant construction abroad is indicative of the fact that foreign nations are continuing to replace their obsolete tonnage with modern vessels.

Of the 157 vessels under construction, above 4,000 gross tons each, 58 are steamships and 99 are motorships. A break-down of this tonnage according to size reveals one steamer above 50,000 gross tons—the *Queen Mary*—under construction in Great Britain, one steamer between 30,000 and 50,000 gross tons in Holland, and two motorships between 25,000 and 29,999 gross tons in Great Britain. A total of 124 vessels are between 4,000 and 9,999 gross tons each, of which 77 are motorships and 47 are steamers.

Classification according to size and type is as follows:

Merchant vessels each of 4,000 gross tons or over under construction on Dec. 31, 1935

[Classified according to size and type]

Size	Steamers	Motorships	Total
4,000 to 9,999 gross tons	47	77	124
10,000 to 14,999 gross tons	5	17	22
15,000 to 19,999 gross tons	3	3	6
20,000 to 24,999 gross tons	1		1
25,000 to 29,999 gross tons		2	2
30,000 to 50,000 gross tons	1		1
Above 50,000 gross tons	1		1
Total	58	99	157

At the end of 1935 a total of 59 tankers, each of 1,000 gross tons or over, were under construction throughout the world, aggregating 438,560 gross tons. Fifty-one of these tankers were motorships, the other eight being steamers.

CONSTRUCTION IN GREAT BRITAIN

Lloyd's Register of Shipping in a recent issue shows that on December 31, 1932, Great Britain had under construction 18 merchant vessels of 4,000 gross tons or over, 32 at the end of 1933, 56 at the end of 1934, and 75 at the end of 1935.

The Journal of Commerce of April 23, 1936, carried special correspondence from London under date of April 14 to the effect that the Cunard-White Star Line was reported as planning three ships, one to be a new superliner and two of the *Mauretania* type. This article said that the public did not realize the enormous strides that have been made in marine engineering during recent years and the enormous potentialities which are opening up as the result of experience with the latest types of high-pressure boilers.

There already exists provision by Parliament for a sister ship to the *Queen Mary* for £5,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION IN JAPAN

In order to aid her merchant marine Japan enacted the ship improvement facilities act, which became effective October 1, 1932. This law was a definite policy. The moving causes for it as summarized in a recent article on the subject were, first, too many obsolete ships; second, need of faster, more economical ships to enter competitive world trades; third, industrial and national strategic value of maintaining efficiency of private shipyards and furnishing employment to skilled labor. This law provided varying construction bounties dependent upon speed. The ships were required to be constructed under the supervision of the ministry of communications and of the navy. The shipping company was required to scrap 2 tons of obsolete tonnage for each new ton built, and the subsidy is to be paid upon the keel being laid, the other half when the vessel was commissioned for sea, provided the obsolete tonnage was placed in the hands of the scrappers. All new construction was required to be in national yards with Japanese labor and materials, including fittings and engines. All vessels built under the terms of the subsidy are not to be disposed of or rebuilt without the approval of the ministry of communications.

This ship-improvement facilities act of 1932 resulted from a study previously made, which showed that more than 1,000,000 tons were obsolete.

Under the provisions of the first act 31 ships aggregating a gross tonnage of 200,027 tons were built, all being over 4,000 tons and having speeds of 15 knots and over, as the policy was a scrap and build on the basis of 2 tons scrapped for 1 built, and 400,000 gross tons were eliminated. The total cost of the subsidy was about 10,400,000 yen.

The first ship-improvement facilities act proved so beneficial to industry it was extended for another 12 months from March 1935. In this act the ships which might qualify for the subsidy were to be over 4,000 gross tons. The ratio of the new tonnage was to be 1 to 1, the total appropriation being 1,500,000 yen for new shipping aggregating 50,000 gross tons.

The appropriation under the second act has been completely allocated, and eight ships over 4,000 tons gross and having speeds of 15 knots and over were contracted for by August 1935.

In addition to these subsidized ships there were a number of fast ocean-going and home-trade ships of various types and sizes, built or being built, for which no exchequer's grant was made.

The majority of the ships built or being built under the first and second acts are of 6,000 gross tons and over, the designed speed being in excess of 18 knots, and some having speeds of nearly 19 knots.

An article appeared in the New York Times of April 26, 1936, to the effect that, according to word received in San Francisco on April 25, 1936, an eight-ship construction program for the express silk-trade service of the Kawasaki-Kaisha interests had been arranged. It was said that the first to be built would be four express Deisel freighters for the Japan-Pacific coast-New York run, and it was said that these ships would be the world's fastest cargo carriers. It was said in this article that these ships would register 9,300 deadweight-tons capacity each, would be powered with 10,000-horsepower Deisel engines, were expected to maintain a 19-knot schedule in service, and the first would be commissioned in February 1937, followed by others in April, June, and August.

The success of the first 3-year program brought on a demand for further modernizing the Japanese merchant fleet, and this was provided for in a new program covering a 5-year period, with 500,000 gross tons of obsolete shipping to be scrapped, and new ships to be built which are to be large and speedy, including both cargo ships and combination freight and passenger liners, additional high-class liners for the San Francisco route being stressed.

Today Japan has more than 50 new economical motorships of from 5,500 to 9,800 gross tons each, with a speed of from 16 to 18¾ knots, actually operating in Pacific waters. These are cargo ships, not passenger or combination carriers. It does not seem necessary that such speed is required for the type of cargo imported into Japan. It must follow that these ships are for quick delivery of manufactured goods which are in competition with all other manufacturing nations of the globe. Their value as naval auxiliaries to the Japanese Navy is obvious.

FUTURE OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

The American merchant marine is more strongly entrenched on world trade routes than at the beginning of the depression. This depression was not foreseen, and it has obliged the Government to come to the aid, financially and otherwise, of everyone in the country—agriculture, banking, manufacturing, and railroads. It is not surprising that while Americans appear indifferent to relief for American ships, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan are bending every effort to modernize their fleets, increase their speed, improve their services, and secure for themselves American trade to which our ships are entitled, and which they could retain if we would only adopt a definite shipping policy. It is not surprising that foreign lines ardently hope that the United States will cut down its aid to American shipping so

that foreign ships may carry more of our exports and imports. Foreign commerce for the last fiscal year was the best since 1931. Exports for the fiscal year 1935 increased $79,000,000 over the preceding year. Imports increased around $65,000,000.

American ships are carrying increasing numbers of passengers in proportion to their accommodations, but there is ample room for improvement, especially in the North Atlantic, where American vessels still get but an eighth of the business while our American citizens constitute three-fourths of the total travel.

The crying need at present is a replacement program for our rapidly obsolescing tonnage. Except for the ships built under the Jones-White Act, practically all seagoing American ships date back to the war period. All of our ships must be replaced within the next few years.

Are we, as Americans, to confess that we are incompetent to solve this problem? Great Britain met the situation in the nineteenth century with the payment of mail subventions to essential services. They have kept up their aids ever since. Consider their discriminatory or preferential duties, imperial preference policies, such as the Ottawa agreement, naval-reserve pay to ships, officers, and crews; special loan grants and the like.

Compare the loans made by Great Britain with our own loans. Under the Trade Facilities Acts, the British have loaned between 1922 and 1929, £27,487,745; under the Irish Trade Facilities Act they have loaned £14,909,237 between 1922 and 1934. In other words, they have loaned $206,000,000 while we were lending about $150,000,000. Great Britain advanced in addition about $50,000,000 to the Cunard Line, about fifty million for a scrap and build program, and another £2,000,000 for tramp-ship subsidy.

Since the loans mentioned above, further huge sums have been guaranteed under those British and Irish acts. Our loans have run along from 66⅔ to 75 percent of the total costs. The British loans have been based upon 80 percent to 100 percent, and their interest charges have run around 3 percent.

The British are always keen to promote their shipping. When American interests formerly threatened they answered with an advance by the British Government of funds to build the *Lusitania* and the *Mauretania* at 2¾-percent interest, and provided mail contracts and naval-reserve bounties to amortize the loan.

Consider other nations. France has continued a policy of aid from the days of Louis XIV. In 1935 French subsidies totaled around $37,000,000, with $27,000,000 going to four lines.

I regret that I cannot go at this time more fully into the benefits granted by other nations. It is well known that France bore practically the entire cost of building the *Normandie*, and has to bear now a large part, if not all, of the cost of the operation. Every maritime nation on the face of the globe is trying to promote a merchant marine. It remains for the United States alone to muddle along with no policy except a policy of destruction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts from newspapers, public documents, and also statistics from the Lloyds' Register of Shipping.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN] I queried the gentleman from Maine on the effect of the failure to make provision for the continuance of this mail subsidy, or in the alternative the passage of subsidy legislation, and the effect of the failure of those two procedures upon the future of the American merchant marine. The gentleman from Maine, for whom I have the highest respect, and who has made a diligent inquiry into this situation, stated it would have a fatal effect upon the future of the American merchant marine. The gentleman is sincere and well informed, and his statement was absolutely correct.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is very solicitous about the future of the American sailor. I do not yield to him in my desire to advance the welfare and economic standing of the American sailor, but I may say now, with full knowledge of the facts, and from a somewhat expert knowledge gained by service on the Merchant Marine Committee, that if the motion of the gentleman from Iowa prevails, and the Senate fails to pass subsidy legislation, there will be no American sailors working on any American ships. American tonnage will be carried under foreign flags and there will be no place for American sailors under that scheme of things. Pending the passage of a constructive act which will build up an American personnel and provide proper seagoing environment, adequate pay for the American sailor, and also safety at sea, the present mail subsidy should be continued so that our flag may not pass from the sea.

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I am sorry, I cannot yield now.

The fact is that at the present time men who are deeply concerned with the welfare of the American sailor and who are not tinged with "red" realize that if this legislation fails in both of its phases the American sailor will be on the docks without employment.

I am deeply sympathetic, Mr. Speaker, with the necessity of writing legislation which contains an adequate provision for the development and protection of American personnel. I am frank to say that the message of the President in this respect was not broad enough to meet my views. The subsidy legislation for which I voted and which has been referred to here was not broad enough to meet my views. In view of the fact that this legislation is hopelessly enmeshed and in a pocket in the Senate, the procedure provided by this committee of continuing the mail subsidy temporarily is sound and should be carried out.

As you know, every nation in the world today is heavily subsidizing its merchant marine. The chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine has referred to the activities of France, England, and Japan. You know that if we are to survive as a nation we must continue our merchant marine, despite the sins of the past to which the opponents of a merchant marine are continually referring.

The President, with full power to do so, has failed to cancel these contracts. The inference is he does not find them illegal and that he does not find them lacking in integrity. The inference is plain that he finds their continuance necessary for the preservation and protection of the American merchant marine and for the purpose of keeping the American flag on the high seas.

I beseech you gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, for the honor of America, for our national development, in the interest of the farmer who has crops to export, to get back of proper subsidy legislation at the appropriate time when the Senate has composed its differences, and for the present at least to continue these mail subsidies, so that the seamen whom my friend from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is so solicitous about, and for which solicitude I commend him, may not be thrown out on the docks and their opportunity for employment forever destroyed.

I urge the Members of the House, in the name of America, which is being outbuilt in freight and passenger carriers by France, England, Italy, and Japan, not to permit your eyes to be closed by prejudice or passion, but to get back of the American merchant marine, and in doing so, vote down the preferential motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. MORAN. Does the gentleman agree with me that the present system has not produced and, presumably, will not produce an adequate merchant marine, and, therefore, some new policy is necessary?

Mr. CULKIN. I agree with the gentleman on that proposition. We cannot return to the old state of things. The operators must be held to a stricter loyalty to America. That can be accomplished without destroying the American merchant marine, which both the gentleman from Maine and myself wish to conserve.

Mr. MORAN. The gentleman and I are in accord on that point.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and to include therein certain papers and quotations from various documents.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, this should not be a partisan question. I believe it should be an American question. I frankly admit I want to see an American merchant marine. I frankly admit I want to see the American flag on the high seas, not only in the coastwise trade but on all the seven seas of the world. I think it is admitted to be impossible to maintain an American merchant marine flying the American flag without some kind of Government help.

Whether the so-called Jones-White Act is the ultimate solution of this question is something we should not consider in adopting a conference report. I think it is admitted that the contracts made in accordance with the provisions of the Jones-White Act are enforceable in the Court of Claims, and if we refuse to appropriate the money the shipping concerns will go into the Court of Claims and collect not only the money due them but also collect damages; and I believe whether the Jones-White Act is the proper and eventual solution or not, we ought to continue to pay on our contractual obligations under that act and as a Congress we ought not to repudiate a legal Government contract. Then let us in this Congress, if we have time, or in the next Congress revamp the whole proposition so we may have a real American merchant marine on the high seas.

Mr. Speaker, my interest in a merchant marine, I am frank to confess, is also sentimental. My great-grandfather started out from Cape Cod when he was 17 years of age and went to sea. Before he was 21 he was a second mate on a ship sailing between Boston and Canton, China. This was in about the year 1802. By the time he was 27 he was captain of a clipper ship that sailed from Boston to China. My grandfather followed him and also went to sea as a boy. So I come from a line of old Yankee ship captains who carried the American flag from Massachusetts to China [applause], and this is the reason I have a sentimental interest in seeing that the American flag continues to remain on the high seas. In those days 90 percent of all our imports and exports were carried in American ships. Those were the days of wooden ships and iron men. We have iron ships now. Do not let us be wooden men.

Between 1820 and the Civil War in 1860 we carried 70 percent of all our imports and exports in American ships. In 1914, when the World War began, we were carrying 9.7 percent of our imports and exports, and our foreign trade was controlled by our competitors.

This is not a partisan question. Let me read you what Thomas Jefferson said:

> The marketing of our productions will be at the mercy of any nation which has possessed itself exclusively of the means of carrying them.

[Applause.]

Thomas Jefferson was the first American President who realized the importance of carrying American goods in American ships under the American flag. Woodrow Wilson, another great Democrat, was one of the strongest Presidents we ever had in favor of an American merchant marine.

Something has been said here about the matter of competition and the differential between our ships and foreign ships. Let me refer to some actual figures which I have obtained from the Shipping Board. For example, here is a summary of capital and operating differentials on a United States vessel of 11,900 gross tons and a British vessel of the same gross tonnage.

The American cost was $3,375,000. They were both built in the same year, and the British cost was $2,250,000, a capital differential in favor of Great Britain of $1,125,000 for an identical boat.

Let us follow this same boat into its operation. We find that the wage differential in favor of the British boat was $1,926.35 a month.

In other words, on the two identical boats built the same year, the wages of the American ship per month was $1,926.35 greater than the wages on the British ship.

Let us go further. The crews were about the same in number. We find that the cost of food given to these American seamen on that ship was $780.41 per month more than the food given the same number of seamen on the British ship. Of course, these differentials would have been greater if the foreign boat had been, for example, Greek, Norwegian, or Japanese.

Let me give you another one. Here is the case of two other boats built the same year, tankers, both approximately 10,387 dead-weight tons. The American boat cost $1,142,570 and the British boat cost $758,000, a difference of $384,570 in favor of the British boat.

Now, look at the wage difference. The wages on the American vessel was $1,570 per month more than the wages paid on the British boat. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, during my early years of service in the House I was a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. During that service, although I am a landlubber by birth and residence, I took a great interest in the development of a merchant marine.

I think I know something about the problems and the difficulties and about the conditions that prevail against the successful operation of an American merchant marine.

I think there is no question of more supreme national importance to all sections of the country, not only on the seacoast but in the interior, than for America, at all times, to have at least a fairly adequate merchant marine, manned by American sailors, under the American flag, and carrying a legitimate proportion of our own commerce to the markets of the world.

I hope we are also approaching the time when there will be a great restoration of the volume of our export trade. Unfortunately during the past few years it has been greatly diminished, down, down, down, until it has almost disappeared. I am one of those who believe that industrial prosperity in America is largely based upon a large volume of export foreign trade, because I know that the men who produce articles for export compose several million of our employable workmen who are now out of work.

What is the issue presented by this motion? In essence it is purely a proposition of the Government of the United States carrying out the contractual obligation with those operators of American ships which are carrying the mail.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No. I am sorry; I do not have time.

Whether or not it is an unwise policy which we have embarked upon is beside the issue. Whether or not there is now pending, with extreme possibility of passing shortly, a new merchant marine bill involving some principles of subsidy is beside the issue. But here we are confronted with what, in my opinion, is a plain contract, in which the Post Office Department of the United States is obligated to pay these men during the period of these contracts a specific sum of money for services to be performed by them. If that is not the issue, then what is the issue?

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No. I cannot yield. The gentleman has had a fair opportunity to present his views. If I had more time, I would be glad to yield.

Probably the question which the gentleman wished to propound would be the question of fraudulent contracts. That has been answered. Those contracts have not been canceled. They are an existing obligation, and I think the attitude of the House committee on this proposition is a sound and correct one. In other words, until those obligations are canceled, or until some new method or contract is established to meet the existing situation, then certainly we can do no less, as an honest government, than to carry out our promise to pay these men during the existence of these contracts.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sorry. If I had more time, I would be glad to answer the gentleman.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. TABER. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. COLDEN. I call attention to the statement of our eminent colleague [Mr. BACON] that in his comparison of wages and cost of ships he took a foreign competitor which pays the highest wages in the world outside of the United States. In Scandinavia, Italy, and France the wages and cost of ships are much less than in England.

Mr. BACON. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I will be unable to yield any further because I only have a few minutes.

Personally I am supporting the position which the chairman of the committee [Mr. LUDLOW] took when he made the motion that the House insist upon its position. I hope the House of Representatives will support that motion. I want to call your attention to a few facts. The object of this Senate amendment is to wipe out about twenty-one or twenty-two million dollars of appropriation which the House carried in the Treasury-Post Office bill to meet the contractual obligations of the Government under these ship-subsidy contracts. What the object of the Senate was in striking out this proposition I do not know, because they have before them, reported by the Senate Commerce Committee, absolutely no bill to meet the ship-subsidy situation. To my mind, it is absolutely essential that this Government maintain ships on the seas. I believe in economy just as much as any man, and will go just as far as any man to promote economy in the United States, but our foreign trade is absolutely dependent upon American ships on the seas. If we do not have those ships on the sea, the freight rates discriminate against American goods going to other ports and in favor of foreign goods coming to American ports and elsewhere, and we have no recourse except to have either Government-owned ships or Government subsidies, just like other countries have.

Frankly I am not just satisfied with the type of subsidy and the type of operation we have. I believe we should have a better one, but this is the kind we have and it is the only opportunity to have any.

Now, what is the situation? The Congress of the United States 3 years ago passed a bill which gave the President the power to cancel these contracts. After careful investigation by the Postmaster General not one single contract has been canceled. The Postmaster General's office has told our committee when we have had them before us that they did not have any evidence on which to cancel these contracts.

Here is the picture. The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. LUDLOW, will read to you shortly a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States. I want to call attention to a word or two of that letter only, because I do not want to trespass on what the gentleman from Indiana will give you. The Comptroller General says that the Treasury would be permitted to pay out of whatever funds are appropriated here $14,300,000. Even if the motion of the gentleman from Iowa were carried, the whole of that money could be used for the purpose of paying, as far as it would go, the Government's obligation. In other words, the adoption of the Senate amendment means a mess of the worst kind; a mess where some of these people can be paid and others cannot be paid. In other words, it is all mixed up. The only thing we can do, and do fairly and honestly, is to vote "no" on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to recede and concur in the Senate amendments and send the matter back to the Senate and let them withdraw that amendment.

I do not believe the House of Representatives should attempt to create a situation where we are trying to get out of paying our contractual obligations.

If we get out of them, one immediate result will be a default upon $53,000,000 of contracts which have been made with the Shipping Board for the purchase of ships, and upon which the shippers are paying their installments and their interest, meaning altogether right there $4,000,000, $5,000,000, or $6,000,000 of loss immediately—at least one-third the amount of this appropriation—and this will be a recurring item.

On top of all that we have another situation. Our ships, it is true, are not so good as I wish they were. At the same time, since this operation has been commenced and these contracts have been in force, we have put on the sea two of the finest trans-Atlantic ships in the world, the *Washington* and the *Manhattan;* and it is worth a good deal to us to have them on the sea. In addition to that, when I came to Washington, first it was costing us for Government operation of the Shipping Board, in one way or another, practically $100,000,000 a year. The result of this operation and these contracts and the things that have been done in between has been to cut down this expense from $100,000,000 to $25,000,000 a year. That is the way it works, and that is the way it would work. It will cost you an awful lot more to have Government operation than it will to have these contractual subsidies. I want to get out of it and give decent service the best and the cheapest way we can. I hope that when you come to vote on this proposition that you will vote "no" on this motion to recede and concur and will insist on the House position.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I favor the position taken by the members of the Appropriations Committee, because this is not a time to legislate. When that time comes we can correct such evils as in our judgment exist. I also favor the elimination of this postal subsidy whenever that is possible. But I want to say in passing that the present administration of the Post Office Department, together with the cooperation of the subcommittee, has pared down the appropriation for the mail subsidy approximately $3,000,000 in the last 3 years. The Department is doing excellent work. By investigating, by inspecting ships, and in other ways, the postal officials have achieved a maximum saving under existing conditions.

There are two ways, as I see it, to correct the evils that have been mentioned in this debate: If there are violations of law not properly attended to by the agencies of the Government which should deal with them, the matter should be made the subject of investigation by a committee of Congress. Secondly, a new law should be brought in here before we disturb the contractual relations and produce a chaotic condition in the dispatch and delivery of the United States mails. In view of the splendid record accomplished so far by the Post Office Department and by the House committee, I feel we ought to act favorably upon this conference report as presented by the chairman of the subcommittee, and then let us make an effort to bring out new legislation to correct such ills as we believe exist in our merchant marine. I, for one, favor taking this subsidy out of the Post Office Department, where it is now a direct charge against that service. However, until such legislation is brought in for our consideration, I believe we ought to sup-

port the position taken by the committee. They considered this matter in conference and prepared a report which, in my judgment, squares with existing conditions.

The present administration of the Post Office Department had one of these ocean-mail contracts eliminated by mutual agreement. A legislative committee of the House recommended that the Seatrain contract be abrogated. That contract has never gone into effect.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I believe that under existing conditions we are carrying the mails in American bottoms, aiding our American merchant marine in a most economical and efficient manner. I hope that legislation will be presented to us before the termination of this session so that we may be able to correct conditions which we know merit consideration and correction, but we have before us nothing but a conference report the rejection of which will mean a test case between the Government and those contractors carrying the mails. Rejection of the report will result in a chaotic condition so far as the dispatch of the mail is concerned. I believe we ought to await that better opportunity which will come to us in a legislative way when a bill is reported by the Senate committee bearing upon this subject.

The Appropriations Committee in charge of this bill have gone as far as possible. They have accomplished everything they possibly could within the existing law, and not until we change the law is it time for us to find fault and differ with the committee in the event they are not doing their level best to carry out its provisions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I shall use the remainder of my time myself, and request the Chair to notify me when I shall have consumed 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain letters from high governmental officials bearing upon the subject matter of ocean-mail contracts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I would like to yield; I would like to be courteous; but I have such limited time that I must ask the gentleman first to let me proceed with my statement.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting subject to discuss, and I have tried to be very kind in yielding to all gentlemen who desired to be heard, so that I have whittled down my own time to almost the vanishing point. For this reason I respectfully request that I be permitted to proceed without interruption during the few minutes at my disposal.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself torn by conflicting emotions in respect to this ocean-mail question. I agree absolutely with the objective that is sought—the complete divorcement of the carriage of ocean mail from merchant marine subsidy—while at the same time I disapprove the irregular, strong-arm, revolutionary means by which it is proposed by another branch of Congress to attain that objective.

For the information of Members I wish to make a brief, concise statement, showing the present status of this particular matter. The act of 1928, under which these ocean-mail contracts have been executed and enforced during the last 8 years, is to a large extent a misnomer. In legislative history and the general understanding among our people it is tied in with the Postal Service, but really its major significance is in the fact that it is the vehicle for carrying a large subsidy to steamship companies—a subsidy which, roughly speaking, amounts to 10 times the size of the appropriation that would be required to carry the same volume of ocean mail if there were no subsidy involved.

Forty-three contracts are now in existence under this statute of 1928, and on the basis of 100 percent performance the Government would be obligated to pay the steamship companies something in excess of $33,000,000 during the fiscal year 1937. To a certain extent there is administrative leeway to reduce the amount where the steamship companies do not meet all of the statutory requirements and the Budget Bureau added its own arbitrary cut so that the estimate, when it reached our subcommittee, provided for a minimum appropriation of $26,500,000 as being necessary to discharge the Government's obligations under the ocean-mail contracts during the next fiscal year.

The House Appropriations Subcommittee approved this amount on the theory, which up to that time had never been challenged or disputed, that as an appropriating committee it had no authority to annul existing law and that money must be provided to pay these contractual obligations as long as the so-called Merchant Marine Act of 1928 remains on the statute books. There is nothing in the history or precedents of Congress that told us that we might take action which in effect would nullify the act of 1928 by denying the funds to carry out the contracts legally executed under it.

The House sustained our viewpoint and the Postoffice and Treasury Departments' appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1937, as it passed the House and went over to the Senate, carried the Budget item of $26,500,000 for the ocean-mail contracts.

When the bill reached the Senate Committee on Appropriations that committee struck out the specific item of $26,500,000 for transportation of mail under the ocean-mail contracts and added $4,500,000 to the item of $9,450,000 in the bill for carrying ocean mail on a poundage basis. By so doing the committee undertook to squeeze $22,000,000 of subsidy out of ocean-mail transportation, the admitted purpose being to hasten the enactment of a new ship subsidy bill which would subsidize the merchant marine on a basis entirely free and independent from the Postal Service.

The Senate adopted the views of its Appropriations Committee and thus the issue was squarely presented in conference between the Senate's position and the House's position on this matter. After an animated discussion in conference, the Senate conferees refusing to yield, your conferees have brought the issue back to this chamber for a vote of the House.

The gentlemen who are associated with me on the conference committee will speak for themselves in voicing their opinions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928. For myself alone I will say that if I had been a Member of Congress when it was passed I would have voted against it and I would gladly vote this instant for its repeal.

To hang a huge subsidy on the fiction of carrying the mails is to my way of thinking a base deception. There is about it a certain tincture of fraudulent pretense when the American people are led to believe that they are paying a large sum for carrying the ocean mail when, as a matter of cold fact, a relatively small part of the expenditure is for mail service and a very large part of it goes into the coffers of steamship companies. I confess that the word "subsidy" grates on my ears.

It seems to me almost a hateful word, something synonymous with special privilege. Under our American form of government special privilege should not be allowed to enter. Certainly it is outlawed by the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, to whom we on this side of the Chamber profess our allegiance.

Entertaining these beliefs I would hasten the day, if I could, when there will be a complete divorcement of the mail service and ocean subsidies but I question whether the end, desirable as I believe it to be, would justify the means by which the Senate proposes to bring about this separation.

However, the merit or demerit of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 is not the question involved here today. The question is whether it is wise or justifiable for the Government to repudiate contracts that have been legally authorized and executed.

What the Senate proposes is nothing less than a caesarian operation, the like of which, I believe, has never been witnessed in legislative annals. If we establish such a precedent I am wondering how often, and in what embarrassing ways, it will arise to haunt us in the future. Can an appropriations committee, by arbitrarily exercising its power of withholding funds, nullify an act of Congress, thus to all intents and purposes destroying that act as completely as if it had been repealed by another act of Congress?

Take, for instance, the Social Security Act. It makes certain specific appropriations to carry out the purposes mentioned in the act—$8,000,000 in one paragraph, $2,000,000 in another, and so forth. Could members of the Appropriations Committee say, "We do not like the Social Security Act and we will not appropriate any money to enforce it." There is an even stronger reason why we should not assume such an attitude in reference to the Merchant Marine Act, for in the latter instance binding contracts have been entered into in good faith"?

If members of the Appropriations Committees were to say that and Congress were to back them in that attitude, what would become of orderly legislative procedure? Would we, or could we, ever know that any legislative act that Congress might pass would be safe from annulment? With such a situation and precedent staring us in the face, I doubt whether the caesarean operation performed by the Senate on the ocean-mail contracts, in order to bring about the birth of a new ship-subsidy law, is justified. As much as I would like to see the existing hybrid, deceptive system of ocean-mail contracts abolished, I cannot convince myself that the end would justify the means.

I am thinking, too, of other consequences of the proposed annulment of the ocean-mail contracts through enforced starvation and I am wondering whether we would not find that we have made a very bad bargain before we get through with it. Undoubtedly lawsuits would pile up for recoveries under the contracts.

It could hardly be pleaded that the contracts are nonenforceable on account of fraud, as the President long had the authority to cancel these contracts for fraud or for any reason whatsoever which he conceived to be in the public interest, and he never exercised that authority in a single solitary instance. If Government contractual obligations mean anything, there is no reason to doubt that the steamship companies would be entitled to heavy recoveries.

This problem is one of many faces and angles and one of its facets has to do with the loans made by the United States Shipping Board to these ocean-mail contractors. Seventeen companies, holding 21 of the most important ocean-mail contracts, owe the United States Government $83,387,904.73 on construction loans. If money is not appropriated to pay the ocean-mail contracts the Shipping Board estimates that $52,500,000 of these loans will be immediately defaulted, with a prospect that a considerable part of the remaining $30,887,000 will be defaulted later. This can have but one result—a large part of this shipping will be thrown back on the Government, to be tied up in our harbors and rot as so much junk.

Your conferees leave the decision with you. After all, it is a matter for the House to decide. If subsidies could be divorced from the mail service without the serious consequences and repercussions that undoubtedly would result from this drastic Senate action I would give the program my personal blessing, but I am fearful of what will happen if we follow this uncharted course. Under the circumstances it is my belief, and I think I reflect the views of the other House conferees, that the normal way is the best way, and that safety and prudence suggests that we continue the ocean-mail appropriation for 1 more year, thus affording time to enact a new merchant marine subsidy law and work out the problem in an orderly manner with full protection to the rights of both the contractors and the Government.

In my opinion the Government ought to meet its obligations under these contracts until the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 is repealed. That is the just thing to do; it is the right thing to do. By withholding the appropriation until the matter is adjusted in this way we will be inviting reprisals which, in the long run, if I am not mistaken, will pile a cost and a burden on the Government several times the amount involved in this appropriation. To my mind repudiation would not only be wrong and unethical, but it would be a very bad bargain from the Government's standpoint.

With the permission of the House I submit herewith correspondence with Postmaster General Farley, J. C. Peacock, Director of the Shipping Board, and Comptroller General McCarl, which has an illuminating bearing on this question.

These letters are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1936.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: This is in reply to your letter of April 30, 1936, addressed to the Hon. Harllee Branch, Second Assistant Postmaster General, stating that the Senate struck out the appropriation for the ocean-mail contracts and provided in lieu thereof an appropriation of $4,500,000 to carry on the ocean mail on a strictly poundage basis, and requesting advice as to what would be the effect of withholding this appropriation as far as the interests of the United States, particularly the interests of the Postal Service, are concerned.

A sum of approximately $4,500,000 will be needed for carrying the mails on a strictly poundage basis. It is believed in the Department that the efficiency of the mail service will not be affected in the least if Congress provides that sum for carrying the mails on a poundage basis. The remainder of the appropriation is a subsidy to the holders of ocean-mail contracts.

The Post Office Department is primarily concerned with the transportation of mails and cannot undertake to express an opinion as to the amount of any subsidy that should be provided for a merchant marine or the effect in detail of eliminating subsidies from the present appropriation. It would seem to me that whether subsidies are to be provided for under the present laws is a question for the determination of Congress itself.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FARLEY,
Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD BUREAU,
Washington, March 16, 1936.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In response to your inquiry, I find that at March 15, 1936, 18 lines holding 21 ocean-mail contracts were indebted to this Bureau on unpaid construction loans aggregating $84,104,932.86. I am enclosing a statement showing the outstanding loans of each company.

These loans relate to vessels which have already been constructed while of course the construction subsidy provisions of the pending subsidy bill would apply only to new construction. If all ocean-mail contract payments should be terminated without some provision for adjustment of existing construction loans as is contemplated in S. 3500, our best estimate is that approximately $53,000,000 of the above loans might immediately default, and it is of course possible that some indeterminate part of the remaining balance of $31,000,000 might also eventually default.

If there is any further information that I can furnish you, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

J. C. PEACOCK, *Director.*

Statement of construction loans outstanding Mar. 15, 1936, to companies holding ocean-mail contracts—unpaid construction loans at Mar. 15, 1936

Contractor:	
Export Steamship Corporation	$5,444,025.00
American South African Line	945,000.00
Grace Line, Inc	1,718,325.00
American Scantic Line, Inc	544,713.50
Colombian Steamship Co., Inc	2,851,750.00
New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co	2,446,875.00
Oceanic Steamship Co	8,755,875.00
Dollar Steamship Lines, Inc., Ltd	10,751,987.16
American Line Steamship Corporation	6,669,700.00
Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc	340,983.94
Panama Mail Steamship Co	10,560,519.00
United Fruit Co	8,329,375.00
United States Lines Co	13,510,530.00
Baltimore Mail Steamship Co	6,128,906.26
Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc	3,933,800.00
American Diamond Lines, Inc	470,085.00
Waterman Steamship Corporation	625,869.00
Gulf Pacific Mail Line, Inc	76,614.00
Total	84,104,932.86

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD BUREAU,
Washington, May 1, 1936.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter of April 30, inquiring as to the probable effect of the Senate amendment which would eliminate the appropriation for the ocean-mail contracts, is at hand.

With relatively unimportant exceptions most of the 28 companies which hold the 43 existing ocean-mail contracts are indebted to the Government on construction loans or ship-sales mortgages, or both. An analysis of those mortgages therefore affords a very good picture of the probable effect of the elimination of this appropriation.

At the close of business last night, 17 companies holding 21 of the most important mail contracts owed the Government construction loans aggregating $83,387,904.73. Our best estimate, based upon long acquaintance with financial, traffic, and other conditions affecting those operations, is that within a very short time after the termination of the ocean-mail contract payments 11 companies holding 13 of these contracts, representing approximately $52,500,000 of the above-mentioned indebtedness, would be in default and would probably find it necessary to turn their fleets back to the Government unless the mail payments are replaced by some other substantial subsidy. The current indebtedness of ocean-mail contractors on ship-sales mortgages is $12,984,773.07, and on the same basis it is estimated that a large part of this amount would also be defaulted and that several additional holders of mail contracts would be forced to turn back their ships.

It appears inevitable that if the mail-contract payments are terminated in this way, a very large proportion of the privately owned and operated fleets which have been built up under the Merchant Marine Acts of 1920 and 1928 will revert to the Government within a short time thereafter.

In this connection I would also point out that the proposed elimination of this appropriation, even though it be not carried through, has already caused injury to the American merchant marine. We have received several reports of its being used as sales talk in the solicitation of traffic for foreign lines. As you probably know bookings are often made for a considerable period in advance and foreign lines have apparently not been slow to capitalize the doubt which has thus been raised as to the possible continuance of the operation of certain of our lines.

Might I also call your attention to the fact that the possible enactment of new subsidy legislation which would replace the ocean-mail contracts with more direct subsidies affords no reason for discontinuance of the appropriation in question for the coming fiscal year. It is generally recognized in all the proposed bills that the transition would take a number of months which in any event would carry over until well after June 30 of this year. Omission of this appropriation would therefore seriously endanger at the very outset a successful transfer to the new system of subsidies. Furthermore both the subsidy bill which was passed by the House at the last session and that which was recently reported to the Senate would make this appropriation available for the purposes of the new act. Its continuance is therefore highly desirable entirely irrespective of whether the ocean-mail contract system is or is not replaced by more direct subsidies.

Sincerely,

J. C. PEACOCK, *Director.*

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 4, 1936.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have your letter of April 30, as follows:

"The Senate, as you know, struck out the appropriation for the ocean-mail contracts and provided in lieu thereof an appropriation of $4,500,000 to carry the ocean mail on a strictly poundage basis.

"As chairman of the House conferees I would like to be provided with all available information as to the probable consequences of the Senate's action if it should prevail in the final adjustment of this matter.

"Without asking you to commit yourself as to the wisdom or unwisdom of the withdrawal of this appropriation, unless you should care to volunteer an opinion, I would like to get all the information you can send to me as to the probable effect of this proposed action, as it is an important matter and, without prejudice to either side of the question, I would like to know, as nearly as is humanly ascertainable, the results we may expect if this action is taken. I need all the light it is possible to obtain, so that I may give correct information to the House.

"What would be the effect of withholding this appropriation, as far as the interests of the United States are involved?

"In cases where there has been partial fulfillment of contract what would be the process of settlement for performance already rendered? In other cases—that is to say, in cases where claims may be filed under the contracts—what would be the process of determination? What would be the situation in regard to loans made to the ocean-mail contractors by the Government?

"I would greatly appreciate any information you may send to me on all phases of this subject and, of course, if you care to express any opinion your views would be most welcome and I will be grateful for an early answer."

Your submission states that the Senate "struck out the appropriation for the ocean-mail contracts and provided in lieu thereof an appropriation of $4,500,000 to carry the ocean mail on a strictly poundage basis." This statement does not appear to be quite accurate.

Heretofore the Congress has appropriated by separate items for transportation of foreign mails, that is, one item for transportation of foreign mails under contracts entered into pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, and a separate item for other means of transportation—steamship (poundage basis), aircraft, and otherwise. As the bill, H. R. 10919, was passed by the House of Representatives this form was continued, $26,500,000 being provided for transportation under such contracts, and $9,450,000 for transportation by other means. The Senate, by amendments 48 and 52, eliminated the specific item of $26,500,000 for transportation under ocean-mail contracts, increased the amount under the other item from $9,450,000 to $14,200,000, and struck out the limiting clause employed by the House of Representatives, reading as follows: "(exclusive of mail carried under contracts awarded under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928)", so that said item as amended by the Senate (amendment 48) reads as follows:

"Foreign mail transportation: For transportation of foreign mails by steamship, aircraft, or otherwise, $14,300,000: *Provided,* * * *."

You will note there appears no limitation on the uses of this appropriation item, as amended by the Senate, to carry the ocean mail "on a strictly poundage basis", and in the absence of such a limitation such appropriation would be available, among other things and while it lasts, for carrying the ocean mails under contracts heretofore entered into pursuant to section 404 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, some of which have several years yet to run. (See list of contracts in S. Doc. No. 69, 72d Cong., pp. 2 to 11.)

You ask:

"What would be the effect of withholding this appropriation, as far as the interests of the United States are involved?

"In cases where there has been partial fulfillment of contract what would be the process of settlement for performance already rendered? In other cases—that is to say, in cases where claims may be filed under the contracts—what would be the process of determination? * * *."

There appears nothing in this pending appropriation bill purporting to amend the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, under which existing ocean-mail contracts were entered into, and nothing purporting to operate upon such existing contracts. Therefore, the condition will be, if the measure is enacted as amended by the Senate, that the appropriation item of $14,300,000 will be available for lawful payments for transportation of foreign mails by "steamship, aircraft, or otherwise", including transportation of foreign mails under lawful contracts entered into pursuant to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, and if the amount appropriated should prove to be insufficient there would be an accounting duty, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the act of June 14, 1878, as amended (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 714), to examine and allow, in the amount appearing legally due, such claims as might result for services rendered under ocean-mail contracts and certify them to the Congress for appropriations with which to make payment. And in this connection see, also, section 401 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, as amended (45 Stat. 692), which provides:

"All mails of the United States carried on vessels between ports which it is lawful under the navigation laws for a vessel not documented under the laws of the United States to carry merchandise shall, if practicable, be carried on vessels in respect of which a contract is made under this title."

There is another phase of the problem which apparently should have the consideration of the Congress—the possible early depletion of the appropriation through payments under ocean-mail contracts and the effect of such depletion with respect to payments for other means of transportation of foreign mails, some of which may not enjoy the contractual basis entitling to allowance and certification of claims under the act of June 14, 1878.

With respect to how loans made by the Government on vessels under the Merchant Marine Act would be affected by the withholding of amounts becoming due under ocean-mail contracts—either temporarily pending sufficient appropriations or permanently in the event of performance and failure of the Congress to appropriate for the payment of the certified claims reported to it, I would suggest you seek the views of the Secretary of Commerce, who is charged with administration of that portion of the Merchant Marine Act.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. MCCARL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 60, noes 4.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 13, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—302

Adair	Driver	Lemke	Richards
Allen	Duffy, N. Y.	Lesinski	Richardson
Andresen	Duncan	Lewis, Colo.	Risk
Andrews, N. Y.	Dunn, Miss.	Lewis, Md.	Robertson
Ashbrook	Dunn, Pa.	Lord	Robinson, Utah
Ayers	Eckert	Lucas	Robsion, Ky.
Bacon	Eicher	Luckey	Rogers, Mass.
Bankhead	Ekwall	Ludlow	Rogers, N. H.
Barden	Ellenbogen	McAndrews	Rogers, Okla.
Barry	Engel	McClellan	Russell
Beam	Englebright	McCormack	Ryan
Beiter	Evans	McFarlane	Sabath
Biermann	Faddis	McGehee	Sadowski
Binderup	Farley	McGrath	Sanders, Tex.
Blackney	Fiesinger	McKeough	Sandlin
Bland	Flannagan	McLaughlin	Schaefer
Blanton	Ford, Calif.	McLean	Schuetz
Bloom	Ford, Miss.	McLeod	Scott
Boykin	Frey	McMillan	Scrugham
Boylan	Fuller	McReynolds	Seger
Brown, Ga.	Fulmer	McSwain	Shanley
Buchanan	Gambrill	Maas	Shannon
Buck	Gasque	Mahon	Short
Buckler, Minn.	Gavagan	Main	Smith, Conn.
Burch	Gearhart	Mapes	Smith, Va.
Burnham	Gilchrist	Martin, Colo.	Smith, Wash.
Cannon, Mo.	Gildea	Mason	Snell
Cannon, Wis.	Gillette	Massingale	Snyder, Pa.
Carlson	Gingery	Maverick	Somers, N. Y.
Carmichael	Goodwin	May	South
Carpenter	Gray, Ind.	Mead	Spence
Carter	Gray, Pa.	Meeks	Stack
Cartwright	Greever	Merritt, Conn.	Starnes
Casey	Gregory	Merritt, N. Y.	Stefan
Castellow	Griswold	Michener	Stewart
Chandler	Guyer	Millard	Stubbs
Church	Gwynne	Miller	Sumners, Tex.
Citron	Haines	Mitchell, Ill.	Sutphin
Clark, N. C.	Hamlin	Mitchell, Tenn.	Sweeney
Cochran	Hancock, N. Y.	Monaghan	Taber
Coffee	Hart	Montague	Tarver
Colden	Healey	Moran	Taylor, Tenn.
Cole, Md.	Higgins, Mass.	Mott	Terry
Cole, N. Y.	Hill, Ala.	Murdock	Thom
Colmer	Hill, Knute	Nelson	Thomason
Cooley	Hill, Samuel B.	Norton	Thompson
Cooper, Tenn.	Hobbs	O'Connell	Thurston
Costello	Hoffman	O'Day	Tinkham
Cox	Hollister	O'Leary	Tobey
Cravens	Holmes	O'Malley	Tolan
Crawford	Hook	O'Neal	Tonry
Creal	Houston	Owen	Treadway
Cross, Tex.	Huddleston	Palmisano	Turner
Crosser, Ohio	Imhoff	Patman	Turpin
Crowe	Jacobsen	Patterson	Umstead
Crowther	Johnson, Okla.	Patton	Vinson, Ky.
Culkin	Johnson, Tex.	Pearson	Wadsworth
Cullen	Johnson, W. Va.	Peterson, Fla.	Wallgren
Cummings	Jones	Peterson, Ga.	Warren
Curley	Kahn	Pettengill	Wearin
Daly	Kelly	Peyser	Werner
Darden	Kennedy, N. Y.	Pierce	Whelchel
Darrow	Kenney	Pittenger	Whittington
Deen	Kinzer	Plumley	Wilcox
Delaney	Kloeb	Powers	Williams
Dies	Kniffin	Rabaut	Wilson, La.
Dietrich	Knutson	Ramsay	Wilson, Pa.
Dirksen	Kocialkowski	Ramspeck	Wolcott
Disney	Kramer	Randolph	Wolverton
Ditter	Kvale	Rankin	Wood
Dockweiler	Lambertson	Ransley	Woodruff
Dondero	Lambeth	Rayburn	Woodrum
Doughton	Lamneck	Reece	Young
Doxey	Lanham	Reed, Ill.	Zimmerman
Drewry	Lea, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.	
Driscoll	Lee, Okla.	Reilly	

NAYS—13

Amlie	Fletcher	Hull	Sauthoff
Boileau	Gehrmann	Lundeen	Schneider, Wis.
Burdick	Hildebrandt	Marcantonio	Withrow
Christianson			

NOT VOTING—112

Andrew, Mass.	Caldwell	DeRouen	Fitzpatrick
Arends	Cary	Dickstein	Focht
Bacharach	Cavicchia	Dingell	Gassaway
Bell	Celler	Dobbins	Gifford
Berlin	Chapman	Dorsey	Goldsborough
Boehne	Claiborne	Doutrich	Granfield
Boland	Clark, Idaho	Duffey, Ohio	Green
Bolton	Collins	Eagle	Greenway
Brennan	Connery	Eaton	Greenwood
Brewster	Cooper, Ohio	Edmiston	Halleck
Brooks	Corning	Fenerty	Hancock, N. C.
Brown, Mich.	Crosby	Ferguson	Harlan
Buckley, N. Y.	Dear	Fernandez	Harter
Bulwinkle	Dempsey	Fish	Hartley
Hennings	Lehlbach	Perkins	Sullivan
Hess	McGroarty	Pfeifer	Taylor, Colo.
Higgins, Conn.	Maloney	Polk	Taylor, S. C.
Hoeppel	Mansfield	Quinn	Thomas
Hope	Marshall	Rich	Utterback
Jenckes, Ind.	Martin, Mass.	Romjue	Vinson, Ga.
Jenkins, Ohio	Montet	Sanders, La.	Walter
Kee	Moritz	Schulte	Weaver
Keller	Nichols	Sears	Welch
Kennedy, Md.	O'Brien	Secrest	West
Kerr	O'Connor	Sirovich	White
Kleberg	Oliver	Sisson	Wigglesworth
Kopplemann	Parks	Smith, W. Va.	Wolfenden
Larrabee	Parsons	Steagall	Zioncheck

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Sears with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Wolfenden.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Ahrends.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Focht.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Brewster.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Bacharach.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Green with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Granfield with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Parsons with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Parks with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Connery with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Marshall.
Mr. Corning with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Crosby.
Mr. Bell with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. White with Mr. Berlin.
Mr. Gassaway with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Brown of Michigan with Mr. Hennings.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Dear.
Mr. Utterback with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Eagle.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Taylor of South Carolina with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Caldwell.
Mr. Polk with Mr. Hancock of North Carolina.
Mr. West with Mr. Montet.
Mr. Dobbins with Mr. Keller.
Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Harlan with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
Mrs. Jenckes of Indiana with Mr. DeRouen.
Mr. Sisson with Mr. Dorsey.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Harter.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Moritz.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Claiborne.
Mr. Duffey of Ohio with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Brennan.
Mr. McGroarty with Mr. Zioncheck.
Mr. Brooks with Mrs. Greenway.

Mr. BACON and Mr. CULKIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MARCANTONIO changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may state the two motions now pending before the House and that the Speaker state the order in which they will be voted upon.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. A vote "nay" is a vote to sustain the position of the House conferees, is it not?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the motions, as follows:

Mr. WEARIN moves to recede and concur in Senate amendments nos. 48 and 52.

Mr. LUDLOW moves that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment nos. 48 and 52.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN].

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Speaker, upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WEARIN and Mr. O'MALLEY) there were—ayes 61, nays 187.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments nos. 48 and 52.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, line 89, amendment no. 49: Strike out "$9,450,000" and insert "$14,300,000."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert "$9,717,500."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the conference report and the various motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

PROTECTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGATION IN ADDIS ABABA

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has directed me to submit a privileged adverse report on House Resolution 504, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McREYNOLDS, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, submitted the following adverse report to accompany House Resolution 504:

"The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the 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 in Addis Ababa, having considered the same, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that it do not pass:

"The action of the committee is based upon the letter to the chairman of the committee from the Secretary of State, dated May 11, 1936."

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolution (H. Res. 504) be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPTURE OF CERTAIN ALLEGED MAIL ROBBERS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged adverse report on House Resolution 507.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MEAD, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, submitted the following adverse report (to accompany H. Res. 507):

"The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 507) calling on the Postmaster General for facts concerning allegations that postal inspectors did not cooperate with agents of the Department of Justice in the capture of certain alleged mail robbers, reports it back to the House and recommends that the resolution do not pass.

"The committee now has in its possession the information called for in House Resolution 507."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTING COMPENSATION FOR POST-OFFICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10267) to provide for adjusting the compensation of division superintendents, assistant division superintendents, assistant superintendents at large, assistant superintendent in charge of car construction, chief clerks, assistant chief clerks, and clerks in charge of sections in offices of division superintendents in the Railway Mail Service to correspond to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10267) to provide for adjusting the compensation of division superintendents, assistant division superintendents, assistant superintendents at large, assistant superintendent in charge of car construction, chief clerks, assistant chief clerks, and clerks in charge of sections in offices of division superintendents in the Railway Mail Service, to correspond to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

T. G. BURCH,
FRED H. HILDEBRANDT,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
I. H. DOUTRICH,
PHILIP A. GOODWIN,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
LYNN J. FRAZIER.
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The conference report was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a short statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to ask all Members of the House, if they can conveniently do so, to remain here until the remaining business is disposed of. We hope to get through and adjourn over until Monday.

SARAH SHELTON

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2982) for the relief of Sarah Shelton and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,000" and insert "$5,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

PENSIONS TO SOLDIERS OF THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12700) granting pensions to certain soldiers of the Civil War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Joseph Thompson, late of Capt. Isaac D. Hon's Company K, Sixty-ninth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of John C. Camden, late of Capt. James H. Bridgewater's company of State Guards and Capt. John Bridgewater's Company A, Halls Gap Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Joshua S. Mullins, late of Capt. J. M. Gooch's Company C, Halls Gap Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Milton McNabb, alias Milton McNab, late of Capt. Henry Bucksath's Company G, Thirty-fifth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of William H. Jones, late of Capt. John R. Curry's Company D, South Cumberland Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Andrew J. White, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's company, Middle Green Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of George Brewer, late of Capt. James Eversole's Company H, Three Forks Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Silas S. Shepperd, late of Capt. Walter P. Ingram's Company D, Halls Gap Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of James E. Hamilton, late of Capt. Richard Murphy's company, Pulaski and Texas Counties Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Peter Cuddy, late of Capt. Henry Bucksoth's Company G, Thirty-fifth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and Capt. Peter R. Dolman's company, Chariton County Volunteer Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

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.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12701) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of soldiers of the Civil War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Bert Milburn, helpless and dependent son of Jesse S. Milburn, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Jessie Myrtle Bennett, helpless and dependent daughter of Jonathan Bennett, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles Hovermale, helpless and dependent son of John A. Hovermale, late of Company D, One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Myra Struchen, helpless and dependent daughter of Abraham Struchen, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Francis A. Sipe, helpless and dependent son of Archibald Sipe, late of Company C, Sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Alice R. Smith, helpless and dependent daughter of William Smith, late of Company F, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Josie Siessly, helpless and dependent daughter of John Siessly, late of Company B, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sallie Hutchens, helpless and dependent daughter of Arthur Hutchens, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Daniel F. Glenn, helpless and dependent son of James Glenn, late of Company E, Fifth Battalion, and Company E, Sixth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Bertha E. Haroff, helpless and dependent daughter of William T. Haroff, late of Company K, One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles W. Ringer, helpless and dependent son of Melancthon Ringer, late of Company C, One Hundred and Twenty-first Regiment, and Company F, Sixty-ninth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Albert Braun, helpless and dependent son of John Braun, late of First Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Harry C. B. Frets, helpless and dependent son of George Frets, late of Company E, Eighty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James B. Long, helpless and dependent son of John W. Long, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Edward Butler, helpless and dependent son of Tobias D. Butler, late of Company B, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery (Twenty-first Regiment Indiana Infantry), and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Frank Burcham, helpless and dependent son of James Burcham, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Luther Hudson, helpless and dependent son of Jeremiah Hudson, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Katie Glenn, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas Glenn, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Twenty-third Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of John W. Lutz, Jr., helpless and dependent son of John W. Lutz, late of Company G, Seventy-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Maude Isabel Schuler, helpless and dependent daughter of Taylor L. Schuler, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of George N. Groff, helpless and dependent son of John Groff, late of Company D, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Alice M. Stites, helpless and dependent daughter of John J. Stites, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hester A. Bradford, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Bradford, late of Company G, One Hundred and Eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Levi Copas, helpless and dependent son of Jackson Copas, late of Company K, One Hundred and Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ivy Pitzer, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel J. Pitzer, alias Samuel E. Pitt, late of Company I, Forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lulu M. Williams, helpless and dependent daughter of Edward Williams, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hallie V. Weeks, helpless and dependent daughter of George Weeks, late of Company B, Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Jesse Mills, helpless and dependent son of Cornelius Mills, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Frank A. Boster, helpless and dependent son of James A. Boster, late of Company A, Eighty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Katie Rock, helpless and dependent daughter of John Rock, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Margaret Ann Canatsey, helpless and dependent daughter of William S. Canatsey, late of Company D, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Alice L. Calderhead, helpless and dependent daughter of William A. Calderhead, late of Company H, One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Ninth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Elmer B. Williams, helpless and dependent son of Andrew Williams, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Isabelle Scott, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry B. Scott, late of Companies D and H, Fifth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles Younger, helpless and dependent son of Charles Younger, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Michael T. Tippie, helpless and dependent son of John M. Tippie, late of Company E, One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Samuel Warner, helpless and dependent son of John Warner, late of Company F, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Everett Horton, helpless and dependent son of James S. Horton, late of Company H, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Minnie B. Leonard, helpless and dependent daughter of Andrew J. Leonard, late of Company H, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Leslie D. Hood, helpless and dependent son of John D. Hood, late of Company A, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Jennie Hopkins, helpless and dependent daughter of William Hopkins, late of Company D, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ella Carl, helpless and dependent daughter of Nathan Carl, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lewis Congrove, helpless and dependent son of Amos Congrove, late of Company I, One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Alberta B. Newman, helpless and dependent daughter of David Newman, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary Jane McGlaughlin, helpless and dependent daughter of John McGlaughlin, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. C. Bigham, helpless and dependent daughter of James Bigham, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hattie R. Wierman, helpless and dependent daughter of Eliakim Wierman, late of Warren's independent company, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles W. Smith, helpless and dependent son of Henry Smith, late of Company F, One Hundred and Sixty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Jim Meredith, helpless and dependent son of Alexander Meredith, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Simpson Pennington, helpless and dependent son of Thompson Pennington, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Nancy Ann Laird, helpless and dependent daughter of James C. Laird, late of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of George Meredith, helpless and dependent son of Alexander Meredith, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary Metzger, helpless and dependent daughter of August Metzger, late of Company H, One Hundred and First Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Azelle V. Crawford, helpless and dependent daughter of William Crawford, alias Thomas S. Carter, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment New York Veteran Infantry, and Company I, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Frances Engler, helpless and dependent daughter of George W. Engler, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Fifty-first Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of George E. Ryan, helpless and dependent son of Francis M. Ryan, late of Company B, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Robert T. Bland, helpless and dependent son of James N. Bland, late of Company K, One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Chester D. Green, helpless and dependent son of Elisha W. Green, late of Company K, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary A. Proudfit, helpless and dependent daughter of James B. Proudfit, late of Company H, One Hundred and Seventy-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James Edward Miller, helpless and dependent son of Andrew J. Miller, late of Company I, Forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Claude Stine, helpless and dependent son of Abraham Stine, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Flossie M. Ramsey, helpless and dependent daughter of James A. Ramsey, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hannah D. Warren, helpless and dependent daughter of Andrew J. Warren, late of Company C, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ida Jones, helpless and dependent daughter of William D. Jones, late of Company C, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Schott, helpless and dependent daughter of Abram M. Schott, late of Company H, One Hundred and Forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Louise E. Stockwell, helpless and dependent daughter of David Stockwell, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James C. Riley, helpless and dependent son of John D. Riley, late of Company H, Seventy-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Bettie Dillard, helpless and dependent daughter of James W. Dillard, late of Company E, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Maggie Sanders, helpless and dependent daughter of James W. Sanders, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment, and Company H, Fifty-second Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Gabriel Patrick, helpless and dependent son of Meridith Patrick, late of Company I, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ella Strutton, helpless and dependent daughter of Elisha S. Strutton, late of Company M, Third Regiment, and Company C, Eleventh Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Albert S. Miller, helpless and dependent son of Aaron J. Miller, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Adelia T. Hoover, helpless and dependent daughter of James Hoover, late of Company I, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Minnie G. Jones, helpless and dependent daughter of Alonzo W. Jones, late of Company G, One Hundred and Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sadie E. Goshorn, helpless and dependent daughter of George Goshorn, late of Company I, One Hundred and Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Edna B. Hartley, helpless and dependent daughter of William Hartley, late of Company D, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of William C. Fisher, helpless and dependent son of William H. Fisher, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of John Westerkamp, helpless and dependent son of Alexander Westerkamp, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Grace A. Walker, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles B. Walker, late of Company E, Eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Nellie Mae South, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry C. South, late of Company F, One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Marion Van Natta, helpless and dependent son of George O. Van Natta, late of Company E, Ninety-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Stella Littlejohn, helpless and dependent daughter of William Littlejohn, late of Company H, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Edith Pyle, helpless and dependent daughter of James W. Pyle, late of Company G, One Hundred and Ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Emma Blosser, helpless and dependent daughter of William H. Blosser, late of Company F, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Amanda Hart, helpless and dependent daughter of Absolom Hart, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sherman King, helpless and dependent son of Benton K. P. King, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of William Gage, helpless and dependent son of Daniel H. Gage, late of Company B, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ernest P. Garloch, helpless and dependent son of Peter A. Garloch, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Jackson, helpless and dependent daughter of Cyrus A. Jackson, late of Company H, Thirty-seventh Regiment

Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora S. Day, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas G. Day, late of Company E, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Martin H. Doolin, helpless and dependent son of William H. Doolin, late of Company K, Forty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Leah Kesterson, helpless and dependent daughter of Hugh Kesterson, late of Capt. Isaiah Guymon's Company A, Mercer County Battalion, Missouri State Militia, and Company D, Forty-fourth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of John Schoonmaker, Jr., helpless and dependent son of John Schoonmaker, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment, and Company K, Second Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Marion Gregory, helpless and dependent son of William Gregory, late of Company F, One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Maretta A. Booher, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel A. Booher, who was pensioned as Samuel A. Booker, late of Company H, One Hundred and Sixty-first Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Henry Friedrich, helpless and dependent son of Conrad Friedrich, late of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harry E. Duffield, helpless and dependent son of Henry D. Duffield, late of Company F, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of William P. Cope, helpless and dependent son of Emmor B. Cope, late captain and aide-de-camp, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of William E. Coughlin, helpless and dependent son of William Coughlin, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Kathryn Smith, helpless and dependent daughter of Mahlon P. Smith, late of Battery C, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Josephine Campbell, helpless and dependent daughter of Lewis Campbell, late of Company C, One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Arthur Boyce, helpless and dependent son of Joseph Boyce, late of Company K, One Hundred and Seventeenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mamie Cartmill, helpless and dependent daughter of James A. Cartmill, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Clara L. Dolman, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles M. Dolman, late of Company I, Seventy-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Cora I. Spangler, helpless and dependent daughter of Franklin G. Spangler, late of Company H, One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ammon Barkman, helpless and dependent son of Daniel Barkman, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Thomas M. Teeters, helpless and dependent son of Josiah Teeters, late of Company B, One Hundred and Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of William Barkman, helpless and dependent son of Daniel Barkman, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Harry Dubs, helpless and dependent son of Lorenzo Dubs, late of Company I, One Hundred and Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Margaret M. Saunders, helpless and dependent daughter of John W. Saunders, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ann M. Callery, helpless and dependent daughter of Phillip Callery, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Excelia Lague-Leyo, helpless and dependent daughter of Joseph Leyo, alias Joseph Lejane, late of Company E, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lewis Stamper, helpless and dependent son of Wesley Stamper, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ned Johnston, helpless and dependent son of Samuel Johnston, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Dora McCallister, helpless and dependent daughter of George W. McCallister, late of Company A, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Myrtle B. Oldfield, helpless and dependent daughter of James R. Oldfield, late of Company C, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles F. Boroff, helpless and dependent son of Daniel Boroff, late of Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charlie Campbell, helpless and dependent son of William A. Campbell, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Joke Campbell, helpless and dependent son of William A. Campbell, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hattie Campbell, helpless and dependent daughter of William A. Campbell, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Robert N. Wilson, helpless and dependent son of William D. Wilson, late of Company C, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Nannie B. Floyd, helpless and dependent daughter of Aaron Floyd, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Effie P. Chiles, helpless and dependent daughter of George W. Chiles, late of Company C, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charlie J. Dupree, helpless and dependent son of George Dupree, late of Company E, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Adam Anderson, helpless and dependent son of George B. Anderson, late of Company C, East Tennessee National Guard, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Nora A. Kitchen, helpless and dependent daughter of William N. Kitchen, late of Company I, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Jane Bernhart, helpless and dependent daughter of William Bernhart, late of Company G, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mazie Layman, helpless and dependent daughter of Daniel B. Layman, late of Company A, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Georgana Layman, helpless and dependent daughter of Daniel B. Layman, late of Company A, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Walter Clice, helpless and dependent son of John P. Clice, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Stephen, helpless and dependent daughter of Peter J. Stephen, late of Company I, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Milton Warner, helpless and dependent son of Casper Warner, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Isabel Bennett, helpless and dependent daughter of John Bennett, late of Company G, Seventy-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James A. Lenhart, helpless and dependent son of Michael Lenhart, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the House should have some explanation of these bills. We just passed one bill without any explanation.

Mr. LESINSKI. The bill H. R. 12700 was a pension bill for original soldiers of the Civil War.

Mr. O'MALLEY. How old are they?

Mr. LESINSKI. Eighty-nine, on an average.

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.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12702) granting increase of pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman how many people are provided for in this bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. In this bill there are 478 widow increases. The average age is 83 years and 4 months.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Are they getting pensions now?

Mr. LESINSKI. They are getting inadequate pensions.

Mr. O'MALLEY. How much pension are they getting?

Mr. LESINSKI. They are getting $20, and we increase it to $30.

Mr. O'MALLEY. They are getting $20; and you are increasing it to $30 for each of the four-hundred-and-some-odd people mentioned in this bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Does this omnibus bill include 400 separate bills?

Mr. LESINSKI. Four hundred and seventy-eight bills.

Mr. O'MALLEY. How much does that increase the amount to, in money, over what they are getting now?

Mr. LESINSKI. Fifty-seven thousand eight hundred and forty dollars.

Mr. O'MALLEY. An increase in pension of $57,000?

Mr. LESINSKI. Fifty-seven thousand eight hundred and forty dollars.

Mr. MAVERICK. Are those widows of Confederate soldiers or Union soldiers? [Laughter.]

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

Mr. O'MALLEY. Reserving the right to object, I am trying to get a complete explanation. The gentleman from Texas asked whether or not they are Union soldiers' widows.

Mr. LESINSKI. They are widows of soldiers under the law enacted in the year 1905.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, simply to ask a question. The old-age pension which we provided under the Social Security Act provides for a pension of $30 a month. If these widows get a $10 increase, they would then receive $30 per month, but they would not participate in that old-age pension?

Mr. LESINSKI. They will not.

Mr. BLANTON. And this is merely to equalize the pension they are getting, being 82 years of age, with what they would get even if they were not widows of soldiers?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this list of pensions for widows have the unanimous support of the Committee on Invalid Pensions?

Mr. LESINSKI. Yes; this is reported out by the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Mary Devine, widow of John Devine, late of Company B, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Capwell, widow of William E. Capwell, late of Company M, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Secrist, widow of Alexander W. Secrist, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment United States Veteran Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susanna Calhoun, widow of Samuel Calhoun, late of Company H, Two Hundred and Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Snyder, widow of Henry B. Snyder, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Cottrell, widow of Caloway Cottrell, late of Company C, One Hundred and Twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet E. Miller, widow of John Miller, late of Company K, Seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of C. Cordelia Strong, widow of Hermon A. Strong, late of Company B, One Hundred and Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eva Elliott, widow of Raburn Elliott, late of Company K, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Phebe M. Temple, widow of George W. Temple, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura E. Hancock, widow of Ephraim H. Hancock, late of Company D, Twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice M. Price, widow of Dorr Price, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary O'Flaherty, widow of Edward O'Flaherty, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment, and Company I, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Estella D. Smith, widow of David Smith, late of Company B, Fifty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Magilton, widow of Joseph Magilton, late of Company F, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susanna Singer, widow of John Singer, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cynthia Conley, widow of James Conley, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella E. Terryll, widow of John C. Terryll, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ann J. Gregg, widow of Daniel Gregg, late of Company B, Thirty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellie M. Young, widow of Thomas A. Young, late of Company F, One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah D. Stauffer, widow of William D. Stauffer, late of Company H, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Malinda M. Kistler, widow of Levi Kistler, late of the First Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate Anderson, widow of Elias W. Anderson, late of Company I, Sixty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna L. Dick, widow of George Dick, late of Company E, Fifty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lorena M. Haskins, former widow of Byron A. Straight, late of Company B, One Hundred and Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. W. Diggles, widow of John P. Diggles, late of Company M, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Comstock, widow of Merl A. Comstock, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida M. Stough, widow of Michael Stough, late of Company G, One Hundred and Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret V. Myers, widow of Jacob H. Myers, late of Company C, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucretia Beer, widow of William A. Beer, late of Companies K and B, One Hundred and Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebeca Hankinson, widow of Samuel Hankinson, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria J. Anderson, former widow of William H. Provin, late of Battery I, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate Harris, widow of Charles M. Harris, alias Charles M. Jordan, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Brown, widow of James L. Brown, alias Lemon Stiles, late of Company H, One Hundred and Eighteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eunice T. Brown, widow of Francis R. Brown, late of Companies D and C, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca Berry, former widow of Paul Tislow, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda A. Sibrel, widow of Thomas P. Sibrel, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Huldah Pedrick, widow of Hiram Pedrick, late of Company F, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Paddock, widow of Peter Paddock, late of Company B, One Hundred and Forty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Green, widow of Francillo A. Green, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Redmon, widow of William T. Redmon, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria Berghoff, widow of John T. Berghoff, late surgeon, Twenty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda M. Fleming, widow of Thomas J. Fleming, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Hindman, widow of Marian G. Hindman, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Myers, widow of David Myers, late of Company H, Seventy-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Kendall, widow of Joseph T. Kendall, late of Company H, Fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joanna E. Vickers, widow of Lorenzo Vickers, late of Company A, One Hundred and Ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Whitlock, widow of James W. Whitlock, late of the Eighteenth and Twenty-fifth Independent Batteries, New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Gibson, widow of Alexander Gibson, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy A. Vandiver, widow of Thomas Vandiver, late of Company C, Twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Belle Armel, widow of William Armel, late of Company K, One Hundred and Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Garrison, widow of Chesley F. Garrison, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Gwinn, widow of William M. Gwinn, late of Company F, Forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry (Third Cavalry), and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Cole, widow of Samuel T. Cole, late of Company G, One Hundred and Twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy E. Bucher, widow of John B. Bucher, late of Company E, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emeline Kinnaman, widow of William H. Kinnaman, late of Company F, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clementine Young, widow of John J. Young, late of Company D, One Hundred and Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy E. Blevins, former widow of Allen Blevins, late of Company E, First Regiment East Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth J. Cunningham, widow of John W. Cunningham, late of Company B, Twenty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Swing, widow of Marcus A. Swing, late of Company A, One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elnora McDowell, widow of William P. McDowell, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Barnholt, widow of Edward Barnholt, late of Company H, Two Hundred and Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Helen Gallagher, widow of William G. Gallagher, late of Company I, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate C. George, widow of David George, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma J. Miller, widow of Oliver P. Miller, late of Company E, One Hundred and Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Lafferty, widow of Jacob P. Lafferty, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine E. Hinkle, widow of Samuel A. Hinkle, late of Company D, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie I. McCoy, widow of Alfred R. McCoy, late of Company B, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Moody, widow of Francis M. Moody, late of Company K, One Hundred and Sixty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Pocock, widow of Edgar J. Pocock, late of Companies F and C, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Reichard, widow of William A. Reichard, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate Rogers, former widow of David R. Jones, late of Company D, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of L. Belle Bailey, widow of George M. Bailey, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Jones, widow of Dennis Jones, late of Company E, Fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane A. Taylor, widow of William A. Taylor, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Blair, widow of Joseph F. Blair, late of Battery A, First Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan Buckingham, widow of Thomas G. Buckingham, late of Company D, Forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Cooley, widow of Dawson Cooley, late of the Twenty-sixth Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Decimay Ely, former widow of Washington Ely, late of the Seventh Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Deborah Hunter, widow of Sullivan Hunter, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Miranda C. Thompson, widow of William W. Thompson, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ruth P. Shivers, widow of Robert E. Shivers, late of Company I, Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Clemons, widow of Robert T. Clemons, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie F. Bloom, widow of Jesse H. Bloom, late of Company F, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eva A. Holter, widow of Alfred H. P. Holter, late of Company K, One Hundred and Fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth J. Coburn, widow of Oscar M. Coburn, late of Company D, Third Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Grange, widow of Charles E. Grange, late of Company F, Eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth L. Crist, widow of Abram L. Crist, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Sturm, former widow of Anthony Loudenburg, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth S. Simpson, widow of John T. Simpson, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Catlin, widow of Charles G. Catlin, late of Company A, First Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia Poust, widow of Henry Poust, late of Company F, One Hundred and Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Malisa Morris, widow of Daniel B. Morris, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Davis, widow of John R. Davis, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Christena M. Sharp, widow of Samuel Sharp, late of Company D, One Hundred and Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lydia E. Laton, former widow of Samuel H. Harrison, late of Companies D and G, Sixty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eunice A. Collins, widow of Franklin A. Collins, late of Company M, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Addie M. Eggleston, widow of Charles Eggleston, late of Company M, Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alwilda E. Seymour, widow of George W. Seymour, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Erzelia A. Lackey, widow of Moses H. Lackey, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Grunert, widow of Henry C. Grunert, late of Company F, One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary H. Ackley, widow of William P. Ackley, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Pickard, former widow of Frederick Wieber, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Merrill, widow of George Merrill, late of Company A, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emogene Allen, widow of Alonzo Allen, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy Fish, widow of Orville Fish, late unassigned, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura Joles, widow of William A. Joles, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Vandresar, widow of Richard B. Vandresar, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Everett, widow of Daniel Everett, late of Company C, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice W. Butts, widow of Daniel D. Butts, late of Company D, One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella A. Hart, widow of Charles H. Hart, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Hennesey, widow of William Hennesey, late of Company F, One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Etta A. Johnson, widow of Myron Johnson, late of Company L, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida Bloss, widow of Jotham Bloss, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rose A. Pettigrew, former widow of John P. Pettigrew, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Victoria Gould, former widow of Russell M. Smith, late of Company G, Eighty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. McAlearney, widow of John D. McAlearney, late of Company E, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy A. Beckwith, widow of Daniel W. Beckwith, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Cahoone, widow of Gideon A. Cahoone, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment, and Company G, Seventh Regiment, Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie E. Chappell, widow of Charles L. Chappell, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Augusta E. Cutler, widow of Alvin Cutler, late of Company C, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha M. Tryon, widow of Henry W. Tryon, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Webb, widow of Elias Webb, Jr., late of Company B, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Violet S. Woodward, widow of Ward N. Woodward, late of Company E, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rachel Smith, widow of James E. Smith, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sophie M. Swigert, widow of Marcus V. Swigert, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy South, widow of Andrew J. South, late of Company D, One Hundred and Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Rupe, widow of Jonathan Rupe, late of Company H, Fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Russell, widow of Timothy Russell, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Pickens, widow of David S. Pickens, late of Company F, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Ribel, widow of Peter Ribel, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Martin, widow of John W. Martin, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Dorinda Phillips, widow of George S. Phillips, late of Company D, One Hundred and Eighty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Effie C. Greene, widow of Alonzo J. Greene, late of the Thirteenth Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery; and Company A, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Kaneff, widow of George W. Kaneff, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Gramm, widow of Frederick Gramm, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henrietta H. Eator, widow of Ira Eator, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Melissa Endicott, former widow of Henry C. Grant, late of Company B, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Derry, widow of John H. Derry, late of Company B, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. DeWitt, widow of Philip DeWitt, late of Company B, One Hundred and Ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julina Crabtree, widow of Jeremiah Crabtree, late of Company H, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Dougherty, widow of Ezra Dougherty, late of Company I, One Hundred and Seventy-second Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane Cooper, widow of John C. Cooper, late of Company F, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Conaway, widow of George Conaway, late of Battery B, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria S. Carsey, widow of Seldon W. Carsey, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Collins, widow of William C. Collins, late of Company B, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adabelle Brown, widow of Anderson Brown, late of Company E, One Hundred and Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amy F. Brown, widow of Charles Brown, late of Company D, Ninety-second Regiment, and Company H, Thirty-first Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Agnes Bentley, widow of Sampson Bentley, late of Company L, Eleventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Board, widow of Daniel A. Board, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Arthur, widow of Azariah Arthur, late of Company D, Fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eva Barlow, widow of Marion S. Barlow, late of Company B, Ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora A. Pattison, widow of W. Terrell Pattison, late of Company D, One Hundred and Thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura A. Smith, widow of Jedediah Smith, late of Company D, Eighty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Perky, widow of Charles Perky, late of Company E, One Hundred and Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances A. Carter, widow of Theodore B. Carter, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and One Hundred and Second Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Abrams, widow of Daniel W. Abrams, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth A. Crum, widow of Jacob Crum, late of Company C, One Hundred and Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lillie A. Athey, widow of John W. Athey, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza C. Dunlap, widow of William Dunlap, late of Company C, Seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances C. Gaskill, widow of Harvey Gaskill, late of Company L, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Phoebe A. Jennings, widow of George C. Jennings, late of Company M, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cordelia Hiatt, widow of Joseph O. Hiatt, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Pittman, widow of Thomas Pittman, late of Company C, Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah M. McCullough, widow of William McCullough, late of Companies F and E, Thirty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet Reynolds, widow of Hayden Reynolds, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Wick, widow of Henry Wick, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Teague, widow of William W. Teague, late of Company I, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. King, widow of Howard King, late of Company H, Two Hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Miller, widow of Nicholas D. Miller, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Eberly, widow of Henry J. Eberly, late of Company L, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Drusilla Barnhart, widow of Montgomery Barnhart, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ernestine Singer, widow of Simon Singer, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna Flint, widow of Myron L. Flint, late of Company F, Fortieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Diehl, widow of Abraham Diehl, late of Company E, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria A. Houston, widow of Samuel E. Houston, late of Company K, One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha C. Howe, widow of John Howe, late of Company B, Ninety-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Snyder, widow of John W. Snyder, late of Company I, One Hundred and Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sallie Miller, widow of Nathan Miller, late of Company E, One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Winnie Hazard, widow of Flem Hazard, late of Troop A, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha R. Henderson, widow of Richard Henderson, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Blacketer, widow of George H. Blacketer, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Vigus, widow of John H. Vigus, late of Company B, One Hundred and Twenty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Appelt, widow of Gottlieb Appelt, late of Company H, One Hundred and First and Thirty-seventh Regiments New York Volunteer Infantry; and Battery K, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda A. Button, former widow of John Hoil, late of Company D, Second Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Miller, widow of George Miller, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine B. McCarthy, widow of Lawrence D. McCarthy, late of Company F, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Seward, widow of Christian Seward, late of Company I, Forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Bridget Haley, widow of Michael Haley, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie V. Myers, widow of Peter J. Myers, late of Company A, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mathilda Danielson, widow of Daniel Danielson, late of Company D, Fifty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret A. Bradshaw, widow of John G. Bradshaw, late of Company B, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Florence I. Huss, widow of William O. Huss, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emily J. McCready, widow of Jacob A. McCready, late of Company G, Sixty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan I. Queen, widow of William H. Queen, late of Company E, Forty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Robinson, widow of William A. Robinson, late of Company K, Seventieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Miriam A. Williams, former widow of David N. Sayrs, late of Company F, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Snyder, widow of John Snyder, late of Company G, Eighty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara L. Waggoner, widow of William R. Waggoner, late of Company M, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Ferguson, widow of Finley H. Ferguson, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Sims, widow of William B. Sims, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sophia Huber, widow of Joseph Huber, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza A. Washington, widow of Charles Washington, late of Company K, One Hundred and Sixteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Florence S. McGinnis, widow of Archibald McGinnis, late of Company A, Ninety-first and One Hundred and Twentieth Regiments Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nora D. Neal, widow of James H. Neal, late of Company B, One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy C. Austin, widow of Pleasant Austin, late of Company M, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria O. Fowler, widow of George Fowler, late of Company K, One Hundred and Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy Fopay, widow of Charles Fopay, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan B. Hill, widow of Silas P. Hill, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Morris, widow of William S. Morris, late of Company C, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret I. Maiden, widow of Jasper N. Maiden, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kittie G. Bozard, widow of Ashbel L. Bozard, late of Company C, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Evelyn C. Devereaux, widow of William H. Devereaux, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Addie J. Wheeler, widow of Solomon Wheeler, late of Company C, Second Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Augusta Bittmayer, widow of John Bittmayer, late of Company B, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jenettie E. Evans, widow of Daniel B. Evans, late of Battery K, First Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Miriam E. Crampton, widow of John H. Crampton, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry (subsequently Third New York Volunteer Cavalry), and Company K, Fifty-fourth Regiment New York National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella G. Millspaugh, widow of Pathuel Millspaugh, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Pierce, widow of Lyman Pierce, late of Company M, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Betsy A. Noble, widow of Bartlett A. Noble, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan C. Stanley, widow of Luther Stanley, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha F. Reynolds, widow of Norman Reynolds, late of Company A. Forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Wilson, widow of James Wilson, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emily Turner, widow of Myron Turner, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry; and the Twenty-second Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amelia A. Owen, widow of Benjamin F. Owen, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. H. Fisher, former widow of John A. Fisher, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Maley, widow of Edward Maley, late of Company C, Ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane Pelletier, widow of Joseph Pelletier, late of Company B, First Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Richmond, widow of Edward L. Richmond, late of Company A, First Battalion Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry; and Company F, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Addie L. Wright, widow of Edward O. Wright, late of Company E, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louise E. Van Norden, widow of James W. Van Norden, late of Company K, First Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella S. T. Witbeck, widow of C. William Witbeck, late principal musician, Ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Burley Van Fleet, former widow of Ideral K. Van Fleet, late of Company C, Thirty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary G. Van Brunt, widow of Henry Van Brunt, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry; and the One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Company, second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary B. Norwood, widow of William Norwood, late of Company G, Fiftieth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Fronia L. B. Norwood, widow of Thomas W. Norwood, late of Company F, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Koontz, widow of Jacob Koontz, alias Jacob Kuntz, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice Paul, widow of David Paul, late of Company F, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida Nagel, widow of William H. Nagel, late of Company I, Thirty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Gorsuch, widow of Richard M. Gorsuch, late of Company H, First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Tucker, widow of John Tucker, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary B. Beckett, widow of William H. Beckett, late of Company D, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie I. Lusk, widow of Absalom A. Lusk, late of Company K, One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Curtis, widow of Horatio O. Curtis, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Mearkle, widow of David S. Mearkle, late of Company G, Ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret E. Laidig, widow of Jeremiah Laidig, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie V. Wilson, widow of Thomas H. Wilson, late of Company C, Thirty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rowena Grice, widow of La Fayette Grice, late of Company G, Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Crets, widow of Frank Crets, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan F. Behymer, widow of John Behymer, late of Company D, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maggie Burke, former widow of Henry Snitker, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Burd, widow of Jesse Burd, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Diker, widow of Charles Diker, late of the Third Independent Company, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Safrona Elliott, widow of Isam Elliott, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fourteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma R. Pettie, widow of Harrison Pettie, late of Company K, Seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennette Knapp, widow of George Knapp, late of Company G, One Hundred and Fifty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Odor, widow of William Odor, late of Company K, One Hundred and Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rosetta W. Ringer, widow of Benjamin R. Ringer, late of Company F, Sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Terry, widow of Joseph B. Terry, late of Company H, One Hundred and Seventeenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen J. Vince, widow of William Vince, late of Company C, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 pbr month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Cook, widow of John Cook, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jeanette Wallace, widow of William Wallace, late of Company B, One Hundred and Sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Shelton, widow of Joseph Shelton, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment, and Company C, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha McGraw, widow of Wesley McGraw, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Delila Coffman, widow of George M. Coffman, late of Company I, One Hundred and Eighty-fifth Regiment Ohio Vol-

unteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia A. Hull, widow of David Hull, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary M. Devol, widow of Allen Devol, late of Company G, One Hundred and Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Buckingham, widow of John Buckingham, late of Company L, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Baker, widow of John A. Baker, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Foughty, widow of Samuel Foughty, late of Company A, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Noble, widow of Henry S. L. Noble, late of Company D, Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Swick, widow of Martin V. B. Swick, late of Companies D and K, Sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Orndurf, widow of William M. Orndurf, late of Company F, One Hundred and Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Flora Smith, widow of Amos Smith, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Birdie L. Santee, widow of Joseph W. Santee, late of Company H, One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Turner, widow of James Turner, late of Company A, One Hundred and Ninty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alwilda Ray, widow of Sylvester Ray, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret C. Mills, widow of Franklin G. Mills, late of Company D, One Hundred and First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Wilson, widow of David Wilson, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Isabelle Call, widow of Harrison O. Call, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret A. Morse, former widow of George B. Morse, late of Company G, One Hundred and First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Saxton, widow of Burton Saxton, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Dora B. Reynolds, widow of James T. Reynolds, late of Company E, Forty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maime F. Presley, widow of Henry A. Presley, alias Henry A. Plesley, late of Company G, One Hundred and Ninety-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Van Treese, widow of Asbury D. Van Treese, late of Company B, First Battalion Nevada Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary F. Hudgens, widow of James M. Hudgens, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. Humphreys, former widow of Elias Templeton, late of Company F, One Hundred and Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah I. Tomlin, widow of Calmet J. Tomlin, late of Company C, Third Regiment, and Company L, Sixth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice Chapman, widow of Samuel R. Chapman, late of Company C, One Hundred and Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan A. Pitts, widow of John W. Pitts, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Magdalene Emrich, widow of William F. Emrich, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida H. Rupert, widow of John Rupert, late of Company F, Ninetieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leah Jones, widow of James Jones, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Dennison, widow of Edward Dennison, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Phenia E. Howard, widow of Stephan D. Howard, late of Company G, Eightieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Georgianna Barker, widow of Edward Barker, late of Company H, One Hundred and Forty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna Keener, widow of Edward Keener, alias Edward Corney, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lydia J. Allard, widow of Jonathan Allard, late of Company E, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen E. Smith, widow of George M. Smith, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella M. Tansey, widow of Anthony Tansey, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Straube, widow of Christian Straube, late of Company B, Forty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Katharina Reis, widow of Robert Reis, late of Company C, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Bays, widow of Thomas J. Bays, late of Company H, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lyda Powell, widow of Louis Powell, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella G. Munhall, widow of Thomas T. Munhall, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella N. Herwick, widow of Thomas G. Herwick, late of Company G, One Hundred and Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Duncan, widow of Alexander Duncan, alias Albert Duncan, late of Company B, One Hundred and Ninety-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Cavanagh, widow of Richard Cavanagh, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company E, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Wetmiller, former widow of Samuel Hummel, late of Companies E and F, Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Aikens, widow of George C. Aikens, late of Company E, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Jane Bump, widow of Edwin Bump, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, subsequently Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma S. Dolaway, widow of George Dolaway, late of Company I, Fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella J. Winegar, widow of William W. Winegar, late of Company B, One Hundred and Thirtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry (Nineteenth Volunteer Cavalry), and Company B, First Regiment New York Dragoons, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie L. Fay, widow of Albert R. Fay, late of Company A, Hoffman's battalion, One Hundred and Twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Clark, widow of Dwight C. Clark, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment, and Company M, Second Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet Brownrigg, widow of George Brownrigg, late of Company G, One Hundred and Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of L. Georgia D. Crane, widow of Henry F. Crane, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Columbia Hankins, widow of Alexander Hankins, late of Company E, One Hundred and Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret V. Besa, widow of Alexander Besa, late of Company F, One Hundred and Ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Bulluck, widow of Warren Bulluck, late of Company D, Ninety-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Agnes C. Johnson, widow of Nelson W. Johnson, late of Companies H and F, Ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie G. Dyer, widow of James W. Dyer, late of Company A, One Hundred and Eighteenth Regiment, and Company E, Ninety-sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mariah C. Kent, widow of George H. Kent, late of Company C, One Hundred and Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and continue the $20 per month additional pension now being paid for the relief and benefit of Lorenzo Kent, helpless and dependent son of the soldier, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The name of Laura M. Shipman, widow of Albert O. Shipman, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Deborah Pond, widow of Joseph W. Pond, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida M. Lent, widow of George W. Lent, late of Company D, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara F. Tower, widow of Almon Tower, late of Company G, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rose Ann Richards, widow of David Richards, late of Company H, One Hundred and Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate P. Shannon, widow of James W. Shannon, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Warman, former widow of Alvin V. Reynolds, late of Company C, Seventy-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie Washburne, widow of William E. Washburne, alias William E. Conneally, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and One Hundred and Sixtieth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Christiann Perrigo, widow of David L. Perrigo, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment, and Company F, Sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura E. Boze, widow of William Boze, late of Company E, Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Chapman, widow of Cary D. Chapman, late of Company L, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. McLellen, former widow of Theodore F. McLellen, late of Company M, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Oliver, widow of David Oliver, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Lee, widow of Charles H. Lee, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy A. Bortner, widow of Henry S. Bortner, late of Company B, One Hundred and Fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Casler, widow of Henry Casler, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie Holman, widow of R. Brunson Holman, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Gage, widow of Augustus M. Gage, late of Company H, One Hundred and Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and One Hundred and Thirty-first Company, Second Battalion Veterans' Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane M. French, widow of Edwin Y. French, late of Company C, Sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and hospital steward, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Spencer, widow of James Spencer, late of Company I, One Hundred and Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Hawk, widow of Emanuel Hawk, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Orrie S. McCutcheon, widow of James N. McCutcheon, late of Company A, One Hundred and Ninety-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Olive J. Ebert, widow of Charles W. Ebert, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Coonradt, widow of William A. Coonradt, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eighty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Campbell, widow of Henry Campbell, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Rinehart, widow of John Rinehart, late of Company F, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Minnie B. Bell, former widow of Augustus C. Bell, late of Company D, One Hundred and Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elmira J. Earhart, widow of William H. Earhart, late of Company G, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Melissa D. Smith, widow of John Mc. Smith, late of the unassigned Ringgold Battalion, and Company A, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Hochstetler, widow of William Hochstetler, late of Company H, First Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Twentieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Provisional Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie C. Knox, widow of William C. Knox, late of the Signal Corps, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice Jordan, widow of Jacob L. Jordan, late of Company H, One Hundred and Fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cynthia A. Mitchell, widow of Wyatt M. Mitchell, late of Company E, Ninety-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha A. Santway, widow of Henry E. Santway, late of Company G, One Hundred and Ninety-third Regiment

New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma B. Korn, widow of John Korn, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment, and Company C, One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rachel A. Barr, widow of John C. Barr, late of Company D, Fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Wiley, widow of Aquila Wiley, late colonel, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and major, Eighth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Agnes E. Silvernail, widow of Warren S. Silvernail, late of Company D, One Hundred and Twenty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mabel A. La Forge, widow of James La Forge, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie E. Robinson, widow of William Robinson, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen V. Gillson, widow of Oliver P. Gillson, late of Company L, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company L, Second Regiment Provisional New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara A. De Kay, widow of Peter De Kay, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna N. Osterhout, widow of Abraham Osterhout, late of Company K, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Buchanan, widow of James A. Buchanan, alias James A. Buck, late of Company I, Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Lindsey, widow of Robert Lindsey, late of Company D, Forty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura E. Coon, widow of Martin V. B. Coon, late of Company G, One Hundred and Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma I. Smith, widow of Lyman Smith, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Etta L. Tifft, widow of James H. Tifft, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Stone, widow of James R. Stone, late of Companies H and K, Forty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Johnston, widow of Miles Johnston, late of Company E, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie M. Warner, widow of Benjamin W. Warner, late of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Georgianna K. Griest, widow of William P. Griest, late of Company I, Two Hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy McClay, widow of William McClay, late of Company E, One Hundred and Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy Hyson, widow of Robert Hyson, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia Woods, widow of Thomas Woods, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lida A. Beverly, widow of Jacob Beverly, late of Company L, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Brittie Ann Gault, widow of John T. Gault, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mildred C. Sexton, widow of John F. Sexton, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anzina L. Harper, widow of Henry B. Harper, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Barbara Cook, widow of John P. Cook, late of Company B, Eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Johanna E. Mouser, widow of Robert I. Mouser, late of Company M, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucinda Lauck, widow of Michael Lauck, late of Company D, Ninety-ninth Regiment, and Company D, Fiftieth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora L. Cole, widow of Jeremiah Cole, late of Company B, One Hundred and Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma C. Bender, widow of Joseph L. Bender, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah D. Brooke, widow of Franklin G. Brooke, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Van Tuyl, widow of John R. Van Tuyl, late of Battery A, First Battalion New York National Guard Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma L. Locklin, widow of John H. Locklin, late of Company F, Sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hester A. Walmer, widow of John Walmer, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Hill, widow of William Hill, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Brown, widow of Martin Brown, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances A. Kuder, widow of Albert D. Kuder, late of Company G, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Brown, widow of William Brown, late of Company K, One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Regiment, and Company I, One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eunice N. Palmer, widow of William H. Palmer, late of Company B, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy A. Welch, former widow of Lewis Welch, late of Company A, Sixty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen A. Stevens, widow of Merari B. Stevens, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret I. Reider, widow of Emanuel Reider, late of Company C, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and continue the $20 per month additional pension now being paid for the relief and benefit of Joseph Reider, helpless and dependent son of the soldier, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The name of Mary Buhrer, widow of Martin Buhrer, late of Company C, Sixty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine J. Cupp, widow of Samuel Cupp, late of Company I, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet Deamer, widow of Solomon Deamer, late of Company D, One Hundredth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Abbie Davison, widow of Lewellyn C. Davison, late of Company I, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Marks, widow of Alonzo Marks, late of Company A, Sixty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay

her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Kohn, former widow of Obadiah Larimer, late of Company C, Sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Christena Huffman, widow of Christian Huffman, late of Company E, Eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza V. Stevens, widow of John L. Stevens, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and Twenty-fourth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizebeth Klepper, widow of Theodore Klepper, late of Company G, One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisiana Cabe, widow of Lucius H. Cabe, late of Company C, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kathryn Bruce, widow of John W. Bruce, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet E. Bryan, widow of Samuel C. Bryan, late of Company H, One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna J. Flick, widow of Benjamin Flick, late unassigned, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lydia R. DuBois, widow of John T. DuBois, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate Schnetzler, widow of Martin Schnetzler, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine A. Page, widow of George W. Page, late of Company A, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Simmons, widow of John Simmons, late of Company I, Forty-third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret C. Lee, widow of William W. Lee, late of the band, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Weiser, widow of George Weiser, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Pendegrast, widow of William Pendegrast, late of Company D, Forty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara B. Kirkendall, widow of Lyman F. Kirkendall, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Reynolds, widow of Henry E. Reynolds, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliar Bales, widow of Stephen Bales, late of Company A, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate M. Farrell, widow of John Farrell, late of Company H, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate Riker, widow of Charles E. Riker, late of Company D, One Hundred and Ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora A. Townsend, widow of Hiram L. Townsend, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna E. Kaney, widow of Joseph Kaney, late of Company F, One Hundred and Eighty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Parish, widow of Oris Parish, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lula H. Powers, widow of Rodney M. Powers, late of Troop H, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Constant, widow of John C. Constant, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sophia Rawlins, widow of Richard N. Rawlins, late of Company H, One Hundred and Forty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lydia Atkins, widow of Lewis Atkins, late of Company D, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth J. Winklepleck, widow of Samuel Winklepleck, late of Companies A and B, Second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Stout, widow of Martin Stout, late of Company F, One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Regiment, and Company A, Sixtieth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary V. Conine, widow of Alfred Conine, late of Company C, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. McNeil, widow of Robert McNeil, late of Company C, One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lovena Tripplett, widow of Calvin Triplett, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary M. Gibbs, widow of Jaseph F. Gibbs, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy Jarrett, widow of James M. Jarrett, late of Company C, Seventy-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances M. Small, widow of William H. H. Small, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nettie S. Taylor, former widow of William C. Schultz, late of Company K, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elmira M. Webb, widow of Leroy J. Webb, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Graves, widow of Chauncey H. Graves, late of Company A, Sixty-eighth Regiment, and Company K, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Abbigial J. Brownson, widow of James M. Brownson, late of Company I, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Ballard, widow of Charles L. Ballard, late of Company A, Thirty-eighth Regiment, and Company D, First Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Frank, widow of Joseph Frank, late of Company F, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and unassigned, New York Volunteer Marine Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary B. Kaiser, former widow of William Bohne, late of the band, Seventy-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. Watts, widow of Joseph E. Watts, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Quirk, widow of Thomas Quirk, late of the unassigned detachment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lovina Baumgardner, widow of John Baumgardner, late of Company E, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth A. Rickenberg, widow of John Rickenberg, late of Company I, First Regiment (Lincoln) New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah M. Flowers, widow of Selden E. Flowers, late principal musician, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Tracy Huffman, widow of William B. Huffman, late of Company G, One Hundred and First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ann R. Mongan, widow of Jeremiah Mongan, late of Company H, First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, and Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Barbara Wiley, widow of James P. Wiley, late of Company D, Second Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Phebe L. Alspaugh, widow of James Alspaugh, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Addie Allen, widow of Stockton Allen, late of Company H, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Lehnen, widow of Piere Lehnen, late of Company H, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maggie B. Gunsalus, widow of Alfred C. Gunsalus, late quartermaster sergeant, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary W. Hannaford, widow of Lyman B. Hannaford, late of Company D, One Hundred and Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Starkweather, widow of Warren H. Starkweather, late of Company H, Ninety-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hulda Bennett, widow of James Bennett, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hettie A. Miller, widow of John Miller, late of Company D, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elmira J. Douglass, widow of William H. H. Douglass, late of Company G, Fortieth Regiment, and Company K, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Smith, widow of George W. Smith, late of Company I, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nora White, widow of John White, late of Company B, Thirty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Hicks, widow of William B. Hicks, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie E. Ashcom, widow of William Ashcom, late of Company F, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Warthen, widow of Alban Warthen, late of Company C, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary G. Nohrenhold, widow of Henry S. Nohrenhold, late of Company H, One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and Company G, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances Eggleston, former widow of Edward J. Keegan, late of Company L, Seventeenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Gibbs, widow of Michael Gibbs, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Wood, widow of Edward Wood, late of Company K, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rachel P. Thomas, widow of Leonard R. Thomas, late captain, Company C, Ninety-seventh Regiment, and major, Ninety-seventh Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda L. Dare, widow of Henry C. Dare, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Adams, widow of Elmer Adams, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth M. Cox, widow of Elias G. Cox, late of Company K, Seventy-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Reynolds, widow of George W. Reynolds, late of Company M, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Smith, widow of Lampson Smith, Jr., late of Company B, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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.

PENSIONS TO CERTAIN WIDOWS AND FORMER WIDOWS OF SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES OF THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12703) granting pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Elizabeth Davis, widow of Simel Davis, late of Company C, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Idella Waid, former widow of Samuel Waid, late of Company A, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susan Melugin, widow of Amos W. Melugin, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah G. Brown, widow of Enos Brown, late of Company D, One Hundred and Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Tompkins, widow of William Tompkins, late of Company F, Forty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Missouri P. Benton, widow of William D. Benton, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Nichols, widow of Albert Nichols, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Caroline Denny, widow of Isaac Denny, late of Company C, Sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary H. Nash, widow of George S. Nash, late of Company D, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy M. Pierce, widow of Franklin D. Pierce, late of Capt. Walter P. Ingram's Company D, Hall's Gap Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Wagner, widow of Charles Wagner, late of Company E, First Regiment Maryland Veteran Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alice Cook, widow of Gilbert Cook, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Johnson, widow of Francis M. Johnson, late of Companies D and B, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Florence I. Steele, widow of George W. Steele, late of Company I, Sixty-first Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Flora Turner, widow of George W. Turner, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Ruth I. G. Pridham, former widow of Joseph L. Goulette, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer

Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Louisa M. Alcorn, widow of William W. Alcorn, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rachel A. Updegraff, widow of Uriah H. Updegraff, late of Company B, Fifty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Kate F. Alderson, widow of John T. Alderson, late of Company K, One Hundred and Nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susanna Pearce, widow of Lewis S. Pearce, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary W. Leslie, widow of John M. Leslie, late of Capt. Warren W. Harris' company of Howard County Volunteer Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rachel Nash, widow of Thomas J. Nash, late of Capt. H. C. Donnohue's company of Pettis County Volunteers, Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy Triplet, widow of George Triplet, late of Company B, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Ella Taylor, widow of James H. Taylor, late of Company I, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Margaret E. Pryce, former widow of Jacob A. Thuma, late of Company C, Sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Parmelia J. Woodward, widow of Stephen P. Woodward, late of Company E, One Hundred and Forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes Metcalf, widow of Allen Metcalf, late of Company I, Thirty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Pearl Brentlinger, widow of Levi Brentlinger, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Orvilla Finton, widow of James Finton, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eleanor R. Gage, widow of William G. Gage, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Jane S. Murphy, widow of George W. Murphy, late of Capt. Jacob B. Cox's Company C and Capt. James H. Davis' Company K, Eighty-first Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary C. Wilkerson, former widow of James W. or Wallas Wilkerson, late of Company E, Eighty-seventh Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susan Harder, widow of John W. Harder, alias J. W. Harder, late of Capt. John Hankin's Company D, Fifty-first Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary F. Williams, widow of John Williams, late of Capt. John W. Younger's company of the Clay County Battalion Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louisa Wainscott, widow of James J. Wainscott, late of Company M, Sixteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nannie Blades, former widow of George Blades, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah C. Burnett, widow of George W. Burnett, late of Company C, Fifth Battalion Missouri State Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Edna A. Cole, widow of Henry Cole, late of the Ninth Independent Battery, Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary C. McKarnin, widow of Charles McKarnin, alias Charles Carnin, late of Capt. John W. Younger's company, Clay County Battalion, Enrolled Missouri Militia, and Capt. John W. Younger's company, Clay and Clinton County, Missouri Volunteer Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna Fletcher, widow of John R. Fletcher, late of Company D, One Hundred and Forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hattie McIntosh, widow of Perry C. McIntosh, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Amanda C. Bodenhamer, former widow of Charles McClung, late of Company E, One Hundred and Forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alice Chumbley, widow of John J. Chumbley, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Roberta Davis, widow of Thomas F. Davis, late of Company I, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret E. Stephens, widow of John E. A. Stephens, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alfrettia Smith, widow of Marion B. Smith, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Della Leach, widow of William N. Leach, late of Company B, One Hundred and Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth H. Camp, widow of William H. Camp, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Bertha T. Hastings, widow of John K. Hastings, late of Company K, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna L. Harman, widow of Benjamin F. Harman, late of Company B, One Hundred and Thirty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah Nance, widow of John Nance, late of Capt. Shadrach Combs' Company D, Three Forks Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucy Jones, widow of John L. Jones, late of Company F, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mollie Sigman, widow of John Sigman, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mumzell Woldredge, widow of John Woldredge, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Ada Simpson, widow of Simuel Simpson, late of Company G, Thirty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lorania M. Blackman, widow of William A. Blackman, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Marietta Cannon, former widow of Joseph Carver, late of Company B, One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Angeline Hart, former widow of James M. Hart, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment, and Company D, Eleventh Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Agnes P. Miller, widow of James A. Miller, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catherine Orender, widow of William Orender, late of Capt. Thomas K. Paul's company of Wright County, Volunteer Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary B. Morris, widow of William F. Morris, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Katie A. Smith, widow of Richard G. Smith, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Melissa P. Seneker, widow of Jacob C. Seneker, late of Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ida A. Borthwick, widow of Charles F. Borthwick, alias Franklin Brown, late of Company I, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes Crawford, widow of Edward Crawford, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Cora Dawson, widow of Samuel Dawson, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Cora B. Gardner, widow of James Gardner, late unassigned, Eighteenth Regiment, and Company E, Ninth Regiment, New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Ella Chapman, former widow of Charles H. Halsey, late of Company G, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary P. Smith, widow of Ellis Z. Smith, late of Company G, Seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma W. Zane, widow of Ethan L. Zane, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ruth P. Kerns, widow of John W. Kerns, late lieutenant, W. A. Cornelius' detachment of Company H, Eighty-first Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Willanna Green, widow of Thomas G. Green, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Issadorah Wilson, widow of James Brooks, known as James W. Wilson, late of Company B, Eighty-third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura E. Rowell, widow of John M. Rowell, late of Company H, One Hundred and Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Adams, widow of William H. Adams, late of Capt. William Miller's Company G, Sixtieth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and Capt. William E. McGinnis' Company H, Eleventh Regiment Kansas State Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nettie B. Protzman, widow of Absalom N. Protzman, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alfarata Phillips, widow of Hiram A. Phillips, alias Hiram A. Thomas, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eleanor A. Warren, widow of William M. Warren, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucy C. Montgomery, widow of Alexander H. Montgomery, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie Tewksbury, widow of Aaron Tewksbury, late of Company C, One Hundred and Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Harriett A. Litten, widow of Silas N. Litten, late of Company F, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Ann Melvin, widow of James M. Melvin, late of Company G, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary V. Saliesbury, widow of James Saliesbury, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Josephine Black, widow of Levi M. Black, late of Company F, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Allen, widow of Hugh Allen, late of Company F, Forty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jeanette Nelson, widow of Milton Nelson, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Carrie Thompson, widow of Joseph D. Thompson, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Second Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nora B. Dunlavy, widow of Henry F. Dunlavy, late of Company G, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna Maude Delay, widow of George W. Delay, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella Orr, widow of James Orr, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Waltenbaugh, widow of Jacob Waltenbaugh, late of Company H, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of H. Emma Streepy, widow of Isaac Streepy, late of Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes M. Jackman, widow of George C. Jackman, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna E. Eldridge, widow of William H. Eldridge, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary A. C. Scales, widow of Henry Scales, late of Company E, Twenty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary C. Learned, widow of Henry Learned, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lizzie M. Schaber, widow of Louis Schaber, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah A. King, widow of John W. King, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment, and Company I, Fifty-sixth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Wood, widow of Lewis Wood, late of Company H, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ethel S. Ferguson, widow of Samuel Ferguson, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ada Plattenberger, widow of Jacob P. Plattenberger, late of Company G, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maria B. Thompson, widow of William J. Thompson, late coal heaver, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie S. Nealley, widow of Meldon A. Nealley, late of Company B, Maine State Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louisa F. Mansfield, widow of James W. Mansfield, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Miller, widow of Winston Miller, late of Company K, One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mattie L. Stults, widow of John S. Stults, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Frances Vaughn, widow of Woodson Vaughn, late of Company F, One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Julia Lyon, widow of James B. Lyon, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Logsdon, widow of Harrison Logsdon, late of Company H, Twenty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha Kasinger, widow of Nicholas C. Kasinger, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's Company C, Middle Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Gorda James, widow of Thomas F. James, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's Company C, Middle Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alwilda Brooks, widow of Calvin W. Brooks, alias C. W. Brooks, late of Lt. Jesse B. Taggart's Company D, Middle Green River Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Sutherland, widow of Robert A. Sutherland, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mattie Bumgardner, widow of Emmett Bumgardner, late of Company F, Thirty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Marie Brown, widow of William R. Brown, late of Company H, One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Fannie L. Leonard, widow of George B. Leonard, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Banks Fuller, widow of Thomas G. Fuller, late of the Twentieth Unattached Company, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Thurman, widow of Samuel Thurman, late of Company B, One Hundred and Sixteenth Regiment, and Company I, One Hundred and Fiftieth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Goine, widow of William H. Goine, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Minnie Smith, widow of Emerson Smith, late of Company H, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nettie J. Brown, widow of Jesse Brown, alias Jesse Brown Buck, late of Company K, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catherine J. Hoyer, widow of Arthur Hoyer, late of Company A, Seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha Ella Downing, former widow of George W. Friend, late of Company E, One Hundred and Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hulda S. Dick, widow of Samuel M. Dick, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Carroll, former widow of William C. Guyer, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Thomas, widow of Andrew Thomas, alias Anderson Thomas, late of Capt. Joel C. Bussey's company of Bath County Rangers, Kentucky State Troops, and Capt. William Searcey's Company F, First Regiment, Capital Guards, Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jessie M. Warner, widow of William C. Warner, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Julia A. Taylor, former widow of William T. Wray, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Flora E. Bailey, widow of Lewis J. Bailey, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna H. Brock, widow of Allen Brock, late of Company D, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jane E. Mitchell, widow of James F. Mitchell, late of Company H, One Hundred and Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Pearl Thomas, widow of John N. Thomas, late of Company F, Fifty-fifth Regiment, and Company G, One Hundred and Fifteenth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie Lewis, widow of George Lewis, late of Company A, Fifty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maryette Sweet, former widow of Delavan Devoe, late of Company F, Fourteenth and One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiments New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Josie Greathouse, widow of William Greathouse, late unassigned, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Anna L. Rumsey, widow of Horace N. Rumsey, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lydia E. Perkins, widow of Charles Z. Perkins, late of Companies F and E, Seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Phoeba Fite, widow of Nathaniel M. Fite, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Margaret M. Crane, widow of Daniel E. Crane, late of Company D, One Hundred and Fifty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura C. Clark, widow of Walter S. Clark, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lee Rigsby, widow of James E. Rigsby, late of Company C, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah Ann B. Emry, widow of William M. Emry, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's Company C, Middle Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Belle B. Hood, widow of Andrew J. Hood, late of Company E, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sylvia Abner, widow of Isaac N. Abner, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's Company C, Middle Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie Lewis, widow of Taylor Lewis, late of Company B, One Hundred and Twenty-third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie Welborn, widow of William T. Welborn, late of Company E, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Officer, widow of Robert Officer, late of Company L, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lou Jones, widow of Francis M. Jones, late of Company K, Third Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Jemima Reeves, widow of Francis M. Reeves, late of Company B, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Bettie A. Reese, widow of Sherwood R. Reese, late of Company K, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha J. Hopper, widow of Robert B. Hopper, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Lillie Siemiller, widow of Israel Siemiller, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Sarah Smith, widow of Henry Smith, late of Capt. William Strong's Company E, Three Forks Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Moore, widow of James F. Moore, late of Company E, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Minerva Wells, widow of William Wells, late of Company D, Three Forks Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emily J. Poe, widow of Meredith Poe, late of Companies F and D, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucinda McDaniel, widow of Arthur McDaniel, late of Capt. William Strong's Company E, Three Forks Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emeline Gambrel, widow of Joseph Gambrel, alias Joseph Garbral, late of Capt. Francis M. Vaughn's Company B, Three Forks Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Polly Stewart, widow of Jesse Stewart, late of Company K, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Luticia C. Anderson, widow of King D. Anderson, late of Company A, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Green, widow of Robert Green, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Lester N. Hays, widow of William Hays, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Hannah L. Heaton, widow of Murphy Heaton, late of Company M, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Allie M. Walker, widow of Marshall A. Walker, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susan E. Jeffres, widow of William Jeffres, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment, and Company I, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maggie Allen, widow of Calvin Allen, late of Company G, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louisa Weaver, widow of Gordon Weaver, late of Companies H and E, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Martha Wyatt, widow of James E. Wyatt, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Zubie Owens, widow of William Owens, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy V. Mosher, former widow of Jonathan Rains, late of Capt. Henry G. Bollinger's company of Camden County Volunteer Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Mecomber, widow of Joseph Mecomber, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Malisa Maze, widow of William Maze, late of Lieutenant Dietrich's company, Cooper County Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie E. McKown, widow of William H. McKown, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie C. Linthicum, former widow of Christian A. Witt, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ruah L. Martin, widow of William T. Martin, late of Capt. Richard Murphy's company of Pulaski and Texas Counties, Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Knight, widow of Moses Knight, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment and Company G, Twenty-first Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Adminnistration.

The name of Sarah K. Copeland, widow of Joseph T. Copeland, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nan A. Benson, widow of McCloud Benson, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie Rhodes, widow of Jacob Rhodes, late of Company B, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Frances E. Newton, former widow of Israel Newton, alias John Scott, late of Company C, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret F. Wilson, widow of James H. Wilson, late of Companies D and G, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Flavia F. Kile, widow of Ransome Kile, late of Company A, Seventy-third Regiment, and Company I, Thirty-eighth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucretia E. Barton, widow of Morgan Barton, late of Company M, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sylvia I. Whiteman, widow of John A. Whiteman, late of Company M, Nineteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Carrie M. Poole, widow of Charles H. Poole, late of Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Burdge, widow of Alonzo G. Burdge, late of Company K, Fifty-fourth Regiment, and Company K, One Hundred and Forty-eighth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ida L. Budd, widow of George W. Budd, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie E. Key, widow of John H. Key, late of Company H, One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella Pierce, widow of Joseph H. Pierce, late of Company I, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lillie E. Brinkerhoff, widow of Leland Brinkerhoff, alias Levi Brown, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, Companies G and A, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company F, Fourth Regiment New York Provisional Cavalry (formerly First Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles), and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hortense Van Horn, widow of William H. Van Horn, late of Company D, Ninety-third Regiment New York National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna V. Peck, widow of John L. Peck, late of Company C, One Hundred and Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Marilla A. Buchwalter, widow of Edward L. Buchwalter, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie Freeman, widow of William A. Freeman, late of Company F, Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Snyder, widow of Isaac P. Snyder, late of Company I, One Hundred and Eighty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jessie B. McElroy, widow of Samuel McElroy, late of Company B, One Hundred and Eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Belle Robinson, widow of Charles H. Robinson, alias Archibald Bush, late of Company L, Twelfth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rhoda H. Lozier, widow of Alexander H. Lozier, late of Company B, Second Regiment and Company A, Fifteenth Regiment, New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Second Veteran Battalion, New Jersey Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Matilda E. A. Hornback, widow of John Hornback, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Bussard, widow of Salem Bussard, late of Company I, One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Norma Roush, widow of Eli Roush, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Debbie Klingler, widow of Isaac Klingler, late of Companies G and F, One Hundred and Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes E. Kimmel, widow of David F. Kimmel, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Annie Beals, widow of John Beals, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Jennie M. Spaulding, widow of Dennison F. Spaulding, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Florence I. Christie, widow of Joseph B. Christie, late of Company E, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of May Tuffree, widow of Francis Tuffree, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Lena L. Evans, widow of Isaac T. Evans, late of Company D, One Hundred and Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Seventh Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella B. Kinnamon, widow of Harrison Kinnamon, late of Company I, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary G. Sherwood, widow of Smith J. Sherwood, late of Captain Smith's Battery A, Chicago Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Schofield, widow of Daniel H. Schofield, alias Daniel H. Cofield, late ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and Company D, Twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Battery L, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Amanda Napier, widow of Francis M. Napier, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Belle Hockensmith, widow of Thomas L. Hockensmith, late of Company K, Seventy-seventh Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lillian La Motte, widow of William O. La Motte, late of Company H, Forty-sixth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ethel Kapp, widow of Andrew W. Kapp, late of Captain Tanner's independent company, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Fifty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mattie Mayo, widow of John A. Mayo, late of Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Della R. Birney, widow of Nelson L. Birney, late of Company F, Ninety-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lottie Smith, widow of James W. Smith, late of Company D, Eightieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary C. Severs, widow of Azaria Severs, late of Company B, Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Florence Bonnell, widow of George W. Bonnell, late of Company I, One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Narcissa Walter, widow of Israel Walter, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah R. Beggs, widow of James M. Beggs, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Julia C. Messamore, widow of Thomas Messamore, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Lizzie E. Brown, widow of Martin J. Brown, late of Company D, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rosa M. Green, widow of Solomon J. Green, late of Company B, Forty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alvesta Otto, widow of Charles A. Otto, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sadie Hainline, widow of Nathan T. Hainline, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Sarah M. Williams, widow of Benjamin F. Williams, alias F. Williams, late of Capt. W. A. Mann's company of Independent Scouts for Greenbrier County, West Virginia State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clara L. Garvin, widow of Evelyn F. Garvin, late of Company H, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Antonia Kuehn, widow of Otto Kuehn, late acting assistant surgeon (contract surgeon), United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Linder, widow of George W. Linder, late of Company H, One Hundred and Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Helen R. Pitney, widow of Orville L. Pitney, late of Company A, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Harriet A. Ward, widow of Charles H. Ward, late hospital steward, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Cluter, former widow of Absalom Hunsaker, alias Abosolm or Absolom Hunsaker, late of Company I, Fiftieth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Hoffman, former widow of John R. Hoffman, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Ellen Barker, widow of Ira Barker, Jr., late of Company G, Eighteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah A. DeGross, widow of Ross A. DeGross, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Neville S. Tout, widow of Henry C. Tout, late of Company B, One Hundred and Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Clarkson, widow of Thaddeus Clarkson, late of Company K, Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah M. Swafford, widow of George W. Swafford, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura A. Garrison, widow of Lewis W. Garrison, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alice B. Mitchell, widow of Thomas F. Mitchell, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Hayes, widow of Charles J. Hayes, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Sutton, widow of Albert Sutton, late of Company G, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie S. Bogardus, widow of John E. Bogardus, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah M. H. Nickerson, widow of Henry O. Nickerson, late of Company A, Third Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Bertha L. Wade, widow of Samuel J. Wade, late of Company C, Sixtieth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Dora B. Mann, widow of John E. Mann, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Spear, widow of Albert A. Spear, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. O'Keefe, widow of Daniel H. O'Keefe, alias Daniel Hennessy, late of Company F, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lizzie Lawson, widow of George N. Lawson, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie L. McNeill, widow of James McNeill, alias James Johnson, late of Company L, Twelfth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna Angelow, widow of William J. Angelow, late unassigned, One Hundred and First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes G. Smith, widow of Dayton Smith, late of Company D, One hundred and Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella F. Stewart, former widow of William Stewart, late of Company M, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie M. Swingle, widow of Calvin F. Swingle, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lena P. Riddick, widow of Isaac H. Riddick, late of Company A, One Hundred and Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Tuttle, former widow of Horatio J. Tuttle, late of Company B, First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, and Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie M. Oliver, widow of John F. Oliver, alias Francis Oliver, late ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucy Pierce, widow of Samuel W. Pierce, late of Company F, Seventeeth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Maggie A. Bernethy, widow of Robert P. Bernethy, late of Company F, One Hundred and Fifty-first Regiment Indiana

Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mira W. Miller, widow of Henry A. Miller, late of Company E, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hattie E. Shobe, widow of Hugh Shobe, late of Company E, One Hundred and Eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary H. Roberts, widow of Francis M. Roberts, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maude Campbell, widow of John P. Campbell, late of Company B, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Neley Keller, widow of William Keller, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Laura C. Hobbs, widow of Andrew J. Hobbs, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Cora J. Lowell, widow of Edwin A. Lowell, late of Company D, Fifty-eighth Regiment New York National Guard, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Grace E. Fairchild, widow of William Fairchild, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary E. Michaud, widow of Henry Michaud, late of Company D, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eliza J. Wilkinson, widow of Thomas A. Wilkinson, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Grace V. Lawrence, widow of Isaiah E. Lawrence, late of Company E, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lena K. Wagner, widow of Phillip H. Wagner, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Esther Critchell, widow of William Critchell, late of Companies E and C, Forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Betsy Ann Boles, widow of William M. Boles, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louise O. Bowman, widow of William H. Bowman, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Unoca Ferguson, widow of James H. Stapleton, known as James H. Ferguson, Jr., late of Company K, Fifty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Annie I. Ritz, widow of John Ritz, alias Daniel Dreibelbies, late of Company C, Sixty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lottie L. Stoner, widow of Martin G. Stoner, late of Company C, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catharine Gunderman, widow of Samuel Gunderman, late of Company F, Forty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah M. Waugh, widow of Enoch L. Waugh, late of Battery E, West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Brewer, widow of Francis M. Brewer, late of Capt. Jacob Bane's Cavalry Company E, Mercer County Battalion, Missouri State Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Della Rankin, widow of George W. Rankin, late of Company B, One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Long, widow of John C. Long, late of Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Viannie M. Walters, widow of George T. Walters, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Edith M. Cruise, widow of John D. Cruise, late telegrapher, Military Telegraph Corps of the Army of the United States, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Charlotte M. Spaulding, widow of Franklin M. Spaulding, late first lieutenant and regimental commissary, Second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sylvia Campbell, widow of Fletcher Campbell, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Herthe L. R. Whitney, widow of William W. Whitney, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susan Van Pelt, former widow of William Allerton, late of Company B, Sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Fifth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Ferguson, widow of Archey C. Ferguson, late of Company D, Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Haskin, former widow of Andrew J. Fisher, late of Company F, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elise M. Lum, widow of Cyrill A. Lum, late of Company H, One Hundred and Eighty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lu M. Linscott, widow of John F. Linscott, late of Company A, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lura H. P. Markley, widow of Henry H. Markley, late regimental commissary sergeant, Second Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ida M. Miller, widow of Alfred F. Miller, late of Company E, One Hundred and Forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Olivia Stebbins, widow of Austin E. Stebbins, late of Company C, Eighty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clara L. Owens, widow of Thomas M. Owens, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Daisy Vredenbergh, widow of Samuel F. Vredenbergh, late of Company K, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Della Bond, former widow of Jesse H. Bond, late of Company F, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Irene C. Flack, widow of William A. Flack, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eliza James, widow of Calvin James, late of Troop G, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Belle R. Taylor, widow of Richard Taylor, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susie E. Payne, widow of Arthur B. Payne, late of Company L, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes Holbrook, widow of David Holbrook, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Elizabeth Smith, widow of James W. Smith, late of Company H, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Minnie F. R. Leach, widow of Charles Leach, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alta Manypenny, widow of Albert Manypenny, late of Company I, Twenty-second and Twenty-ninth Regiments Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mattie St. Clair, widow of Grismore St. Clair, late of Company F, One Hundred and Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma T. Porter, widow of Nelson L. Porter, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Bessie Hall, widow of William Hall, late of the First Independent Battery, Minnesota Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Caroline Washburn, widow of Nelson Washburn, late of Company L, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and

increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Hattie Yarwood, widow of Norman B. Yarwood, late of Company D, First Battalion, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lillie Daley, widow of Palan R. Daley, late of Company H, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Bertha M. Lewis, widow of Samuel E. Lewis, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Joanna Gray, widow of David Gray, late of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Salina J. Slaughter, widow of Elijah T. Slaughter, late of Company K, Seventy-seventh Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hattie House, widow of Draper F. House, late of Capt. William F. Pell's company of Independent Scouts for Wirt County, West Virginia State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Julie A. Allen, widow of James Allen, late of Company K, First Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rose Milliman, widow of John Milliman, late of Company A, One Hundred and Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Louise Workman, widow of Thomas Workman, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Minnie A. Lacy, widow of Miles H. Lacy, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Carrie Stidham, widow of Samuel Stidham, late of Capt. William Strong's Company E, Three Forks Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jane Armstrong, widow of James W. Armstrong, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie E. Jackson, widow of William H. Jackson, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary E. Ringer, widow of George A. Ringer, late of Company C, Sixty-first Regiment, and Company I, Twenty-third Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Nora Pierce, widow of David E. Pierce, late of Company A, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Battery E, Kentucky Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Reatha Reneau, widow of Napoleon Reneau, late of Company M, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hattie Harvey, widow of James J. Harvey, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment, and Company K, Ninth Regiment, Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucy E. Huff, widow of Jonas Huff, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah L. Ellison, widow of Berry Ellison, late of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha Story, widow of Thomas Story, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Venia Moody, widow of Francis M. Moody, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Cinda Forbes, widow of William Forbes, late of Company E, Third Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Lake, widow of John C. Lake, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Mitchell, widow of Thomas J. Mitchell, alias T. J. Mitchell, late of Company M, Seventy-third Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and Capt. William L. Fenix's company of Taney County, Volunteer Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Effie T. McElhiney, widow of Robert T. McElhiney, alias Robert McElhaney, late of Capt. C. B. Owen's company, Missouri Home Guards, and Capt. G. H. Rumbaugh's company of Cavalry (Berry's battalion), Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lydia A. Havens, widow of Benjamin Havens, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nettie LaTour Welcome, widow of Francis D. Welcome, late of Company F, One Hundred and Seventeenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catherine C. West, widow of Handy West, late of Company A, One Hundred and Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hattie Ware, widow of Franklin Ware, late of Company B, One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Newton, widow of William B. Newton, late of the Kentucky State Volunteer Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mariah M. Johnson, widow of Greenville Johnson, late of Captain William D. Caldwell's Company G, Three Forks Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucy Leach, widow of Henry C. Leach, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maggie Berry, widow of Samuel Berry, alias Samuel Cynthiana, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lou A. Strother, widow of George W. Strother, late of Company K, First Regiment Capitol Guards, Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elsie Latshaw, widow of George Latshaw, alias George Gatshaw, late of Company D, One Hundred and Twenty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Frances Collins, widow of Levi Collins, late of Company D, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Ferris, widow of Jacob Ferris, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Hilles, widow of Charles H. Hilles, late of Troop L, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ellen Edwards, widow of James Edwards, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie Washington, widow of Otho Washington, late of Company B, Fortieth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mollie B. Clinkinbeard, widow of James L. Clinkinbeard, late of Capt. James H. Davis' Company K, Twenty-fifth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eudora M. Elkins, widow of Calvin P. Elkins, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Jane Asberry, widow of Franklin C. Asberry, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eliza Cupp, widow of Lemon V. Cupp, late of Company I, One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Julia A. Allen, former widow of Prosper W. Lawrence, late unassigned, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company I, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Lynch, widow of Thomas Lynch, late of Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Olive M. Hunt, widow of Robert R. Hunt, late of Company F, One Hundred and Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Z. Bowden, widow of Edward Bowden, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth J. Lloyd, widow of William E. Lloyd, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary A. McCullough, widow of George McCullough, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Kitty Alice Love, widow of George P. Love, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Phina McCrary, widow of Ira McCrary, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Frances C. Strickler, widow of William J. Strickler, late of Companies G and C, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Edna P. Welsh, widow of Edward A. Welsh, late of Company G, Second Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary C. Miller, widow of Samuel R. Miller, late of Company C, One Hundredth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catherine Keyser, widow of Jacob Keyser, late ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma K. Clark, widow of William F. Clark, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lana Miller, widow of William H. Miller, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louvisa Brewer, widow of Valentine S. Brewer, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy Jane Dyer, widow of King S. Dyer, late of Company C, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Hilliker, widow of John Hilliker, late of Company F, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lenace Marlin, widow of Oliver Marlin, late of Company F, One Hundred and Forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary J. Goodwin, widow of Eugene B. Goodwin, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

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.

TOM ROGERS

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8262) for the relief of Tom Rogers, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

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 Tom Rogers, and the heirs of W. A. Bell, Israel Walker, Henry Shaw, Thomas Bailey, and Joseph Watson."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT FREDERICA NATIONAL MONUMENT, ST. SIMON ISLAND, GA.

Mr. DEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8431) to provide for the establishment of the Fort Frederica National Monument, at St. Simon Island, Ga., and for other purposes, 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "area", insert "not to exceed 80 acres."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM A. DEVINE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2806) for the relief of William A. Devine be rereferred from the Committee on Civil Service to the Committee on Claims. It involves an appropriation and I do not think our committee has jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

ASSESSED VALUATION OF REAL PROPERTY TAX IN VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8287) to establish an assessed valuation real property tax in the Virgin Islands of the United States, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out all after "value", down to and including "President" in line 13, and insert "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."

Page 2, line 15, strike out "colonial" and insert "municipal."

Page 2, strike out lines 17 to 24, inclusive, and page 3, lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 5. The Virgin Islands Company 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."

Page 3, line 12, after "real" insert "and personal."

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution to correct the RECORD, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 514

Resolved, That certain matter appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1936, on page 7168, in extension of remarks of Hon. JOHN A. MARTIN, of Colorado, beginning with the words "Mr. TABER", in the next to the last line in column 1 and extending to and including the word "situation", at the end of the ninth paragraph in column 2, be stricken from the RECORD as not embraced in the consent to extend remarks, together with the introductory paragraph to said remarks of Mr. TABER, being the paragraph immediately preceding the above language ordered stricken.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, answered "present" 1, not voting 157, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—269

Adair	Dorsey	Lamneck	Robertson
Allen	Doxey	Lanham	Robsion, Ky.
Ashbrook	Drewry	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Ayers	Driver	Lee, Okla.	Russell
Bacon	Duffy, N. Y.	Lesinski	Ryan
Bankhead	Dunn, Miss.	Lewis, Colo.	Sabath
Barry	Dunn, Pa.	Lewis, Md.	Sadowski
Beam	Eckert	Lord	Sanders, Tex.
Beiter	Eicher	Lucas	Sauthoff
Biermann	Ekwall	Luckey	Schaefer
Binderup	Ellenbogen	Ludlow	Schneider, Wis.
Blackney	Engel	Lundeen	Schuetz
Bland	Englebright	McAndrews	Scott
Blanton	Evans	McCormack	Scrugham
Bloom	Farley	McFarlane	Seger
Boehne	Fiesinger	McGehee	Shanley
Boileau	Flannagan	McKeough	Shannon
Boylan	Fletcher	McLaughlin	Short
Brown, Ga.	Focht	McLean	Smith, Conn.
Buchanan	Ford, Calif.	McLeod	Smith, Va.
Burdick	Ford, Miss.	McMillan	Smith, Wash.
Burnham	Frey	McReynolds	Snell
Cannon, Mo.	Fulmer	Maas	Snyder, Pa.
Cannon, Wis.	Gavagan	Mahon	Somers, N. Y.
Carlson	Gearhart	Main	South
Carmichael	Gehrmann	Mapes	Spence
Carpenter	Gilchrist	Marcantonio	Stack
Carter	Gildea	Martin, Colo.	Starnes
Cartwright	Gingery	Massingale	Stefan
Casey	Goodwin	Maverick	Stewart
Castellow	Gray, Ind.	May	Stubbs
Chapman	Gray, Pa.	Mead	Sutphin
Christianson	Greever	Merritt, Conn.	Sweeney
Church	Griswold	Michener	Taber
Citron	Guyer	Millard	Taylor, Tenn.
Clark, N. C.	Hamlin	Mitchell, Ill.	Terry
Cochran	Hancock, N. C.	Mitchell, Tenn.	Thom
Coffee	Hart	Monaghan	Thomason
Colden	Healey	Mott	Thompson
Cole, Md.	Higgins, Conn.	Murdock	Thurston
Cole, N. Y.	Higgins, Mass.	Nelson	Tinkham
Colmer	Hildebrandt	Norton	Tobey
Cooley	Hill, Ala.	O'Connell	Tolan
Cooper, Tenn.	Hill, Knute	O'Malley	Tonry
Costello	Hobbs	Owen	Treadway
Cox	Hoffman	Parsons	Turner
Cravens	Hollister	Patman	Turpin
Crawford	Holmes	Patterson	Umstead
Creal	Hook	Patton	Vinson, Ky.
Cross, Tex.	Hope	Pearson	Wadsworth
Crosser, Ohio	Huddleston	Peterson, Ga.	Wallgren
Crowe	Hull	Pettengill	Warren
Crowther	Imhoff	Peyser	Wearin
Culkin	Jacobsen	Pierce	Weaver
Cullen	Johnson, Okla.	Pittenger	Werner
Curley	Johnson, Tex.	Plumley	Whelchel
Daly	Jones	Powers	White
Darden	Kahn	Rabaut	Whittington
Darrow	Kelly	Ramsay	Williams
Deen	Kenney	Rankin	Wilson, Pa.
Delaney	Kinzer	Ransley	Wolcott
Dies	Kloeb	Reece	Wolverton
Dietrich	Kniffin	Reed, Ill.	Wood
Dirksen	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Disney	Kocialkowski	Reilly	Zimmerman
Ditter	Kvale	Richards	
Dockweiler	Lambertson	Richardson	
Dondero	Lambeth	Risk	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amlie

NOT VOTING—157

Andresen	Bulwinkle	Dickstein	Gambrill
Andrew, Mass.	Burch	Dingell	Gasque
Andrews, N. Y.	Caldwell	Dobbins	Gassaway
Arends	Cary	Doughton	Gifford
Bacharach	Cavicchia	Doutrich	Gillette
Barden	Celler	Driscoll	Goldsborough
Bell	Chandler	Duffey, Ohio	Granfield
Berlin	Claiborne	Duncan	Green
Boland	Clark, Idaho	Eagle	Greenway
Bolton	Collins	Eaton	Greenwood
Boykin	Connery	Edmiston	Gregory
Brennan	Cooper, Ohio	Faddis	Gwynne
Brewster	Corning	Fenerty	Haines
Brooks	Crosby	Ferguson	Halleck
Brown, Mich.	Cummings	Fernandez	Hancock, N. Y.
Buck	Dear	Fish	Harlan
Buckler, Minn.	Dempsey	Fitzpatrick	Harter
Buckley, N. Y.	DeRouen	Fuller	Hartley
Hennings	McSwain	Perkins	Sullivan
Hess	Maloney	Peterson, Fla.	Sumners, Tex.
Hill, Samuel B.	Mansfield	Pfeifer	Tarver
Hoeppel	Marshall	Polk	Taylor, Colo.
Houston	Martin, Mass.	Quinn	Taylor, S. C.
Jenckes, Ind.	Mason	Ramspeck	Thomas
Jenkins, Ohio	Meeks	Randolph	Utterback
Johnson, W. Va.	Merritt, N. Y.	Rayburn	Vinson, Ga.
Kee	Miller	Rich	Walter
Keller	Montague	Robinson, Utah	Welch
Kennedy, Md.	Montet	Rogers, N. H.	West
Kennedy, N. Y.	Moran	Rogers, Okla.	Wigglesworth
Kerr	Moritz	Romjue	Wilcox
Kleberg	Nichols	Sanders, La.	Wilson, La.
Kopplemann	O'Brien	Sandlin	Withrow
Kramer	O'Connor	Schulte	Wolfenden
Larrabee	O'Day	Sears	Woodrum
Lehlbach	O'Leary	Secrest	Young
Lemke	Oliver	Sirovich	Zioncheck
McClellan	O'Neal	Sisson	
McGrath	Palmisano	Smith, W. Va.	
McGroarty	Parks	Steagall	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Hancock of New York.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Gwynne.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Sisson.
Mr. Wilcox with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. McClellan with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Merritt of New York with Mr. Houston.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire with Mr. Gasque.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. O'Leary.
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Kramer.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Faddis.
Mr. Palmisano with Mr. Haines.
Mr. Wilson of Louisiana with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Cummings with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Kennedy of New York.
Mr. Sandlin with Mr. McGrath.
Mr. Chandler with Mr. Duncan.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Polk.
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma.
Mr. Samuel B. Hill with Mr. O'Neal.
Mr. Clark of Idaho with Mr. Meeks.
Mr. Driscoll with Mr. Johnson of West Virginia.
Mr. Moran with Mr. Goldsborough.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Kopplemann.
Mr. Young with Mr. Berlin.

Mr. ADAIR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

GERMAN PIONEERS ASSISTED GREATLY IN BUILDING TEXAS—DESERVE COMMEMORATIVE MONUMENT

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—I had intended to ask it on that eulogy on the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]—but I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks without reference to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Leave out the eulogy.

Mr. MAVERICK. I will leave out the eulogy.

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

There was no objection.

GERMANS PROFOUNDLY AFFECT TEXAS HISTORY

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Texas there is to be built a monument to the German pioneers of that State. A plan has been suggested by Hon. Leo M. J. Dielmann, one of the leading architects of Texas, and a descendant of one of the early pioneers. The information which I here place in the RECORD concerning the history of these courageous pioneers has been given me by the brother of Mr. Dielmann, the Honorable Henry B. Dielmann, one of the prominent lawyers of the State of Texas. The plan suggested by Architect Dielmann calls for a lofty obelisk superimposed on a base in the form of a lone star. The interior is to be used as a historical monument.

The great commemorative obelisk is to be placed in Landa Park, New Braunfels, Tex., which is only 30 miles from San Antonio, in my congressional district, and New Braunfels is the cradle of German immigration in Texas. It was founded on Good Friday, March 21, 1845, and I am informed by reliable historians of the German migration that it is the logical site for this monument. It was the home of Dr. Ferdinand Jacob Lindheimer, who fought at the Battle of San Jacinto which established Texas as an independent republic and freed it from Mexico. Dr. Lindheimer was a distinguished botanist, the first editor of the New Braunfelser Zeitung, which he founded in 1852 and which is published to this day. New Braunfels is the first city in Texas which taxed itself for the maintenance of a public free school. In public education the German pioneers were among the leaders, and their descendants today are among the strongest supporters of public education.

The settling of a great number of Germans in Texas occurred at a time and under circumstances which profoundly affected the events leading to the independence, the security, and the prosperity of the young Texas Republic and the future Lone Star State.

A glance at the map of Texas in 1836 reveals the fact that most Texans of that day lived in the eastern and southeastern part of the State. The very first Germans who came to Texas settled on the fringes of its civilization. Austin County, where Friedrich Ernst started the first German settlement in Texas in 1831, known ever since by the significant name of "Industry", Fayette County, where Joseph Biegel founded Biegel's Settlement in 1832, were comparatively far from the then existing settlements. So were Cat Spring, founded in 1834, by Robert J. Kleberg, one of the greatest of Texas pioneers; Frelsburg in Colorado County, founded by William Frels in 1837, after he had taken part in the storming of San Antonio in 1835 and in the Battle of San Jacinto in 1836. So were the other settlements in Washington, Fayette, Colorado, and other counties.

LEFT TYRANNY—BROUGHT SPIRIT OF LIBERTY

These settlements brought many Germans to Texas at a time when every man counted for much in the struggle which was imminent. These Germans were all men who had left their native countries because of tyranny and a desire for freedom, and they brought the spirit of liberty with them. Although in Texas but a few years and not yet even well acquainted with their fellow Texans, they immediately entered the slim ranks of the Texans and fought and died at San Antonio, at Goliad, and San Jacinto, for the formation of the new Republic.

The most significant event in the history of German settlements in Texas was the organization of the Society for the Protection of German Immigrants in Texas. Under its auspices shipload upon shipload of the highest type of better citizenship, healthy and desirous of establishing homes, set foot upon Texas soil, changed the red man's hunting grounds into fields and gardens, and founded model cities and towns wherever they settled. These new German settlers did not receive their grants of land in the safe eastern and central portions of the State, but had to occupy the fringe extending from south Texas to west Texas, from the Comal and Guadalupe to the Pedernales, Llano, San Saba, and upper Colorado, the land of the fierce Comanche Tribes.

The protection which these German frontiersmen afforded their fellow Texans is enough to entitle them to a monument. But this protection also assured the German settlers of the opportunity to firmly establish their new home on Texas soil. In the villages and in the hills of the great stretch of virgin Texas lands they occupied they established New Braunfels, Fredericksburg, Sisterdale, Boerne, and Comfort as original German settlements. From them sprang the now flourishing German communities in the counties of Mason, Llano, Gillespie, Kerr, Kendall, Comal, Guadalupe, Medina, Bexar, De Witt, Victoria, Lavaca, Bastrop, Travis, Harris, and others, large areas which for examples of modern farming, orderly government, fine cities, and towns are outstanding in America.

GERMAN SETTLERS OPPOSED TO SLAVERY

Life in the early German settlements in Texas had distinct characteristics which other settlements did not possess. The German settlers did not believe in slavery. There were no Negroes in their communities. All labor was performed by themselves as self-respecting citizens. Consequently many artisans and craftsmen were present wherever Germans settled. Farming was carried on in a scientific manner. Wherever they settled they built permanent homes.

Likewise, their contact with the highest forms of social, scientific, and cultural life in the country of their origin generally was so close that travelers like Frederick Law Olmsted write of the fullness of their social life in terms of highest praise. Having brought to their new homeland the advantages of a higher education and having in their midst physicians, lawyers, university professors, able journalists, and even poets, painters, and musicians, it is not surprising that we find classical literature, scientific lectures, and the finest of music a matter of everyday enjoyment. Robert Kleberg's excellent piano, library, and paintings were lost in the burning of Harrisburg in 1836, but within a decade the music of Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven was played and sung in many a humble but happy German home in Texas.

The Germans are known the world over for their love of song. Every German immigrant who came to Texas brought with him his love of song. It cheered many a weary frontiersman and brightened the fireside of many a settler. Singing clubs were organized in every settlement. On July 4, 1853, the first Saengerfest was held at New Braunfels. Quite a number of societies organized before the Civil War are still in existence and are still members of either the Texas Gebirgssaengerbund or the Deutsch-Texanischer Staats-Saengerbund (German State Singers' League). To this day annual or biennial song festivals are held.

SONS OF HERMANN AND OTHER SOCIETIES BACK MOVE

The people of Texas owe it to themselves and to the sturdy pioneers of German extraction to build one central monument to their memory, large enough to depict the outstanding services they rendered at San Antonio, at Goliad, at San Jacinto in the fight for liberty, and after independence in the great work they did in the building of the great Lone Star State.

The movement to erect this monument is in the hands of a corporation called Monument Association for the German Pioneers of Texas. Among the board members are Martin Faust, Carl Biebers, Paul J. Hertting, Henry B. Dielmann, C. A. Goeth, G. F. Neuhaeuser, George Haeusler, Robert H. Wagenfuehr, John R. Fuchs, and other prominent men. The Sons of Hermann in Texas, the Catholic State League, the Texas State Saengerbund, the Mountain Singing Societies, the Association of German Societies in Texas, and well-known Texans like the late Gen. Jacob F. Wolters, Charles Nagel, a native Texan, Erhard Guenther, Hermann Ochs, Morris Stern, Ernst Raba, Fred Reutzel, Otto Meerscheidt, Jesse Oppenheimer, Mrs. Otto Koehler, F. C. Weinert, Dr. Biesele, and many others have endorsed the movement.

Mr. Speaker, the German pioneers not alone deserve this monument for their public service in our fight in Texas for liberty but for their plain, hard-working citizenship and orderly building. With their good traits of character, they also paid their taxes for the support of their Government. Their descendants, now numbering several hundred thousand, are proud of their heritage, but are at the same time good, patriotic American citizens. Many of them are the best leaders of Texas and substantially contribute to the welfare of the State and Nation.

HISTORY OF IMPEACHMENT TRIALS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a speech I delivered myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my speech before the American Judicature Society, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, on the evening of May 6, 1936, as follows:

A very serious mistake was made as to this part of the program. You should not have "picked on me", a simple country boy, when my two friends, the other managers on the part of the House, really know something about the subject and were primarily responsible for the success of the prosecution which resulted in the recent purge of the bench. I would not be true to myself nor to your confidence in me if I did not pay my tribute of respect to the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, who deserves practically all of the credit for this achievement, who knows more about the law of impeachment, and who has done more to clarify and rectify thought on the subject, than any man I know. I would that he had been invited to speak, instead of the speaker you did select. I am at a loss as to why you have chosen a "green" country boy like me to speak in such august presence, on a subject that has engaged some of the best thought of our profession. I am borne out in my apology by the word of the distinguished man to whom I have just referred. I was in Alabama when the House elected me as one of the managers. When I returned I went to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who had influenced the selection, I felt sure, and expressed my appreciation of the honor that had been done me. He said: "Don't be getting the bighead about this appointment—we figured that we needed both feet and heads on this committee, and you are to be the feet!" So you have the feet of the committee before you, and I am bold enough to try to speak to you only because you have wished it on yourselves!

You all know, I am sure, the history of impeachment trials—that they are the gift of Anglo-Saxon civilization. The outgrowth of this particular kind of trial appears in history about the fourteenth century, but we find it in its tribal form much further back than that, through several stages of development, until its emergence about the fourteenth century. For the last 200 years the present form of impeachment trial as we know it has been followed. There has been no change worthy of mention. Therein lies the chance of misapprehension that obtains in the minds of the American people and even of the Senate itself. Originally, and up to the time of the adoption of our Constitution, it was distinctly a criminal proceeding. The punishment ran from mere removal from office, through the confiscation of estate, on up to hanging, drawing, and quartering. With that background we borrowed from England, "lock, stock, and barrel", the parliamentary system of impeachment, but stripped our Senate of all power to punish except by ousting. Therefore it has been here a mere ouster proceeding, with no element of a criminal trial except the form. But that form has been largely responsible for the error in our thinking—the fallacy that this procedure is criminal. The modern trend has been away from that conception, largely by reason of the influence of Judge Sumners.

All through the history of the 12 impeachment trials that have been conducted in this country before the Senate of the United States we see the conflict between these two distinct points of view: (1) That it is strictly criminal in its nature, although without punishment except removal from office; (2) that it is a strictly civil procedure, merely to remove an unfit person from office. I think it is safe to say and remind ourselves that since 1912, with the trial of Robert W. Archbald, that ghost has been pretty well laid. The decision of the Senate in that case, in which no crime nor misdemeanor known to the criminal law was involved in any of the charges, removed that judge from office for misbehavior not amounting to crime or misdemeanor. Since then there may not be again a serious contest regarding the nature and innate character of an impeachment trial. I believe we are all agreed (1) that it is not in any sense of the word a criminal proceeding; (2) that the burden of proof is not on the prosecution to prove guilt "beyond a reasonable doubt", as it is in a criminal trial; (3) that there is no presumption of innocence to be indulged in favor of the respondent, such as attends every defendant in a criminal court; and (4) that judges shall hold their offices only during good behavior. Those four, I believe, we may accept as recognized principles of the modern law of impeachment cases.

In the recent Ritter trial, for the first time in the history of our Government, we saw a conviction on a new article in impeachment procedure. Contrary to what has been said, that article is not a summary, a catch-all, but it is the only article of impeachment that should ever be written. The question is not, as the Constitution itself says, whether or not you will punish a crime, because that is reserved for the courts, irrespective of the outcome of the impeachment trial. We are all interested in the purity of the spring from which justice flows, the judge on the bench. We care little if he be convicted of any criminal offense or no. We are tremendously concerned that one who has brought the bench into scandal and disrepute should be no longer permitted to disgrace it. Therefore there was that thought governing our pens when we wrote the seventh article of impeachment for the trial of Judge Ritter. It simply says that the consequence of his course of conduct has been to bring the bench upon which he sits into disrepute. In support of that charge the other six articles are pointed to as instances of that course of conduct. All the other articles merely point the way to the conclusion. They point to sins, if you please, against various and sundry persons or institutions; but the chief sin and, as I conceive it, the only sin of which the Nation and Senate and the bar need take cognizance is the one against the bench. This is the second contested trial that has gone through all the stages to conviction and removal. While there were two other finished impeachment trials against judges of Federal courts, these two other judges, who have been removed, were not present—their cases were not defended. Of all the nine impeachments of Federal judges, this latest one is the only one in which conviction was upon an article charging this supreme sin of a judge, the sin against the bench. Not only is the conviction of Judge Ritter grounded on the bedrock of justice, but he was adjudged guilty of the gravest judicial sin—disgracing the bench—as charged in the only article which should be used in the impeachment trial of any judge.

The only other consideration to which I challenge you is: What of the future? We all recognize that in this day, with every passing hour, the duties of the Senators become more and more onerous. We should appreciate fully that it is too much to ask of the 96 Senators that they drop their public business, cease to function in any of the multiform ways required of them usually, and postpone legislation, no matter how important, for the time necessary to give full attention to a trial of this kind. It is not in any sense in criticism of the Senate of the United States that a change in the modus operandi is suggested. They lived up to the proud heritage which is theirs, gave us as splendid attention as could be expected, and were, as they always have been, the courteous gentlemen and distinguished statesmen who should occupy the seats of the mighty. They kept the faith. But the thought remains that it is asking too much of them and that there is no necessity for it. Once we cease thinking of impeachment as a criminal trial, we have solved the problem of conducting it as such by the Senate. The constitutional guaranty that every defendant in a criminal case must be confronted with the witnesses against him should not apply to an impeachment trial. If it is not a criminal trial, there is no necessity for bringing all the witnesses to testify in the presence of the whole court and of the accused. I should like to suggest to you as thinking men that no longer in this respect is it necessary to continue that which for 200 years has been the procedure in all impeachment trials. We could, with greater efficiency, entrust the taking of evidence to a committee of the Senate, taking all the evidence that is of vital interest in open court, and the rest by deposition. Time would be conserved. The cost to the Government would be materially lessened. I am perfectly sure the Senators would appreciate the saving of their time and would approach the task with fresher energy and interest. All of the Senators would, of course, read all of the evidence, and their judgment would be just as enlightened and dependable. Such a change in procedure would save nine-tenths of the time of nine-tenths of the Senate.

It is such a pleasure to have been with you, and I hope that your interest will bear fruit in constructive thought and effort which shall make more simple and certain the preservation of the purity, the dignity, the honor of the bench. Pull down the pillars of the temple of justice and we all perish.

ISSUES OF 1936 CAMPAIGN

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of an address I made before the Republican State convention in Nashville on May 5.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I delivered before the Republican State convention in Nashville, Tenn., on May 5:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Republicans, it is certainly a very great privilege and pleasure for me to be with you today and behold this fine demonstration of militant Americanism. As I survey this vast audience I fancy I can read in your resolute faces that decree against the so-called New Deal which was pronounced against another regime of unbridled revelry many centuries ago—"mene, mene, teckel upharsin", meaning "thou hast been weighed in the balances and found wanting."

The national campaign which confronts us presents the most vital and important issues to the people of the United States since the old Liberty Bell announced the birth of the American Republic. It is not the customary quadrennial campaign of the past wherein two great political parties, both loyal to the hallowed traditions and institutions of America, vied with each other in patriotic rivalry for mastery. Far from it, my friends! It is a campaign wherein the forces of constitutional government are arrayed in deadly conflict against the forces of a socialistic philosophy, and upon the outcome of that issue depends the very existence and perpetuity of this Republic.

In this campaign the people of this country will decide whether they will remain loyal to the tenets and ideals of liberty and justice handed down to us by an illustrious ancestry or whether they will wander off after the false gods of socialism and ultimate communism and become regimented, blueprinted, and straightjacketed into a system which destroys individual initiative and challenges that sacred philosophy of Holy Writ that man may or shall "eat bread in the sweat of his own face."

Under this system which has been euphoniously denominated the New Deal, there can be no personal independence. The state founded on bureaucratic government dominates everything, person and property alike. It is government by men, in amplified form, instead of government by law, as provided in the Constitution.

With an autocracy in Washington which closely resembles dictatorship, dominating a servile Congress and even daring to threaten the dignity and integrity of the Supreme Court, we wonder what has become of that great instrument promulgated by our fathers, the Constitution of the United States. With this same autocracy entering into competition with and coercing private industry, and undertaking to regulate the daily life of our entire citizenship, we wonder again as to what has become of the Bill of Rights in which we have taken such pride, and about which we have been accustomed to boast as a proud and liberty-loving people. With a so-called government invading the privacy of the mails and the great communication facilities of our land, even to the point of requisitioning correspondence between husband and wife, as has been done recently by two great governmental activities, we wonder what has become of the covenant in the Constitution which guarantees the citizen against "unreasonable search and seizure."

No, my friends, I repeat, this is not a campaign of rivalry between two great political parties such as we have been accustomed to in the past. It is a contest between two conflicting systems, and in this deadly conflict will be found, regardless of past political affiliations, those who believe in the sanctity of private ownership, individual initiative, and personal liberty on the one side, and those who would set up a system similar to that of the Soviets of Russia on the other.

It is already apparent that in this conflict we will find men and women—millions of them—who in the past have followed the precepts of Jefferson, Jackson, and Grover Cleveland with fanatical devotion arrayed with us in our battle for the restoration and preservation of the American system as against this new order that would sabotage the charter of American liberty and erect on its ruins a system which would reduce us to a state of the rankest sort of paternalism, which inevitably leads to stark dictatorship.

My friends, in the present administration we have seen the greatest exhibition of embezzlement of public confidence and misappropriation of public trust that has ever been known since the days of Talleyrand and Machiavelli. We have seen a man elected to the highest office in the gift of the Republic not only boldly repudiate the platform upon which he was elected but advocate and sponsor measures directly in conflict with said platform and his solemn preelection pledges. The question is, Will the people of the United States stand for this betrayal of their confidence? In the light of history, both remote and recent, I do not believe they will thus again be led like sheep to the altar. The American people have always demanded of a public servant a strict accountability of his stewardship. They have always disdained and condemned a breach of faith, and I don't believe they will tolerate it in the present instance.

When the National Democratic Convention met in Baltimore in 1844 the northwestern boundary of the United States was a vital issue. A serious dispute had arisen between Great Britain and the United States as to our northwestern boundary line, England insisting on the forty-ninth parallel of latitude while Uncle Sam said it should be 54.40. The Baltimore convention, by solemn resolution, pledged its nominee, who happened to be a distinguished Tennessean, James K. Polk, to carry out the contention of the United States.

This question was the dominant, the paramount issue of the campaign and the Democrats adopted the famous slogan—"Fifty-four forty or fight." On this issue practically alone Mr. Polk was triumphantly elected. Shortly after his inauguration, however, John C. Calhoun, Secretary of State at the time, negotiated a treaty with Great Britain whereby the United States acceded to the demands of the British Empire, and the 49th parallel was agreed upon and is today our northwestern boundary line. The people of the United States were so outraged and chagrined by this breach of faith that Mr. Polk's name became a byword; and notwithstanding the fact that during his administration the Mexican War was fought and won as a result of which vast and valuable territory was annexed to our national domain, Polk was not even considered for a second term, and the nominee of his party was ignominously defeated in the election which followed. The people of this country simply would not condone this downright betrayal of their confidence, and, in my judgment, the same temper permeates the fiber of our citizenship today.

In 1916 Woodrow Wilson was elected President of the United States on the slogan that he had "kept us out of war." As a result of this false and fraudulent slogan millions of votes were cast for him which would otherwise have been cast for the candidates of the opposite party. On this issue alone millions of conscientious Republicans stultified themselves to vote for Mr. Wilson, and he was elected, but by a very small majority. Yet notwithstanding the solemn assurance that if Wilson were elected the United States would be kept out of the war, within 60 days of his inauguration war was declared and this country was plunged into the greatest vortex of carnage that the world has ever known. But in 1920 the American people, smarting under the betrayal of 4 years before, went to the polls and smote "hip and thigh" the candidates of the party that had deliberately violated their confidence in 1916.

In 1932 Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as a candidate of the Democratic Party, not only subscribed 100 percent to its platform adopted in Chicago, which he declared was a "sacred covenant with the people", but during the campaign he repeatedly solemnly asseverated his determination to strictly observe and discharge the mandates of that platform. The platform adopted by the Democratic convention in 1932 is a high-class, constructive document, and there is no doubt that it had a strong appeal to the voters of the country. They supported Mr. Roosevelt, confidently expecting him to carry out the provisions of that platform in perfect good faith, as he solemnly obligated himself many times to do.

What does the record show?

The platform adopted at Chicago in 1932 emphatically declared for economy in government, pledged the party to the elimination of bureaus and commissions, and in the most explicit and specific terms committed it to a 25-percent reduction in governmental expenses. In the very teeth of this injunction of his party his administration has created more than 100 bureaus and commissions, to obtain titles for which the English alphabet has been abused and exhausted, adding to the Government pay roll more than 400,000 full-time employees. In March 1933 Secretary Wallace began his administration of the Department of Agriculture with an organization of 26,000 employees. Up to the day that the Supreme Court consigned to the scrap heap the A. A. A., Wallace had increased this number to 66,000 full-time employees. The Civil Service Commission estimates the average salary of these Government employees as $150.50 per month. This means that the New Deal pays out of the taxpayers' money to this one group alone an annual salary of $120,824,916. And, in addition to this army of full-time employees, Mr. Wallace has organized a field force of part-time employees of 115,366, drawing, according to the August report of the Civil Service Commission, an average of $28.83 per person per month. This makes a grand total in this one Department alone of 182,355 employees, or 40,000 more than the entire standing Army of the United States.

The personnel of all other governmental agencies has been augmented to similar proportions, thus further burdening the already exhausted taxpayers of the Nation.

To promote the more abundant life the eminent New Deal magicians prescribed the reduction of crops, the destruction of food products, and the birth control of pigs and calves. They prescribed the lowering of our tariff walls and the negotiation of reciprocal treaties. And, behold, as a result of these nostrums alone, we have not only lost our foreign market, but we have seen the cost of living skyrocketed from 50 to 100 percent. This idiotic policy has not only robbed the American farmer of his foreign markets, but it has irreparably damaged his domestic market as well. Last year, 1935, under Roosevelt and the New Deal imports to the United States increased 24 percent, while our exports increased only 7 percent.

My friends, ponder these astounding figures for a moment: In 1932 this country sold 54,879,000 bushels of wheat to foreign countries, valued at $32,684,000. In 1935 this country sold to foreign countries only 232,965 bushels of wheat valued at $212,231. In 1932 the United States sold 7,886,000 bushels of corn to foreign countries, valued at $2,815,000; whereas in 1935 we sold to foreign countries only 117,382 bushels of corn, valued at only $66,157. In 1932 this country purchased from foreign countries 13,856 tons of hay valued at $96,000. In 1935 we purchased from foreign countries 67,171 tons of hay valued at $664,667. The increase of imports from Canada to the United States is a concrete example of the baneful effects of these trade agreements on American agriculture. Permit me to give you the figures for the month of January 1935, as compared with January 1936:

Product	Imports	
	January 1935	January 1936
Fresh pork	$4,386	$76,010
Cattle	54,483	457,962
Cheese	7,863	96,727
Horses	15,315	98,500
Turnips	45,124	118,757
Potatoes	2,414	27,853
Milk powder	9,387	28,348
Fresh beef	4,097	23,713
Bacon and hams	8,223	21,623
Wool	7,110	159,598
Poultry	698	7,359

And yet, in the face of this dismal and alarming picture, the New Dealers continue to carry on this stupid policy, which, in its final analysis can only spell doom to the American farmer.

This deluge of foreign importations is by no means confined to agricultural products. The increase in industrial importations is even more ominous. For instance, in 1932, we imported from Japan 58,000 square yards of bleached-cotton cloth. In 1933 we imported from Japan 30,000,000 square yards of this same material, an increase of more than 500 percent.

When you consider that a cotton weaver in Japan is paid a daily wage of only 21 cents, it is easy to understand the wherefore. And what is true of Japan likewise applies to Germany, Italy, Czechoslovakia, and other European and Asiatic countries where low standards of living and pauper wages prevail.

The factories and farms and the laboring classes of America can only be saved from this flood of cheap merchandise by an old-fashioned, William McKinley protective tariff.

When Mr. Roosevelt entered upon his administration, as a Representative in Congress I felt obligated to support his program so long as it did not run counter to my conscience and my conception of my patriotic duty. With considerable reluctance I supported the N. R. A. in the hope that it might contribute to the solution of the depression and promote recovery. At that time I did not have the remotest dream that the administration, through this agency, would attempt to regiment and dominate the entire business structure of the Nation. At that time it never once occurred to me that through this instrumentality the Federal Government would set up a bureaucratic dictatorship in Washington and undertake to suspend the constitutional rights of individuals and prescribe what industry could or could not do to the remotest detail.

The American Bar Association has recently reported that "the N. R. A. agency alone issued more than 10,000 pages of pronouncements intended to have the force and effect of law; that in 1 year of time they issued regulations and alleged laws exceeding the volumes of all the Federal statutes passed during the life of the Republic."

As a result of the drastic provisions of the codes thus set up and the threat of prosecution and imprisonment thereunder, tens of thousands of industries and hundreds of thousands of citizens submitted to the imperious dictates imposed upon them by the agents of our paternalistic government, and Government spies swarmed throughout the United States even as did the locusts and frogs in Egypt during the reign of Pharaoh. Many of the things done during this reign of terror were even more ruthless and destructive of liberty than anything done by Stalin, Hitler, or Mussolini. This high-handed tyranny was carried on in the name of "necessity." One hundred and fifty years ago that great statesman and patriot William Pitt said:

"Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants. It is the creed of slaves."

In the name of "necessity" an honest man was arrested and sent to jail for having hired men at a price satisfactory to them, to assist in repairing automobile batteries; a poor woman engaged in her own house in decorating tin cans to be used as flower pots was threatened with prosecution and forced to discontinue these endeavors whereby she was supporting herself and five fatherless children; citizens were arrested and fined for shipping the products of their own toil; a poor New Jersey tailor was arrested and thrown in prison for pressing a pair of pants for 5 cents less than the price fixed by the Code Napoleon of Roosevelt; men were threatened with fine and imprisonment for selling milk to starving babies at a price less than that fixed by a group of milk-dealing autocrats; an American citizen was arrested, fined, and threatened with imprisonment for refusing to buy a sick chicken in violation of a code regulation set up by a group of arrogant chicken-dealer czars.

In an attempt to go along with the administration on emergency measures I voted for the Triple A, which was recently "thrown out of the window" by the Supreme Court of the United States; but when I voted for it I never dreamed that it would be used as an engine of tyranny and oppression. When I voted for this measure it never occurred to me that under its authority an autocratic Cabinet officer would undertake to satisfy the hunger of the land by the cruel and inhuman slaughter of 6,000,000 suckling pigs and undertake to inaugurate a system of birth control among the sisterhood of sows of the Nation.

When I voted for the Triple A I certainly did not realize that the Treasury of the United States would be exploited and prostituted in rewarding people for indolence by paying them for not raising anything. It certainly never entered my mind that two sugar planters would be paid over $2,000,000 for not raising sugarcane; that a cotton farmer in Texas would be paid over $200,000 for not raising cotton; and a single hog farmer would be paid $220,000 for not raising hogs. I never dreamed that a citizen of Kentucky who owned a vast farm consisting of 4½ acres and who fed his hogs the garbage he gathered from hotels and restaurants would be paid the sum of $113,000 to curtail his hog production.

More than $1,100,000,000 of the taxpayers' money was worse than wasted on this scandalous crop- and stock-reduction insanity.

Is it any wonder that Mr. Wallace declines to give publicity to the names and the amounts paid out of the Peoples' Treasury to the recipients of this woeful and wanton extravagance? His explanation that such publicity might subject the daughters of the farmers receiving these fat Government checks to kidnapers shows the feeble state of the mentality of this prince of boondogglers.

But as a crowning act of stupidity, a supine and complacent Congress, at the behest of the "brain trusters", passed the late-lamented potato-control bill, better known as the "spud" bill. I must say, my friends, that while I sincerely desired to go along with the administration in its so-called recovery program, I simply could not swallow this piece of absurd and assinine legislation, and I accordingly voted against it. When it came to supporting a bill which would send a man to jail for raising potatoes in his own back yard, and which would fine and imprison an American mother for buying potatoes not wrapped in cellophane and not stamped and certified by the Secretary of Agriculture, I thought it was high time to call a halt.

But, alas, my friends, the potato turned out to be entirely "too hot" for the administration, and the law to regulate its production and distribution is now no more. Under the withering ridicule and indignation of an outraged people, and especially under the threat of the vengeance of the Supreme Court, at the earnest request of the White House, a pliant and submissive Congress a short time ago ruthlessly cut down this youthful and promising New Deal agency, along with its triple sisters, the cotton and tobacco enactments, and now they lie alongside the three A's and the blue eagle on the pitiless "cooling board", and "none are so poor as will do them reverence."

You can imagine the chagrin and humiliation of those Congressmen who, under the Executive whip, voted for these un-American measures only a few months later, under the same lash, to be compelled to vote for their repeal. I said imagine the "chagrin and humiliation." As a matter of fact, these administration Congressmen have become so calloused by the Executive saddle that their withers are so galled that they have perhaps lost their sense of chagrin and humiliation.

I have supported every measure that has been proposed by the administration to relieve unemployment and human suffering in the United States, but these vast billions have been so dissipated in boondoggling practices that the problem has been aggravated rather than reduced.

In his annual message to the Congress on January 4, 1935, the President said:

"The Federal Government must and shall quit its business of relief. I am not willing", said the President, "that the vitality of our people be further sapped by the giving of cash or market baskets, or a few hours of weekly work cutting grass, raking leaves, or picking up papers in the public parks."

Mark you, these are the words of the President of the United States—Franklin Delano Roosevelt!

This clarion declaration was received by the joint session of the Congress with tremendous applause. Mark you, this announcement was made after the Congress, at the President's request, had voted him the colossal sum of $3,300,000,000, which had been squandered with no appreciable results.

However, since that heartening declaration was made, upon his urgent demand, the Congress voted him an additional $4,800,000,000, most of which has already been "poured into a rat hole" and now he comes back asking for $1,500,000,000 more.

Has human misery in the United States been assuaged? Only temporarily. True, we have had a succession of "shots in the arm", but when the exhilaration following these hypodermics died away, another shot had to be immediately administered; and the poor old pump has been worn out completely by successive and excessive priming.

Has unemployment been banished? Far from it. Notwithstanding his solemn promise during the campaign to provide a job for every idle man in the United States, we have practically as many unemployed in the United States today as we had when this smiling Lochinvar "came out of the East" and was inaugurated. According to a recent statement of the American Federation of Labor, there are 12,625,000 people in the United States out of work now, and the number is increasing daily.

My friends, I doubt if my words will penetrate beyond the confines of this convention chamber; however, I want to say that if we continue this orgy of waste, this accumulation of public debt, we are not only headed for early inflation, but it will be a question of a very short time until repudiation will follow, just as it did in Germany.

When Woodrow Wilson was inaugurated as President of the United States on March 4, 1913, our entire public debt was only $1,193,645,042. When Mr. Wilson retired from the Presidency on March 4, 1921, our public debt had mounted to $24,045,136,549. Due to the economic and businesslike methods of the Harding and Coolidge administrations, in 8 years this staggering public debt was reduced to $17,344,872,799. When Mr. Hoover left office on March 4, 1933, our public debt had been increased to $20,937,350,964, but this difference represents the financing of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Farm Board, two Federal agencies of sound economic merit. On April 15, 1936, due to the wild extravagance of the Roosevelt administration, our public debt aggregated $31,453,296,162, and, according to an estimate of Budget Director Bell, on June 30, 1936, our national indebtedness will be $34,500,000,000.

Just how long our financial structure can stand this strain, with a net deficit of $10,659,171,911 as of April 15 of this year, no one can predict.

The cost of government—and I refer to Federal Government alone—has almost doubled during the past 3½ years. In 1933 the per-capita cost of Federal expenses was $40.91, the Federal per-capita tax was $179.32, and the number of persons on relief was 20,500,000. At the present time the per capita of Federal expense is $75, the Federal per-capita debt $250, and the number on relief is 24,200,000.

The Federal Government today is spending $20,000 every minute and is going in debt $10,000 every minute. We are building up a terrible Frankenstein of public deficit, which sooner or later, if continued, will overwhelm us.

In a speech before the Congress in March 1933 President Roosevelt said:

"Too often in recent history liberal government has been wrecked on loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger."

Recently one of the outstanding economists of the country sounded this emphatic warning:

"So far the Government has been able to borrow the $10,000 a minute that it is spending beyond its income—to borrow from wealthy investors, from insurance companies, from colleges, hospitals, and from the banks. These institutions already own over 60 percent of the outstanding Federal Government bonds. But to whom does the money of these institutions belong? To 47,000,000

bank depositors and to 65,000,000 insurance policyholders. When the Government can no longer borrow to pay its current bills, then real inflation will begin, financial chaos will follow, and the life savings and family protection of a great cross-section of the American people will be wiped out."

In frenzied accents Mr. Roosevelt calls upon private industry to come to his succor. Private industry, after being browbeaten and bulldozed for 3 years; private industry, that has been subjected to the rack and the thumbscrew of governmental coercion, intimidation, and competition; private industry, that has been cowed to a point that it has lost its morale, and with confidence gone, is now expected to "turn the other cheek" and shoulder the burden of unemployment and recovery. I sincerely hope it responds, but with business demoralized and with markets completely sacrificed or on crutches; threatened with a tax bill which, if enacted, will seriously penalize their thrift and capital structure, and with no bona-fide assurance of Government sympathy and cooperation, the prospects are, indeed, desolate and gloomy.

When I supported these gigantic appropriations for relief and recovery it never occurred to me that the proceeds would be wasted in chasing rainbows and in boondoggling tomfoolery. It never entered my mind that the New Dealers would essay to emulate the example of the celebrated King Kanute by squandering millions in a futile effort to harness the Atlantic Ocean by means of the now famous Passamaquoddy hoax. In the face of the findings of the Army Engineers that such a project is not only fantastic but impossible, these boondogglers have already spent five millions on Quoddy, and would go through with their iridescent scheme but for the avalanche of ridicule that has come up from all parts of the country. The hundred-and-sixty-million Florida canal is just as visionary, just as futile, and just as lousy. The "red house" settlement in West Virginia belongs in the same category, together with the weird and desolate homesteading of farmers in sight of the aurora borealis in frozen Alaska. This adventure has already proved to be a dismal failure, as have many others too numerous to mention.

But in reciting some of these boondoggling experiments we would feel remiss if we did not call attention to the magnificent $25,000 bathhouse for the use and benefit of wayward dogs at Memphis, Tenn. This elaborate facility, with its porcelain compartments and tessellated floors, is certain deserving of special notice, for it is there that the truant Pekinese, the poodle, the fox terrier, the great Dane, and the just plain dog are taken in, given a bath, a permanent wave, has his toenails manicured, and fed hot tamales and other delicacies while men, women, and children, poorly clad, walk the streets without food or shelter, "O ye of little faith!" How can you have the temerity to challenge either the wisdom or the righteousness of this utopian pipe dream.

But, my friends, probably the most scandalous and reprehensible feature of this entire performance is the stark and repulsive fact that this administration is actually playing politics with human distress and human misery. In the administration of this so-called relief it is an established fact that no job of any importance may be held by anyone who does not subscribe 100 percent to the New Deal fallacy, and before one can obtain employment even as a common laborer he must submit to a searching catechism testing his political faith; and if he does not answer the questions satisfactorily, "woe be unto him, for his name is Dennis."

The major part of these huge appropriations has been consumed in extravagant overhead, red-tape administration, fat salaries to the faithful, and the construction and maintenance of political fences at the shameless expense to those victims of the depression for whom it was intended.

Political corruption in the past has been confined to local political subdivisions. For the first time in our history we have beheld the sad and disgraceful spectacle of a national organization penetrating all parts of our country in a deliberate effort to debase the morale and debauch the people as a whole. The maladministration of relief has perhaps not been quite as flagrant and vulgar in Tennessee as elsewhere, but it has been bad enough here. The whole Nation has been shocked by the scandalous revelations recently brought to light in Pennsylvania, New York, Michigan, West Virginia, the State of Washington, and elsewhere throughout the country. Rottenness and corruption of the most putrid and venal sort have been shown to permeate and characterize the system from Maine to California. The entire set-up is honeycombed with partisan politics and favoritism such as would have amazed Boss Tweed and bring a blush even to the cheeks of the Tammany Tiger.

Listen to this:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 14, 1936.*

DEAR COMMITTEEMAN: Contact all houses in your division and get the names of all men on relief, also all those holding W. P. A. jobs. Urge them to register Democrat on March 25 or lose position.

(Signed) CHAS. MCDONALD,
Democratic Leader, Fourteenth Ward.

Listen to this from the State of Massachusetts:

"I have sent your name through for highway work. If you are not a registered Democrat, kindly visit the town clerk before 5 p.m. March 18 and have your designation changed to Democrat."

On the floor of the United States Senate 10 days ago Senator HOLT, Democrat, of West Virginia, delivered a ringing speech in which he read scores of letters, telegrams, and affidavits revealing the sordid, wholesale abuse, and misappropriation of Federal funds intended for relief in his State. A letter written by a prominent Democratic mayor, which was typical of the rest, was read by the Senator, and is as follows:

"It is my opinion that there is not a man or woman in this county, regardless of party affiliation, who is of ordinary common sense and who has made any observation whatever, that does not realize fully that this relief measure as it is being administered is deeply steeped in politics and almost void of results actually intended. Of course, there are many who will not openly express themselves, because they are fearful to do so."

This loathsome practice has been shown to be general throughout the United States, and plainly shows the depths of degradation to which those "hell bent" on the continuation of the New Deal orgy will descend. In some of the States it has been the practice to demand 4 percent of their pay checks from W. P. A. workers as a political contribution. Just recently my attention was called to an editorial in a country newspaper in East Tennessee, in which it was asserted that such a practice was being enforced in the county in which the newspaper is published.

My friends, I could go on for hours reciting the crimes that have been committed by the present administration in Washington subversive of the rights, liberties, and welfare of the American people, but I must not further impose upon your patience.

In conclusion, let me remind you again that this is not the customary bout between Democrats and Republicans. This is a battle to vindicate and preserve constitutional government. In Russia they sing the Internationale. If they like it, that is their misfortune. In France the welkin rings to the inspiring strains of the Marseillaise. That's their privilege. In Germany it's "Deutschland über Alles." So mote it be. In Italy it's "Viva Mussolini", and that's their affair. In England it's "Long live the King", and I have no objection to that. But here in America, for the sake of ourselves and for the sake of our posterity, let's continue to sing the Star-Spangled Banner: let's continue our allegiance to the Constitution and never falter in our faith in the inspired wisdom of our fathers, who set up here on these shores this Nation, which has survived five wars and their attendant upheavals and resultant dislocation—this government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address made by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLEOD] last Tuesday evening.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following speech of Congressman CLARENCE J. MCLEOD, of Michigan, on the Right to Know, over network of the National Broadcasting Co. from Washington, D. C., May 12, 1936:

Just as education is the keystone to civilization, enlightened public opinion is the bedrock upon which the foundation of good government must rest, otherwise it cannot endure as an efficient, responsive tool in the carving of their own destiny by a people.

The germs of oppression and dictatorship can never thrive in the bright light of a well-informed public. They may sometimes gain a temporary foothold but will always wither and fade under the scorching rays of intelligent public opinion.

The self-governing genius of the American people is found in our national capacity for news. Newspapers with more than 38,000,000 circulation are printed daily in every corner of the land. Day and night the press agencies operate to bring latest news flashes to millions of homes.

These news services are the very foundation pillars that link an enlightened public opinion to the structure of our Government. They constitute the surest safeguard for every fundamental right of citizenship.

When we find someone chipping at these pillars of information, trying to color, to distort, or to suppress facts, we find someone who does not believe in the right of the people to possess the knowledge upon which self-government is built.

In foreign lands public knowledge is a limited privilege. In our country it still remains an inalienable right, guaranteed by the basic law of the land.

In spite of this sacred guaranty, we have had 3 years which have been made conspicuous by the destructive activities of those in official life who do not believe the people have a right to know what is being done by their Government.

An outstanding news commentator recently exposed efforts by the President to influence newspaper owners and publishers to discontinue articles criticizing waste and mistakes of the New Deal. As we know, the President failed in those attempts. He did not stop there, however; and to use that writer's own words as they appeared in a recent newspaper, I quote:

"The President has set in motion a campaign to discredit, if possible, the effectiveness of those Washington correspondents who write articles critical of his administration."

This astounding revelation is one of the most recent developments in the New Deal campaign to void the people's right to know what is being done by their public servants.

Some time ago a resolution was adopted by the Board of Investigation in the Department of Commerce, exposing the shortcomings of the Department and censuring its officials for opposing legislation to prevent repetition of the *Morro Castle* and *Mohawk* disasters, in which hundreds of lives were sacrificed.

The officials responsible for the release of this resolution to the press were summarily dismissed from office without even a hearing, in spite of their civil-service status.

It will be recalled that 2 years ago Mr. Roosevelt tried to take business leaders into camp by the creation of a Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce. This Council was to meet periodically, study conditions, and put its conclusions into printed form. It has done so; but have any of those reports been made public by the administration? No; they have not. One found its way out of the secret archives of the Department of Commerce, but, I repeat, it did not reach the newspapers with the consent of the Roosevelt administration.

Most of us will remember that only a few months ago Mr. Roosevelt was announcing over the radio, at press conferences, and everywhere else, that the Treasury deficits were growing smaller. But what have we learned since? Only a week ago Secretary Morgenthau appeared before the Senate Finance Committee to testify concerning the pending tax legislation which Mr. Roosevelt had previously declared would not be necessary. Mr. Morgenthau could not well discuss the need for revenue without answering questions concerning the Treasury's condition. Quite unwillingly, I believe, Mr. Morgenthau let the fact be known that the prospects of the Treasury in this fiscal year include a probable deficit of $5,966,000,000, the largest deficit in peacetime history.

Because of his first-hand knowledge, Gen. Johnson Hagood a short time ago was requested by a congressional committee to give his opinion on Federal-relief spending. He gave the committee his honest views on the administration's policy of waste, which policy made it almost impossible for him to secure funds for essential repairs while the supply of money was plentiful for needless garden walks and other frills. His subsequent persecution by Mr. Roosevelt for merely telling the truth will remain as one of the dark stains on the record of this New Deal venture.

Last September the Department of Agriculture compiled a thorough study intended for public consumption entitled "Cotton Production in the United States." Because various sections of this study contained devastating disclosures showing the harmful results of the A. A. A. with respect to cotton and agricultural labor, the original document was quickly suppressed, even though it had been signed by the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

It is hardly necessary to add that the carefully revised report which was finally made public contained none of the facts which exposed the blunders of the New Deal agricultural program. The facts surrounding the suppression of this document would still be one of the many dark secrets of the present administration were it not for a resolution introduced in the Senate last February calling for a copy of the true and original, uncensored and unexpurgated document.

The Washington bureaucrats are fast assuming the airs of absolute autocrats. What is being done by the people's Government with the people's money is becoming more and more of a mystery.

All through the 32 months since Mr. Roosevelt took office we, the public, have been told just as little as possible about the inner and experimental workings of our Government, unless—and I want to emphasize this—that the facts which were turned over to the propaganda machine for distribution showed information which could be used by the New Dealers in their incessant policy of deception and gross exaggeration.

The public today would not know of the huge sums of money paid to a few of the friendly and wealthy individuals and corporations out of the funds appropriated for the farmers, if it had not been for the stubborn and determined fight recently waged in the Senate. This fight forced the Secretary of Agriculture to disclose what was being done with this money, the people's money, presumably appropriated only and exclusively for needed farm relief.

The whole mantle of secrecy and suspicious aversion to legitimate requests for information, which hangs like a pall over Washington today, is so utterly alien to every American principle that it is difficult for us to realize that it exists, even when we are confronted with the undeniable proofs.

Who is there today, however, except a select little clique of New Deal leaders, who can tell what is being done with the $2,000,000,000 of the people's money which was turned over to the Secretary of the Treasury to manipulate as he sees fit for stabilization purposes?

Who is there, outside of the New Deal high command, who can tell what information of vital interest to the people is contained in the countless suppressed reports on Government activities?

Every few days we in Washington hear of some new instance where still another Government report has been suppressed. These frequent rumors create suspicion. The reason for the suspicion is found in the fact that every time one of these suppressed reports leaks into the newspapers, information exposing more New Deal fiction and blunders is invariably found.

Instances of suppression, where facts have been deliberately withheld that should be known to the people, are too numerous to describe in detail.

Even requests by representatives of the people in Congress for essential information to help in formulating new legislation run up against the stone wall of New Deal arrogance and suppression.

The Congress has been considering another huge appropriation bill to provide relief for those in distress. Last summer, the President requested his close personal friend, Gen. Hugh Johnson, one of the originators of the New Deal, to administer Federal relief in New York City. Upon completion of his term of service, General Johnson submitted a report on Federal relief spending which was promptly suppressed. It was suppressed because it contained many derogatory facts about waste and relief spending that did not provide relief, and, further, because these facts of corrupt waste, if known to the people, would further arouse righteous indignation.

So that the Congress might institute corrective measures for the truly important problem of greater relief for the needy, I introduced a resolution of inquiry, requesting that the House of Representatives be furnished with a copy of this report. The resolution was promptly rejected by the subservient New Deal majority.

During the present Congress there have been 23 requests for information made under the "resolution of inquiry" rule of the House of Representatives. All but three of these requests have been promptly suppressed by the present Roosevelt-controlled Congress.

There is no real difference in the type of suppression that tries to keep information from the press and the censorship that keeps facts from the people's representatives in Congress. Both keep the people ignorant of the facts which they are entitled to know.

To those who may still feel inclined to doubt that their security and the security of those near and dear to them is being threatened by the New Deal's long succession of blunders, I would like to suggest that the present week is a most opportune time for reflection. This week, having been dedicated to social security in its truest sense, it is most fitting that a careful inventory be taken at this time of those actions of the administration which have a bearing on the security of the people.

This week, above all other weeks of the year, has been set aside as life-insurance week, a week of meditation on not only our own social security but the social security of our dependents.

You, Mr. Citizen, who labor for a living, what is your life-insurance policy worth, the policy that you have been buying for the past number of years, buying with hard-earned dollars worth 100 cents, buying with the thought of the social security you were hoping to bequeath your closest kin, your aged wife, your dependent children; what is that policy going to be actually worth in real value when it is finally surrendered? We know today that the 100-cent dollar that you were investing in, and investing with, is only worth 59 cents.

Insurance week is, indeed, the time to meditate, and meditate well, while we still have time to pick up the threads of real security before the insane antics of the Roosevelt administration entangles them to the point where social security will become only a vague myth of tradition.

I know that it is only human to make honest mistakes. Mistakes cannot remain honest, however, when they are repeated time and time again under the deceptive cloak of secrecy. We must remember that the security of an entire nation of nearly 130,000,000 people is at stake, and we must not forget that that security depends in a large degree upon the ability of the people to exercise their inherent right of suffrage, to correct mistakes in matters of government. That ability and that inherent right to correct is shattered when the people lose their right to know about their Government and their public servants.

I am not one of those alarmists who believe that we have already lost that right.

Neither am I one of those who, blind to the unmistakable trend of events, refuses to see the ultimate danger that lies in the ever-growing campaign being waged by the New Dealers to hide their blunders and allow the people to see only the favorable side of the policies and actions of their public servants.

In this address I am not going into the numerous costly mistakes Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal administration is making—I am pointing out briefly something far more serious than administrative blunders—something now only in its infancy, but something, my friends, that if permitted to mature, will prove fatal to our right to know; and, of course, if that happens, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and every other form of freedom guaranteed by the Constitution will become a hollow mockery.

The situation calls for a vigorous and continuous counterattack on official threats against the people's right to know. If the long struggle for this basic right teaches one thing more than another, it is that constant vigilance is the price we must pay if we wish to retain those cherished heritages that are the birthright of every American.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wonder now that we have declared at least a temporary armistice if we could not blanket these requests?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would that include one's own remarks made over the radio?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE BRIG. GEN. ROBERT H. DUNLAP

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7110) to authorize the President to bestow the Congressional Medal of Honor upon Brig. Gen. Robert H. Dunlap with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment. I may say by way of explanation that this merely amends the title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask if this is the bill which passed the House authorizing the conferring of the Navy Cross instead of the Congressional Medal of Honor?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the President to bestow the Navy Cross upon Brig. Gen. Robert H. Dunlap, United States Marine Corps, deceased."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the address of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CASTELLOW], I may address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION IN MISSOURI

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on the day the deficiency bill was passed Mr. SHORT, of Missouri, in the course of his remarks was permitted to place in the RECORD a letter he received from R. Newton McDowell, a general contractor, whose headquarters are at Kansas City, in which he criticized the Works Progress Administration in my State. Mr. Speaker, I am one Member of Congress who has faithfully tried to keep politics out of relief work. I feel that no matter who applies for a job, if the applicant comes within the policy of W. P. A., then every effort should be made to place the applicant regardless of politics. In every letter I have written to those applying for such work I have told the writer a letter from a Congressman is not and should not be sufficient to secure an applicant work. I take the position we appropriated the money for people in distress and I want to see it spent for people who are in need.

When I received the same letter from Mr. McDowell I sent it to the Administrator of W. P. A. in Missouri, asking for an explanation, and I have received his reply. I have talked with Mr. SHORT, and he agrees that I should place the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

FEDERAL WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION,
Jefferson City, Mo., April 1, 1936.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COCHRAN: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 30 enclosing file you received from R. Newton McDowell regarding W. P. A. set-up in Missouri.

I have read enclosures carefully and want to state that McDowell is very careless about the way he handles facts of the case. We have been trying to get McDowell to take W. P. A. employees off our pay rolls and put them to work on his contract jobs, but this he seems adverse toward doing; having made some wild promises at the time certain county-bond elections were being voted.

Mr. McDowell would rather criticize than be helpful. As far as criticism is concerned, I think constructive criticism is good for any program, but, knowing McDowell as I do, I am always looking for McDowell's angle, and after this is once located you can generally put your finger on the trouble.

Mr. McDowell fell out with the Works Progress Administration program when I said "no" on a proposition that was set up in the following manner:

I am quoting from a letter that Mr. McDowell wrote to Mr. P. H. Daniells, division engineer of the State highway department, July 1, 1935:

"As you probably understand, the relief program is worked out on a basis of $1,150 per year per man, which includes his pay of $32 per month, with a balance left to pay for supplies, etc. In our case, we would be furnishing a plant, switch tracks, stock-pile sites, steamboat, barges, and all necessary equipment to handle this tonnage. The State would pay $9,200 in freight on the stone moving to Weldon Springs, with no freight to be paid for sand. In short, by using Mr. Murray's organization and our facilities, which will be paid for by the Government, you will be furnished with 78,000 tons of sand and stone in stock piles at point of use for the very ridiculous price of about 11 cents per ton.

"It strikes others, as well as myself, that Mr. Murray will be hard put to find worth-while projects, and I believe this one fills the bill. None of us yet are certain as to how these projects are to be initiated, but if this one appeals to you, it seems to me that the logical method would be for you to put this project up to Mr. Murray's organization in St. Louis."

Also, quoting from statement attached to McDowell's letter of July 1, 1935:

"Total of 400 men employed for 3 months in producing and hauling to stock-pile sites at Weldon Springs of 78,000 tons of material for bridge and 40 TR—46,000 tons of stone and 32,000 tons of sand. The relief program permits an allowance of $1,150 per year per man to cover wages and materials. On this basis, 400 men for 3 months' work would afford an allowance of $114,000, of which each man for this period would receive $96, or a total labor bill of $38,400, leaving a balance available to pay us for our facilities about $76,000.

"The State will pay freight rate of 20 cents per ton on 46,000 tons, or $9,200—no freight on sand. We will be paid $76,000 for services rendered to the Government."

I could not see my way clear to paying McDowell $76,000 for alleged "services rendered to the Government."

In the case of the Glasgow Special Road District in Howard County, in which county McDowell says he has a contract, I have a statement from the three commissioners of the Glasgow Special Road District, L. S. Jackson, F. L. Ferguson, and Rice A. Maupin, that McDowell made threats to them that if they did not vote a bond issue and spend the bond issue through P. W. A., he would see that no roads were built in the Glasgow Special Road District. Work in this district is being performed by the W. P. A. at this time, and the other day Mr. McDowell decided that the W. P. A. workers on quarry project of this special road district were just the type of men that he wanted on his job and offered to take these men off W. P. A. rolls, when we have plenty more on the rolls exactly the same as those he selected.

We now have in operation in the State of Missouri over 1,100 projects, some of which are working in the immediate vicinity where McDowell has contracts; and while I have not personally gone over the projects in that locality, my reports from this territory indicate that the work we are doing with W. P. A. labor is better than the work being done under contract by McDowell.

I wish to thank you for your inquiry in this matter, and am returning herewith papers forwarded with your letter.

Very truly yours,

MATTHEW S. MURRAY,
State Administrator.

THE LATE HARRY C. STEVENS

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is appropriate that we should take note of the passing of Harry C. Stevens, the dean of Washington newspaper correspondents,

who, for 42 years, represented the Minneapolis Journal at the Nation's Capital. He died last Sunday and on yesterday was carried to his rest by Members of this House and former associates in the press gallery.

For two generations Mr. Stevens saw and recorded history in the making. He was the friend and confidant of every man who has served as a Representative or a Senator from Minnesota and its neighboring States since 1892, when he joined the staff of the Journal—the only newspaper on which he ever worked.

Among his old cronies were such men as Senator Knute Nelson, whose memory my State reveres; "Uncle Joe" Cannon, who once held tight the reins of this House; and Herschel V. Jones, the late publisher of the Journal, to whom he was more than an able and trusted employee.

He knew Elihu Root, William A. Day, and many other Cabinet members intimately, and as a journalist saw the procession of Presidents from Benjamin Harrison to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He wrote the day-by-day history of Washington during two wars and noted the steps by which a half-grown nation marched to empire. He witnessed also the steady development of the Federal Government from its once modest proportions into the present labyrinth of departments and bureaus; and because he had watched the growth he knew and understood, as few others, its structure and functions. He "covered" President Coolidge during the latter's vacation in the Black Hills and was one of the newspapermen who stood in line and received the little slips of paper on which was typed the wise, though cryptic, announcement, "I do not choose to run in 1928."

As a newspaperman Mr. Stevens was always alert and vigilant. He was also dependable; he was never known to have violated a confidence. He was never harsh in his criticisms. He was generous with his time and means. A coworker of many years, who knew him well, pronounced the finest possible eulogy on Harry C. Stevens when he said, "He came as near to living the Golden Rule as any person I have ever known."

MOBILIZING THE RELIEF VOTE

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a radio address I made the other night.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address that I made over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Monday, May 11, as follows:

The still increasing relief burden of the cities and States is today our most pressing national problem.

What shall we do to bring this terrific expense within the limits of our national ability to pay?

Relief is the central factor in our urgent budget problem.

And our grievously unbalanced Federal Budget is the very core of our continued economic stagnation in the heavy industries.

Thus the New Deal's relief squandering is a principal obstacle to sound and sustained business recovery.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives I have had occasion recently to survey the whole picture of Federal relief administration anew.

It is apparent to all that Roosevelt economic policies assure a heavy Federal relief load for a long time to come. But I am convinced that this burden might be reduced by half by the single act of purging the Federal relief machinery of political patronage.

The evidence adduced in our committee hearings establishes beyond all question that, as now administered, the relief agencies are shot through with corroding and paralyzing political spoils. No State, no city, no county has escaped this blight. Political patronage, both in jobs and material contracts, has reduced the W. P. A. program and the Resettlement Administration to purely political organizations for the duration of the campaign. Our evidence discloses further that the C. C. C. camps are heavily loaded with political appointees.

This survey of the situation indicates clearly to my mind that adequate relief, if efficiently administered through nonpolitical agencies, could be managed with about half of the amount now being spent from the Federal Treasury. Let the relief dollar go for relief—not for politics.

The way out is to return the administration of relief to State boards wholly nonpartisan in character, responsible directly to the respective Governors. All administrative matters then would be handled within the States and counties. The Federal spoilsmen would have no appointive power in any State relief organization.

A Republican amendment to the new relief bill, designed to accomplish this objective, was promptly rejected by the Democratic majority of the House last Friday.

But only by this method can the present deplorable waste, corruption, and inefficiency be eliminated, and the administrative overhead reduced to a reasonable percentage of the relief outlay.

There is no question in the mind of anyone familiar with present conditions, but that at least one-third of the current Federal relief allocations are dissipated in the baldest political activity, aimed at the perpetuation of New Dealism.

Here is a letter from a Democratic ward leader in Philadelphia to his precinct lieutenants. It is dated March 14, 1936, just 10 days before the Pennsylvania primary registrations. I read from a photostatic copy of the letter:

"DEAR COMMITTEEMAN: Contact all houses in your division and get the names of all men on relief, also all those holding W. P. A. jobs. Urge them to register Democrat on March 25 or else lose their jobs.

"Sincererly yours."

That letter is signed by a recognized Democratic leader of the fourteenth ward in Philadelphia.

And here is another letter dated April 13, 1936. It is addressed to a citizen in Philadelphia who had applied for a W. P. A. job. He had sent his application to a Democratic Member of the United States Senate in Washington. The letter I have before me is signed by the Senator's secretary. Here are the last two paragraphs, on the official stationery of the United States Senate:

"This matter is handled entirely by Hon. Edward N. Jones, State administrator, Works Progress Administration, Harrisburg, Pa.

"I would, therefore, suggest that you contact your local Democratic leaders with a view to having them recommend your appointment to Mr. Jones who will, I feel sure, give your application and their recommendation every possible consideration."

Here is a frank confession that the way to a W. P. A. job is to "contact your local Democratic leaders with a view to having them recommend your appointment."

Now this is not a partisan document. Every time the New Deal is exposed the jobmaster general cries "propaganda." But the letter I have just quoted is written on the official stationery of the United States Senate. It offers prima-facie evidence that today the administration of relief is a part of the Democratic political preparation for the Presidential campaign.

One letter from Philadelphia demands that every W. P. A. worker register Democratic. The other tells how to get on the relief rolls through political appointment of "your local Democratic leaders."

Nor is this sort of political corruption in the relief machinery confined to Pennsylvania. Here is a case from New Jersey.

A young man applied for a position in the C. C. C. organization. He wanted to be an instructor in physical education. So far as the record reveals he was admirably qualified by training and experience. Omitting all names, I now read the letter the applicant received from the Federal officer in charge:

"In reply to your letter of April 22; as stated in my letter of April 8, this office is unable under binding Federal instructions to consider any nontechnical man for appointment to the supervisory work in the C. C. C. camps unless his name is certified to us on the so-called advisers' list from Washington.

"This is the list of names submitted by Senator ——— and Democratic Representatives in Congress from New Jersey to the Federal administration for employment in this C. C. C. activity. The only way in which you can put yourself in a position to secure employment, therefore, is by making arrangements to have Senator ——— or one of the Democratic Congressmen request that your name be put on this advisors' list."

There you have an epitome of the high humanitarian purposes which guide the day-to-day administration of this gigantic relief program.

If there were no other evidence in the entire United States, these three letters would fully substantiate the charge that Federal relief has been disgracefully warped and distorted for political purposes. But the record is literally brimming with other evidence to the same point.

On April 16, for example, the administrator for the State of Washington was removed from office following revelation that he had gathered from relief workers under his jurisdiction a campaign fund of more than $3,000 in cash.

Charges of the same nature have been aired on the floor of the Senate or House of Representatives in relation to relief work in West Virginia, Colorado, Illinois, Ohio, California, Maine, Indiana, Nevada, and Oregon.

The shocking situation in West Virginia several weeks ago became a focal point of national attention. Following a personal investigation on the scene, Senator HOLT, a New Deal Democrat, once described W. P. A. in his own State in these words on the floor of the United States Senate:

"There is only one way to identify the W. P. A. in West Virginia and that is to say it is a horrible mess. * * * I charge the W. P. A. in West Virginia with being full of politics, with being extravagant and wasteful and with a thorough censorship and spy system to prevent any complaint."

At another point in the debate Senator HOLT read this letter, which had been sent out from the State administrator's office to one of the county supervisors:

"I hand you herewith a list of doctors in Ohio County. Kindly separate the Democrats from the Republicans and list them in order of priority, so we may notify our safety foremen and compensation men as to who is eligible to participate in case of injury."

In due course one of these lists of doctors came back to State headquarters with this heading: "List of county doctors—Democratic doctors are listed on the left-hand side and Republicans on the right."

Now, this was a list of local doctors subject to call in emergencies on any of the West Virginia W. P. A. jobs—a part of the Federal responsibility under the Workmen's Compensation Statutes. "The Democratic doctors are listed on the left"!

It must be understood, of course, that if on some stormy night no Democratic doctor were available a Republican physician probably would be eligible for call. But the relief spoilsmen have taken every possible precaution against that dreadful crisis.

"The Democratic doctors are listed on the left."

Two weeks ago the American Institute of Public Opinion polled the Nation on this question: "In your opinion, does politics play a part in the handling of relief in your locality?"

Tens of thousands of ballots were distributed. They went to every State in the Union. They were returned by men and women in every walk of life. Democrats and Republicans were polled in exactly the proportion of their voting strength in the several States. The composite answer presents a reliable cross-section of national opinion on the question. And here are some of the returns:

The vote in Arkansas was 83 percent yes. In New Jersey the vote was 78 percent in the affirmative; in West Virginia it was 77 percent; Louisiana, 76 percent; Rhode Island, 76 percent; Mississippi, 75 percent; Washington, 73 percent; Massachusetts, 72 percent; Oklahoma, 71 percent.

So the figures run through every State. Not one State returned a majority vote in the negative. In every one of the 48 States, the majority opinion prevails that the relief agencies are operating as a part of the Democratic national campaign—a campaign kept going largely by these fabulous grants of relief money from the Federal Treasury.

A more flagrant trafficking in human need is not to be found in all the pages of American history.

A more wanton corruption of a noble humanitarian principle is not to be found in all the annals of the American people.

Even the men and women on relief are convinced that politics dominates these relief agencies. The national poll I have just cited was further analyzed according to the controlling economic interest of the voters. Ballots cast by persons on relief showed that 49 percent voted "yes" on the question of political administration; and farmers voted 70 percent "yes." These are the groups which actually have had personal contact with the relief machinery. No groups are in a better position to know the truth concerning political influences at work in the relief pork barrel.

The inevitable result of all of this political pay-roll padding in the relief agencies, of course, is a terrific burden of waste.

Incompetence knows no rule of action save to squander through.

Turned loose to fatten in the lush pastures of pork, political bureaucrats have but one rule of conduct—to spend $2 where $1 would do the work.

In his testimony, 2 weeks ago, before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, W. P. A. Administrator Harry Hopkins presented detailed figures showing that for every $972 spent on work relief last year, only $600 actually was paid into the hands of the W. P. A. workers. The balance of $372 went for supervision, administrative expenses, materials, equipment, and other overhead.

In some States the administrative expenses ran as high as 18 percent of the total relief outlay.

Compare this with the experience of the American Red Cross, which computes 3 percent as an adequate administrative overhead in relief work.

In W. P. A. the difference of 15 percent must be charged to the cruel political bureaucracy which is diverting relief funds to the partisan purposes of the Roosevelt campaign.

And there is another very disturbing consideration in this picture today, namely, that the more business recovery we have, the greater grows our relief bill.

Of course, it does not make sense; but the figures are from Mr. Hopkins' latest report. Total relief expenditures from all sources for the calendar year 1933 were $792,910,000.

For the calendar year 1934 they were $1,476,372,000—almost double.

And in 1935 they were $1,756,375,000.

At this moment these expenditures (from all sources) are running at the rate of a little more than $2,000,000,000 for the calendar year 1936.

When Mr. Hopkins made his first national survey in July 1933 he found 3,908,068 relief cases—each case representing a family or unattached person. That was the beginning of the gigantic New Deal venture in plain and fancy boondoggling.

But by January 1935, after 18 months of Roosevelt recovery, Mr. Hopkins' rolls carried 5,272,472 cases!

These figures present the whole lamentable story of political relief. The greater the recovery, the greater the relief load.

Can this scheme of management be explained in any terms save the terms of incompetence, prodigious squandering of the public funds, and gross political corruption?

In these terms alone can New Deal relief be explained—but in no terms known to the heart of humanity can this political diversion of relief funds be justified or defended.

Relief according to the needs of the political precinct is shocking to the American tradition of faithful public service and offensive to every instinct of public morals.

I, for one, do not believe that the American Nation can ratify this sorry record.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and following the address of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CASTELLOW] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object in this instance, but we are getting along toward the close of the session. There are a great many Members who have bills pending on the Consent Calendar, and they are anxious to have these bills acted upon. I hope no further request will be made to address the House on Monday next, so that ample time may be provided to dispose of bills on the Consent Calendar.

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

There was no objection.

PROTECTING OUR FOREIGN SERVICE ABROAD

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks with reference to Addis Ababa and to also include a letter from the Secretary of State which has been made public.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has not that letter of the Secretary of State been incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD heretofore?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; but it has been made public.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Secretary of State to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
May 11, 1936.

The Honorable SAM D. MCREYNOLDS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MCREYNOLDS: I have received Mr. Barnes' letter of May 7, 1936, transmitting a copy of House Resolution 504 requesting (1) information regarding the steps taken to protect the American Legation at Addis Ababa and American citizens in that capital and (2) copies of all communications exchanged between the Department and the Legation at Addis Ababa regarding the recent looting and action taken or proposed to be taken in connection therewith.

In reply, I submit the following:

(1) According to an official report from the American Legation at Addis Ababa dated February 25, 1935, the following American nationals were resident in Ethiopia on that date. These figures include men, women, and children:

In employ of United States Government	3
Missionaries	108
Others	[1] 16
Total	127

[1] Virtually all of the persons listed under this heading were colored citizens. Practically all of them were indigent and unable to leave the country. As it was considered that they would be

Approximately one-half of these missionaries resided in the capital, while the other half were scattered through mission stations in the provinces. Many of these stations were from 2 to 3 weeks' travel by caravan from the capital.

The question of the protection of American citizens in Ethiopia first arose early in May 1935, when the Department took up the matter with the American Embassy at London and suggested that the Embassy endeavor informally to ascertain what steps were being taken by the British Government for the possible protection of its nationals. The Foreign Office expressed the view that foreigners in Ethiopia would be protected as long as the Emperor remained in power, but that difficulties would be likely to arise in case of his overthrow. The Foreign Office stated at the same time that in case it became necessary to evacuate foreigners from Ethiopia it would be glad to instruct its Legation at Addis Ababa to do everything it could to assist in the evacuation of American nationals there.

Upon receipt of this information the Department instructed the American Chargé d'Affairs at Addis Ababa by telegram to consult in strict confidence with the missionary leaders and report the earliest date on which American nationals could evacuate the capital. Bearing in mind the above-mentioned offer of the British Foreign Office and in view of the fact that the personnel of the American Legation consisted at that time of only three unmarried American nationals, the Department advised the Chargé d'Affaires that it assumed arrangements could be made with the British Minister for the evacuation in case of necessity of those three officials.

On June 29 the Chargé reported that those missionaries who were prepared to leave could do so at once and that he had recommended an immediate evacuation of outlying mission stations.

On July 2, 1935, the Department instructed the Chargé d'Affaires confidentially but urgently to advise all American missionaries in the capital to leave immediately and to give similar advice regarding missionaries in the provinces unless there was sound reason for believing they were not in danger. He was instructed to stress the fact that the continued presence of American nationals in Ethiopia was likely to prove embarrassing to this Government. At the same time the Department addressed letters to the home mission boards in the United States urging them to withdraw their personnel from Ethiopia.

On July 6, 1935, the Chargé d'Affaires reported that all missionaries had been advised as instructed, but that the chief difficulty in their departing was lack of funds and absence of instructions from the home boards. The Department immediately advised the home mission boards of this situation and urged them to supply their personnel with funds to withdraw from Ethiopia. The Chargé stated that he had again urged the closing of all mission stations. He also reported that he had discussed the situation with the Emperor who had promised all possible protection to American nationals and had agreed to inform the Chargé frankly if a crisis should arise.

Late in July it learned that the German Government had requested that the British Legation in Addis Ababa extend protection to German nationals in case of necessity. It was also learned at this time that the British Government had requested permission of the Ethiopian Government to increase its usual guard of 10 men and 1 officer by something over 100 additional men and officers. This permission was refused, but nevertheless 148 officers and men of an Indian regiment were dispatched to Ethiopia and arrived in Addis Ababa on September 7, 1935. They brought with them extensive arms, ammunition, and supplies.

The French and British Ministers at Addis Adaba had meanwhile come to an understanding that the extra British troops would be stationed at the capital, while French troops would be stationed at Diré Dawa where the shops of the largely French-owned railway were located. Eventually French troops arrived at Diré Dawa on October 6, 1935.

At this point it should be stated that except for the British, French, and Italian Legations, which for some years had maintained in Addis Adaba small guards of their native colonial troops, all other legations relied upon the employment of native guards. Thus, prior to the outbreak of hostilities, the American Legation had available the following personnel for guard purposes:

Guards	6
Messengers	4
Overseer	1
Total	11

Upon the arrival of four American naval radio operators on October 14, 1935, the defensive strength of the Legation was of course increased by these trained naval men. The three unmarried officials of the Legation at that time stationed in Addis Ababa were naturally also prepared to defend themselves in case of necessity.

The following arms and ammunition, furnished by the War Department, had for some years been available to the Legation:

Rifles	4
Revolvers	4
Rifle cartridges	400
Revolver cartridges	900
Bayonets	4

On January 20, 1936, the Chargé d'Affaires at Addis Ababa, presumably after a careful survey of his needs, requested the following additional arms and ammunition. This request was immediately transmitted to the War Department, which made the shipment from one of its arsenals.

Rifles	6
Automatic pistols	6
Rifle cartridges	600
Pistol cartridges	600

Even if further equipment, such as machine guns, had been requested, it is open to serious doubt whether the Ethiopian authorities would have permitted the importation of such equipment since it was well known that other governments experienced difficulties and long delays in importing shipments of such a nature into Ethiopia.

In this connection it should be pointed out that troops are stationed in foreign countries as legation guards only in those cases where such a right has been acquired by treaty or long-standing usage or suffrance. The United States had acquired no such right in Ethiopia, and like all other legations there, except the British, French, and Italian missions, it relied on native guards.

On August 10, 1935, the Department instructed the Chargé d'Affaires at Addis Ababa urgently to renew his advice to all missionaries remaining in the country to depart. Again the home mission boards were urged by the Department to take steps looking to the immediate departure of their personnel. The Chargé d'Affaires on August 14, 1935, reported that his instructions had been carried out.

On this same date the Chargé also reported that it was his opinion that as long as the Emperor remained alive the Ethiopian authorities would make every possible effort to protect foreigners. In this connection it should be recorded that on December 19, 1935, the Chargé reported the receipt of information that the last of the Italian missionaries had departed early in December (i. e., 2 months after the beginning of hostilities) and that not a single instance of ill treatment of such missionaries had been reported. On the contrary, he stated, they had been shown courtesy and kindness by the Ethiopian authorities and people. This fact, he added, had made a most favorable impression on foreigners. On February 3, 1936, in reporting that he was bringing his wife and family to Addis Ababa from Egypt, the Chargé stated that his colleagues did not anticipate that Addis Ababa would be bombed or that police protection would fail, but in any case they were better prepared for either eventuality than they had been in the fall of 1935.

On March 24, 1936, the minister resident reported the issuance of an official Ethiopian notice calling on all the population to maintain their reputation for hospitality by showing no hostility to foreigners "who live among us as friends." He added that this was apparently merely a precautionary measure, since no foreigners had been molested.

Late in August 1935 careful consideration was given to the possibility of dispatching an American war vessel to the Red Sea area to assure radio communications between Washington and Addis Ababa and for possible use in protecting American nationals. However, since that area was well within the troubled zone and in view of the tension existing there at the time this plan was abandoned. The facts on which this decision was based cannot be discussed in a public document, but I shall be glad to have the data furnished for the confidential information of the committee if it is so desired.

Other steps taken to protect American nationals who insisted on remaining in Ethiopia despite repeated warnings to leave may be summarized as follows:

1. Construction of bombproof shelter at American Legation, authorization for which was granted on September 24, 1935.

2. Establishment of naval radio station at the Legation. This naval detail consisted of four men who naturally were available for defense purposes in case of necessity. In connection with the establishment of the radio station it is of interest to note that because of the opposition of the Ethiopian Government to the establishment of such stations the Chargé was obliged to bring in the material for the station as "electrical equipment" and the naval radio operators as "clerks." Such being the case and bearing in mind the protests of the Emperor against the increase in the British Legation guard, it is obvious that any attempt to introduce an American military guard into Ethiopia would have been staunchly opposed by the Ethiopian authorities.

3. On September 14, 1935, the Chargé reported that he had advised American institutions in Addis Ababa to paint or stretch large American flags on the roofs of their buildings as a precaution against air raids. The Ambassador at Rome was instructed to furnish this information to the Italian Government, with the request that it be transmitted to the Italian military authorities in East Africa. The Italian Government promptly conveyed this information to its military authorities.

4. Early in October the Chargé d'Affaires at Addis Ababa reported that the members of the Diplomatic Corps there had

---

particularly helpless in case of trouble, they were repatriated during the summer and autumn of 1935 through funds obtained from a private source. It was necessary to obtain such funds privately since no appropriation is available for repatriating indigent American nationals.

decided to ask their respective governments to bring to the attention of the Italian Government the fact that Addis Ababa and Diré Dawa were open and undefended towns. Upon receipt of this information the Department instructed the American Ambassador at Rome to bring the matter to the attention of the Italian Government, which promptly issued a statement to the effect that these towns would not be bombed as long as they were not used for troop concentration.

5. On April 7, 1936, the American Ambassador at Rome was directed to express to the Italian Government the hope that Italian military authorities in East Africa might be advised of the location of American institutions in the provinces of Ethiopia. Such action was duly taken by the Italian Government.

On the outbreak of war on October 3, 1935, the Chargé d'Affaires at Addis Ababa reported that he had insisted that certain missionary women and children leave at once. He continued as follows:

"For all Americans remaining I have arranged with the British Legation to be afforded such protection as may be possible. British Minister has kindly consented to distribute gas masks to any Americans who desire them and to allow them to set up tents in his compound in the event that police protection fails. I have been repeatedly assured by the Emperor and local authorities that everything possible will be done to protect American lives and property."

On April 18, 1936, the Minister Resident at Addis Ababa reported that in connection with the possible departure of the Ethiopian Government from the city the Diplomatic Corps was making every effort to arrange for adequate police protection during the interval between the departure of the Government and the arrival of Italian forces.

On May 1, 1936, the Diplomatic Corps at Addis Ababa agreed individually to endeavor informally to dissuade the Ethiopian Government from taking steps which might lead to fighting near the city, basing their efforts on humanitarian motives and with a view to protecting their nationals. Later on May 1 the Minister reported that, as he had learned that the Ethiopian Government had decided to try to defend the capital, he was advising American women and children to prepare, in accordance with previous arrangement, for concentration at the British Legation.

(2) With respect to the request for copies of all communications between the Department of State and the American minister resident at Addis Ababa regarding the recent looting and action taken or proposed in respect thereto, I attach copies of all pertinent telegrams. I invite particular attention to my telegrams, no. 179 of May 3 and no. 190 of May 4, to the Minister at Addis Ababa, stressing the fact that considerations of safety should at all times be controlling and that no one at the Legation should jeopardize his life merely for the purpose of remaining there.

I should make it clear that our arrangement for protection of our nationals in the well-defended British Legation was not at all unusual. It is the frequent practice of one government to seek assistance for its nationals from another government which, because of the large number of its nationals and the importance of its interests in a given area, may be better prepared to render such assistance. On many occasions diplomatic and consular officers of the United States, in accordance with the universal practice of all nations, have used their good offices in protecting foreign nationals in those parts of the world where this country has outstanding interests and where it is well equipped for such services. As a matter of fact, some 40 foreign nationals sought and received protection in the American Legation during the recent crisis in Addis Ababa.

The following facts must also be borne in mind. It was confidently expected that American nationals in Ethiopia would follow the advice urgently given them in July 1935, and repeated in August, to withdraw from the country. If these urgent warnings had made no impression, it was expected that the President's statement of October 5, 1935, that any of our people who engaged in transactions with the belligerents did so at their own risk, might at least have had some effect. If these warnings and admonitions had been given the consideration which was due them by unofficial American citizens in Ethiopia there would have remained in that country only the personnel of the American Legation, whose protection offered no difficulty. Obviously, to protect those American citizens who remained and who were widely scattered throughout Ethiopia would have required the dispatch of a large military force.

In connection with the suggestion that American armed forces might have been sent to Ethiopia for the protection of the American Legation, it seems unnecessary to recall the state of public opinion in this country during the summer of 1935, which resulted in the passage in August of that year of the neutrality resolution, specifically designed to prevent this country's being dragged into any foreign conflict. The dispatch of an American war vessel carrying American troops to a distant, troubled zone at such a time and for such a limited purpose would have subjected this Government to a charge of flagrantly violating the spirit of the neutrality act and would undoubtedly and rightfully have met with vigorous protest from the American people.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. Speaker, when I introduced House Resolution 504 I did so because I felt that the Members of Congress should know all of the facts in connection with the protection of the American Legation at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, during the recent looting. I am sorry the committee did not see fit to report favorably on the resolution, for there are parts of Secretary Hull's letter that will stand discussion.

The United States Government has an exceedingly unenviable reputation throughout the world for the lack of interest observed in the protection of its embassies, legations, and personnel. Since the Addis Ababa events occurred I have received many letters from American citizens who have lived abroad. These letters invariably call attention to the humiliating spectacle of a country the size of ours appealing to the British Government for the protection of its Legation. Some of the writers of these letters go so far as to advise any American in foreign lands to get acquainted with the British Legation in anticipation of trouble, because of the respect Great Britain has from all nations.

This, too, is borne out in Secretary Hull's letter, quoted below. It will be noted in his fourth paragraph that in May 1935—1 year ago—the Department of State asked the American Embassy in London "to ascertain what steps were being taken by the British Government for the possible protection of its nationals." Great Britain's Foreign Office stated that "in case it became necessary to evacuate foreigners from Ethiopia it would be glad to instruct its Legation at Addis Ababa to do everything it could to assist in the evacuation of American nationals there." In other words, our Government intended to rely on a foreign power to protect our citizens, and apparently planned to do nothing itself. It is a confession of weakness.

Our Government warned its citizens to leave Ethopia, and many of them did so, those remaining electing to do so on their own responsibilities. Many did not leave because they did not have the money to do so. But what of the plight of the employees of our Government who had no choice but were obliged to remain at their posts unless orders to the contrary were received?

The Department of State admits that it used subterfuge in bringing into Ethiopia radio equipment and radio operators as "electrical material" and "clerks." While the State Department was willing to use subterfuge in this respect, it was unwilling, apparently, to do so to protect our Legation. It was not too proud to do some smuggling, but too proud to do other smuggling. What a ridiculous position! Too much dependence was placed on Great Britain, not only for supplies and shelter in time of trouble but for men and arms for defense against the looters.

The question of involvement in the war or the violation of the spirit of the Neutrality Act does not enter into the matter at all. The defense of the Legation was not against the organized soldiery of Ethiopia or any other nation but against unlawful looters and bandits who were not subject to any regulation or command. That was the danger. Had our Minister or his wife or the other employees been killed, it is quite probable that neither Ethiopia nor Italy would have been held to blame. Situated in the most dangerous part of Addis Ababa, our Legation was defended by Minister Engert and the other employees with what few rifles, shotguns, and pistols they had at hand. The most effective weapon of defense was an Italian submachine gun, procured late, by chance, through the good offices of an Abyssinian policeman, who had fled to the American Legation. All because our Department of State was unwilling to risk the refusal of permission to import machine guns. Secretary Hull's statement on this point is pitifully weak:

Even if further equipment, such as machine guns, had been requested, it is open to serious doubt whether the Ethiopian authorities would have permitted the importation of such equipment since it was well known that other governments experienced difficulties and long delays in importing shipments of such a nature into Ethiopia.

It is not wild conjecture to presume that Great Britian had a sufficiency of arms. We know they had the men, despite the refusal of the Ethiopian Government to permit them to have them.

Secretary Hull admits that our interests are protected in countries where we have outstanding interests, but in small and often dangerous posts the employees and citizens are left to shift for themselves or are placed under the protection of a foreign government. This is wrong, and makes our policy a matter of dollars and cents.

In the next to the last paragraph of his letter the Secretary states that the problem of protecting the personnel of the American Legation offered no difficulty. That this is not so is borne out by the fact that two persons were injured in the fighting in the Legation.

I feel that it is most important for the morale of the Foreign Service that our State Department should hereafter make provisions for the defense of American Legations in exposed areas. We have an excellent corps of trained men, capable of coping with every diplomatic emergency, but when they are exposed to attack by looters and tribesmen running amuck, as was the case in Ethiopia, they should be afforded protection, or at least the means to protect themselves.

RAILROADS ARE THE PRINCIPAL BENEFICIARIES OF RIVER AND HARBOR DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address which I made.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following radio address which I delivered on Monday, April 27, 1936:

Fellow citizens of New York State, I wish to discuss with you tonight the Stokes resolution, now pending in the New York State Senate, submitting a constitutional amendment to permit the Legislature of the State of New York to impose tolls on the barge canals. I am glad to present the matter to the people of the State from the national viewpoint.

The imposition of tolls on our canals will, I firmly believe, impair the prestige and development of our State. It will also result in grave loss to our bankers, to our industrialists, and to the consuming public. To all of them now go the savings which come from the operation of our canals. I have served on the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House for 8 years and have come to be familiar with the national picture on transportation. The prime necessity of America today is adequate low-cost freight charges. In some sections of our country we have great surpluses of products of the farm and factories for which there is no market. In other sections there is distress because of the need of these commodities which cannot be transported to the area where they are needed by reason of the prohibitive and, may I say, excessive freight rates. It is my honestly considered opinion that the development of our internal waterways and of our coastal harbors is now beginning to solve this acute and distressing problem. Another feature in the solution is the 3,000,000 miles of roads and public highways which the Nation has improved. Over these the development of transportation by truck is already furnishing some relief to the suffering farmer and businessman. We have 15,000 miles of canalized rivers suited to navigation within these United States. We have about 250,000 miles of railroads. As at present constituted these various methods of transportation are not meeting the problems of the people, and I am convinced from my examination of the subject that the present rate structure of the railroads is a definite and complete handicap to the farmer or industrialist who wishes to get his goods to market. As time has gone on, these railroad rates have become more and more oppressive. The management of the railroads have since the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission remained quiescent and have until now been content to make an annual pilgrimage to the Interstate Commerce Commission where they asked for and usually received an increase in freight rates. These charges finally became so excessive that the public has been driven to water and truck transportation, where they were available.

May I say that I have no grievance against the railroad; and while I wish to give them due credit for the part they are playing in American economics, I desire to emphasize that their growth in America has gone hand in hand with the development of waterways. This fact has been ignored by the ardent advocates of the railroads who are now seeking to get a monopoly of transportation in America. The Congress has disbursed more than $800,000,000 upon seacoast, lake harbors, and channels in a period of 125 years. Sixty-seven percent of this total was upon coastal harbors. These harbors were the connecting links between the ships and the railroads and equally beneficial to both. Take, for example, New York Harbor; over 10 branches of New York Harbor improved by the Government, ferryboats operated by the railroads carried freight in 1932 valued at over 14 billion dollars. If such harbor improvement constitutes subsidy to the ships, it also constitutes an equal subsidy to the railroads.

On the Great Lakes we handle an average of 100,000,000 tons of freight per year. This tonnage, consisting mostly of ore, coal, and wheat, is handled by rail at both ends of the line. The railroads receive about 10 mills per ton-mile on these freights and the boats 1 mill per ton-mile. Thus the railroads enjoy the major benefits.

The classic example of railroad development due to water transportation is the area around Pittsburgh. During the 25-year period between 1900 and 1925 the waterway traffic at Pittsburgh increased 31,000,000 tons; the rail traffic increased 116,000,000 tons. This growth and development was entirely due to the low-cost water transportation which carried the iron ore from the Mesaba Range in Minnesota to the Lake Erie ports, from where it was a short haul by rail. Except for the low-cost transportation by the Lakes the production of steel in and around Pittsburgh would have been impossible and the railroads would not have enjoyed the tremendous development incident to the establishment of the steel mills adjacent to the coal mines.

The growth of our large cities on the coast and on the Great Lakes has been due to the existence of water transportation. Chicago, Cleveland, and Buffalo on the Great Lakes; Galveston, Houston, and New Orleans on the Gulf; the great cities on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, have had their development and growth by reason of water transportation provided in part by nature and improved by the Federal Government. Around these centers of population the railroads have had their greatest and most profitable development so that the continuing flow of propaganda against waterways comes with poor grace and without justification from the railroads and their spokesmen. They have been the beneficiaries of all these developments and are now biting the hand that fed them. I definitely charge that the railroads of today are seeking a monopoly of transportation and have entered upon a campaign of misrepresentation of the waterways and trucks which reaches to every nook and corner of the land. If a monopoly of transportation comes—and it will come unless industry and agriculture are aroused to the dangers of the situation—the costs of living will go up by leaps and bounds and we shall have to fight again the battle which the people won in 1886, when the Interstate Commerce Commission was established.

Just now the firing line is here in New York State where a preliminary attempt is being made to destroy the usefulness to the people of the New York State barge canals. The railroads have assumed their ancient role and propose to wreck these canals by the imposition of tolls. If they succeed in this, they will then demand that the highways be operated under a similar system. These canals connect the Great Lakes area with the seacoast. They run from Lake Ontario and Lake Erie to Albany and have at present a navigable depth of 9 feet. From Albany to New York via the Hudson River we have a 27-foot channel. The canals are increasing in usefulness each year, and the tonnage is gradually mounting as better transportation facilities are afforded. They furnish an essential link to all transportation from the Lake States and Middle West to the Atlantic seaboard. These canals last year carried approximately 4,000,000 tons of freight. It is estimated it will reach 6,000,000 tons in 1938. Over this canal passes at low transportation cost fertilizers, feeds, gasoline, flour, canned goods, building material, kerosene, fuel oil, and a host of other raw and manufactured products. Low-cost canal charges bring a saving to the farmers and urban consumers on these items of at least $8,000,000 per year. Then there is the item of savings to the farmers and urban consumers in lower freight rates in other forms of transportation as a result of barge-canal competition. We may estimate this additional saving at $5,000,000 per year.

Employment in New York State industries is stimulated and made possible by the low transportation cost of raw materials by barge canal. This is a concrete and definite benefit which would pass to other States in the event that tolls were imposed on the canal. These industries employ many thousands of men and pay large sums in taxes. Commerce on these canals at their terminal points give employment to marine, warehouse, and port workers. There are no exact figures available on this, but it may be conservatively estimated at a total of $5,000,000 per year.

These canals have a sanitary and drainage value that cannot be measured in dollars. Over them pass each year, going from the seaboard to the lakes, thousands of recreational craft which give health and recreation to the people. As a result of the construction of the canals great water powers have been created which result in the employment of thousands of people. This canal is not operated for the benefit of the transportation companies using it.

The fact is that their savings in transportation costs are passed on to the consumer, farmer, and the industrialist. Within the zone of the canal in the State of New York a freight differential is established by the railroads which illustrates the potential effect of the canal upon the freight rates. I have heard it stated by excellent authority on transportation that if the barge canals of New York State did not transport a ton of freight the mere existence or presence of the canal would result in a saving to the people of the State of New York of $50,000,000 per year in freight rates. That was the reasoning of our forebears on this proposition, so they wrote into the constitution of this State two provisions. One, that the canals could not be sold or leased, and the other, that the canals should be toll-free forever. They did this because they realized how vital the continuance of the canal system was to the protection of the economic life of the State. The reasons that applied when these provisions were put into the constitution

apply with greater force now when the railroads are seeking and are actually making progress toward a monopoly of transportation.

The United States Engineers, who are the greatest economists on water transportation in the world, recommended in 1929 that the Government take title to the canals. The engineers found that the New York State barge canal was a sound navigational project and that the economics resulting from its operation justified not only its continuance but its being taken over by the Government. I wish that every citizen of the State who is listening in on this discussion might read the engineers' illuminating and commendatory report on the New York State canals. Pursuant to said report Congress passed an act in 1930 which provided for Government operation. The act carried an appropriation of $2,500,000 annually for the operation of the canal. I had a hand in writing that statute.

I regret that the State did not take advantage of this opportunity to nationalize the barge canals. It has always been my belief that the New York State Barge Canal, which is a vital link in our national system of waterways, should be operated by the Government as are the Atlantic, the coastal, the Illinois, and other waterways of this type.

The constitutional provision against the sale or lease of the canals more or less stood in the way, and in 1932 my colleague, Mr. GAVAGAN, of New York City, introduced a bill for the deepening of the canal to 12 feet navigable depth without taking title. Subsequent to that the United States Engineers recommended an appropriation of $27,000,000 for the purpose of deepening the canal to 12 feet navigable depth, giving greater clearances under the bridges and straightening out some of the bends. We spent many weary months getting this measure through Congress. The representatives of the railroads trained their heaviest guns on this project, but without success. Last year $5,000,000 was spent on this deepening by the Federal Government. This year there will be an additional $5,000,000 available for this purpose, and an equal sum each year till the work is done. It makes the canal 50 percent more efficient, and it will result in corresponding savings in transportation costs when this improvement is completed. It, of course, materially helps the unemployment situation in New York State and at the same time is a worth-while and thoroughly constructive navigational project.

I think I know the situation at Washington. It is my judgment that on the completion of the canal deepening the Federal Government will take over and operate the canal provided the State is then willing. The passing of the pending resolution in the senate, no. 163, by Senator Stokes, providing that the Legislature of the State of New York may levy State canal tolls as it sees fit, will stop the expenditure of this $27,000,000. It will also defeat probably for all time our purpose in Congress, provided the State consents, to take over and operate this canal.

Congress is vigorously opposed to any form of toll upon a public utility, whether it is a highway, a bridge, or waterway. America passed that stage many decades ago. It remained for the railroads to attempt to turn back the clock and restore this relic of the Dark Ages. Members of Congress, both East and West, North and South, are of one mind on this subject of tolls. The Congress will not vote money to any public utility that collects tolls. If tolls are made probable by the action of the Legislature of New York State at this session, then New York State must remain on its own because so far as the Federal Government is concerned, it will not aid or contribute by taking this canal over, operating it, and continue its deepening. The people of our State will then have to take refuge in the cold bosom of the railroads, where they will find scant comfort with a certain loss of State prestige and development and transportation costs that will be ruinous to agriculture and industry.

I want to call your attention to a letter written by General Markham, Chief of Engineers, to the New York State Authority on this question. It is as follows:

Mr. BILLINGS WILSON,
Assistant General Manager, the Port of New York Authority,
111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of January 29, 1936, in which you refer to a proposal removing the prohibition against the levying of tolls on the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, introduced in the New York State Legislature, and ask to be advised if the authorization contained in the recent river and habor act, approved August 30, 1935, would not prohibit the allotment of Federal funds to this project in the event such legislation were established.

It is the view of this office that the authorization contained in the river and harbor bill based on the report of this department, is specific in that Federal funds may not be made available for the improvement in the event legislation is enacted for the establishment of tolls. It is my further view that in such event it would be necessary for me to recommend the revocation of any unexpended balances from the fund provided from the Emergency Relief appropriation for the work now under way, and that no further Federal funds could be allotted to the improvement of the canal under the present authorization.

Very truly yours,

E. M. MARKHAM,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

With characteristic audacity the railroads say that the passage of the Stokes Resolution No. 163 will make no difference with the disbursement of Federal money. The letter of the distinguished chief engineer throws that contention out of the window.

I have become familiar with the national transportation problems of the farmer by reason of my service at Washington. I have been in contact with the national officers and representatives of the Grange and the Farm Bureau Federation. These bodies realize the damage which threatens their people by reason of the present activities of the railroad. Both the National Grange and the Farm Bureau feel that the railroads are seeking a national monopoly of transportation in America. I have fought shoulder to shoulder with the Grange and Farm Bureau leaders on this proposition. So, I appeal to you listeners who are members of farm organizations to write or telegraph your Senator in the New York State Legislature requesting him to oppose this Stokes Resolution No. 163. I likewise appeal to the industrialists and to all citizens who are concerned with the welfare and development of our State to take similar action. I make no war on the railroads. I am for giving them their place in the sun. I will vote to give them Federal aid in every reasonable, proper way.

In conclusion I wish to emphasize with all earnestness and sincerity that the passage of the Stokes resolution in the senate will be a body blow to the people of our State in that it will hamper its development, increase the present burdens of the farmer, add to the high cost of living, and will surely discontinue necessary and proper Federal aid to our barge-canal system.

Thank you and good night.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House at this time is to call attention to the fact that in the passage of the deficiency bill several days ago, and in relation to the Works Progress Administration, on page 23, from line 4 to line 9, appears language which, in my opinion, would preclude veterans who will otherwise be eligible in accordance with existing regulations from being employed unless the language is changed by the Senate. The House bill states:

In the employment of persons on Works Progress Administration projects applicants in actual need of such employment whose names have not heretofore been placed on relief rolls shall be given the same eligibility for employment as applicants whose names have heretofore appeared on such rolls.

The words "actual need", in my opinion, will preclude veterans from receiving work in the Works Progress Administration unless the words "actual need" are supplemented by appropriate language inserted by the Senate not to exclude veterans who are in need, but who might be denied such employment because of receipt of the bonus.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Works Progress Administrator is in sympathy with the employment of veterans who are in need and does not feel that the receipt of the bonus should interfere with such employment.

It was not the intention of the Members of the House, and I know it was not my intention, and I do not think the intention of either the Democratic or Republican Members, to state that veterans, just because they may receive the bonus, shall be denied employment in the Works Progress Administration. I also know that the distinguished gentleman that proposed the amendment eliminating the dead line would feel the same way. I hope the Senate will incorporate an appropriate amendment, and when it comes back for our consideration that the House will concur.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Printing, I send to the Clerk's desk a privileged report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 35 (Rept. No. 2666) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 35

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Constitution of the United States of America (annotated), including all amendments thereto, and with citations of the cases of the Supreme Court of the United States construing its several provisions, collated under each separate provision, be compiled and revised up to date, and that the same shall be printed and bound; and that 3,000 copies shall be printed, of which 2,200 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 800 copies for the use of the Senate.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FISCAL RELATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes to make an announcement regarding the conference on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington newspapers have reported that a Mr. L. H. Parker is a great expert on civic tax matters and that he has given a special report on fiscal relations here in Washington which would show that the District of Columbia is the third highest taxed city in the United States.

This statement is so ridiculous that it is absurd on its face. All of us who have been giving close study to local tax matters here for 20 years know he is a fake when he makes that assertion. Our subcommittee had this man Parker before us and questioned him in a hearing, and he showed that when he worked for the city of New York he had been drawing a salary of $230 to $240 a month, and that he is drawing now an annual salary of $9,600 from a joint committee of Congress, and yet last October he hired himself out to this Washington Board of Trade, on the side, for $5,500, which they paid him to make this ridiculous report about Washington being overtaxed, when the people here are the least taxed of any city in the whole world.

We showed that he does not know anything worthy of belief about the civic tax rate in this and comparable cities, or about the fiscal or tax relations of Washington and the United States Government. We showed that he was not an expert on civic taxes, and that he had not been to any one of these cities that was given by the President in his report last year as paying much larger taxes than Washington, and that he knew nothing about their tax matters, and his whole evidence before our subcommittee showed he had sold himself last October to the board of trade for $5,500 to give this report that is against the interest of the Government, which is paying him an annual salary of $9,600.

We are going to have this evidence, taken before our subcommittee, printed and it will be accessible to you Monday morning. I am going to mail every one of you and every Senator a copy of his testimony and I hope every Member of this House and every Member of the Senate will read this man's testimony. It is ridiculous. It is absurd. He was bought by Washington for $5,400 and testified he knew what they expected him to do for this handsome fee. It just shows how far Washington will go to try to escape just taxation. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleagues for allowing me to present further facts about what occurred at our hearing. This Mr. L. H. Parker admitted that when he came to Washington the tax rate here was $1.82 per $100, that in 1926 the tax rate was $1.70 on the $100, that in 1927 they raised it back to $1.80 on the $100, that in 1928 they lowered it back to $1.70 on the $100, and that from 1928 to 1933, inclusive, the tax rate in Washington was $1.70 on the $100 or $17 on the $1,000.

TAX RATE $1.50 ON THE $100

Mr. L. H. Parker likewise admitted that since 1934 the tax rate in Washington, D. C., has been only $1.50 on the $100, or $15 on the $1,000, which is the total tax paid here on tangible personal property and upon real estate, which is assessed at a valuation far below its real value.

NO SPECIAL TAXES IN WASHINGTON

Mr. L. H. Parker admitted that on property in the District of Columbia there is no State tax, and no county tax, and no school tax, and no special water tax, and no special school tax, and no special courthouse-, jail-, or bridge-bond tax, such as are paid by people living in some cities, additional to the city taxes they pay.

WASHINGTON TAX LOWEST IN UNITED STATES

Mr. L. H. Parker admitted that he could not name another city in the whole United States where the total tax on tangible personal property and real estate was as low as $1.50 on the $100, paid by the people of Washington.

FREE OF BURDENS OTHERS PAY

Mr. L. H. Parker admitted that Washington people paid no estate tax, no inheritance tax, no gift tax, no income tax, and no sales tax (additional to the Federal tax which all people alike pay), such as the people in some of the other cities of the United States have to pay.

ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS EXEMPTION ON HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE

Mr. L. H. Parker admitted that he could not name another city in the United States besides Washington where each family is given an exemption from taxes on $1,000 of household furniture, which $1,000 exemption Washington people enjoy.

LIBRARIES EXEMPT WHETHER $5 OR $500,000

Mr. L. H. Parker admitted that he could not name another city in the United States besides Washington where each person has exempt from all taxes his private library, regardless of value, whether it is worth $5 or $500,000, which exemption Washington people enjoy.

TWO-CENT GASOLINE TAX

Mr. L. H. Parker testified that he could not name another city in the United States besides Washington where the tax on gasoline is as low as 2 cents per gallon, which low rate of 2 cents per gallon on gasoline Washington people enjoy. Across the Memorial Bridge, 2 miles from the Capitol, over in Virginia, the tax is 5 cents per gallon on gasoline, and over beyond Chevy Chase in Maryland, 5 miles north from the Capitol the tax is 4 cents per gallon on gasoline, plus the sales tax that prevails in Maryland, which Baltimore people have to pay, while Washington people enjoy their 2 cents per-gallon tax on gasoline.

FAMILY WEARING APPAREL EXEMPT, REGARDLESS OF VALUE

Mr. L. H. Parker testified that he could not name another city in the United States besides Washington where each person has exempt from taxes all wearing apparel, regardless of value, whether worth $5 or $500,000, which exemption Washington people enjoy.

LOW RATE OF $6.60 PER YEAR FOR WATER

Mr. L. H. Parker testified that he could not name another city in the United States besides Washington where the charge for water is only $6.60 per year for the average family, which low rate the Washington people enjoy.

ONE-DOLLAR REGISTRATION FEE FOR $12,000 ROLLS-ROYCE

Mr. L. H. Parker testified that he could not name another city in the United States besides Washington where the annual registration fee on automobiles covering license number plates is only $1 per year, whether the car is a Ford or a $12,000 Rolls-Royce, which low nominal fee the Washington people for years have enjoyed.

NO CHARGE FOR REPAIRING AND REPLACING SIDEWALKS AND STREET PAVING

Mr. L. H. Parker could not name another city in the United States besides Washington where the people are not charged for repairing or replacing sidewalks and street paving in front of their residences, which privilege Washington people have enjoyed for years.

NO ANNUAL CHARGE FOR SEWER SERVICE

Mr. L. H. Parker could not name another city in the United States besides Washington where, after a residence is once connected with the sewer system, there is never thereafter any charge made against the owner for sewer service, which privilege Washington people have always enjoyed, while people in some cities have to pay a monthly charge.

ONE-HALF OF 1 PERCENT ON INTANGIBLES

Mr. L. H. Parker testified that he could not name another city in the United States besides Washington where the tax on intangible property (or the tax that compares with it) is as low as the Washington tax rate of only one-half of 1 percent on intangibles, which low rate Washington people have enjoyed, with no law here that forces them to render their intangibles, millions of dollars of which are hidden away in lock boxes in banks and not rendered for taxes, and it is only when people die and their estates go through probate that the full amount of their intangibles become known.

ASHES, TRASH, AND GARBAGE GATHERED FREE FROM RESIDENCES

Mr. L. H. Parker could not name another city in the United States besides Washington where the people have their ashes gathered free from their homes, their trash gathered free from their homes, and their garbage gathered free from their homes, which privilege Washington people have always enjoyed.

TREES FURNISHED, PLANTED, PROTECTED, SPRAYED, PRUNED, AND REPLACED WITHOUT CHARGE

Mr. L. H. Parker testified that he could not name another city in the United States besides Washington where in front of and around their residences the trees are furnished to the owners without charge, are planted without charge, are protected with lumber inclosures without charge, are watched and cared for free, are sprayed free, are pruned free, and are replaced without charge when they die, which privilege Washington people have enjoyed for many years.

ASSESSED VALUE LESS THAN HALF OF REAL VALUE

Mr. L. H. Parker had his attention called to numerous pieces of property, with figures and facts furnished by Tax Assessor Richards showing that in 1933 Washington experts on property values testified that the value of numerous lots was double and even treble the assessed value, and that the Government was forced to pay double and even in instances treble the assessed value for many pieces of property, including the numerous lots it bought for sites of the New House Office and the United States Supreme Court.

ASSESSED VALUES REDUCED $80,000,000 IN 1934 AND $50,000,000 IN 1935

Mr. L. H. Parker had his attention called to the fact that Commissioner Melvin C. Hazen, chairman of the Board, testified that in 1934 the Commissioners arbitrarily reduced the assessed value of real estate in Washington $80,000,000, and that in 1935 they arbitrarily reduced the assessed values of real estate $50,000,000, so that during the past 2 years the assessed values of real estate in Washington has been lowered $130,000,000, which has meant a great saving in taxes to Washington people.

WASHINGTON PEOPLE LEAST TAXED AND BEST TREATED

Mr. L. H. Parker had his attention called to the fact that Commissioner Melvin C. Hazen testified, as shown by the printed hearings, that the people of Washington were the least taxed, enjoyed more privileges, and were better treated, than the people of any other city in the United States.

PAID NOTHING ON THE $14,750,000 MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. L. H. Parker testified that Washington people paid no part of the $14,750,000 spent on the Memorial Bridge, all of same being paid by the United States.

PAID NOTHING ON BEAUTIFUL HIGHWAY TO MOUNT VERNON

Mr. L. H. Parker testified that Washington people paid nothing on the beautiful highway to Mount Vernon, which is constantly enjoyed by all Washington people, all of such expense being paid by the United States.

WASHINGTONIANS BENEFIT FROM ALL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. L. H. Parker admitted that the people of Washington have funds furnished for projects of local interest and benefit to them in large sums from the Interior appropriation bill, and from all of the annual appropriation bills for the different departments of government.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY FINANCED BY UNITED STATES

Mr. L. H. Parker admitted that Washington people paid nothing for Howard University here, but that the United States finances and maintains it.

WONDERFUL CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY COSTS WASHINGTON PEOPLE NOTHING

Mr. L. H. Parker admitted that Washington people have paid nothing either for the construction or annual maintenance of the fine Congressional Library here, daily used by Washington people.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTIONS HERE ATTRACT TO WASHINGTON HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF TOURISTS WHO SPEND MILLIONS IN WASHINGTON

Mr. L. H. Parker admitted that because of the Government institutions here, hundreds of thousands of tourists are attracted to Washington, and that the enormous amount of money they spend here annually is a bonanza to Washington people.

ALTHOUGH EMPLOYED BY HOUSE AND SENATE AT SALARY OF $9,600 ANNUALLY, NEITHER REQUESTED HIM TO REPORT ON LOCAL TAXES

Mr. L. H. Parker admitted that although he was employed by a joint committee of Congress, of which Senator PAT HARRISON is chairman and Congressman BOB DOUGHTON is vice chairman, that neither Senator HARRISON nor Congressman DOUGHTON had ever requested him to make any report on local taxes, and that neither knew anything about his hiring himself out to the Washington Board of Trade last October for a $5,500 fee to help the board of trade.

HIGH TAX RATE IN COMPARABLE CITIES

Mr. L. H. Parker had his attention called to the list of comparable cities which President Franklin D. Roosevelt submitted to Congress last year, which he had had investigated by the Treasury Department, showing that in all of them the tax rate far exceeded that paid in Washington, and that the tax rate in Washington was the lowest of them all, and Mr. Parker admitted that he had never been in any of these cities to check up their tax rate, and he showed our subcommittee that he did not know anything whatever about the tax rate of comparable cities.

PARKER'S OWN RESIDENCE ASSESSED FAR BELOW VALUE

The property at no. 1317 Iris Street NW., being lot 12 in block 2774, was a vacant lot in 1929 and was then assessed at $2,310, and a new residence was built on it, and on August 15, 1931, was sold to Mr. L. H. Parker for $17,950, of which Mr. Parker paid $500 cash, and assumed a first trust of $10,000, and a second trust of $7,450, and while he owned it, and from 1930 to 1934 this property was rendered for taxes at an assessed valuation of only $11,010, and for 1935 and 1936 it is assessed at only $10,110, which at the tax rate of $1.50 pays the lowest taxes of similar property in any other city of the entire United States.

WANT COLLEAGUES TO READ PRINTED HEARINGS

These hearings will be printed and available by next Monday, and I want my colleagues, both in the House and Senate, to read same. They will find in same some very interesting information.

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE HAS BEEN DILIGENT AND FAITHFUL

Our House subcommittee has worked hard, has been diligent and faithful, and I know that it will have the hearty support of the House in not allowing an amendment that will force the taxpayers of the United States to make a gratuitous contribution of $5,700,000 out of the Public Treasury, to pay on the local fiscal expenses of Washington people, who, as Commissioner Hazen says, are the best treated, the least taxed, and enjoy more privileges than any other people in the United States.

I know that the people of Missouri, Iowa, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Texas do not want us to tax them to make a $5,700,000 annual gift to Washington people each year, and I believe the people of Oklahoma, New York, Virginia, New Hampshire, and South Dakota are of like mind, and would resent being made to pay taxes to raise $5,700,000 to give to Washington people each year.

FIGHTING FOR WHAT IS RIGHT IS EXPENSIVE

In addition to the time and labor spent on these matters, it has cost me a lot of money. I have paid to the Government Printing Office quite a sum of money for reprints, just to let the people know about this situation. Just to show how much the Government Printing Office has charged me for printing matter relating to the fight I am making to keep communism out of public schools I have gotten permission to print the following certificate:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD CLERK,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1936.

AS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk, who handles all orders for reprints of public documents, I do hereby certify that the reprints of hearings and excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ordered by Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON relating to his efforts to keep communism out of schools, were not printed at Government expense, but that Congressman BLANTON was charged regular prices

for same by the Government Printing Office, and such reprinting cost Congressman BLANTON the following amounts, to wit:

Order No. 54760. Extracts from hearings, Committee on Appropriations, on eliminating subversive matter from public schools	$309.60
Order No. 12573. Excerpts of speeches from CONGRESSIONAL Record on communism	668.86
Total on above	978.46

The above shows the total charges made by the Government Printing Office against Mr. BLANTON for printing the above.

W. A. SMITH,
Congressional Record Clerk.

APPLE BLOSSOM FESTIVAL AT WESTFORD, MASS.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House to make an announcement and extend an invitation to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday and Sunday of this week the inhabitants of the beautiful little town of Westford, Mass., are to have an apple-blossom festival, and I want you to know how anxious we are to have every one of my colleagues come there to see our beautiful apple blossoms and also accept the hospitality of the Fifth District and Westford in particular. We want you all very much, and I may say to the people from the South who have not been there before that we will give you a welcome as warm as the sunny South; and I may say to the people who have left our section to go to the central West and far West we want to welcome you back; and I will say to the gentleman from North Dakota, who, perhaps, has forgotten us in New England a little, we have the same affectionate feeling for the people who have left us, and we want them at least to come back and see us.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is the gentlewoman from Massachusetts by any chance referring to the remarks of the gentleman from North Dakota yesterday when he referred to the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. Moses?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman realize that apparently the heavens resented those remarks, and hailstones, like thunder, descended on this roof? [Applause.]

FRAZIER-LEMKE BILL

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a few excerpts on the Lemke bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks and insert therein a few excerpts on the Frazier-Lemke farm debt refinancing bill, I am inserting herewith a letter just received from one of my constituents. The contents of this letter is very much in line with my argument made yesterday on the floor of the House in connection with the consideration of the Frazier-Lemke bill.

COLUMBIA, S. C., *May 12, 1936.*

Hon. H. P. FULMER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULMER: I notice that the Frazier-Lemke farm debt refinancing bill is being considered by Congress. From the account in the today's paper it appears that you are in favor of the passage of this bill. I am glad that you are on the right side.

I am unable to see how the issue of currency to pay debts already contracted could bring about inflation, and if it did, would that evil be any greater than that which now exists as a result of the high rate of interest landowners are paying to stave off foreclosures and loss of their homes?

I am enclosing herewith notice to me of installment due the Federal land bank on a loan which the bank made me about 1924. I have no criticism of the bank. As a matter of fact, it has always treated me with the greatest consideration and courtesy, but my purpose in enclosing this notice is to impress upon you and other Members of Congress who may come into possession of this information the enormous interest charges which mortgagees are paying. You will observe that the semiannual payments on this loan amount to $130.23, of which $86.04 is for interest and only $44.19 is applied to the principal. In other words, the interest is approximately double the principal. I may say in this connection that the interest charges on this loan prior to a couple of years ago, when the Government arranged to have interest rates reduced, were considerably in excess of the figure given here. The total payment of principal and interest then being something over $320 per year in the place of approximately $260 which I am now required to pay. After making payments at the rates mentioned above since the money was borrowed in 1924, the principal has been reduced to about $4,400 on a $5,000 loan. The principal has been approximately paid in interest. With the high taxes and the high cost of living it is almost impossible for farmers who owe a mortgage indebtedness to save their homes. I personally know of a number of cases—and you probably do—where foreclosures have been made and the home owners, after years of struggle, have been thrown out either to become tenant farmers or drift to town and pick up whatever odd jobs chance might give them.

From my own experience and observation I do not feel that the Congress could do anything that would go further to relieve a most distressing situation and improve conditions as a whole than to pass this bill. I trust that the delegation from this State will give it solid support.

I would like to know what the Bankhead "sound dollar" is worth to the poor devil who does not have one to spend.

With kindest regards I am,

Yours very truly,

J. IVEY HUMPHREY.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SNELL. What does the gentleman expect the program to be for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week?

Mr. BANKHEAD. So far as we can tell now, I may state to the minority leader, Monday, as the gentleman knows, is Consent Calendar day. I do not know whether the Speaker has any suspensions in mind or not. I have not conferred with him.

On Tuesday we will have private claims bills; and if we dispense with Calendar Wednesday, we will take up the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD a certificate from the RECORD clerk of the amount of money I have paid recently to the Government Printing Office in my fight against communism.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FARMER AND HIS MORTGAGE

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I seriously doubt that anything that might be said or done by me with reference to the pending legislation and the friends of this bill—Frazier-Lemke—which so many of us think will be of great benefit to the farmers of this country, will have any substantial effect. We are told that the powers that be on this hill are opposed to this particular legislation. I dislike very much being put in the attitude of opposing the leadership of this body who have in charge the administration's policies, for I realize that this administration has done possibly more for agriculture than any previous administration. If I am incorrect in this, then I know that I am on sound ground when I state that the Roosevelt administration has attempted to do more to assist agriculture than any previous administration. And I might add that there has been more reason and justification, possibly, for assistance to the

farmer in the past 3 years than at any time. For certainly there has never been a time in the history of the country when agriculture needed the sympathetic cooperation of its National Legislature more than it did at the period when this administration came into power.

Moreover, I am not unmindful of the fact that there is a desire today on the part of the agricultural interests of the country to cooperate insofar as possible with an administration that is trying to help them. But, Mr. Speaker, this is a most important matter, as I view it. It goes to the very foundation of the troubles which beset the American farmer today. I should be the last Member of this House to challenge the sincerity of many of those who oppose this legislation. I do not question their desire to constructively help the farmer. But I have a right to my own opinion, and I hope that as long as I am a Member of this body I shall always have the courage to exercise the right to follow that opinion when I have once reached it after careful study and thought. Therefore, I shall vote for this measure.

A brief analysis of the bill would be in order, but I shall content myself with merely pointing out some of the salient features of the bill which, I think, would be beneficial.

INTERST OF FARM MORTGAGES TOO HIGH

The whole purpose of this bill is to refinance existing farm mortgages at a rate of interest that the farmer can pay. There are today, and, for that matter, every day, mortgages being foreclosed on the farms of this country by the Federal Land Bank and by private mortgages. These mortgages are being foreclosed because of the fact that the farmer is not earning sufficient income from his farm to pay the rate of interest which he today has to pay. If the business interest of this country had to pay the same rate of interest on its mortgages and other indebtedness the foreclosures in the business world would be just as substantial as they are in the field of agriculture. Business could not stand it; neither can agriculture.

When this administration came into power in 1933 the whole economic structure of the country was tottering. People were hungry. Banks were toppling like toy houses before the anger of a spoiled child. In fact, the country was facing a revolution. The present administration, under the leadership of our great President, proceeded to bring order out of chaos. Much is yet to be done.

SAME TREATMENT FOR AGRICULTURE AS FOR INDUSTRY

One of the first things that was done was to grant generous loans through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at a low rate of interest to industry. The industrial wheels were about to stop. They were threatened with foreclosure—they were being foreclosed in thousands of instances daily. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation came to their aid. Today, in spite of the assistance that has been rendered to agriculture by this administration, finds agriculture in very much the same position that industry was then. In fact, agriculture was in the same condition 3 years ago as industry. We are asking today that the same privilege be granted to agriculture that was granted to industry then—refinance the farm mortgages on a lower rate of interest. Need I remind you that millions upon top of millions of dollars went to the relief, through the medium of loans through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, of industry. Happily, they were able to refinance their obligations at a lower rate of interest, and today industry is fairly comfortable. Give the farmer the same opportunity to refinance his mortgage indebtedness and you will find him in a few years fairly happy and content.

FARMERS TRYING TO REPAY WITH HIGH MONEY INDEBTEDNESS INCURRED WITH CHEAP MONEY

Mr. Speaker, the condition of the farmer today, in spite of all the attempts that have been made to assist him, is not an enviable one. The chief trouble with the farmers of this country today is that they are trying to repay obligations incurred when cotton was selling at 20 cents and wheat at $1.50 with money earned on 10-cent cotton and 90-cent wheat. I doubt if it can be done. Thousands of farmers in this country are faced with the loss of their farms—their homes, if you please—because back in prosperous times when money was cheap they incurred obligations at a low rate of interest (which is always incidental to cheap money) and are now forced into the unfortunate position of trying to repay these obligations with tight money, which must be obtained at a high rate of interest; this, too, when they are now receiving approximately half for the commodities which they produce as compared with the price received for their commodities when the obligation was incurred. But it is argued that the farmer should not have incurred these obligations in prosperous times. The farmer is not to be indicted for this any more than the city dweller, the laborer, or any other class of people. Even the master minds in the industrial world would be subject to the same indictment. All classes of people made the same mistake, if a mistake it was. We have realized that and attempted to correct it in this Congress. We have granted relief to the home owners through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. We have extended the helping hand to industry. We have saved the banks of the country through the guaranty deposit law. We have undertaken to grant security for the aged through the old-age pension. Financial assistance to the crippled and unfortunate children of our country has been given. And, frankness compels the admission that we have attempted to help the farmers of the country.

All of these undertakings were worthy and received my steadfast and enthusiastic support. But here, as I see it, we have an opportunity through this piece of legislation to go to the taproot of the farmer's trouble by liquidating his farm mortgage through a process of refinancing at a rate of interest at 1½ percent, plus the carrying charges, which should, at the most, not exceed over another 1½ percent. In other words, under the terms of this legislation if enacted into law, the farmer would be able to swap his mortgage upon which he is now paying anywhere from 6 to 8 percent for another mortgage on a long-term retirement plan at a rate of interest at 3 percent. It would give him security. If this bill were enacted into law there are thousands, yea, hundreds of thousands, of farmers in this country who could rest at night with the assurance that they had reasonable security for their farms and their homes from this ghostly spectre of the advent of the farm auctioneer. Three percent interest with the liquidation of the mortgage over a period of 40 years—what comfort, what a sense of security the mortgage-ridden farmers of this country would have!

INFLATIONARY

But we are told that this bill is inflationary and that that is one of the chief objections to its enactment into law. As one who has given considerable time to the study of our monetary system, I disagree with this charge. Inflation is a question. Few people agree upon what constitutes inflation. Time will not permit a discussion of the monetary question involved. Suffice it to say that these bonds which are proposed to be issued and sold under the provision of this bill would have behind them every safeguard, as the bill is now amended, that any other existing obligation of the Government has.

They would have behind them the gold and silver in the Treasury of the United States. Moreover, they would have behind them the real value of this country—the real estate and the homes of the country. After all, what constitutes value? Certainly it is not money. The true wealth of this Nation is not in the stocks and bonds owned by the financial interests of this country. Our real wealth is based upon the value of the property of the country's citizenship. The bonds which are proposed to be issued under this act will be secured by that value.

I fear that, if the present conditions with reference to the farm mortgages of this country continue as they have for the past 7 years, the morale of the farming class of this Nation will be undermined and destroyed. And when the morale of the agricultural class of this country, constituting as it does the fundamental wealth of the Nation, is destroyed, this country will cease to exist on its present basis with its present institutions. Recent statistics tend to prove that farm tenancy is on the increase. I fear that it will continue to

grow until some substantial remedy, such as the pending legislation, is granted.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK VERSUS FEDERAL LAND BANK

One of the chief objections advanced against this legislation is that it is not orthodox and that it proposes to give the Federal Land Bank the power to issue Federal Land-Bank bonds. This is exactly what is done under the orthodox monetary system we have. In other words, we are merely asking here for the same privilege that the Federal Reserve Bank enjoys. How can it be said that it is perfectly orthodox for the Federal Reserve Bank to do one thing and that it is unorthodox for the Federal Land Bank to do the same thing? The truth about the matter is that those who advance this argument advocate the political thought or philosophy that teaches, in the final analysis, that the monetary policies of this Government should be dictated by the financiers, the big banking interests of the country.

There is more misinformation and more ignorance on the question of the monetary policies of this country than on any other subject. When the people of this country awaken to the real truth about our monetary policy in this country, there is going to be a change. There is no sound reason why the taxpayers of this country should pay in excess of a billion dollars a year for the privilege of issuing its own money. When the masses of the people of this country are educated on this important question, Congress will exercise its constitutional right and duty to coin and issue its own money and save this billion dollars annual interest charge that the Government now pays for that privilege. We are wedded to the old policy through years of practice; and when we attempt here in this body to exercise our right and perform our duty as Members of Congress, we are immediately told that we are unorthodox.

LET US BE SINCERE

Mr. Speaker, this is not a moratorium, and I am glad that the bill has been amended to strike out the bankruptcy provision. Let us be fair and sincere about this matter. The farmers of this country do not want a moratorium, and they do not want bankruptcy. They want two things: First, they want a fair price for their commodities; and second, they want a rate of interest on their farm indebtedness that it is possible for them to pay and, at the same time, make payments upon the principal. In other words, they want an opportunity to retire their outstanding obligations. And they want such an opportunity as has been given the industries of this country.

I realize that $3,000,000,000 in bonds, or in money, or in credit, is a sizeable amount. I realize that it is no light thing to provide for the issuance of $3,000,000,000 worth of farm-mortgage bonds. I am equally cognizant of the fact that it is not a trifling matter to further utilize the credit of this country, as great as its resources are, for an additional $3,000,000,000. But we have provided for in excess of $10,000,000,000 for relief of the unemployed, the aged and maimed, the home owners, the railroads, banks, and industry. Are we to say to the farmer that he is the forgotten man? I may be in error about this. My interest in the farmers and the agricultural class of my district and the country as a whole may cause me to become too enthusiastic. Ordinarily, I try to stay within the bounds of reason. I think I am conservative by nature. But I think we have a real opportunity in this legislation to render a real service to the mortgage-ridden farmers of the land—another opportunity to place agriculture upon a parity with industry.

And so long as I remain in this House it will be my purpose to try to improve the lot of the agricultural class of this country. Whenever a question arises affecting their interest as has been raised here today, I shall resolve that doubt in favor of the farmers of this country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KELLER, for 1 week from May 15, on account of sickness in family and business necessity. His first absence in three terms.

To Mr. MEEKS, for 1 week, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 32. An act to provide for the creation of the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3992. An act for the relief of Capt. Laurence V. Houston, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1398. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near Crescent City, Calif.;

H. R. 2119. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Babcock, mother and guardian of Nelson Babcock, a minor;

H. R. 2467. An act for the relief of Holy Cross Mission Hospital;

H. R. 3340. An act for the relief of Jesse S. Post;

H. R. 5058. An act to convey certain lands to Clackamas County, Oreg., for public-park purposes;

H. R. 8089. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Baylin;

H. R. 8370. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Port Washington, Wis.;

H. R. 8506. An act for the relief of Oliver Faulkner;

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. 9370. An act for the relief of Frank Cordova;

H. R. 9373. An act for the relief of H. L. and J. B. McQueen, Inc., and John L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department;

H. R. 9455. An act for the relief of Robert J. Mann;

H. R. 10308. An act to amend article 3 of the "Rules Concerning Lights, etc.", contained in the act entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions upon certain harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States", approved June 7, 1897;

H. R. 10321. An act to amend section 4 of Public Act No. 286, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 19, 1935, as amended;

H. R. 10589. An act 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;

H. R. 10847. An act to authorize the acquisition of land for cemeterial purposes in the vicinity of New York City, N. Y.;

H. R. 11036. An act to amend section 4321, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 263), and for other purposes;

H. R. 11302. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend to the reunion committee of the United Confederate Veterans 3,000 blankets, olive drab, no. 4; 1,500 canvas cots, to be used at their annual encampment to be held at Shreveport, La., in June 1936;

H. R. 11346. An act for the relief of H. R. Heinicke, Inc.;

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. 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;

H. J. Res. 547. Joint resolution providing for the importation of articles free from tariff or customs duty for the purpose of exhibition at Great Lakes Exposition to be held at Cleveland, Ohio, beginning in June 1936, 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.

BILL 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 bill of the House of the following title:

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

MY REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON OF MY 4 YEARS' SERVICE AS THEIR REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with my practice in former sessions, I now desire to render to the people of southwest Washington a brief account of my stewardship as their Representative in Congress during the past 4 years, as I feel that this is information which they are entitled to have.

PERIOD FROM 1933 TO 1936

During the two terms I have served in Congress, during the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses, I have diligently and faithfully represented the people of the Third Congressional District of the State of Washington, to whom I have the honor of submitting this report. It has been my privilege to actively participate in the enactment of the legislation and formulation of the policies which have materially improved the condition of our people, as contrasted with the distress and despair of the dark, terrible months of early 1933, when business, industry, and agriculture were prostrate. In southwest Washington we have gone a long way from the never-to-be-forgotten conditions of 1929–33 and evidences of improvement are everywhere apparent, in retail business, farm prices, industrial pay rolls, building construction, and business generally. However, our task is far from completed. We have made substantial progress, it is true, but we must continue to completion the program and efforts which we have started to bring about better and happier living conditions for all our people.

MY PROGRESSIVE VOTING RECORD

In my reports of previous sessions I have set forth in detail the measures which I have actively supported and voted for and those which I have opposed and voted against. In this last session I voted for the following major measures:

First. Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936—bonus—and to pass it over veto.

Second. Neutrality Act, extending and amending, to keep the United States out of war.

Third. Conservation of soil resources, to benefit the farmers.

Fourth. Impeachment of Federal Judge Ritter, of Florida, for having been involved in financial transactions unbecoming a member of the judiciary.

Fifth. H. R. 8458 and conference report, Federal Government employees' leave bill; and H. R. 8459 and conference report, Federal Government employees' sick leave bill.

Sixth. An act to continue Electric Home and Farm Authority until February 1937 to finance installment sales of electrical fixtures for homes in rural and country districts.

Seventh. An act to amend title I of the National Housing Act and to extend same to April 1, 1937, providing insurance of loans and advances for the purpose of financing alterations, repairs, and improvements of homes and other real property, including churches.

Eighth. The act to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to better serve the farmers in orderly marketing and to provide credit and facilities for carrying surpluses from season to season.

Ninth. The rural electrification bill—S. 3483—to provide a 10-year program to furnish the farmers of America with the conveniences, economies, and comforts which are a part of the modern, electrified home.

Tenth. A bill to extend to July 1, 1938, the power of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to make loans, purchases of assets, or guaranties to reduce or avert threatened insurance losses, for the protection of depositors in banks.

Eleventh. H. R. 11687, to authorize Federal aid for highways and road construction, for the fiscal years 1938 and 1939, and to establish in the Bureau of Public Roads a section of rural roads, as favored by the National Grange in the interests of better roads for farmers, as passed by the House.

Twelfth. The corporate tax bill to tax incomes, capital stock, and excess profits of large corporations.

Thirteenth. Work relief bill, to provide funds for continuance of program.

Fourteenth. The Frazier-Lemke bill to refinance farm mortgages; also voted for discharge of committee and was twenty-second out of 218 Members who signed petition to bring bill before House for debate and vote.

THE TOWNSEND PLAN

My stand in favor of the Townsend plan is well known, not only to the people of my district and State but also to the entire Nation. I became an advocate of the Townsend plan over 2 years ago, at a time when there was not a single Townsend Club in my district, and I have taken an active, prominent part in the campaign waged in its behalf in and outside of Congress, and was the only Member of Congress who addressed the Chicago convention in October 1935.

I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 4, 1934, the first statement and explanation of the Townsend plan which was made in the Congress of the United States and the first official notice which it received in the National Capital. I have studied it continuously since then, and was one of a small group of House Members who drafted the first and second bills embodying the plan, the latter receiving 56 votes—of which mine was one—in the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and have again served on the steering committee in this past session.

I appeared in behalf of Dr. Townsend and Mr. Clements when the hearing was held before the Rules Committee on the Bell resolution for an investigation, and also spoke twice on the floor of the House on that subject, my remarks on these occasions having been broadcast by the March of Time. We have made more rapid progress in furthering the Townsend plan than has ever been made in regard to any other important legislative proposal, and I feel confident of our eventual success. I intend to continue to support it vigorously in the future as I have in the past.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

I have been one of the most active Members of the veterans' bloc in Congress who have consistently fought for a greater measure of justice for the veterans of our wars. I have had the honor and pleasure during the past 2 years to serve as one of the 22 members of the steering committee headed by Congressman WRIGHT ("Bonus") PATMAN, of Texas, who have carried on the fight for immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates, which resulted in final victory in this session of Congress.

I led the contest for the passage of my bill (H. R. 6995) to restore the pensions to the veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, their widows and dependents, in the Committee on Pensions, of which I am a member, wrote the favorable committee report, secured its passage on the floor of the House, aided in its passage through the Senate, and in securing the approval of the President, which was the most important single piece of pension legislation enacted by Congress in many years, and has been the subject of Nation-wide comment.

LABOR AND FARM LEGISLATION

I have actively supported in this session, as I have in all former sessions, the legislation favored by the American Federation of Labor and the Railroad Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, providing for more just working conditions for employees. I actively supported the Retirement Pension System Act for railroad employees both times when it was enacted, and will do so again if such action becomes necessary by decision of the Supreme Court. I have favored all measures in the interests of higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions for the men who labor and by their labor make possible the comfort and happiness of mankind. This policy on my part has been pursued in a realization of the fact that the prosperity of business and industry depends upon the purchasing power of the wage earners and producers.

For these very reasons I have also continued to go on record in favor of all social-welfare legislation sought by the postal employees, rural and substitute carriers, and all employees of the Federal Government who are faithful and efficient public servants and deserving of just treatment at the hands of Uncle Sam.

I have likewise supported all farm legislation sponsored by the National Grange, the Washington State Grange, and by the Pomona and local Grange units within my district, as I am convinced that on account of their practical experience and knowledge of the problems of agriculture they know what is best for the farmer. It is my firm conviction and sincere belief that we can have no permanent or lasting business prosperity unless it rests upon the well-being of agriculture, and it is therefore absolutely essential that our dairy, poultry, grain, and fruit farmers be treated, in all our legislation, on a parity with industry. We have made real progress in our efforts to restore agriculture, as evidenced by increased prices of all farm products, but our main objective will not have been achieved until the farmer receives a reasonable profit for his product, whether it be milk, butterfat, eggs, vegetables, fruit, berries, or grain, above his cost of production.

RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS

During the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress an omnibus rivers and harbors bill, the first in 5 years, was reported out by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, on which I hold membership, and was passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President. It carried nine projects for southwest Washington and four surveys for new projects, the largest number of southwest Washington projects ever included in a rivers and harbors bill.

First. Grays Harbor jetties: This project to reconstruct the north and south jetties to an elevation of 16 feet, at a cost of $4,565,000, the biggest single project west of the Mississippi River, after having been repeatedly rejected by United States Army Engineers for many years, has been approved and is in progress of construction. Dredging the inner channel of Grays Harbor, at an annual cost of $58,000, which local taxpayers have paid since 1919, has been assumed by the Federal Government, commencing in 1934.

Second. Port of Vancouver: This is a project to provide a channel 300 feet wide and 30 feet deep from the mouth of the Willamette River to the Interstate Highway Bridge at Vancouver, Wash., with two turning basins, each generally 2,000 feet long, 800 feet wide, and 30 feet deep, at a cost of $140,000 for new work and annual maintenance of $35,000, for which P. W. A. funds were obtained, and the project has been constructed. It follows closely the allocation of $58,000 P. W. A. funds secured the previous year to dredge the channel and basins to a depth of 28 feet. Another new project to extend the lower turning basin downstream for a distance of 1,000 feet and to a depth of 30 feet at low water was initiated by me in a resolution adopted by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors on June 20, 1935, and finally approved by the United States Army Engineers at Washington, D. C., on January 2, 1936, and is in line for inclusion in the next rivers and harbors bill. In the meantime efforts have been made by me to have an exception made in regard to this project and have the necessary funds allocated out of other sums available for rivers and harbors work. We have also secured a Federal P. W. A. grant in the sum of $136,653 toward the cost of constructing a new dock terminal for Vancouver.

Third. Willapa Harbor and Narrows: This is a project for the further improvement of Willapa Harbor and River by straightening the "narrows", consisting of a sharp S bend about a mile downstream from Raymond, at a cost of $207,000, and P. W. A. funds were secured and the project has been constructed. Previous to that an allocation of $80,000 P. W. A. funds was secured to dredge and deepen the main channel.

Fourth. Olympia Harbor: Two revised and modified projects to dredge and deepen the channel to 30 feet and provide certain turning basins have been approved, at a total cost of $105,467 for new work, which has been secured from P. W. A., and the project completed, and a third modified project has recently been approved to widen the outer reach to 500 feet and enlarge the turning basin, at the present depth of 30 feet, to cost $98,000, which is in line for inclusion in the next rivers and harbors bill.

Fifth. Bakers Bay: This project to provide a channel 200 feet wide and 10 feet deep, extending through the easterly passage at Sand Island to the port of Ilwaco, which has been advocated for many years, has been approved, and altogether $80,000 P. W. A. funds were secured, and the project has been completed. We recently succeeded in defeating the attempt to close the west channel, and a project to improve the same is now pending.

Sixth. Surveys for new projects: The omnibus rivers and harbors bill also carried items for preliminary examinations and surveys of Shelton Harbor in Mason County, a highly important lumber, pulp, and forest-products manufacturing community; Vancouver Lake and Columbia River, to furnish a fresh-water harbor ideal for industrial sites and purposes of national defense; Elokomin (Cathlamet) Slough, to serve important lumber and manufacturing interests; and the Chehalis River from the mouth of the Skookumchuck River to the Grays Harbor County line, Washington.

BONNEVILLE PROJECT

I have continued my efforts to further this worthy project which is important to Skamania, Clark, and Cowlitz Counties in my district. Approval of the United States Army Engineers has been secured for a ship channel 300 feet wide and 27 feet deep at low water from Vancouver to North Bonneville in the Columbia River, at a cost of $2,380,000. The dredging of this channel and providing of suitable turning basins and dockage facilities to accommodate ocean-going vessels will insure the industrial development of the Hamilton Island industrial area at North Bonneville and vicinity. I also will continue to favor the construction of the main trunk transmission line down the north bank of the Columbia River, on the Washington side, to Camas, with an extension to Vancouver and Longview, as recommended by the United States Army Engineers.

FLOOD CONTROL

The United States Army Engineers are proceeding pursuant to my bills passed by Congress, Public Laws Nos. 336, 337, 338, and 339, affecting the Cowlitz, Chehalis, Lewis, and Columbia Rivers and all their tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods, which was the first legislation of this character affecting the rivers of southwest Washington which has ever been enacted. The recommendations and plans of the Federal Engineers constituted a basis for obtaining Federal funds in order that, after a delay of 30 years without any action being taken, the property and lives of our citizens are to be protected. I have actively cooperated with municipal, county, and State officials in formulating a practical cooperative flood-control program for our section of the State, and by our continued joint efforts we are attaining our objective.

OLYMPIA-GRAYS HARBOR—WILLAPA HARBOR CANAL

Further progress on this project, which has been successfully revived after having been dormant for nearly 40 years, has been made. The United States Army Engineers have

recommended the Puget Sound-Grays Harbor unit of the canals to the National Resources Board to provide a 13-foot navigation canal at a cost of $25,213,000. At the thirtieth and thirty-first annual conventions of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, held in Washington, D. C., the projects committee of that powerful waterways organization approved the entire project.

It is intended in the next session of Congress to include this project in an omnibus canal bill which will include meritorious canal projects in various sections of the Nation for which strong support has been enlisted.

The route of the Willapa Harbor and Grays Harbor units would not, according to the Engineers, be permitted to damage the cranberry bogs or oyster beds of Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties, and at the public hearing held at Aberdeen 3 years ago I insisted upon this precaution being taken.

GAME AND FISH RESOURCES

One of the most important enterprises which can be encouraged by the Federal Government is the developing, propagating, and conserving of our game and fish resources. I have therefore at all times cooperated with the House Special Committee on Conservation of Wild Life and Resources, as well as with the Willapa Harbor Sportsmen's Association, Grays Harbor County Game Protective Association, and the Poggie Club of Washington, Aberdeen Chapter, and other sportsmen's organizations in my district. According to their recommendations, I have introduced in this last session of Congress a bill for the establishment of a fish-cultural station on the west fork of the Humptulips River, in Grays Harbor County, Wash., for the propagation of trout and steelhead, in support of which I am assured the cooperation of Hon. Frank T. Bell, Commissioner, United States Bureau of Fisheries. Request has also been made for additional W. P. A. funds for improvements at the Quinault Hatchery to increase the pond system for the purpose of rearing a larger number of fish to the fingerling stages before releasing them. I have given prompt attention to the requests received from the holders of fish and game licenses in southwest Washington for information regarding the Federal laws and pending legislation relating to the subject of wildlife, and have secured for them such Government pamphlets and circulars as are available for distribution.

DEPARTMENTAL AND COMMITTEE HEARINGS

I have made frequent appearances before the bureaus and departments of the Federal Government whenever the interests of southwest Washington have been involved. During the pendency of the negotiations and hearings in regard to the reciprocal-trade agreement with Canada, at every stage of the proceedings I vigorously presented the case and viewpoint of the lumber and shingle industries, and have received many letters from prominent shingle and lumber operators commending and praising me for my efforts and activity, which were contributory to the satisfactory results obtained, compared with the scant consideration our forest-products industries have received during former national administrations.

PUBLICITY FOR SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON

During my service in Congress I have obtained desirable publicity for southwest Washington without neglecting my official duties while doing so. I have been a guest speaker before the Women's National Democratic Club, American Legion, Grange, United Spanish War Veterans, Temple Baptist Church, Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church, Kiwanis Club, Order of Vasa, Washington State Society, and other civic and fraternal organizations in Washington, D. C.; and during the past 4 years have addressed five important national conventions in various parts of the United States, namely, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, national encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, national convention of the Townsend Clubs of America, national convention of third- and fourth-class postmasters, national convention of the Railway Mail Association. My activities in Congress have received honorable mention in Harper's Magazine, Time, Literary Digest, National Tribune (Stars and Stripes), Plain Talk Magazine, Townsend Weekly, the United States News, Eagles Magazine, Real America, Foreign Service (Veterans of Foreign Wars), the Postmasters' Advocate, the National Rural Letter Carrier, the Progressive (La Follette's magazine), to mention just a few of the more important national publications, and generous news and pictorial mention in the newspapers of Washington, New York, and other eastern cities. This publicity has not only been beneficial to my district but it has served to make me known in Washington, D. C., and throughout the country.

ROAD AND HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

I have taken a keen interest in the Federal road-building program and in securing appropriations for same. The Third Congressional District has received more Federal aid than ever before, and as a result there has been more road construction in the counties of southwest Washington than during any previous period. I have particularly cooperated in furthering road building in the rural districts, as I appreciate fully the value and importance to our farming population of farm-to-market roads. I have kept close contact with the United States Bureau of Public Roads and have received very friendly and sympathetic consideration from that agency at all times. I am heartily in favor of a national rural free-delivery mail road building program apart from the Federal and State highway systems and to be apportioned to the respective States without any matching of funds by the States. These roads should be built according to specifications satisfactory to the commissioners of the county in which located and the Secretary of Agriculture in determining the portions of the road to be improved and the specifications therefore to consult with the Postmaster General and such county commissioners.

Such a program will improve the rural free-delivery mail service and also relieve unemployment throughout the country and prove of decided benefit and advantage to my district.

FEDERAL PROJECTS IN THIRD DISTRICT

In every community in our nine counties useful Federal projects have already been constructed or are under construction. Numerous public-works projects, C. C. C. camps, the Longview Subsistence Homesteads, the Kelso, Centralia, and Montesano post offices, new roads, dikes, and flood-control works, rivers, harbors, and jetty projects are evidence of the progress which has been made in the past 4 years in building a greater southwest Washington.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

I have actively favored providing in public works and relief appropriation bills adequate funds to pay the salaries of school teachers and maintain our public schools as well as institutions of higher learning, as I consider the cause of public education to be paramount and favor the following program:

First. Adequate free public education to the children of the United States.

Second. Adequate pay for public-school teachers as a matter of justice and as a means of retaining in and attracting to the teaching profession the most competent, devoted, and best equipped men and women.

Third. An annual minimum of at least 8 months' teaching in the public schools of all the States.

Fourth. An adequate number of safe, commodious, and well-equipped school buildings.

Fifth. Free textbooks for all public-school pupils.

Sixth. Adequate assistance by the Federal Government, through appropriations and otherwise, in accomplishing the above-named objects.

Eighth. Such other allied purposes as may serve the best interests of the teachers and pupils and shall make the public schools a more effective, liberal, and far-reaching force in local, State, and national life.

I also favor the creation of a Federal Department of Education, to be headed by a Secretary of Education to sit in the President's Cabinet, with all the facilities and resources of the Federal Government enlisted in behalf of the cause of education. We are now the only civilized nation in the world which has failed to grant to education a national

department and a cabinet officer. No less than 72 of the leading nations of the earth have included a minister of education among their cabinet officers.

CONSTRUCTIVE LEGISLATION

I consider the following to be the most constructive legislative achievements of the present administration:

First. The unemployed, their wives and children, have been fed and a relief and public-works program has been carried out. In this connection I have favored modifying the regulations as to employment on relief projects to provide jobs to those worthy citizens, who, although they never have applied for relief benefits, are yet in need of employment.

Second. A million city families have been saved from eviction by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and a number of private mortgage and lending companies made solvent, whose investors are citizens of small means.

Third. Farmers' cash income last year was two and one-half billions larger than in 1932. Farm Credit Administration loans have stopped foreclosures. Bankruptcy prices have given way to profitable prices. Despite a serious court setback, a national program of planned production and soil conservation is again moving ahead.

Fourth. A prostrate banking system has been reconstructed and the Federal bank deposit insurance law has restored confidence and rendered the deposits of the people safe and secure.

Fifth. Investors, for the first time, have their investments safeguarded, through the securities registration, stock market, and holding company acts.

Sixth. Labor has gained recognition of the right to bargain collectively, and means of enforcing that right have been provided.

Seventh. The Federal Housing Act has proved beneficial and with reduced interest rates, and more liberal lending terms will prove a further stimulus to the construction and repair of homes and give employment to members of the building trades and those employed in manufacturing building materials, which applies particularly to the lumber, shingle, plywood, and veneer industries of our own section of the country.

Eighth. A start has been made to provide social security for our people, including the blind, crippled children, underprivileged mothers, and the aged. This program is, in my opinion, inadequate and will be supplanted by the Townsend plan, which will render unnecessary all pension systems, public and private, and also redistribute purchasing power among the masses in such a manner as to bring about permanent good times and insure social security for our unemployed young people as well as aged citizens.

Ninth. We have enacted the first real neutrality legislation in our history to prevent our being dragged into the vortex of another world war, with its consequent loss of life and treasure.

The foregoing are the main achievements of the past 4 years, and can lead to but one answer to the question, "Would we go back to the conditions from which we emerged as a direct result of this legislation?" That answer is, "No; we do not want to go back; we want to go forward to achieve still greater benefits and safeguards and security for the average man, for the so-called lower and middle classes, who are the backbone, the brawn, and the brains of our beloved country."

MY RECORD IS ONE OF SERVICE

Since I first came to Congress 4 years ago I have striven to respond promptly to every reasonable request made of me by my constituents, making it a rule to promptly answer all letters and inquiries, and whenever possible to carry out their wishes. This has necessarily increased my work, but I have always felt that my first duty was to my district. The good citizens of southwest Washington have been very kind to me, and as the people whom I have sought to serve, they are the best and only judges as to whether my services as their representative in Congress have been satisfactory. While I have felt that my primary and first duty was to the people of southwest Washington, I have tried faithfully and diligently to serve the State of Washington and the Nation, and to measure up to the high ideal of a national Representative.

RECONSTRUCTION NOT RELIEF—OUR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT HAS MADE INEVITABLE OUR PRESENT DILEMMA—COOPERATION CAN CURE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, while few intelligent people question the necessity for continuing relief until a better way is found, it is becoming more and more obvious that merely voting more billions for relief will not solve the problem. The cure of any disease involves dealing with underlying causes. Treating symptoms is not enough. Salve, even a billion dollars' worth, does not get at the causes.

Business improvement appears to be definitely under way, with indications that it may go a long way. But the relief load is not dropping in proportion to business improvement. There is a vast reservoir of marginal cases, those who are just on the verge of relief. As these come to an end of their resources and savings, and relatives and friends, they have no choice but to join the ranks of those on relief. The addition to relief rolls from this marginal reservoir is almost keeping pace with the removal of cases from relief by reemployment.

PERMANENT RELIEF PROBLEM

Some estimate that the marginal cases exceed those actually on relief and that together they constitute about 40 percent of our total population. Continued improvement in business should take up some of this 40 percent, but because of other factors at work, because of basic, world-wide economic changes this improvement will not completely take up the slack. It will not solve the relief problem.

END OF AN ECONOMIC ERA

Unemployment in America grows out of economic causes far more basic than the old concept of the business cycle. We are not merely in a depression. We are historically at the end of an economic era. We are faced with making basic adjustments to a condition that is new, not only to America but in the history of the race.

For 300 years America has participated in the world-wide operation of an economic mechanism, variously called the price system, or capitalistic, or profit system. That system has notoriously served the master races at the expense of the subject peoples. In spite of its ups and downs and in spite of inequalities, and the ever-present and fluctuating margin of poverty, that system has served the majority of people in America reasonably well. Ignoring, for the moment, all questions of justice or of social righteousness, and considering only the mechanical or mathematical workability of the system, it is plain that that workability depends upon constantly getting rid of accumulated profits.

THE MARGIN OF PROFIT

This necessity may be illustrated with a simple example. Suppose a manufacturer, producing 10,000 chairs, makes 10-percent profit. His profit is 1,000 chairs. Now suppose there is not sufficient redistributed buying power to provide for the consumption of that profit margin of a thousand chairs. They remain on display in the stores. To that extent they reduce orders to the factory for more chairs. As orders are cut down, the factory cuts down its hours or days of operation, cutting down employment and reducing pay rolls, or redistributed buying power. As this redistributed buying power is cut down, the sale of chairs falls off still further, cutting down operations, employment, and pay rolls. It is a vicious circle that is not only a circle but a spiral that goes constantly downward. It is the unconsumed margin of profit that wrecks the mechanics of the profit system. The obvious crux of the problem is to get rid of the chairs. Again emphasizing that we are here considering solely the mechanics of economics, and ignoring for the moment all questions of social values, it is of no consequence how the profit margin is consumed, so long as the chairs are disposed of so they cannot stand in the way of new orders to the factory. They may be invested in stocks and bonds, which eventually find their way into expansion of production plant,

new buildings and equipment, larger sales and promotion expenses, increased operating costs, rents, interest, insurance, and dividends so widely distributed that they increase consumption. Or the profit margin of chairs may be burned up, or sunk in the ocean, or blown up in a war. Purely from the standpoint of economics, the particular method, or the particular moment of time of disposing of the profit margin is of little consequence. But that profit margin must be consumed if the system is to keep working.

CONSUMPTION MUST EQUAL PRODUCTION

The first axiom in the successful working of any economic system is that consumption must equal production. The consumption side of this equation includes saving and all the elements and factors connected with it. Saving for the rainy day, for insurance to replace losses, for investment, for reserves for obsolescence, replacement, and expansion; all of these merely inject the time element into consumption. They affect the particular time and method of consumption without in any degree affecting the basic economic law that in the long run consumption must equal production. The method of profit disposing that we have come to think of as normal, the method on which America has principally depended for 300 years, is the constantly expanding market. But that market was based on three foundation stones, each of which is now either passing or already gone. These three foundation stones are:

First. A frontier.

Second. A rapidly growing population.

Third. An apparently unlimited foreign market, based on the mechanical supremacy of the western races.

The frontier has practically gone.

The curve of population growth is leveling off. It is estimated that our population will be practically stationary by 1950.

The mechanical supremacy of western races is true today—a matter of history. We have sent our mass-production machinery to the far corners of the earth. We have sent our engineers to show these backward people, not only how to operate the machinery but even how to make it.

OUR FOREIGN TRADE

On the same identical machinery these backward people are putting labor at rates far below our own. Japan, with identical mass-production equipment, manned with labor at from 7 to 14 cents a day, is sending beer to Germany, and laying down manufactured cotton goods in Manchester, England, cheaper than the Manchester mills can turn it out. The western, or so-called advanced, races have turned their former customers into competitors, and competitors with a tremendous advantage over themselves. Our foreign trade, based on that mechanical supremacy, is definitely a thing of the past. We shall probably continue to wrangle such slight margins as we can. We shall continue to hear much of trade agreements, of favored-nation positions, of unilateral, bilateral, and reciprocal arrangements. We shall try to get the most possible out of the constantly shrinking margin of foreign trade. But the big reservoir of foreign market, which we have so long thought of as practically without limit, is gone forever.

With these three foundation stones of constant expansion either gone or on the way out, the profit system, based on that constant expansion, is facing a basic change.

OTHER FRONTIERS OF EXPANSION

There are, of course, other frontiers of expansion, or ways of bringing about increased consumption to dispose of the profit margin. Notable among these are:

First. New industries, with the new desires and possibilities of consumption that they create, and their increased expenditures for new plant and equipment.

Second. Expansion of private credit or debt. Inflation that increases consumption temporarily but postpones facing the issue.

Third. War; mass destruction of the profit margin, both past and future.

Fourth. Government-directed redistribution of buying power.

These frontiers, or methods of disposing of the clogging profit, are usually present in varying degrees and exercise their influences in varying combinations. In about 1890 the last large land frontier was opened to settlement. The intensive expansion and development of the West continued for some time to provide an outlet for accumulated profit margins. But about the beginning of the present century that expansion was beginning to slow up, and we were beginning to feel the pressure of an inadequate expansion market. But new industries, particularly the automobile, stepped in and temporarily solved the problem.

WAR

By 1912 to 1914 the slack was fairly well taken up and again we were feeling the pinch of inadequate disposal of the profit margin. Along came the World War with its unprecedented destruction of material goods. It served to physic the accumulated profits out of the economic system. But it went further than that. It levied heavily on future profits. Credit was expanded. Debts were accepted in place of payments. Destruction continued. We had tremendous activity. The system was ravenous for material goods. There was demand. And we went zooming into unprecedented prosperity.

Of course, this prosperity has never been paid for. Neither the war additions to our own national debt nor the war debts owed to us by the other nations have been liquidated. It was obviously only an illusion of prosperity. But the illusion served those who either did not want to think or were incapable of thinking or did not want others to think. In any event, consciously and unconsciously, it did help to salve the conscience of the Nation on the crime of going into the war, and it postponed meeting the real issue of the profit system.

After the war, with tremendously expanded production facilities, we were again in a pinch for disposition of profits, or for consumption of goods. Again the system was getting badly clogged. This time we saved our skin by resorting to the wildest orgy of credit expansion we had ever known. This expansion was in three principal channels:

First. Bank credit for business expansion, investment, and speculation.

Second. Time-payment buying to increase purchases of consumption goods.

Third. Government debt.

When this vast bubble of credit expansion burst in 1929, the profit system was in the toughest spot yet. The normal method of disposing of the profit margin, the constantly expanding market based on frontier, rapidly growing population, and a foreign market founded on mechanical supremacy, was gone. In the first 29 years of the century we had been through a major industrial expansion, a major war, and a major credit expansion. We had either to face the issue and pay the piper or resort to the only remaining device for postponement, expansion of Government-directed redistribution of buying power. We chose to continue on the road of evasion and postponement and expanded this last remaining device, not that this device was new.

THE GOVERNMENT TAKES A HAND

Many methods of Government redistribution of buying power have been with us so long that we have taken them for granted. Such are the Army and Navy expenditures, Post Office deficits, public roads and buildings, reclamation work, forestry, pest control, health work, and improvement of rivers and harbors. When we consider these activities at all, we are apt to think only of their social implications and values, forgetting that they are also definitely a part of our economic procedure for redistributing buying power to increase consumption and dispose of the clogging profit margin.

While this method had long been used and had been materially expanded following the war, it had always been used in conjunction with some other of the major devices of profit disposal. But after the break of 1929 it had to be used almost alone.

The Republicans under Mr. Hoover increased many Government activities, notably reclamation work, and instituted new

agencies, such as farm-credit organizations, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for public financing of private enterprise. Taxes were increased and the national debt inflated before the Democrats came into power in 1932.

The Democrats under Mr. Roosevelt have merely been expanding the older parts of this method of Government direction of redistribution of buying power, such as Army and Navy expenditures, reclamation work, and so forth, increasing the scope of the more recent devices added by the Republicans and adding new ones. Within this general method they have added such devices as the land banks, home-loan banks, Federal Housing Administration, seed loans, stock loans, C. W. A., F. E. R. A., and W. P. A., with the whole relief program, both direct dole and the thinly disguised dole, or manufactured work relief. They established the C. C. C. to furnish subsistence employment to a particular group; the N. R. A. to increase distribution of buying power among labor; the A. A. A. with its cotton program, its corn and hog program, its tobacco and potato programs, and its soil-conservation programs, all in an attempt to bring about parity for the farmers, to increase their buying power. They have been working on old-age pensions and various social-security proposals. With all their infinite variety in detail, all of these activities and proposals obviously come within this fourth general method for getting rid of the obstructing profit margin, "Government-directed redistribution of buying power." In expanding this method we have added nothing new in principle. We have merely added to the variety and size of the operations.

The cost of this method has perennially been met by some combination of taxes for immediate payment and public debt for postponed payment.

On the cost side we have added to both the variety and size of taxes and increased the public debt. We have also added that thing relatively infrequent in American history—inflation of the currency or depreciation of the dollar. But since this move was made principally to meet a condition in international exchange, it has relatively slight bearing on the particular domestic problem we are considering here.

As taxes get heavier it is becoming plain to more and more people that every consumer pays taxes, whether or not he is technically a taxpayer. The living standard of each individual is lowered by taxes exactly to the extent that taxes are eventually collected for the support of others on the goods, services, and conveniences that he uses or consumes.

The inflation of the public debt is spread through practically all political subdivisions. Material increases have been accumulated in the national debt, and in most, if not all, of the State, county, and city debts.

In this connection a clear distinction should be made between the purely economic function of this device of Government-controlled stepping-up of consumption to dispose of the profit margin and the many questions of social value and political expediency involved. Every detail of such a program, and of each new proposal, presents problems of relative social values, of the possibilities and the expediency of different methods of taxation, and of the wisdom and safety limits of public-debt expansion.

INFLATION

To make any attempt to judge how far the public debt can be inflated with safety, when and to what extent we shall resort to further currency inflation, when and to what extent other methods of profit disposing, such as new industries or a new war, may again get under way and once more be major factors would be dealing in the realm of prophecy and is beyond the scope of this analysis.

The present Government has merely developed this Government-directed redistribution further than ever before in our history; and to this old process Mr. Roosevelt has applied the new and hopeful name of "pump priming", on the theory that, if carried far enough, it would start the old economic processes to function more normally. To the extent that these processes depend on the psychological factors of confidence and belief, it is a well-founded hope, and doubtless has already had good results. But to the extent that the old normal processes depend on more basic factors than have passed off the stage, it cannot provide a basic answer. In that sense it can function only to the extent that the buying power so redistributed is able to take up, or provide consumption for, the otherwise unconsumed profit margin of production.

It could succeed completely only if carried to the extent of taking, through taxation and inflation of the public debt, from those who have more than they can consume, all of that surplus and redistributing it to those who have less buying power than their consumption possibilities. It is now, as it always has been, merely an equalizing device to alleviate to some extent the peak pressures produced by our economic system.

ROBBING PETER TO PAY PAUL

In other words, it can only succeed to the extent that it robs Peter to pay Paul. It may distribute buying power to all the Joneses in order that they may buy more from all the Smiths. On this buying the Smiths may make some profit. As long as this distribution is based largely on the futures, or increasing the public debt, the Smiths will probably not worry much and will be pleased with the profit they are making. But when the day of reckoning comes the Smiths will wake up to the fact that, whether through taxes or through inflation or repudiation, they are paying not only the 10- or 20-percent profit they have made but the rest of the bill as well—the hundred percent.

NEW INDUSTRIES

One of the principal hopes during this period of dallying and postponing the real issue is that new industries will be developed to save the situation. It is said that scientists have enough tricks up their sleeves, enough inventions that are intentionally held back to protect older industries, to bring about a tremendous increase in employment. Nor has the inventive genius of the human race come to an end. New industries do make their appearance from time to time. A major new industry or a sizeable group of new smaller industries may come on the scene any time. Such a development would absorb some of the slack, possibly a considerable part of it.

But such absorption would, at best, be only temporary. While new industries create new desires, expand the possibilities of satisfying desires, induce increased consumption, and create new kinds of work, it is not all net gain. While the automobile and the tractor have absorbed vast amounts of labor in their own manufacture and distribution, in tires and all manner of accessories, in the building of roads, and in increased business for all kinds of travel and tourist services, they have also displaced much of the wagon-making industry, buggy manufacture, harness business, and that portion of agriculture that went into the raising and maintaining of horses. The truck has materially affected the railroad industry. The radio has largely displaced the phonograph, has thrown thousands of musicians out of work, and made the lecture tour almost a passé industry. The electric refrigerator has made inroads on the manufacture and distribution of ice, and so forth.

On the whole, new industries tend to shift the channels of unemployment rather than to increase the sum total of employment. In fact, under the profit system, with its pyramiding control and labor-saving machinery, the net result has been actually to reduce the total employment. It is obvious to anyone that when hand labor was the only means of satisfying those human needs which were not supplied by nature in the raw state there was no such major problem of unemployment as we now have.

Not that we ever will or ever should go back to hand methods. But as production is increased by modern science, it is plain that consumption must be increased to equal the production.

The problem resolves itself into one of consumption.

And since a high percentage of our people are consuming far less than their needs or desires would dictate, it is

obvious that the problem is further resolved into one of distribution of buying power.

Whatever tends to widen the distribution of buying power is a help. Whatever tends to concentrate buying power, or to funnel it into the hands of relatively few consumers, thereby reducing total consumption, is a liability.

The principal modern factors of concentration of buying power are the machine, with the question of its ownership and the pyramiding of ownership and control through the legal devices of the corporation and the holding company.

A COMMON FALLACY

An argument commonly put forward is that machines actually create more labor, since labor is required to make the machine, which is a new activity with the introduction of each new machine.

This argument is a fallacy. When a new machine first comes on the market, it does create new labor for the time being. But the machine lasts longer than the time required for its creation. And it displaces more man-hours than are required for its creation. Before long the curve of labor displaced by the machine crosses and exceeds the curve of labor employed in its manufacture.

In the first stage of mass production, when machines still required human labor for their operation, hundreds of thousands of hand laborers were displaced. But we are now well into the second, or the automatic stage, where machines are operated by machines. Human labor is being displaced at geometric rates of progression.

Under our system of private ownership of machines, "labor saving" simply means reduction in redistributed buying power. Another name for it is reduction of consumption or market. Each business strives to reduce costs. The inescapable result is that collectively they reduce the possible market.

THE PROFIT SYSTEM

The "profit system" is, by definition, a system in which each industry and each undertaking aims to make a profit. A profit is obviously the margin of income over expense. Expense is, of course, another name for "redistributed buying power." Each business undertakes to take in more buying power than it redistributes. In other words, the very aim of industry, under the profit system, is to destroy that necessary equation between production and redistributed buying power—consumption.

As long as the profits remain small enough to be consumed by those making them, no damage is done to the economic working of the system. The small businessman, the professional man, or the small contractor, whose profits are simply the equivalent of wages or salary, and within the limits of what he and his dependents consume, is no economic liability. But when big business accumulates profits beyond the consumption of those engaged in it, profits that need to be reinvested, but can find no economically sound channel for such reinvestment, it is then that the sterile pools of idle profit accumulate, upset the equation, and block the mechanics of the system.

No new industry would achieve major significance in the profit system that did not become both successful and large. Being successful, it would take in more buying power than it redistributed, upsetting the equation. And being large, it would carry that lack of balance to the point of adding to the sterile pools of accumulated profit. So new industries, on which some are pinning hopes, will, in the profit system, as soon as they become successful enough and large enough to have major significance, simply add to our troubles by further destroying the necessary balance between production and consumption.

There are only three possibilities for correction. One is absorption of the surplus production in the constantly expanding market, outlined above. Another is the group of artificial devices for forcing redistribution, also listed above—war, credit inflation, and Government-directed redistribution. The third is a fundamental reorganization of our economic system to some basis of community or cooperative ownership and control of our natural resources and the machines.

INCREASING PRESSURES

The only points I want to emphasize here are that, historically, the profit system has already been artificially maintained, by war and credit inflation, for many years beyond the period of its normal existence; that we are merely continuing to maintain it artificially by further credit inflation, which must some day be balanced, either by the sweat of future generations or by repudiation, with all the chaos and suffering that that entails; that it now appears to be entirely probable that we shall again be called upon to maintain this dying system still further by participation in another major war, that most heinous and inexcusable of all national crimes, mass murder; that as long as we try to hang on to and to drag along with us this rotting corpse, we are progressing irrevocably into the vortex of increasing pressures; that the pressures of the human suffering of the dispossessed portion of our people have already passed the safety zone and reached the point of imminent threat to social order and the continuance of our democratic processes; that the spectacle of starvation and increasing disease, crime, and suicide in the face of potential abundance is a blot on American intelligence and morality; that some day, willy-nilly, we shall have to meet the issue of the profit system squarely; and that we should face that issue now instead of further dallying with it.

COOPERATIVE ECONOMY

There are two major alternatives to the profit system: One, state socialism, with the dangers of fascism and communism at its opposite extremes, and the other, long proven, practical, and working out with happy results in many countries, cooperative economy.

Socialism is already in actual operation in our own country in our vast systems of roads, Postal Service, rivers and harbors, many of our public works and activities. It should certainly be allowed to grow in a natural way and with reasonable care.

Cooperative economy, in spite of the outstanding success of partial cooperative undertakings, such as cooperative marketing associations, and in spite of some minor experiments and a good deal of public discussion and agitation, is still almost new to us.

A major part of our governmental program should be the furthering of scientific laboratory experiments and the development of practical working models in a cooperative economy.

THE ROBINSON-PATMAN BILL INSURES EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND FAIR PLAY IN BUSINESS—PROTECTION FOR INDEPENDENT MERCHANTS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important bills to come before the House in this session is the Robinson-Patman bill. I was highly pleased when the House Judiciary Committee reported the bill out favorably and more than pleased when the Senate passed the bill last week. I know that this bill will have the overwhelming support of the Members of the House of Representatives when it comes before us for a vote.

We can remember when not so long ago our home merchants were the leading substantial citizens in our cities and villages. They were actively identified with local civic associations, clubs, fraternal orders, lodges, and churches. All of their employees were local citizens who were well known in the community and had the best interest of the city at heart.

Later, however, the monopolies began to operate. The retail business became organized and controlled by the officials of high finance with offices in New York, Chicago, and other cities. They had unlimited means. They could afford to sell certain articles far below the cost to the local merchant, and it was only a matter of time when the home merchant was forced out of business. Their business was taken away by strangers. They lost their investments and were forced to quit. By the passage of this bill Congress will grant the independent merchant lawful protection. Then we may again see our young men who are frugal and industrious enter on a business career in their own name.

WILL INCREASE PURCHASING POWER

It is our sincere desire and also that of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, to increase the purchasing power of the people. The present discriminatory practices in merchandising does more than merely create competitive conditions unfair to the independent merchant. The unequal concessions exacted from manufacturers and processors, through which the favored few benefit, press backward on costs and tend to keep down and reduce the wages of workers in those industries. In addition they become a powerful factor in depressing and holding down the prices paid to farmers for their agricultural products.

The reduction in purchasing power that results from the depressing of wages and agricultural income amounts to a great deal more than any price reduction which may reach the consumer. It is a well established fact that when wages are reduced in the plants of these manufacturers who grant concessions to the monopolies, the other industries likewise follow suit and reduce wages. These wage reductions are reflected in the wages of all industries.

This is also true of the farmers and the producers. The unfair and unequal competitive conditions that result from the various price and service concessions which a few privileged monopolies can now exact has practically ruined our whole merchandising system. It sets up an endless chain of chiseling operations that undermines wages, destroys farm incomes, and weakens our entire business and economic structure.

This unfair system of competition must be eliminated before we can hope to achieve that greater purchasing power which all of us are striving for.

FAIR COMPETITION IS ALL RIGHT

The opponents of this bill continually raise the objection that this legislation will stifle competition. Competition in business is a good thing when it is fair competition. Unfair competition, the kind that has destroyed small business in this Nation, must not be tolerated further.

The monopolies insist on concessions, allowances, and rebates to enable them to compete with independent merchants. This, I say, is unfair competition. Why are they afraid or unable to compete with the independent merchant on equal terms? Why are they afraid to start with goods at equal costs? The monopolies claim to have superior efficiency. Let us have an honest test.

This bill does not demand any special privileges for the independent or small merchant. It merely demands that unfair, unequal, and unethical business practices, including unfair price discrimination, be prohibited by law. I cannot see anything wrong in this. I am sure that under these rules the independent merchants can and will hold their own with the big monopolies and chain stores.

AMERICAN FAIR PLAY

This is truly an American bill. It is based on the principles of American ideals, which demand equal opportunity and fair play. It is based on the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which the founders of American democracy wrote in the Declaration of Independence.

The opponents raise the old cry of laissez faire. They believe that this gives them the inherent right to destroy all other business. They say that we have no right to impose governmental restraints upon the conduct of private business, even though it be to protect those rights defined in the Declaration of Independence in the interest of the great majority of American citizens.

Congress has, at various times, passed laws for the regulation of business. The Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 required the railroads to refrain from discrimination in rates and services. The Sherman Act of 1890 freed individual enterprise from the burden of oppressive agreements among competitives. The Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914 authorized the suppression of certain unfair practices.

The Robinson-Patman bill merely carries these principles another step forward to protect the independent merchants who have been able to withstand the onslaughts of the chain stores and monopolies. Seventy-five percent of the retail business done in America is done by the independent retailers. So 75 percent of the wholesalers, brokers, and manufacturers are dependent upon the success of the independent retailer for the successful sale of their products.

The large burden of overhead costs of manufacturers and wholesalers are charged against the merchandise bought by these numerous merchants all over the country. The large mass buyers know this. A manufacturer running under capacity can afford to take on a large block of new business at a price below his net cost so long as it will yield him something additional. He will take an order from the chain stores or the monopolies at prices sometimes 20 percent or more below that which he charges the independents. He will do this to prevent his competitor from getting the business. The chain stores will point out to him that his overhead costs remain the same whether he gets the additional business or not and that it is to his advantage to take a small profit and to charge his entire overhead expense against the business that he gets from the independent merchant.

The Federal Trade Commission in its findings of fact on the famous Goodyear-Sears, Roebuck & Co. case, involving price discrimination, found among other things that the gross discrimination in favor of Sears, Roebuck & Co. ranged from 32 to 53 percent. This agreement was guarded in the closest secrecy. It was concealed from its own sales force and when their own Goodyear dealers complained that they could not possibly compete against such an arbitrary price advantage, they denied first that they were even selling tires to the Sears, Roebuck Co. I merely cite this as an example.

There are numerous other like cases which have come before the Federal Trade Commission.

Monopoly is the result of unwholesome competitive methods. It cannot result where the method of competition is fair. Hence, to prohibit price discrimination—unfair method of competition—is to prohibit the methods which foster monopoly. Monopoly on the whole is an unnatural product. It has no place in America. The price discrimination to Sears, Roebuck & Co. was not justified on account of differences in the grade, quality, or quantity of the commodity sold or by difference in the cost of selling or transportation or good faith to meet competition. It had the effect of destroying independent dealers and creating a monopoly.

Now, the same practices prevail in practically every other business. This is particularly true of the grocery and drug-store business. I cannot at this moment think of any young man attempting to go into the grocery or drug-store business on his own initiative. It would be the greatest folly. He would be ruined in a few months' time. The best that he can hope for is to obtain a job working as a clerk for one of the chain-store companies. To him "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" is a myth.

The chain-store monopolies talk about the Robinson-Patman bill destroying equality of opportunity for young people. No agency in the American system of distribution has been any more destructive of opportunity for youth than the chain banks and chain enterprises, who seek to regiment and standardize clerkships, counter salesmen, auditors, and store managers into a vast army of mediocre wage slaves living on starvation wages, devoid of every iota of originality or independence.

The American youth believes that competition is the life of trade. He believes in the policy of live and let live, and further he believes that it is the duty of government to protect the weak against the cheating and bribing of the strong.

PROTECT AMERICAN BUSINESS

The Robinson-Patman bill is a protective measure. It is a plug for the loophole of crooked merchandising; a loophole that only time and experience and our changed social and economic order has shown to exist in our present anti-trust laws. It prevents discrimination in prices where such discrimination tends to create monopoly. A manufacturer

can manufacture all the goods he wants to and sell them at a loss if he wants to, provided he takes the same loss on sales to the independent distributor that he takes in his sales to the chain stores and mail-order distributors.

The bill does not in any way attempt to change the business methods or practices within the chain-store systems whether those practices be good or bad. It does not put any penalty on efficiency either in manufacturing or distribution. It does not prevent the distributor or retailer, whether he be chain store or independent, from passing along to the consumer every saving that efficiency can devise.

This bill will prohibit practices that destroy competition and bring about monopoly. It will not injure any legitimate business or legitimate practice.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this bill into law will redound to the everlasting glory of this Democratic administration.

AMERICAN AIRSHIPS SHOULD BE DESIGNED BY AMERICAN ENGINEERS

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, during the past week we have had a demonstration of the large airship in trans-Atlantic commercial service. The tremendous acclaim of the press and the public should be convicing evidence that America is airship conscious.

It is not my purpose to make any statement that may reflect on the German engineers who constructed the *Hindenburg* or of those in charge of the airship during its successful flight, but as an American citizen and Member of Congress, I feel it my duty to comment on certain statements published in the press.

The Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., May 10, states:

Eckener reveals purpose of trips. United States financial backing is sought. Dr. Hugo Eckener, commodore of the Zeppelin fleet, said in an interview tonight the primary purpose of the *Hindenburg's* cruises to the United States this year was to win financial backing for a German-American trans-Atlantic transport service.

Such an arrangement between the two countries was planned in 1928, he pointed out, but was frustrated by the depression.

Loss of the Navy dirigibles *Macon* and *Akron* has since soured the American public against dirigibles, he said, and lighter-than-air enthusiasts hope to remove that feeling by week-to-week demonstrations of the *Hindenburg's* capabilities.

It is of interest to know where this financial backing is expected to come from. I have a letter signed by a vice president of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., dated April 28, 1936, stating the following:

We are interested in the subject of airships but are not presently considering the erection of a ship. This has to go through the process of authorization by Congress.

The Washington Herald, Sunday, May 10, states:

United States dirigible sought to match *Hindenburg*. Naval experts' hopes rise as officials prepare to greet Eckener. Successful trans-Atlantic flight of the German Zeppelin *Hindenburg* yesterday buoyed hopes of naval and congressional lighter-than-air enthusiasts that the Federal Government would sponsor construction of a twin ship, perhaps to complement the German air liner's North Atlantic schedule.

Senator BULKLEY, Democrat, of Ohio, has introduced a bill authorizing Federal construction of such a ship.

Navy experts have already planned for construction of a giant sky cruiser exceeding the *Hindenburg* dimensions, to replace the U. S. S. *Akron*, lost at sea 2 years ago.

The Navy's scientific advisory committee, following investigation of the *Akron* and *Macon* disasters, in a preliminary report has recommended continuance of the Navy policy of developing the science of lighter-than-air flights and has urged construction of a new superdirigible. The ship would be operated experimentally apart from the fleet.

The Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation, at Akron, Ohio, staffed with German Zeppelin engineers, has assured the Navy such a ship could be built for about $3,000,000.

The Navy high command maintains such a dirigible would be the equivalent of a $10,000,000 light cruiser in fleet scouting, her higher speed compensating for her greater vulnerability.

The Navy plans calls for "belly hangars", housing up to 10 airplanes. Planes would be launched and retrieved by a patented trapeze. An observer could watch enemy fleet operations from a "sub cloud car" suspended from a thousand-foot cable while the dirigible remained hidden from detection above the clouds.

The statement that "Naval experts already have planned for construction of a giant sky cruiser, exceeding the *Hindenburg* dimensions, to replace the U. S. S. *Akron*, lost at sea 2 years ago", recalls my remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 14, 1936, in which I said:

The Zeppelin frame is classified as an indeterminate structure and may be calculated only upon what is termed an "empirical formula" and may not be calculated upon normal engineering formulas. It is interesting to know that the empirical formula is established only through experience of actual construction and use of what is classed as an indeterminate structure.

Prior to the construction of the *Akron* and *Macon*, the Zeppelin engineering organization was supplied with data for an airship only as large as the *Los Angeles* or the *Graf Zeppelin*. They may have desired to construct an airship the size of the new *Von Hindenburg*, but perhaps had no data to then warrant such construction. What would they do about it?

If the German Zeppelin engineers wanted definite information that would warrant them to build the *Von Hindenburg*, which is larger than the *Akron* or *Macon*, and to advance their empirical formulas with construction and operations data, they would need to build larger airships or get someone else to pay for the experiment. My opinion is the United States was again chosen to be "the goat." The construction and destruction of the *Akron* and *Macon* undoubtedly supplied valuable data to the German Zeppelin organization for the construction of the *Von Hindenburg*.

In reference to the paragraph "the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation, of Akron, Ohio, staffed with German Zeppelin engineers, has assured the Navy such a ship could be built for about $3,000,000," I am wondering if a Zeppelin-type airship or the American suspension-bridge frame airship is referred to.

On October 29, 1934, the Honorable Ewing Y. Mitchell, then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, presented to the Federal Aviation Commission an airship-construction program endorsed by the Department of Commerce, and which Mr. Mitchell stated was prepared by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. This program called for the construction of two Goodyear-Zeppelin airships, of 7,000,000 cubic feet capacity, which is the size of the *Hindenburg*, the first costing $6,500,000 and the second costing $4,250,000.

Now, according to press reports, the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation has assured the Navy a much larger airship "could be built for about $3,000,000." It seems that the past 20 months have reduced the cost of American airship construction very materially.

The demonstration made by the *Hindenburg* is worthy in that it shows the capabilities of large airships in trans-oceanic commercial service. If American engineers duplicated the *Hindenburg*, except in its frame, what could prevent such airship performing as well as the *Hindenburg?*

If the American airship frame was stronger the airship would be safer; if American nonexplosive helium gas were used, instead of explosive hydrogen gas, the American airship would be much safer; if the American frame were of less weight a more profitable pay load could be carried; and were the total engine power increased, the American airship would be faster.

I have introduced the bill, H. R. 12682, May 12, 1936, authorizing the construction and operation of two American trans-Atlantic airships, through a loan by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The effect of this bill is that Congress provides means for an organization of American engineers and business executives to solve the American-airship problem, and to design, construct, equip, and operate American airships in overseas commercial service. This bill is as follows:

That for the purpose of fostering the American airship industry and to promote American overseas trade with use of commercial airships, to be available in time of war, to encourage American design, construction, and operation of airships, to demonstrate the value and profit of overseas airship service thus to promote its extension with private capital, and to provide immediate employment in American airship construction, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to lend the sum of $12,000,000 to the Respess Aeronautical Engineering Corporation for the purposes of constructing an American airships plant, an Atlantic operating terminal, and two airships employing the self-anchored suspension bridge type frame, each airship having not less than 7,000,000 cubic feet of helium-gas capacity, and for operating such airships in commercial service between the United States and England or other European countries.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall investigate the personnel and engineering organization of the Respess Aeronautical Engineering Corporation and he may require such changes in the present organization as he shall deem to be advisable before such

loan is made, and he shall require that full insurance be carried to cover replacement in event of fire, damage, or loss of the airships or other property purchased or constructed with the proceeds of the loan until the full amount of the loan is repaid.

SEC. 3. Such loan shall carry interest charges at the rate of 3½ percent per annum, which shall cumulate for a 2-year period, and shall remain a lien on the patents, the patent rights, and all present and subsequently acquired assets of the corporation until paid. The loan, plus accumulated interest, shall be paid in 10 annual payments, the first payment to be made 3 years after the date of the enactment of this act, and any payments on account of the loan shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to be credited to miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $12,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

This bill is for the purpose of providing a loan through which the development and operations of airships will be delegated by Congress to American engineers. It is a business proposition in which the Government extends its aid in forwarding an activity that is of extraordinary value to our Nation, an activity that has already been delayed too long.

The loan may provide the following:

(1) Approximately 80 percent of the loan may be used in direct and indirect employment of labor.

(2) It may give employment to great numbers of engineers and highly skilled men for whom it is now difficult to provide work in their respective lines.

(3) It may construct two great airports, one being in the South and one on the Atlantic seaboard. These airports should be of great military value in event of war.

(4) Within 2 weeks after the money is made available for this work several hundred men may be employed, and within a few months approximately 2,000 men may be employed in direct labor, with perhaps several thousand employed in indirect labor.

(5) Many types of established industries would be benefited through orders placed for this activity. Approximately 25 percent of the loan may be expended for orders placed with major industries.

(6) It may be the start of a great new American industry and be the first step toward establishing a major form of overseas transportation through which our commerce with foreign nations may be expedited and increased.

(7) With the evidence of Government support, as demonstrated by this loan, it is proposed within the year to arrange private financing for the continued construction of airships.

(8) It is proposed, through the employment of three and in some cases four shifts of workers, the construction program may be completed in a period of about 12 months.

(9) After a thorough test of the airships it is expected trans-Atlantic service may be established, with each airship making a round trip weekly between our Atlantic coast and England. If the loan is approved by this Congress, these airships may be in regular service before the fall of 1937.

(10) Such service may expedite our mails and commerce to other nations of the world, to Europe, and to countries which are now best served by transportation from England or European countries.

(11) It may in time establish the United States in a dominating commercial position, through fast and economical transportation direct to overseas commercial centers, including those within the interior of continents where rapid transportation is now unknown.

(12) It may provide twice a week transportation across the Atlantic in less than 40 hours, which with later improvement may be reduced to 30 hours.

(13) This may be America's answer in the race for faster ocean vessels, that in other countries are built with large government construction loans and are supported by annual operating subsidies of considerable size.

(14) It will demonstrate to American inventive genius and skilled engineers the confidence of our Government in their ability to design and construct American airships. It will also demonstrate the superiority of American design and construction of airships.

In view of the fact the borrower must depend upon commercial operations for its profit, the construction would be at the lowest cost and of the best quality. No profit may be added nor any royalty be paid under the patents.

Considering the conditions for this loan, we should also consider estimates submitted on October 29, 1934, by the Honorable Ewing Y. Mitchell to the Federal Aviation Commission in the airship-construction program endorsed by the Department of Commerce. The two Goodyear-Zeppelin airships would cost $10,750,000 and an Atlantic operating terminal to cost $3,000,000, making a total of $13,750,000.

With the loan of only $12,000,000 the Government would have for security two better, stronger, and safer airships of approximately the same size or larger than the Goodyear-Zeppelins, and an Atlantic operating terminal; also an airship-construction plant costing approximately $4,000,000, making a total of $17,500,000, with the valuation based on the cost of two airships and a commercial airship terminal, being $13,750,000 in the Department of Commerce proposal. Further, $1,000,000 of the loan is either applied for additional construction or operating capital; also the patents and patent rights and all present and subsequently acquired assets of the borrower would be pledged as security until the full amount of the loan is paid.

The borrower is required to carry full insurance to cover replacement in event of fire, damage, or loss of the airships or other property purchased or constructed with the proceeds of the loan, until full payment is made. Insurance for these airships was taken up with a Lloyds' American representative, and at first 20 percent of the airships' value was required for annual payment. However, when further consideration was given to the suspension bridge type of frame to be employed, the insurance charge was reduced to 15 percent and it was stated might be reduced to 10 percent.

The cost of insurance aptly illustrated the difference in the proposal submitted by the Department of Commerce and the present proposal for private construction and operation. Twenty percent annual insurance on $10,750,000 for two airships of the Zeppelin type would amount to $2,150,000, while 15 percent annually on the $5,000,000 cost of the two American designed airships would be only $750,000. Quite a difference, and similar differences would be shown by the sums required for depreciation, maintenance, interest, and so forth.

Another comparison is interesting. Mr. Mitchell, in presenting the Commerce Department airship-construction plan, told the Federal Aviation Commission that "Mr. Harpman, representative of the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation of Akron, Ohio, stated at our conference on the subject of airships that his company would enter into a contract for operation of the two airships and maintenance for 5 years on the basis of a dollar per year, if the Government desired them to submit a bid." This would seem to establish the value placed by the builders of the two airships, for which the Government would be required to pay $10,750,000.

Going back 4 years, when bill H. R. 8681 was before the House Commerce Committee, the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation offered to build airships and operate them in trans-Atlantic service to Germany if the Government would pay $32 per mile—in both directions but carrying mail in only one direction—for a reservation of 10,000 pounds of mail. This charge of $32 per mile for 8,000 miles, round trip to Germany, would have cost the Government $256,000 for transporting 10,000 pounds of mail across the Atlantic to Germany, or for only 1 pound of mail if only that amount were forwarded.

The Commerce Committee did, however, recommend a payment of $20 per mile and the bill H. R. 8681 was approved on the floor of the House on June 15, 1932, thus a mail charge of $16 per pound was approved.

With the loan of only $12,000,000 the Respess Aeronautical Engineering Corporation proposes to establish twice-a-week airship service in both directions, carrying passengers, mail,

and freight at only $1.50 per pound. They do not require that the Government send any mail on its airships; but if the Post Office Department wishes to use its service the charge per pound is the same as reservation for passengers, $1.50 per pound.

Further, instead of the Government buying airships at a high figure, possibly including a large profit, and leasing them back to the builders at $1-per-year rental, the Respess Aeronautical Engineering Corporation will repay the full amount of the loan plus interest, will maintain the airships in first-class operating condition, set aside funds to replace the airships when it is deemed necessary to retire same, and will carry full insurance to cover replacement if an airship is damaged or destroyed, as well as liability insurance for passengers, mail, and merchandise.

That airships can do this is because the Respess airships will be safer, stronger, have a much longer useful life, be capable of carrying a larger pay load, and because of their simplicity and ease of construction these airships can be built in America at lower cost than Zeppelin airships can be built, with cheaper labor, in Germany.

The superiority of the Respess airship is substantiated by the report of Messrs. Robinson & Steinman, eminent American engineers, 117 Liberty Street, New York City, in which are the following statements:

Whatever may be said of the performance of the Zeppelin airship will apply equally to the Respess airship, but the Respess airship would have in addition the following advantages:

Greater strength and safety.
Greater inherent strength.
Increased length of life.
Decreased maintenance costs.
More efficient use of material.
Reduction in cost of construction.
Reduction in time of construction.
Ease of construction.
Simplicity, accuracy, and definiteness of calculation.

The stresses in this airship never reverse, thereby removing all fear of failure in the hull through fatigue and crystallization.

The net pay load will be unusually high, facilitating economical commercial operation.

That Respess airships may be operated at an attractive profit is indicated by an estimate of the probable annual receipts and expenditures for such service, as contemplated for the construction and operation of two 7,000,000-cubic-foot airships, each making a round trip weekly between our Atlantic coast and England or Europe.

Operating charges

Administration and communications	$300,000
Fuel and oil	850,000
Helium gas	300,000
Crew	300,000
Engine maintenance and replacement	500,000
Terminal charges	300,000
Contingencies	400,000
Insurance	750,000
Airship maintenance	500,000
Airship depreciation	500,000
Liquidation of construction loan	500,000
Interest at 3½ percent annually	175,000
Traffic solicitation and handling	660,000
	6,035,000

Estimated income

	Pounds
Total pay load available each trip	48,000
Total load 208 trips	9,984,000
Average 75 percent full loads	7,488,000
Average 80 percent of schedule trips	5,958,400
Income with $1.50 pound charge	$8,937,600
Deduct operating charges	6,035,000
Net profit	2,902,600

These estimates were submitted with realization that no service of this character has ever been operated, and consequently the figures must be taken as approximate. A sincere effort was made to estimate the operating charges high and the prospective income low. It is fair to state also the pay load is believed will be much more than 48,000 pounds.

The terms of the bill provide a condition that the Secretary of the Treasury shall approve the personnel and engineering organization of the Respess Aeronautical Engineering Corporation. Such organization will be competent to design, construct, equip, and operate the airships in transAtlantic service and to conduct the affairs of the corporation in accord with the purposes of this act.

The Secretary of the Treasury is not required to consider the technical details of the construction of these airships. The United States has as competent engineers, builders, and operating personnel for large enterprises as any other nation. If the standing of the engineers and executives who are selected for this work meet the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury we can be assured the design and construction will be sound, the operations will be conducted with efficiency, and a satisfactory demonstration will be made of the value and profit of overseas airship service so that private capital may be forthcoming to build scores of other great airships for establishing American commercial airship service to all parts of the world.

I am convinced that private capital will become available when a demonstration of these airships has been made, because I have recently received numerous letters from large banking and trust companies, as well as from security underwriters, which state they are interested in this development and request that they be kept informed.

I now desire to say a few words concerning the prospective value of large airships for addition to our naval and military forces employed in the defense of our Nation in the event of war.

It cannot be said that large airships have had sufficient trial to establish their full naval or military value. Unfortunately, the airships we have previously constructed lasted such a short time that real service trial was very limited.

The *Akron* and the *Macon*, however, demonstrated some features of exceptional value. They proved, beyond any question, that airships may transport and service fighting airplanes, thus becoming in effect movable airfields, or they may serve the same purpose as naval airplane carriers.

They demonstrated by their water-condensing systems that helium gas can be employed and it is not necessary to "valve out" the gas in order to control the airship, as is now resorted to by the *Graf Zeppelin* and the *Hindenburg*. They demonstrated the practicability of military operations of large airships over sea or land. Their destruction demonstrated a weakness in the type of frame then employed and should tell us to now call upon our American engineers to provide an improved structure that is strong, safe, and not subject to reversal of stress, fatigue, and crystallization of the metal employed.

I feel we cannot learn the true future value of airships for use in the defense of our country without we make further tests with American-designed airships. Congress provided funds and two naval airships were constructed upon German design. These airships we lost. Will our Navy admit defeat? Must our Navy continue to follow German leadership when we have far better structural engineers in America?

Proper personnel and the most modern wartime equipment should be provided for both our Navy and Army. Not so long ago cavalry was an important division in our land forces, and naval airplane carriers were unknown. Instead of warfare being confined to land and sea, future wars may be decided in the air, from which both our naval and land forces are vulnerable.

The nations of the world are spending hundreds of millions of dollars annually for the construction of new heavier-than-air craft. During the World War lighter-than-air dirigibles, even in their then undeveloped state, were a valuable aid to German arms. The naval battle off Jutland may have had an entirely different end had Admiral Jellicoe been supplied with information which the German airships conveyed to the Imperial German Staff. Germany continues to build airships.

Nature has given the United States the only large supply of nonexplosive helium gas, which would provide greatly increased safety for both commercial and military airships. Congress has voted and there has been expended more than $11,000,000 for the development and conservation of this valuable gas for American airships, with provision no helium

may be shipped to foreign countries except with Presidential approval.

A former Congress recognized the future importance of airships and of helium gas for the use of our airships. We expended about $10,000,000, appropriated by Congress, for the construction of two airships upon the advice of Zeppelin engineers by an American corporation in which the German Zeppelin interests own 25 percent of the stock. We lost these two airships, and are we through? If the Germans discovered during the World War that airships with further improvements would be of military value, would they encourage other nations to build airships of the kind they seem to be able to build in Germany and we fail, under their advice, to build in the United States?

In my judgment the airship will become in time a major form of commercial transportation, in which the United States should have a dominant place. Further, great airships may in time replace the expensive naval airplane carriers and become a valuable arm for the defense of our cities and vital transportation systems in event of war.

The United States has the greatest bridges, buildings, and other evidences of the high qualities of the American engineer and the initiative of private industrialists. In time of need we turn to them for aid in the defense of our Nation. Why do we not now enlist these forces in the preparation of our defense, by having private industry solve the airship problem for us.

In conclusion, I desire to present a few pertinent extracts from numerous letters I have recently received from American engineers:

It can be said without boasting that the American engineers stand preeminent in resourcefulness and ingenuity.

I heartily concur in your movement to place further design and construction of American lighter-than-air craft under the sole direction of eminently responsible American engineers. Such men in the past have demonstrated peerless ingenuity in other lines of endeavor, and should receive consideration in any future aeronautical program. When responsible authorities continue to be inhibited by the foreign influence, after experiencing the fruits of past disasters, I believe a change of command is indicated if American commercial supremacy is to remain secure. I shall be pleased to enlist support of your movement to stop foreign experimentation with American funds, and substitute therefor the certified results obtainable through American engineers.

Concerning the ability of American engineers to design and construct airships, this society wishes to express its gratitude to you for the action you have taken and sincerely hopes that Congress will place these problems in able hands; and when they do, the American engineer will be respected in this field as he is in all others.

I have never been convinced that it is necessary for the American Government to depend on foreign engineering talent for the design of its airships, for I feel we have in this country men who are fully competent to do this work. Costly experiences have indicated that following the principles of German designs has been unsuccessful, and I believe this work, if it had been done by American engineers, would probably have been much more satisfactory, and we certainly would have learned a great deal that would be of use in the future.

While I am not personally familiar with the project of the Respess Aeronautic Engineering Corporation, I am very much in favor of the program for lighter-than-air development in general. I believe it is vital for this country to maintain an interest in lighter-than-air craft as well as the heavier-than-air variety and that all possible Government aid should be given to this important item of our national defense. I was particularly interested to note that Dr. D. B. Steinman, the eminent engineer of New York, is interested in the project and has made a study of the design. Dr. Steinman is preeminent in his field, and I am sure that if his assistance can be gained in connection with this project that its success and adequacy is assured.

I am particularly impressed with what you say relative to the efficiency of the engineers of the United States. It is a profession concerning which so many of the public are little informed and which, after all, is the profession on which the life, health, and prosperity, and the advancement of those things which go to make the Nation prosperous, are so dependent.

I abhor war. The Ethiopians had no desire for war. Still war comes and must be considered. This country needs, and must have, airships of this type for national safety. I am strongly of the opinion that many American professional engineers have structural knowledge and experience equal to, if not superior to, that of any other country in the world. To me it seems lamentable that the leading engineering and mechanical Nation of the world should be confined to some one design just because it has been operative in some other country. Such procedure prohibits consideration of possible improvements which are based upon scientific engineering knowledge and principles. This restriction automatically puts this Nation in a second-rate position. American engineers built Boulder Dam without assistance except good American ability. They did a wonderful job of it. It happens that I have the honor to know Dr. Steinman personally. I have such confidence in his integrity and judgment concerning structures of this class that if Dr. Steinman favors the suspension type of frame for airships I am convinced it will prove the superior type of structure.

As to the construction used in the Zeppelin, the criticism has often been heard in the past, even in authoritative German quarters, that it is not the most satisfactory solution and that it becomes less so with increase in size of the airship. The rigidity is all built in the hull, consisting of transverse polygonal frames braced by longitudinal open-frame beam members. Professor Eberhardt, of the Technische Hochschule Darmstadt, came to the conclusion years ago that this method of obtaining rigidity can be improved upon by anchoring the hull to a longitudinal central member, such as provided in the Unger design. Little has been heard about this design, not because of its lack of merit but "because of the hopelessness of the task of contesting the Zeppelin design", which I quote from a letter of a prominent German engineer. The name "Zeppelin" enjoys such popularity and is so strongly associated with airship construction in the minds of people that, not alone in Germany, it is thought to be the only one that will do for an airship.

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TEXTILES SUPPORTS THE ELLENBOGEN TEXTILE BILL

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, the national textile bill in its revised form, H. R. 12285, has received the unanimous and enthusiastic backing of the National Federation of Textiles.

At a recent meeting in the city of New York Mr. Peter Van Horn, president of the National Federation of Textiles, called attention to the deplorable plight of the rayon and silk industry. Mr. Van Horn said that—

The country's 120,000 rayon and silk looms, operated at capacity, could produce twice as much cloth as the market could take up.

Since the Supreme Court killed the N. R. A. textile codes, along with the rest of the codes, textile production has increased 30 percent, billings have increased 9 percent, and third-shift operation has gone up 12 percent; but textile prices have declined, wages have dropped 5 percent, and employment in the textile industry has dropped 13 percent. This means a drop of $10,000,000 in purchasing power of workers in the textile industry; and that means the textile industry and all other consumers' goods industries can sell proportionately less goods.

The bill has been reported favorably by the Committee on Labor and a rule for its consideration is now pending before the Committee on Rules.

SOME ASPECTS OF BRITISH METHODS IN HANDLING UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most intelligent of the many able foreign correspondents who make our press gallery and fourth estate in the Capitol the outstanding group of newspapermen in the world, Sir Arthur Willert is quoted as saying totidem verbis that our delay in attacking the social-justice program has placed us far in the rear of the efforts of his own country. I have pointed out before that David Lawrence admitted the truth of this assertion. It is now my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to give in a humble way some of the outstanding efforts of the British methods of attack.

I am unusually anxious to do this because I noticed in yesterday's paper that the leading nominee for opposition candidate to our modern-minded and alert Chief Executive in the fall of this year has just complained about the lack of definite knowledge of the facts underlying the relief of the unemployed. He seems exercised about waste and politics. Parenthetically he is Governor of one of the sovereign States of this Union and as such he should be in a far better position to detect such wastage and graft than any man in his commonweal. If he had given us the facts of the Kansan situation in all its entirety, pointed out its defects, and made sincere comments, at least that State would be free from alleged political thievery and Treasury sabotage or we would be to blame. I submit that since he has not done this we might well say that Kansas has an excellent administration and the Federal Government has done an excellent job in that State. If this is not so and he has remained silent, well, then, he has failed in the most personal and Jeffersonian of all duties, that of State pride and keeping one's own house in order.

This is a gigantic problem in all its phases when we honestly realize that this administration inherited the faults of

over half a century of Republican do-nothingism and acceptance of the free play of the blind forces of a profit-motive system. Suddenly—yes, overnight—President Roosevelt was asked to effect remedies for situations that might have well had some prior anticipation and planning.

I cannot call this task of the President herculean, for that masterly son of Zeus and Alcmene could not have performed it himself even if it was set out by cousin Eurystheus as an additional or thirteenth labor. Cleansing the Augean stables with its stabled herd of 3,000 oxen was a mere physical task compared to the mental, spiritual, and physical labors of the Chief Executive of this country as he faced in 1933 the most startling, threatening cataclysm in all our history.

Nothing but a stubborn and benighted toryism can ever stand up and criticize his efforts and his present endeavors to permanently solve this Gordian knot of twentieth-century democracies.

Like the words of the of the Duke of Wellington:

> I find many very ready to say what I ought to have done when a battle is over; but I wish some of these persons would have come to me and told me what to do before the battle.

The President might well propound the same question.

The outstanding conclusion from the most thorough of the studies of the English system brings us to the realization that there is no short cut to a workable system, even after close to three decades of effort, in which all the great contributory factors of England's great power—labor, the Crown, Parliament, with the House of Lords—all put their most serious attention to the solution. In a complicated economic order there, which was turned topsy-turvy all over the world, the way back must be slow and prolonged, made doubly so by the quickening interest of millions of voters enjoying suffrage and audible voice for the first time. The ravages of unemployment have left fears of titanic proportions, and the often-found petulent attitude toward the setting up of the new machinery in this country must be realized and thoroughly appraised if a real understanding is to be had.

Through the ages Great Britain has had her system of poor relief administered by local officials compelled by law to relieve destitution and want wherever it existed, but today that system has been for the most part relegated to the memories of the past, and England has health insurance, granting maintenance and medical attention; workmen compensation acts for industrial accidents; pensions; and various types of other assistance. The British method was to employ every type of assistance available, including contributory unemployment insurance, noncontributory relief to representatives of the insurance scheme, relief works, and extended assistance of employment exchanges, very modified poor relief, restraining of the unemployed movement of the unemployed from areas of scarcity to areas of need, and stimulating emigration.

It must be remembered, however, that England attacked this problem as far back as 1911, when over 2,000,000 people were compelled to join a compulsory insurance scheme managed by the National Government. Nine years later it attempted to extend this insurance over all its industrial wage earners, but the extension was a distinct failure. It is using every expedient today to still effect a solution. Thus, it may be said that for 25 years the English have exerted every effort to eliminate the problems of industrial maladjustment. It must be remembered, moreover, that the President of the United States, heir to the apparent burden of 25 and more years of neglect in this field, has been compelled to solve these problems within a space of 4 years.

The censure of the carping criticasters who are raising their heads out of their storm cellars is forgetful of all this, and in most cases is bitterly partisan, which means that it has no respect for whatever the administration is doing. This one-sided stricture becomes all the more political when it is realized that the opponents on the other side of the aisle imply that a solution should have been reached by this time, thus betraying their ignorance of the Sisyphean labors involved.

The change in the treatment of the British worker from the historic consideration as a criminal and a pauper to a highly privileged position today in English political consideration is the outstanding phase of the British policy.

Seemingly the British system of local poor relief and its greatest auxiliary charity assistance are today incapable of solving this age-old problem. This is strikingly true in England, where the Royal Commission, organized to study the relief problems, has again and again stressed the need for national assistance. Perhaps the most famous of these was the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws for Relief and Distress, organized in 1905, which came back with these three points: (1) That existing methods for handling unemployment should be radically changed; (2) that a national system of labor exchanges should be established; (3) that state-subsidized unemployment insurance should be instituted. That was the start and the opening wedge in the 25 years of handling this problem.

In the first place, it is settled now in English policy that destitution must be solved by an agency in Government circles, and that unemployment itself is due to faulty economic structure and is not blameable on the employee himself. Finally, this solution is not the burden of the local communities but of the National Government or the Crown. She has, however, insisted that there is a common cooperative responsibility for everyone for the entire problem.

To cope with this problem, which for continuity has even outlived the time of Thirty Years War, outstripped the expenditure in money and efforts of her greatest generals and admirals, caused more suffering and bitterness relatively than all the catclysms of her history, England has tried everything; and in that laboratory of attempted success and failure we may well look for a background and a sympathetic back-drop for our own efforts.

One word, of course, should be inserted at this point—that the English people are content to pay as you go and accept the tremendous taxation burden that is unknown here in America. No American can adequately study the British system and not realize that the average Englishman pays infinitely more in taxes and suffers the loss of practically all of the luxuries that the average man in America enjoys daily. The English attitude is that it is the problem of his generation, and he is going to pay it today. Further, too, a more enlightened viewpoint on taxation governs the entire country, and a better system of handling taxpayers oils the wheels of administrative machinery. Further, too, the average English citizen is content to accept a lesser amount for relief than is true in America. These facts must be remembered before we attempt to appraise the English unduly or attempt to use it as a basis of our American plans.

We must therefore admit a very open-minded willingness on the part of the English Parliament to discuss the problems of maladjustment in its entirety and an even greater desire to modify and even eradicate all past methods if necessary. It must be remembered that the English type of government is a true parliamentary one in which the Executive, Crown, or King, as you will, is absolutely responsible to the legislative branch, or Parliament. What the Parliament says or does is law without review by Crown or court.

The year 1911 marks the first effort of the British to cope with the problem of unemployment and the recurring cycles of depression. Two and a half million people were compelled to join a compulsory-insurance scheme operated by the National Government. This was the first step in removing the ever-recurring perplexity from the agencies of old; the poor-relief law and charitable agencies.

For a decade this scheme worked with marvelous encouraging prospects, so much so that in 1920 the attempt was made to extend the privileges to the entire group of industrial wage earners. But the depression of 1921 riddled the scheme full of holes. From an actuarial point of view the base could not take care of the demands of a group that numbered three times the estimated recipients. The entire scheme was stranded on the rocks of a depression the like of which had no parallel in modern annals.

The Deserted Village of Oliver Goldsmith presents no more pathetic picture than was unfolded as one key industry after

another succumbed to this economic plague. Steel, coal, iron, wool, cotton, worsteds, shipping, all fell by the wayside, blighted and stripped of energy and life.

Parliament acted, of course, with the swiftness that is so indelibly associated with that cabinet type of government. Additaments of complicated changes to the first and second insurance schemes were offered, permitting longer benefits for longer periods and liberalizing the requirements for benefit reception. The financial changes needed were made up by doubling premiums and obtaining funds from the national treasury in the shape of subsidies.

Local authorities, too, attempted to plug the holes of this terror again supplemented in many instances by trade-union benefits and occasional aid from large enterprises that had their own insurance systems, along with the conventional charitable aids.

This characteristic cooperation of both the national and local bodies has been in vogue since the first unemployment workmen act of 1905, when unemployment got its baptismal recognition as a byproduct of industrial maladjustment. This acceptance of the blamelessness of the workingman, himself, gave a dignity to the tasks' future handling that forced public responsibility for the maintenance of the laborers affected and withdrew them from the reproach of fault or blame.

In a brilliant unfolding of the formation and character of the National Insurance Act of 1911, Sir William Beveridge, in his book, paints the picture of the scheme that provided for the mandatory insurance of 2,000,000 manual workers in seven of the most fitful of English industries—shipbuilding, mechanical, public works, iron founding, building, vehicular construction, and saw milling. A million and a half munition and kindred war workers were added during the war.

The initial insurance premiums were made up by weekly contributions in adult brackets of 2⅓d. by worker and employer each, with the state adding 1⅔d. Weekly benefits were 7s. Various provisions to curtail the inroads that bad risks would cause were put into organic law. As we said above this proved splendidly adequate and the future seemed roseate at that time.

But in 1920 too precipitate a view of ultimate success veiled caution and enthusiasm was unduly responsible for the extention to cover over eleven million more. The subsequent break-down is history, but a study of the system is still worth while if only to prove the need for caution and consideration for the efforts of the President to utilize the mistakes of that campaign across the water.

There are close to 13,000,000 compulsorily insured against unemployment, including the obligatory enrollment of all persons employed under a contract of service of apprenticeship. Over 6,000,000 workers are therefore outside of this scheme. These exempted or excused classes include workers under 16 and over 65, agricultural workers, domestic servants, railroad, utility, governmental, and kindred groups, outworkers, banks, and others.

There is a waiting period of 3 or 6 days, all types of regulations, and designated officers for reports, appeals, and so forth; sometimes elaborately set out, but all made and changed with the cooperation of all parties, including labor unions, whose services have been most helpful.

Obviously the originally short-period plans were changed to meet the inroads of the worse depression in history. Even benefits were paid in advance of contributions. But even greater liberalization was necessary; so much so that the entire insurance structure was creaking under the strain. It was a short cut to the employment of the scheme to give money to those whose contributions did not entitle them to benefit under the original plan.

At times these payments were often also given in advance. In the famous Blanesburgh, or 1925 report, however, it was that committee's opinion that the question of unemployment insurance should be permanently broadened. It tackled the problem of the work-shy who preferred benefit to work. They first attempted to work out a definition of those who "genuinely were seeking work", but the tremendous disadvantages of attempting to get behind the worker's mind and his attitude made this impossible. Labor itself was distinctly opposed to this method of attack. As a substitute the Morris committee of 1929 recommended that a claimant should be denied benefit if he refused an offer of suitable work or if he failed to prove that he had made reasonable efforts to obtain suitable work had it been available. The burden of proof therefore was changed from the claimant to the insurance officer. The latter was now compelled to prove that the claimant had refused the job or was so indifferent that he failed to obtain one when available.

We know that the totally unpredictable demands upon the unemployment insurance in 1931 not only caused consternation for the existence of the system itself but it came dangerously near being of alarming peril to the finance system of the Empire. The result was that the benefits from insurance were strictly reduced and other aid was closely tied to poor relief. Various changes were made. This resulted in the establishment of the "means test", which in so many words means that those persons who had already drawn 26 weeks of benefits in a year, or who had sufficient contributions to entitle them to benefit, were required to prove their need for assistance to the poor-law officials.

Now, it is not necessary to point out the elaborate machinery set up to help this change in overhead policy. It is sufficient to say that the actual change as indicative of the constant necessity for revamping the entire policy. No one has found the touchstone to turn these problems into a formula or common denominator which will effectuate a solution.

It might be added also that the constant changes in the requisites for unemployment benefits has been the cause of the threatening insolvency in the fund itself. Obviously funds from the Crown were the only salvation.

It is significant that all of these reports are predicated upon the admittedly sound belief that "an unemployment insurance scheme must now be regarded as a permanent feature of the code of social legislation." All believe that the obtainable solution must eventually be along the lines of insurance features. The system has taken some terrific blows, but the English method of refusing to go off half cocked has been the salvation of the present existing methods. Definitely, certainly, and enthusiastically this spearhead of attack in the form of insurance constitutes England's answer.

Of course, the sustaining force in those dark days was the British Treasury. From those unexpected drains came various additional helps and subsequent studies on the problem. Recourse to the treasury was allowed, we have seen, by those who had even exhausted their legitimate insurance claims. This really precipitated the national budgetary crisis in 1931 with practically close to a half a billion dollars going to this insurance propping.

What about the future? An effort to include all of the hitherto exempted lists for the most part will bring into the fund all of those whose contributions will be steady and, by and large, will result in little or no benefit but will, in short, bulwark the drains of the others. The exclusion of these good risks in the past has prevented the spread of the scheme over those whose aid and assistance has been most needed for a Nation-wide coverage. The only safeguard is insurance. Of course, these people are being taxed to subsidize their fellow men in groups less fortunate in tenure of office and large pay rolls. When it is realized, however, that the safety of all depend upon the care of all the charge on these prior exempted secure groups seems justifiable, at least, in the English system.

What other auxiliaries was the British system establishing in the fight on the effects of economic maladjustment?

Brilliant efforts in the field of unemployment-exchange systems dominate these outside handmaid efforts. Provisions for work and the removal of potential workers from glutted areas to others with scarcity of workers were the salient features of the branch. Employment directories, national and divisional webs with exchange information, publicity chan-

nels, local committees of assistance, all linked with employer and employee, dot the map of the economic battlefields.

Training areas for women, girls, and juveniles were set up with success. The effort to get rid of surplus laborers by oversea immigration proved a pitiful fiasco and it is sufficient to say that it forms a sorrowful chapter in the entire story. Briefly, however, it was the Empire Settlement Act of 1922 which projected the 15-year plan to settle British subjects in the Dominion with the National Government to pay a half of the costs. Transplanted men, with habits and training unresponsive to new surroundings, found discouragement and tribulation, and the failure was due principally to this absence of prior agricultural training.

In the public-works projects the central government supported some directly, while the treasury guaranties of credit aided others. Subsidies to the local authorities also helped. Practically all men in these projects were registered on the employment-exchange records. As time went on efforts were made to place projects in areas termed "prosperous", so as to relieve other areas of the stigma of stagnation and cause mobility of labor. Projects calling for unskilled labor, with as few machines as possible, were utilized. Placement of men for every-other-day work periods increased the numbers aided, with added favorable consideration to ex-service men whose cases and reasons for maladjustment long antedated the depression.

A billion dollars worth of projects, however, never materialized. An unemployment grants committee dealt in wage grants, loan grants, transference grants, all of which served to cushion the load, but eventually the futility of public works was recognized and a gradually tapering off was noticeable. This does not mean that there were relatively no funds spent on public works. On the contrary, close to a billion was spent by both national and local authorities over 10 years in road work, sewers, sewer disposal, water supplies, electricity, docks, parks, municipal buildings, sea defense, baths and bathhouses, public health, and other types. It would serve no purpose to go into the details of this avenue of attack. In the British scheme of things it was helpful, but not capable of very permanent extension under existing conditions.

Any résumé of the efforts of other countries to handle this problem of unemployment or economic maladjustment shows primarily that its ravages can only be handled on a long-time, permanent basis. Temporary measures and expedients are not enough. The most sane, intelligent, and open-minded group in our Nation must handle this vexing problem with all its intricacies, and the machinery set up must be carefully planned and continually subject to inspection and revision. No one of the foreign methods can, of course, be taken or adopted in toto, but there is not one of them that cannot be studied for helpful suggestions.

Obviously, the time is not far distant when this Congress must pass upon the permanence of this problem. True, indeed, is it that we have hitherto delegated to the executive department powers broad in their blanketing features in the emergency handling of the entire matter. But truer still is the growing realization that it will soon be our problem to amass the facts, study the experiences, and formulate a permanent set-up. At that time the entire history of the Presidential efforts—and they were heroic endeavors—will be subject to our scrutiny. I wish to say now that it is my personal opinion that those efforts of the White House will reflect great glory on the honesty and brilliant handling of a tremendous problem under terrific pressure.

No one in this administration, Mr. Speaker, can deny that errors have been made in the extension of our relief program. But can anyone seriously gainsay the fact that Mr. Hopkins has been willing to listen to all complaints and suggestions and attempt a reasonable solution? We hear much from the other side of the aisle about substitutes and earmarking funds, bitter condemnation of W. P. A., graft and boondoggling, decentralization, home rule, and such talk, but we wonder if a single estimable gentleman on the minority side has realized that any abrupt face about in our handling of the problem would entail confusion, fear, and maybe chaos. Something has been done, and its results are patent. Whether we like the formula or the policy we can appraise the resultant product. Is it fair to say that a consequence which has been secured only after 3 years of intensive study, with its early efforts at times blindly emergent yet sincere, should be scrapped overnight? Is it fair for those who charge politics in its present administration to hold themselves out as nonpartisans now when they must or should know that changes now would be calamitous. I have tried to show in a feeble way within what I believe should be the limits of a revision and extension of this type that the entire problem is one of trial and error, and there is no panacea. As a matter of fact, if we had a Federal commission of inquiry composed of the biggest men in this country able and all willing to leave their own work to study this problem in its entirety, it is difficult for me to believe that such an inquiry would not take 6 months of the most painstaking study, yet we are asked to accept the conclusions of men whose bent is primarily political and overturn an entire system which at the worse cannot be totally wrong.

Let us not accept or prefer the report to the bullet or the echo to the report in this momentous question. These criticizers would take a leap forward if the Achilles of modern liberalism were not in the White House, but they dare not emerge with anything but the most glittering generalities. They do not dare to go into details, or at least they will not while this House is in session, for it would be treated to the most searching analysis in the world. It would be well for the country, however, if the Republican minority would present some tangible detailed plan with a worked-out philosophy to this House through one of its leaders and let us see what 3 years of external aloofness has fashioned, or are they too far down the inclined plane of political misfeasance which is nothing more or less than the path of fatuous censure and overreaching condemnation?

Let us not forget that the Republican Party is judged by its membership in Congress, and it cannot hope to whitewash their sins of omission by a sugar-coated platform. The voters want more than party planks to lift a candidate or a party above the rest of us. They demand results, and if party timber sincerely applied cannot produce results, it is well to discard that useless lumber. When one hears the platform talk, one is reminded of the vigorous statement of Justice Holmes in *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416):

> We see nothing in the Constitution that compels the Government to sit by while a food supply is cut off and the protectors of our forest and our crops are destroyed. It is not sufficient to rely upon the States. * * * The reliance is in vain.

THE SCRIPPS-HOWARD CHAIN OF NEWSPAPERS CONTINUES ITS VIGOROUS SUPPORT OF THE WAGNER-ELLENBOGEN HOUSING BILL

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have already commented on the widespread interest and active support which the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill has aroused in the newspapers of this country since the bill's introduction a few weeks ago. Among those journals which hailed the bill immediately on its appearance, and which have given it full editorial support, the liberal Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers has taken a leading part.

In an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press and other papers of the Scripps-Howard chain on May 3, 1936, an excellent analysis is made of the importance of the bill, both as an economic and social measure.

Commenting on the fact that surprisingly little opposition developed at the hearings on the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill, the editorial credits this to "a general approval of its social aims and economic needs."

The editorial then addresses itself to such criticisms as have arisen and analyzes and answers each.

First, to the claim that there is no housing shortage, it replies that a preponderance of authority disputes this.

> To cite one of standing—the Public Administration Clearing House of Chicago—estimates on a basis of census figures a need for 7,700,000 additional dwelling units during the next 10 years.

Next the editorial takes up the assertion that a scarcity of purchasing power, and not a housing shortage, causes these conditions.

In refutation of this charge it points out, very wisely, that—

One of the chief causes for scarcity of purchasing power in this country is the lag which has characterized the so-called heavy industries during the whole depression. Other industries have picked up. But the "heavies", generally speaking, are still in the doldrums. And to more than any other single cause this lag is due to lack of building. Nothing would more sharply stimulate employment and its consequent purchasing power in the heavy industries than just such a program as that contemplated in the slum-abatement bill.

We can learn from the experience of others. England's vast public housing program resulted in a private home-building boom as well as in greatly increased factory production.

It has also been contended, the editorial notes, that publicly financed housing kills thrift and discourages initiative. A look at the record of England is suggested, where the result was exactly the opposite.

Between 1919 and 1933 total assets of British building societies (institutions like our private building and loan associations) increased from 77,000,000 to 501,000,000 pounds, a 600-percent improvement.

The editorial dismisses, properly, the claim that the Government should not compete with private industry, because there is no competition.

All authorities agree that really low-rent housing does not and will not attract private capital.

It is asserted—

Remarks the Pittsburgh Press—

that such financing as called for in the bill is not a proper governmental function.

Why not?—

Asks the press.

We spend tax money to put down fires, crime, disease, and disorder. Those things are bred in the slums. Tax money spent to do away with the breeding is even better spent, and is more than returned in decreased health department, fire and police expenses. Tuberculosis, for example, is 30 times more prevalent in slum areas than elsewhere, baby deaths 300 percent higher, juvenile delinquency 300 times more frequent. In terms of broad economics as well as social improvement this strikes us as the most powerful of all the arguments for slum abatement. Prevention is cheaper than cure.

In conclusion, the editorial commends the emphasis which the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill places on local rather than Federal participation in its program.

The very essence of the plan is to emphasize not the Federal but the local aspect through limited loans and grants to local housing authorities over a 4-year period.

In its moderate aims, its long-term viewpoint, and its decentralization features, it marks a decided advance over all our previous rehousing plans.

The Scripps-Howard papers say of the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill.

This consistent and able support which the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill is receiving is a testimonial to the sound purposes and aims inherent in the bill, and the practical manner in which they are resolved.

The continuance of this support will aid in enlightening the people of this country to the merits of the measure, and a consequent Nation-wide demand for its passage.

DEFICIENCY BILL OF 1936 AND RELIEF

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, the title of this bill is a misnomer. It is so much more than the title designates. The bill appropriates a little more than $2,364,000,000. According to the committee $1,425,000,000, or half of this amount, is allocated to the Works Progress Administration. This cannot be construed as a deficiency. It is an outright new grant to the Works Progress Administration for alleged relief purposes.

Involved in the other half of the funds appropriated by the bill are the necessary funds to make effective the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act, as well as the operation of the Post Office Department under the 40-hour-week system. To vote against the bill would require me to vote against the grants to States for old-age pensions, grants to States for aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind. These are humane measures, necessary and meritorious. These laws are already enacted, and require this money to make them operative. A man cannot strike at the aged, nor at the defenseless destitute blind, nor at crippled children and keep his self-respect. It is only a little less obnoxious to me to strike at the postal employees by refusing to appropriate the money for their salaries or to be so unjust as to refuse to grant the Railroad Retirement Board the money provided by this bill after requiring the railroads to pay their contribution to that fund and the railroad employees to stand the deductions from their meager salaries.

I resent having a bill brought in this Chamber to be voted on which so hopelessly commingles these vital things with the unnecessary grant of money to the Works Progress Administration. I say unnecessary advisedly. Even though I believed in the efficiency of the W. P. A., I would still say this grant of a billion and a half is unnecessary. It is unnecessary because that agency now has, and will have on the 1st day of next July, an unexpended balance of more than a billion two hundred million dollars. An unexpended balance only two hundred million short of the sum you are giving them in this deficiency bill in which there is no deficiency except in the funds for the purposes I have enumerated.

I voted against the three billion three hundred million relief measure. I voted against the four billion eight hundred million relief measure. I stated at the time my reasons. Those reasons are as good to me today as at the time of those votes. I objected to requiring the taxpayer to pay in taxes double the amount of the relief, which we do through our system of paying for relief by the issuance of interest-bearing tax-exempt bonds. I do not believe that the people of this Nation should be required to pay a bonus for the privilege of taking care of its destitute citizens. When this bill has passed we will have appropriated for relief $9,600,000,000. That is what we will have expended. That is what the people on relief and those employed in its distribution will receive, but it will cost the taxpayer $20,000,000,000 to dispense the nine and one-half billions.

I protest the price is too high for what the citizen gets. He is expending $2 to get back one. He is like the man who went into the match business, bought matches for 5 cents a box and sold them for 4 cents, expecting to sell 20,000,000 boxes and make his profit on the volume of business done.

This relief appropriation is like all the others. It gives all the power to one man. Under this bill you must go, hat in hand, to Mr. Hopkins, bow before the idol, and await his will. Relief under this system is governed by remote control. And we have been under Mr. Hopkins' inventive genius, progressing constantly in this form of relief administration. Mr. Hopkins' maxim is the more remote the control the better, and the further the idol in charge is removed from the recipient of his bounty the more honor to the idol and the more cost to the taxpayer.

These are not idle words to draw an indictment. Let me give the figures. I give you figures obtained from the county auditors in seven counties in my district and the figures obtained from the district offices of the W. P. A. In seven counties for the 9-month period immediately following August 1, 1935, the date on which the remote-control system of relief administration under the W. P. A. was instituted the total cost for the seven counties was $1,337,163.87 or an average cost of $148,573.76 per month for the 9-month period.

Prior to August 1, 1935, relief was administered for 26 months by local control. The Government granted the money to the States and the States distributed it by and with the advice of local authorities in the communities. Under that system the cost for 26 months was $1,352,563.44, or an average monthly cost for the 26 months or $57,021.67 per month.

In these seven counties in Indiana under Mr. Hopkins' system the cost per month is almost three times that of the relief before the W. P. A. came into control. Under Mr. Hopkins' system we have the security wage for labor and

the prevailing profit for the material man. I am opposed to such discrimination. If the material man is entitled to the prevailing profit on his investment, then labor is entitled to the prevailing wage on its investment. Under the system before Hopkins, the system of local control, the F. E. R. A. and the C. W. A., the prevailing wage as well as the prevailing profit was paid. Relief, while not administered without errors, was better administered than now and, according to the figures I have given you, at one-third of the cost. This bill is being amended to provide for the prevailing rate for labor. I concur in that amendment. It is a step forward but is not the prevailing wage. Under this amendment you will increase the rate and not the wage. You require labor because it receives the prevailing rate of pay to shorten its hours so as to continue to be under a starvation wage.

The Nation cannot attain to a proper economic recovery under a starvation wage that permits only a mere existence to a number of the citizens. Neither the farmer nor the merchant can eventually profit when the purchasing power of labor is kept at merely enough to keep body and soul together.

Mr. Hoover's theory of relief was to spread existing employment among more people by shortening hours. Put two men on one job and divide the wage. His theory was, let all starve together. Mr. Hopkins' theory is the same, with only a slight variation. Mr. Hopkins believes all should be kept alive, but with as little life as possible.

I think the time has come to inject a new serum into the lifeblood of relief administration and relief thought. The time has come to throw off the old worn-out cloaks of both Hoover and Hopkins, the theories of recovery based on starvation and accept as a national relief system a theory based on American standards of living.

The expenditure of relief money in lasting public works of a permanent nature would employ people in the heavy industries—in the manufacture of materials. It would be a great indirect aid to recovery. Many now on the public-relief work would find employment in private industry. The Government cannot continue indefinitely as the employer of 6,000,000 people. The problem can be solved only when the transfer is made from the public pay roll to a private pay roll. Without private business to be taxed there can be no funds for public relief.

Our present system on relief, whether we name it a dole or a security wage, saps the pride and crucifies the high soul of the individual who is forced to accept it. We are creating a Nation of governmental suppliants to replace a Nation of working men and women proud of their ability to maintain themselves.

Never before has a relief appropriation bill been brought before the House attached to a deficiency bill so that the two could not be separated. There must have been a reason for preventing a separate vote on the relief appropriation. I have my opinion as to that reason. This I do know, that there are other Members, like myself, who would not vote for it if it were not so tied up with other appropriations that to vote against it would be to crucify the helpless, destitute aged, curse the blind, deny the joy of life to helpless crippled children, and abrogate already existing law by failing to make provision for the necessary money for the operation of those laws.

Mr. Speaker, I am forced to vote for the bill to keep faith with the helpless, but in so doing I am not commending or supporting an appropriation for relief by remote control and tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILLS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, few of our constituents realize the vast amount of work that it is necessary for a Member of Congress to perform which is in no way reflected in our districts. We are expected by some to have a personal knowledge of all pending legislation, but if those who expect this of us stopped to realize that when this Congress adjourns in a few weeks the RECORD will show over 20,000 bills and resolutions have been introduced since January 1935, they would better understand the situation that confronts us.

Our tasks are diversified and many. Because the hour of meeting is noon, many feel that a Congressman's life is a round of pleasure. If those people would be at our office early in the morning and see dozens of letters in the first of six mails that come to our desk during a day, then watch us run to a committee meeting or around to various Government Departments scattered over a great city, they would have a more intelligent understanding of what their Representatives do other than to sit and listen to speeches and vote. The standing committees of the House, where all legislation and matters that affect the conduct of the Government are considered, is the place where all well-informed people know a vast amount of work is done. Take as an example the hearings on the deficiency bill. That bill contained about two and one-half billion dollars in appropriations for various Government agencies. Several thousand pages of testimony is found in the hearings. A complete analysis of the activities of the Works Progress Administration is found in one volume. How many of our citizens know that members of the committee sat morning and afternoon, not for weeks, but for months, while Chairman BUCHANAN, of Texas, and his 38 associates secured information relative to expenditures in the past and made Government officials justify their request for additional money before placing their stamp of approval on the Budget recommendation by placing the item in the bill. When the statement is made, "the amount is below the Budget estimate", it means the official could not justify the demand for the full amount. You will see by that hearing, pages of testimony, even regarding such expenditures as for telephone, telegraph, automobiles, typewriters, and stationery, not speaking of the more important activities. Everything, however, is covered. How many people read Mr. Hopkins' explanation of boondoggling projects, so called? Mr. Hopkins not only read the criticism of the partisan press but then submitted a statement of facts and in each instance justified the project. The criticism did not jibe with the facts.

It was at night that the members of this committee, along with many others, were required to remain in their offices looking after the mail from their constituents.

It so happens the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is charged with certain duties, and as chairman of that committee I feel it is only proper that some attention be given to claims bills. It is not a pleasant undertaking for one to disagree with his colleagues on private bills. The Government departments naturally watch the action of Congress in handling claims growing out of Government contracts, and so forth. My contention has been Congress should give more than ordinary attention to the principle involved in some of these claims, no matter how small the amount. I know my attitude has been criticized. In fact, one Member has gone so far as to say, because I opposed a bill providing for the payment of insurance of $10,000 in a veteran's case, I have no sympathy for the disabled ex-service men. The principle involved in that case was whether Congress desired to adopt a policy of setting aside a decision of the Veterans' Bureau. I contended to do so would open the door for the introduction of thousands of similar bills. The author of the bill fully understood my position, as we did not discuss the merits of the case. That criticism does not bother me in the least. It is better to try to do something for the taxpayers now and then, even if wrong at times, than to do nothing.

There is absolutely nothing personal in my opposition to certain private-claims bills. The work in presenting a synopsis of some of the bills for the benefit of Members who do not have the time to examine the reports due to other duties is arduous, especially when one wants to be perfectly fair. I found a month ago I was doing too much for my own good, and the House physician so advised me. I will be unable to take the floor, as I have in the past, on Tuesday, May 19, when the omnibus bills are called, but I am now submitting a brief statement regarding some of the claims that are on the calendar, just as I have done every time the bills have been considered at this session.

As a result of my efforts many bills have been defeated, and some that I opposed, which passed, have been vetoed by the President.

There are seven omnibus claims bills on the calendar—five from the Committee on Claims, one from the Committee on War Claims, and one from the Committee on Public Lands. There are many meritorious bills included, but it is my opinion that there are a number that should not pass or at least should receive more than ordinary attention, and it is the latter I refer to.

My statement follows:

H. R. 9045 (OMNIBUS)

This bill is from the Committee on Claims. There are several measures included in this bill to which I call the attention of Members of the House.

TITLE II—H. R. 3559—JOHN L. ALCOCK

Under this bill the Court of Claims would be given jurisdiction to adjudicate a claim for anticipated profits under executory contracts between claimant and foreign buyers covering spruce lumber, which the United States commandeered for war purposes. Claimant has heretofore recovered damages for the loss on lumber in his possession at the time the Government took over all spruce timber.

Does Congress wish to obligate the Government to pay anticipated and speculative profits? The War Department says in part:

If the relief be granted, it is believed such action would constitute a precedent too dangerous to even contemplate, as it would open up untold tens of thousands of claims of a like nature, for the reasons that during the war the Government not only requisitioned ships which were under contract and charter at the time of their requisition but undertook the control of wheat, sugar, coal, and other commodities of almost every nature, thereby rendering impossible the execution of previous contracts, respecting these commodities, and took over steel mills, railroads, shipyards, telephone and telegraph lines, the capacity output of factories and other producing activities. If this bill should be enacted into law, it is the opinion of this Department that it will inevitably result in a stampede and gold rush in the nature of claims upon the Government in comparison with which the Klondike gold rush would appear as a solo affair. If this should be passed, it is difficult to understand why, in principle, every soldier who was drafted into the military service would not have an equally meritorious claim against the Government for a special act of Congress for relief to compensate him for the difference between his meager Army pay and the pay, salary, or earnings he was receiving in civil life.

In view of such a statement from the present Secretary of War, Congress should give more than ordinary consideration to this proposed legislation and defeat the bill.

TITLE IV—H. R. 3729—HENRY W. BIBUS AND OTHERS

The claim of Henry W. Bibus and others grows out of the purchase of land for use by the Government during the war, for which the claimants were paid $472,250.30. There are 11 claimants, and all but 2 received the option price. In one instance the compromise was $5,000 less, and in the other the same amount. In four cases the Government paid more than the option price. The report shows the Government spent millions for improvements. It converted the land into highly desirable industrial property by reason of the expenditure in excess of $6,000,000. Now the former owners want the Congress to pass a bill that might result in their securing the amount between the purchase price and the sale price—over a million dollars. The War Department is opposed to the bill, and the Congress should defeat it.

TITLE VI—H. R. 4841—RELIEF OF CERTAIN ARMY DISBURSING OFFICERS AND OTHERS

A similar bill, S. 556, became Private Act No. 214, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 14, 1935, after this title was included in the omnibus bill, H. R. 9054.

TITLE IX—S. 1360—TERESA DE PREVOST

The bill has been pending for many years and grows out of the so-called Alsop award of July 4, 1911, made by the King of Great Britain as arbitrator.

Mrs. de Prevost maintains this money should be paid to her by the Government because of alleged irregularities in the distribution through the State Department to claimants under the Alsop award. The United States Government held the Government of Chile was liable to the United States, acting for certain named persons and their heirs. The King of Great Britain was named as arbitrator, and he decided in favor of the United States. The contentions of the claimant indicate a former Assistant Solicitor of the State Department resigned after the award had been made and within a few years entered the case as an attorney. If the allegations of Mrs. de Prevost are true, then the Assistant Solicitor of the State Department was guilty of unethical conduct, to say the least. This lady has spent many years around the Capitol in an effort to secure the passage of an act to reimburse her.

Mrs. de Prevost died several weeks ago, and, so far as I can ascertain, she did not leave any relatives in this country.

The Committee on War Claims reported the next bill and, of course, has to do with claims growing out of the war. Some even go back to the War of the Rebellion.

H. R. 9112 (OMNIBUS)

TITLE I—H. R. 237—ROWESVILLE OIL CO.

The bill is to remove the statute of limitations so far as it applies to the linters claim of the Rowesville Oil Co., arising out of a contract it had with the Government in 1919. The Judge Advocate General of the War Department indicates that at this time, with incomplete records, the Government would be at a great disadvantage in defending this suit if the bill was passed. Further, while the plaintiff made a plea at the time of cancelation of contract that it feared bankruptcy, the Judge Advocate General says:

As a matter of fact, the plaintiff did not fail. Like all industries connected with the manufacture of munitions, the plaintiff made great profits as a result of the war.

The company did not protest the cancelation clause at the time the contract was made.

TITLE II—H. R. 254—FARMERS STORAGE & FERTILIZER CO.

The second bill is for the Farmers Storage & Fertilizer Co., and is similar to the Rowesville Oil Co. bill.

TITLE III—H. R. 3790—WALTER W. JOHNSON

This bill proposes to pay a balance alleged to be due claimant for services rendered in behalf of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation during the years 1918 and 1919 in launching ships built for the Government at various shipbuilding yards.

In decision of April 30, 1930, no. E-455, the Court of Claims found the value of the claimant's services in launching the ships to be $20,000, and that $5,495 of that amount had been paid by the shipbuilding corporations, the amount of the judgment being $14,505. Does the Congress wish to authorize this payment notwithstanding the claimant has already been paid in full, in the view of the Court of Claims?

The net judgment was paid by the Government. It amounted to $14,505 and was paid September 6, 1930. This certainly should dispose of the claim. The bill seeking further reimbursement should be defeated.

TITLE V—H. R. 4059—ELLA B. KIMBALL

The bill to pay Ella B. Kimball, daughter and heir of Jeremiah Simonson, is a Civil War claim. It provides for payment of $16,441.81 for furnishing supplies and labor in the construction of the U. S. S. *Chenango*. The findings of the court were submitted in 1907, but all efforts to collect the money by an act of Congress have failed, as have hundreds if not thousands of other Civil War claims.

TITLE VI—H. R. 6356—JOSEPH G. GRISSOM

The claim of Joseph G. Grissom of $1,153.43 is another Civil War claim. This was to cover a period between the time he was commissioned by a Governor and actual date of muster in. One hundred and sixty-three such claims passed the House but were rejected by the Senate. This is the first time since 1914 this claim has been reported by a House committee.

TITLE VII—H. R. 7727—GEORGE B. MARX

The claim of George B. Marx grows out of an informal contract to make 200 wire carts for the Signal Corps in 1918. The War Department canceled the order on November 9, 1918, later considered the claim and paid Marx $139,876.86. Marx claims $76,574.12. The committee, despite the objec-

tions of the War Department in the Seventy-first Congress, recommended Marx be paid $58,259.02. The bill was defeated. Now it is proposed to refer the case to the Court of Claims. The Government should not be required to defend such a suit.

TITLE VIII—S. 2520—T. D. RANDALL & CO.

This bill proposes to authorize the Court of Claims to readjudicate a claim for losses and damages arising out of contracts for furnishing hay to the War Department in the year 1918. The claim was referred to said court by Private Act No. 507, Seventieth Congress, approved March 2, 1929, and denied by the court for the reason there was no agreement or understanding whereby the Government was to provide cars for shipping the hay, and, there being no breach of contract by the United States, no liability resulted for the alleged losses and damages (71 Ct. Cls. 152).

Does the Congress wish in effect to amend the contracts at this late date by changing the rights and obligations of the parties thereunder so as to make the Government liable for risks which the contractor voluntarily assumed in its undertakings?

This company wants $20 and $25 a ton for 3,600 tons of hay it contracted to furnish the Government for $14 per ton. The Government paid the contract price.

The next two omnibus bills are from the Committee on Claims, H. R. 11214 and 11215.

H. R. 11214 (OMNIBUS)

TITLE II.—H. R. 2479—CHARLES G. JOHNSON

The bill is for the relief of Charles G. Johnson, State treasurer of the State of California.

I have no objections to this bill, as the coupons have not been presented to the Treasury Department, but the bill should read, a bill for the relief of the Maryland Casualty Co., as that company has actually paid the loss, and in the end, Mr. Johnson will reimburse the surety company.

TITLE XI—S. 925—TO CARRY INTO EFFECT THE FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS IN THE CASE OF WILLIAM W. DANENHOWER

This is an ancient claim, over 15 years old.

Section 9 of the act of February 12, 1901, according to the Court of Claims shows, provided among other things for the payment, 50 percent by the United States and 50 percent by the District of Columbia for all damages to property owners resulting from, incidental to, or connected with all relocations and changes of alinements and grades of the tracks of said railroad or the streets of the city.

The act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. 624, 625), repealed section 9 of the act of February 12, 1901, and provided for the ascertainment of the actual damages resulting to property owners from changes made in streets and railroad tracks under the act of 1901.

No suit was ever brought under section 9 of the act of February 12, 1901, or claim filed as provided by the act of June 23, 1906, by the claimant.

It seems to me if the Congress is to further reimburse this owner, the District of Columbia should be required to pay 50 percent of the damages, but this bill calls for the payment of the entire amount from the Treasury of the United States.

It further appears that this owner slept on his rights and did not take advantage of the acts referred to.

TITLE XII—S. 952—ZELMA HALVERSON

The decedent in this case lost his life while fighting a forest fire in Montana during August 1933 as an employee of the Sieben Livestock Co., of Helena, Mont. It seems to be admitted by everyone except a representative of the company that at the time of his death as a result of the fire Harry Halverson continued to be employed with the company. He was not employed in the Forest Service of the United States at any time up to and including the time of his death, August 21, 1933. In other words, if employed by the company and not by the Government, there is neither moral, equitable, nor legal obligation upon the Government, such obligation resting squarely upon the company. There appears to be no sound reason why the United States should assume the liability if in fact that liability is rightfully upon another.

TITLE XIV—S. 1328—SNARE & TRIEST CO., NOW FREDERICK SNARE CORPORATION

The contractors in this case are asking the Congress to grant them the sum of $83,978.05 in full settlement of all claims against the Government for damages incident to delays (alleged to have been caused by the Government) in connection with work performed by them under a contract for furnishing labor and materials necessary in the improvement of the water front at the submarine base, Key West, Fla. The contractors have had their day in court on two different occasions.

The Congress has already made available $800,000 more than the contract price which was paid.

In the Seventy-third Congress, S. 1760 authorized the Court of Claims again to hear and adjudicate the case without regard to the statute of limitations.

This bill, however, does not return the case to the Court of Claims, where it has been on two previous occasions, but directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the money direct, by providing that the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the $83,978.05.

If any action is to be taken by the Congress on this bill, it certainly should be to return the claim to the Court of Claims, and not pay the claim from the Treasury, as the bill provides.

TITLE XV. S. 1431—COLLIER MANUFACTURING CO. OF BARNESVILLE, GA.

The contracts under which the claim of the Collier Manufacturing Co. was predicated were entered into by the firm of Clift & Goodrich, and the Court of Claims has found that settlements with the latter company were made by the Government. The Government dealt with Clift & Goodrich, not with the Collier Co. Why should it be necessary to pay this company the sum of $48,719.70 in full settlement of all claims when they have in fact no claim against the Government? The case has been decided adversely to the Collier Co. by the War Department Board of Contract Adjustment and by the Court of Claims—certiorari denied by the Supreme Court of the United States.

H. R. 11215 (OMNIBUS)

TITLE I—H. R. 653—GEORGE R. BROWN

This is a bill to authorize payment of pay and allowances to George R. Brown, a former second lieutenant in the National Guard, to cover a period during which it is claimed he was illegally placed in a discharge status from the service of the United States. A fact that was apparently overlooked when the War Department acted to restore claimant to an active status was that when his National Guard organization was transferred into the Federal service on August 4, 1917, he was not an officer of the National Guard, having been discharged therefrom by the Governor July 28, 1917, which order was received August 1, 1917, and therefore he was not an officer in the service of the United States when the alleged illegal discharge order was issued or at any time during the period for which pay and allowances are claimed.

It is a further fact that Lieutenant Brown rendered no services during the period in question, never reported to a military post or station, and was not ordered to do so. The accounting officers of the Government in 1918 and the Court of Claims in 1924 found no merit in the claim and the War Department in agreement therewith has reported adversely. Amount claimed, $689.90.

TITLE IV—H. R. 2115—FIRST LT. R. G. CUNO

This bill would reimburse First Lt. R. G. Cuno for damages to his personal property which were sustained by reason of a storm which flooded a warehouse at Langley Field, Va., August 23, 1933, where the Government had stored the property during the officer's absence as a patient at Walter Reed General Hospital. The property was stored free of charge, and, at most, the Government was merely a gratuitous

bailee, requiring the exercise of only ordinary care and certainly not liable for damages resulting from unforeseeable causes. The damages to the property may be considered as the result of an act of God, any consequent losses necessarily resting on the owner of the property.

Since as early as 1885 (23 Stat. 350) the Government has accepted only a limited liability for loss, destruction, or damage of the property of personnel of the military services (see act of Mar. 4, 1921, 41 Stat. 1436), but it has never gone so far as to insure personal property of an Army officer against loss, damage, and destruction when the custody by the Government was for convenience of the owner of the property.

Hundreds of enlisted men and officers at Langley Field, Fort Monroe, and the navy yard and hospital at Langley Field lost their personal belongings in the flood of 1933.

Is Congress to reimburse this man to the extend of $851.61 and not recognize the others?

TITLE VIII—H. R. 3179—JESSE ASHBY

The claim of Jesse Ashby arose out of work required to be performed under contract dated April 28, 1931, for painting plaster walls in the new Department of Commerce Building, Washington, D. C., and the provisions of this title VIII have for their purpose a reference of his claim to the United States Court of Claims with jurisdiction to hear the same notwithstanding the failure of any Government officer to give proper written orders for additional work with instructions to adjudicate the same upon the basis set forth in the bill. Article 3 of the contract requires that any claim resulting in an increase in the contract price must be asserted within 10 days after the change is ordered and supervisory officers of the Government have stated that the claim of the contractor is more in the nature of an afterthought subsequent to completion of the work, based upon his personal opinion that the profits should have amounted to more than were actually realized on the job. This merely shows the value which flows to the Government under section 3709, Revised Statutes, in requiring competition from contractors. Common experience teaches that oftentimes profits are small, and in some instances losses are incurred as a result of competitive bidding on close estimates. This is a chance that all contractors take in entering into competitive bidding, and in this particular case claimant stands on no different footing than other contractors similarly situated. In any event, if the claimant thinks he has a legal claim against the Government under the contract he is not precluded from pursuing whatever remedy he believes himself entitled in the Court of Claims, the statute of limitations not having run at this time. If the Government is going to guarantee a realization of the profit estimated by a contractor, then the protection accorded the Government by the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes, will be practically nullified. No amount is estimated.

TITLE XIII—H. R. 6105—FOR THE RELIEF OF THE NEW AMSTERDAM CASUALTY CO.

This bill is for the relief of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co. This company furnished the bond for one Zangwell Engelsher, who had been indicted on six counts for counterfeiting. You have hundreds of similar cases where forfeited bail bonds will be demanded when bills of this character pass. Then, again, it would be interesting to know who guaranteed this bond when it was written by the company. In many cases I have heard of surety companies demanding security before they will furnish such bonds. Was the company reimbursed; and if so, will it return this money to those who furnished the guaranty?

TITLE XVII—S. 895—TO CARRY OUT THE FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS IN THE CASE OF THE ATLANTIC WORKS, OF BOSTON, MASS.

The claim of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass., is a more or less ancient one, the basis thereof being predicated upon construction of the revenue cutter *Daniel Manning*, under the terms of a contract with the United States dated June 27, 1895. The vessel was completed October 7, 1897, was delivered to and accepted by the United States, and the full contract price, plus the cost of extra work, was paid and received by the contractor as payment in full.

It appears clear from an examination of the findings of fact by the Court of Claims, to whom was referred the case under the Tucker Act of March 3, 1887, that the error in estimates for the job was due in large part to the inexperience and lack of facilities for handling the same.

The nature of the claim was summarized in the Court's conclusion of law as follows:

> If the Court have jurisdiction under any of the provisions of the Tucker Act to render judgment, its conclusion is that there is no liability upon the United States under the terms of the contract to pay said claim, and that the claim is neither a legal nor an equitable one. The claimant insists that the claim is one for "a grant, gift, or bounty" by the Government and the payment of such a claim rests in the judgment and discretion of Congress.

This claim thus appears to be merely another case where the Government is asked to donate or give to a contractor moneys of the taxpayer to partly reimburse such contractor for losses due to errors in estimating its costs and profits on Government work. The amount involved is $22,170.30.

TITLE XVIII—S. 2119—FOR THE RELIEF OF AMOS D. CARVER, S. E. TURNER, CLIFFORD N. CARVER, SCOTT BLANCHARD, P. B. BLANCHARD, JAMES B. PARSE, A. N. BLANCHARD, AND W. A. BLANCHARD AND/OR THE WIDOWS OF SUCH OF THEM AS MAY BE DECEASED

The claim of Amos D. Carver et al., in the sum of $35,916.68, is stated to represent losses incurred by the owners of the schooner *Betsy Ross* by reason of interference with, delays to, and forced cancelation of a private charter of and the appropriation of the use of said vessel by the United States Shipping Board on or about April 5, 1918. The basis for the claim appears to be that the loss was incurred in handling a shipment of wheat for the United States Food Administration from Australia to New York instead of a shipment of chrome ore to the west coast of the United States under a private charter. The United States Shipping Board has denied appropriation of the use of the vessel and the Supreme Court of the United States has confirmed the contention of the Government on the merits to the effect that no liability attached to the United States, this action being on writ of certiorari after judgment by the Court of Claims against the United States.

As before stated, the Supreme Court of the United States has found that no legal liability existed, and if the Congress sees fit to pass the bill in behalf of the claimants as a grant or gift there would appear to be for ascertainment what, if any, expenses were incurred by the owners incident to the shipment of wheat from Australia to New York over and above the expenses which would have been incurred in the shipment of chrome ore, taking into consideration the respective freight charges which would have accrued to the owners on each shipment. From all that appears the shipment of chrome ore under the original charter may have resulted in a greater loss than the shipment of wheat, incident to which it apparently is contended the loss was incurred.

H. R. 12322 (OMNIBUS)

TITLE I—H. R. 1369—R. L. TANKERSLEY

This bill would grant to the beneficiary $5,000 from the United States Treasury as damages for personal injuries alleged to have been sustained in an encounter with one Capt. John C. Luikhart, commanding officer of Service Troop, One Hundred and Eleventh Cavalry, New Mexico National Guard, while the organization was in attendance at an encampment at Fort Bliss, Tex. The trouble appears to have been the result of an argument between Mr. Tankersley and the captain regarding the taking of watermelons from the former's patch by certain undisclosed enlisted members of the New Mexico National Guard. Aside from the fact that the tort feasor has never been heard in defense of the alleged assault, the report of the Secretary of War indicates, at least tacitly, an accepted or admitted liability by the State of New Mexico by its willingness to pay all hospital bills and remunerate Mr. Tankersley for his loss of time, but this offer by the State appears to have been refused, the plaintiff insisting upon a large money settlement and criminal prosecution, thus indicating either that the injuries were of a minor

nature and the loss of time negligible or that the victim of the affray can be satisfied only by the granting of a substantial sum of unproved injuries. The law is clear that members of the National Guard in time of peace are administered, uniformed, equipped, and trained in their status as National Guards of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and the fact that the Federal Government appropriates money for allotment to the States in assisting them in the training of their troops does not shift the liability either legally, equitably, or morally upon the Federal Government for damages which may have been caused by these State troops.

TITLE II—H. R. 1868—MARY E. RONEY

The person who would benefit under this title is the widow of one George H. Roney, who died October 16, 1931, as a result of injuries sustained when struck by an automobile being operated by a member of the District of Columbia police department while responding to an emergency call, and the payment would be made from funds of the Federal Government, no part thereof being contemplated from funds of the District of Columbia in proportion to the contributions legally made by the Congress for the support of the District of Columbia. It appears that this claimant has already been paid the sum of $5,000, the maximum amount authorized by the Congress in such cases by the act of February 11, 1929, as amended by the act of June 5, 1930 (46 Stat. 500), and the passage of this bill would amount to a special exception to the general law made and provided for just such cases, not only by increasing the amount beyond the $5,000 limitation, but also by authorizing the entire payment above $5,000 from the Federal Treasury rather than from funds of the District of Columbia.

TITLE III.—H. R. 2148—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

This bill would provide another legal avenue through which the corporation can again bring suit against the United States for recovery of approximately a half a million dollars of the taxpayers' money for the admitted purpose of paying dividends to the Italian-American stockholders in the corporation. This corporation has already tried numerous times to impress several Federal courts with the merits of its claim, but its claims have uniformly been turned down. The memorandum from the Director, Shipping Board Bureau, included in the committee's report, indicates that most of the Government's important witnesses have since died and that the expense of summoning the remaining witnesses in behalf of the Government would entail a tremendous cost. It is stated further that the Government already has suffered a loss of approximately $1,500,000 out of the transaction. It is also indicated that the corporation from practically the beginning found it extremely difficult to operate, partly because of internal dissension in the board of directors and partly because of a tremendous drop in the shipping business. It is submitted that to require the Government to defend another suit at this time, after the death of so many of its principal witnessses; after the statute of limitations has long since run against the claimant, would place the Government at a decided disadvantage and entail an unnecessary and burdensome cost.

This corporation, once indicted for conspiracy to defraud the United States, should not be placed in a position superior to that of an individual litigant who has sued and lost to another private litigant instead of to the Government. In such a case the plaintiff having exhausted his legal remedies unsuccessfully may not by vexatious litigation perpetuate his lawsuits, and the Government should be protected to the same extent, which the Congress can do by not consenting to the bringing of another suit of this nature in the Court of Claims.

TITLE IV—H. R. 2644—KRIKOR HAROUTUNIAN

There appears to be absolutely no reason, legal, equitable, or moral why this claimant should be paid $1,000. Haroutunian posted a bond conditioned upon the voluntary departure from the United States of two Turkish nationals temporarily admitted to this country, who by a series of delays, hindrances, and obstacles have to all intents and purposes flouted the immigration laws and still remain in this country. The facts as reported by the Second Assistant Secretary of Labor are more or less of a travesty and insofar as the two aliens received permission to remain in the United States, the following excerpts from the said report appears pertinent:

> As you will have seen from the foregoing facts, neither Mrs. Zakarian nor her daughter, Vehanush, was permitted to remain in the United States. The former, as stated above, voluntarily departed from this country, going to Canada, and was, on the same day, lawfully admitted to the United States after she had complied with all requirements of the immigration laws. Vehanush, as further shown above, is still in this country, but she is not here lawfully under the immigration laws and is here only because of the indulgence and forbearance of this Department. Therefore the statement in bill H. R. 2515 that these aliens subsequently received permission to remain in the United States is incorrect.
>
> The propriety of the Department's action in forfeiting the collateral security deposited with the immigration bond can hardly be questioned. That action was in accordance with the plain provisions of the bond and also the authority conferred upon the Secretary by the power of attorney which Mr. Haroutunian executed. The bond was exacted from the aliens in accordance with the authority contained in section 15 of the act of 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 215). The obligation voluntarily assumed by Mr. Haroutunian was that the aliens would depart from the United States voluntarily before the expiration of the period of time fixed by the Department for their temporary stay, and that they would do so without causing any expense to the United States. That they failed to do either is obvious from the facts stated above. Instead, they persisted in remaining in this country in obstinate regard of the Department's orders respecting them. * * *

Why should the United States return a forfeiture exacted under the bond under these more or less vicious circumstances? A subterfuge undoubtedly was perpetrated in solving and surmounting the immigration hurdles erected by the Congress and the surety certainly should not be rewarded for the success of the enterprise. This title undoubtedly should be stricken from the bill.

TITLE V—H. R. 4500—FRANK LEE BORNEY

The wording of this title would lead to the inference that injuries were sustained by the claimant as a result of innocently coming into contact with a dynamite cap used by the Civil Works Administration contractors. Actually, however, it appears that the Negro youth stole the cap from the cache where they had been placed by the dynamite workers for safety and subsequently in experimenting therewith caused the explosion which resulted in the loss of two fingers. The situation is the same as though he had stolen a loaded revolver and accidently shot himself and then made claim upon the owner of the gun for damages for his injury. There is absolutely no liability on the part of the Government, and it is not believed that Congress should ratify or approve his larceny by rewarding him for his illegal act which accidently resulted in the injury.

TITLE VI—H. R. 4695—STERLING BRONZE CO.

See report of the Comptroller General of the United States, dated April 26, 1934, on pages 34, 35, and 36 of Report No. 2416 of the Committee on Claims, accompanying this omnibus claims bill, H. R. 12322. This bill has to do with the New House Office Building. The report is lengthy and not favorable.

TITLE VIII—H. R. 5826—MISSISSIPPI BARGE CORPORATION

This is a claim by the disputed owner of the steamboat *Dandelion* claimed to have been sunk by a Government vessel in February 1929, over 7 years ago. The amount of the claim is now $20,000. It appears that this old ship was built in 1893 and was sold by the United States Lighthouse Service to the alleged vendee of the claimant for $2,500. The committee report, while admitting that the purchaser of the vessel from the Lighthouse Service paid only a small sum for the ship, states "There is nothing to show that he did not make repairs before he sold it." It may also be stated that there is nothing to show that he did make any repairs. There seems to be much confusion as to ownership and

value of this old crate at the time it was sunk and it is significant to note that the alleged owners have never pursued their remedies, if any they had, in a court of competent jurisdiction capable of hearing both sides, of viewing the witnesses, and of submitting them to cross examination by the opposing counsel. Neither is it shown that any attempt was ever made to minimize the damages by salvage operations. In this connection attention is invited to that part of the memorandum of the general counsel, Inland Waterways Corporation, dated April 20, 1934, as follows:

Our claim department, shortly after the sinking, advised the Mississippi Barge Corporation that we denied any liability.

Liability on the part of either the Government or the Inland Waterways Corporation, whichever may be considered to have been the owner of the towboat *Natchez*, is by no means certain under the law.

Even if liability exists it would be manifestly unjust to pay the Mississippi Barge Corporation and disregard the rights of the other claimants of interest.

It should be noted that the owners made no attempts to minimize their damage by salvaging the boat. On the contrary, they abandoned it as a wreck.

The Suits in Admiralty Act would apply to this case. Under its terms the owners were afforded abundant time in which to ascertain their damage, make claim against the Inland Waterways Corporation, and sue either the Corporation or the towboat *Natchez*. This time has now expired, and it is doubtful if any court would now entertain jurisdiction of such a claim either against the United States or Corporation or the towboat *Natchez*.

TITLE IX—H. R. 6273—J. H. KNOTT

The only report of the facts in this case is that of the Navy Department quoted from a report of the driver of the Navy automobile, from which it may be concluded that the victim of the accident negligently walked into the path of the moving machine. The Government's driver appears to have voluntarily paid from his personal funds the medical expense incurred, and the undisputed evidence shows that the truck was moving slowly, the chauffeur sounding his horn, and that, due to the pedestrian shielding his face from the rain and wind, he walked into its path.

There appearing no negligence attributable to the driver, authorization of payment of this claim by the Congress must be on the theory that the Government is an insurer against injury to those who walk the streets where its vehicles are driven.

TITLE X—S. 427—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. 427 passed the House May 5, 1936.

H. R. 12323 (OMNIBUS)

TITLE I—H. R. 2415—FOR THE RELIEF OF STANDARD OIL CO. FOR LOSSES SUSTAINED BY PAYMENT OF DISCRIMINATORY EXCESS TONNAGE TAXES AND LIGHT MONEYS

This bill involves $60,283. In going over the report I found the Court of Claims held that the taxes imposed were legally assessed and collected. Despite this decision I found a letter from the Secretary of Commerce in the committee report directly in contrast to that of the Attorney General. I immediately wrote the Secretary of Commerce requesting an explanation. I also talked to the Solicitor of the Department, who said the matter had never been called to his attention.

For the information of Members I submit a letter received from the Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 22, 1936.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of the 18th instant, calling my attention to a conflict between my letter of June 10, 1935, with reference to H. R. 2415, a bill for the relief of the Standard Oil Co., and a communication of the Attorney General dated July 1, 1935, on the same subject.

In my letter of June 10, 1935, it was said in part:

"Immediately after the closing of the World War hostilities, there were collected by collectors of customs, acting under orders of this Department, from the vessels of the Standard Oil Co. penal taxes under sections 4219 and 4225 of the Revised Statutes, inasmuch as it was considered that the commercial treaty between Germany and the United States had been suspended or abrogated by the war, in which case the said penal taxes would be incurred.

"The Standard Oil. Co., however, brought action against the Government on the ground that the collection of these penal taxes was not in accordance with the law. The Government defended the case and the decision of the court was against the Government.

"Inasmuch as under the decision of the court the above collection was erroneous, it appears to the Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection that the Department should not object to the payment of the sum found due the Standard Oil Co."

These statements are incorrect and are based upon a misconception of the decision of the Court of Claims dated May 13, 1933 (77 Ct. Cls. 206), formed by officials of the Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection who made the preparatory study for the letter of June 10, 1935.

As is stated in the letter of the Attorney General above referred to, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey brought suit in the Court of Claims for refund of tonnage duties and light money collected on certain vessels under the provisions of sections 4219 and 4225, Revised Statutes, respectively (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 121, 128). The Court of Claims decided that the moneys collected from the Standard Oil Co. under the provisions had been lawfully collected and that, therefore, the claim of the Standard Oil Co. had no merit. It is therefore felt that, since the Standard Oil Co. has had its day in court and the determination of its claim on the merits, there is no reason for extending legislative relief which would in effect be a refund of the aforementioned collections.

I regret the error and the resultant confusion arising in this matter. I am addressing a letter under the same date to the chairman of the Committee on Claims, House of Representatives, calling his attention to this matter and requesting his approval for the withdrawal of my letter of June 10, 1935.

Sincerely yours,
DANIEL C. ROPER,
Secretary of Commerce.

In view of the letter of the Secretary of Commerce as well as the report of the Attorney General, I feel the committee should ask that the title be stricken from the bill.

There can be no doubt but that the favorable letter from the Secretary of Commerce resulted in the favorable report on the bill.

Further, let me say it seems only proper that the legal division and not the officials of a bureau should prepare a statement of facts in cases of this character. This, I feel confident, will be done by the Department of Commerce in the future.

TITLE II—H. R. 4789—COAST FIR AND CEDAR PRODUCTS CO., INC.

This title covers a case where the contractor asserts a claim for payment for cross ties claimed to have been shipped under a contract dated April 18, 1928, with the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. The cross ties—five carloads—as a matter of fact, were in excess of the amount required to be furnished; the Government had no use for them; they were placed upon a railroad siding for disposition by the contractor; the contractor was promptly notified, and subsequently he sold some of this excess to other parties. Both the Department of the Interior and the Comptroller General of the United States have reported adversely on the merits, and the claimant has tacitly admitted the correctness of these reports by never having pursued his remedy in the Court of Claims, where a judicial determination of his rights could have been obtained. The excess shipment of cross ties, for which payment is now sought from the Government, appears to have resulted primarily from erroneous calculations or estimates by the contractor and his subcontractors for which the Government was in no way responsible.

TITLE VIII—S. 373—CONFERRING JURISDICTION UPON THE COURT OF CLAIMS TO HEAR, DETERMINE, AND RENDER JUDGMENT ON THE CLAIM OF ROBERT A. WATSON

This claimant was dealing in the sugar market for the primary purpose of realizing a profit from the transactions and his chief concern appears to have revolved around the possible effect of the Lever Act, upon the profit believed to be necessary in order to meet the risks involved and the necessary financing. Due to an unforeseen break in the price of sugar, the contemplated profits of the claimant apparently were not realized, and it is the purpose of the title to permit suit to be instituted in the Court of Claims for the damage or loss sustained. The financial institutions with which credit apparently was established by Mr. Watson to purchase the sugar took the same chances as any other person in buying with the object of selling their commodities at a profit, and when unforeseeable losses are incurred, such losses properly should fall upon them and not upon the taxpayers of the country.

TITLE IX—S. 1960—FOR THE RELIEF OF THE FLORIDA NATIONAL BANK & TRUST CO., A NATIONAL BANKING CORPORATION, AS SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE FOR THE ESTATE OF PHILIP ULLENDORF, DECEASED

This bill sets aside the statute of limitations and delegates the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to consider a claim for refund of inheritance taxes. The President has time and again vetoed such bills. Why send him another that will meet a similar fate. The Treasury Department strongly opposes passage of the bill.

WILL THE PEOPLE, WITHOUT MONEY, MAKE THIS GOVERNMENT RESPOND TO THE GREATEST GOOD TO THE GREATEST NUMBER?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, poor people, without money, and in some form of distress, have quite given up hope of ever seeing an administration that will respond to the greatest good to the greatest number. I desire to register a protest against this belief. Under our form of Government the people can, every 2 years, get control of their Government. No new national party need be organized. Everything is set, as it is, to gain control of the Government. Every 2 years every Congressman in Washington must be elected. Every 2 years, therefore, the way is open to the people of this country to elect a new Congress. Forty-eight different methods can be employed, or as many methods as there are States.

It would not be possible to elect a President, because that is not a part of our machinery of elections. A President is not elected by popular vote, although he should be. It takes a national party—or, rather, a Nation-wide party—to elect a President. But the President can do nothing, except hand out jobs, without the backing of Congress. If we had a Congress with backbone that would lay down the law to the President, he would have to follow the law. Unfortunately, in this country the custom has grown up that the President directs Congress. Today that is really so, but there is absolutely no need for it. Congress could write the laws, and the President would have to execute them or be subject to impeachment.

In the election of Congressmen, each State can do that job without a national party. All that is necessary is that the people demand that these men stand for a principle above party ties. When they have candidates of this type, elect them. Elect them in every State, or as many States as possible. When Congress convenes it would then be composed of men and women who were elected to office on principle rather than party. That Congress would then be independent—the President would count in his own department, but only in that department. Congress would write the laws. They would write the laws which the people demanded. Under this kind of operation, it would not make a great deal of difference, outside of jobs, who was President. No matter who it was, he could not override the wishes of the people, for the Congress would actually be the representative of the people.

The chance to control legislation is within reach of the people. Party banners are not what is needed—it is education on the part of the people to understand and appreciate, and grasp the opportunities of government which they have always had. This will take place some day—maybe in the coming election; maybe not. But if this Government is to endure, that very thing must happen. When it does, the whole Nation will not be prostrated because there is a Presidential election. Things will be normal and the Presidents under this exercise of government will be servants of the people and not the masters of Congress.

On the roll call to discharge the Rules Committee on the Frazier-Lemke farm refinance bill there were 220 votes for it and 153 against. To this must be added the paired votes. On pairs for there were 10 votes and 10 votes against. This would make the actual vote as follows: 230 for and 163 against. Of this vote of 230 for, they came from the following sources: Seven Progressives of Wisconsin, or 100 percent of that membership; 3 Farmer-Laborites from Minnesota, or 100 percent of that membership; 2 nonpartisan Republicans from North Dakota, or 100 percent of that membership; 169 Democrats, or 53 percent of that membership; 49 Republicans, or 49 percent of the membership.

On the roll call on the final passage of the bill the vote stood: For the bill, 142; against the bill, 235. To this vote must be added the following pairs: 10 for and 10 against, making the actual vote 152 for and 245 against. These votes for the bill came from the following sources: 7 Progressives (Wisconsin) or 100 percent of that membership; 3 Farmer-Laborites (Minnesota) or 100 percent of that membership; 2 nonpartisan Republicans (North Dakota) or 100 percent of that membership; 28 Republicans, or 28 percent of that membership; 113 Democrats, or 35 percent of that membership.

Those entitled to the most credit for this courageous vote are the Democrats. With the administration and the leaders of the House appealing to everything known in politics, yet 35 percent of them stuck to their principles.

The Wisconsin Progressives, the Farmer-Laborites, and the nonpartisan Republicans do not deserve so much credit, because they always vote for the people—always. They were elected to do that and they never fail. There is no administration to browbeat them; no Jim Farley to threaten their defeat at home; there are no political appointments at stake.

The 28 Republicans deserve great credit for their independence. The leaders were against the measure—the Republican press was against the measure—the measure itself was a blow at "special privilege", which the national Republican Party has supported, and will support again if the reactionary element controls the Cleveland convention.

Of those who voted to give the bill a hearing, the following deserted the cause on the final roll call: None of the Progressives (Wisconsin); none of the Farmer-Laborites (Minnesota); none of the nonpartisan Republicans (North Dakota); 56 Democrats, or 33 percent of those who voted to give the bill a hearing; 27 Republicans, or 49 percent of those who voted to give the bill a hearing.

From these figures the percentage of progressiveism among the Democrats is still higher than the percentage of progressiveism among the Republicans—merely a 7-percent difference in favor of the Democrats.

Another thing definitely established is this: That on the vital question before Congress, that of the people on one side and the organized money power on the other, that both the Democratic and Republican Parties can be thoroughly trusted. Sixty-five percent of the Democratic membership voted against the people and in favor of continuing the reign of organized wealth, while the Republicans went them one better, and 75 percent of the membership voted against the people.

Here is what the question was before the House on this bill as told by Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Salmon P. Chase:

Capital primarily did not exist except as natural resources and when labor was applied to natural resources it brought capital. Hence labor was previous to capital and entitled to first consideration.—(Lincoln.)

BANKS MORE DANGEROUS THAN STANDING ARMIES

I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised a money aristocracy that has set the Government at defiance. The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government and the people to whom it properly belongs.—(Thomas Jefferson.)

My agency in procuring the passage of the National Bank Act was the greatest financial mistake of my life. It has built up a monopoly that offsets every interest in the country. It should be repealed. But before this can be accomplished the people will be arrayed on one side and the banks on the other in a contest such as we have never seen before in this country.—(Salmon P. Chase, Secretary of the Treasury under President Lincoln.)

I see in the near future a crisis arising which unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. The money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until the wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this time more anxious for my country than even in the midst of war.—(Lincoln.)

On this basis and as between the Democratic and the Republican Party, the people have little to choose between. The fight on this bill demonstrates one thing definitely and finally, and that is: If the people ever win their fight against the power of the Banking Trust, they must break the shackels that bind them to a party name and vote for Members of Congress who stand for principle. That is the way the following Members reached Congress: Seven Progressives from Wisconsin found their way into Congress; three Farmer-Laborites from Minnesota found their way into Congress; two nonpartisan Republicans of North Dakota found their way into Congress.

Once in Congress these 12 Members were united on every major matter before Congress. That is the way some hundred Democrats got into Congress. Their people sent them here on a question of principle. When in Congress those 113 Democrats never fail to support the people on all major issues. Twenty-eight Republicans in Congress stand with the people always; they cannot be subdued by the party lash.

If the 12 Progressives had waited until there was organized a National Progressive Party, they would not be in Congress today.

While each State is engaged in the process of electing its Congressmen, there is nothing in the way to prevent those States from supporting a Nation-wide liberal movement, which eventually could name the President of the United States. In this way the plain people of the United States could secure complete control of their Government. It is now up to the people of the United States to keep in Congress the 142 Members who are now here and ready to carry on the fight for the people; it is up to the people in every State to make sure at the coming November election that those who have voted against the people be left at home and replace them by men and women who will stand up and be counted for the people.

It will take some time to make New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Virginia, and the rest of the original Southern States Progressive, but that day will surely come. It cannot be that the people in all of these States are set against Progressive principles. The gospel must be spread, and it will be up to these 142 Members of Congress to carry the brunt of this work into every State in the Union. Old reliable Pennsylvania is already breaking away from party rule. New Jersey, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, and the Pacific Slope States, the old Southwest, Ohio, Maryland, all show signs of independence. The majority of the voters in the United States are ready for independent voting. All the people need is to know the record made by their enemies in both the Democratic and the Republican Parties.

A TRIBUTE TO THE GREAT ARMY OF POST-OFFICE EMPLOYEES—THEIR LABOR EXEMPLIFIES LOYAL PUBLIC SERVICE—REMARKABLE EFFICIENCY OF THIS DEPARTMENT IS ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE QUALITY OF THEIR WORK AND THEIR EXCELLENT RELATIONS WITH THEIR SUPERIORS

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Service is more than a remarkable business; it is a great public institution. All of us know its success in the dispatch of the mails. We accept its value to the Nation but very few of us take particular note of the importance of the personnel in the orderly functioning of this Department.

These men and women employees do not need any praise from me. Their work and accomplishments speak for themselves. However, when I recently had occasion to see how efficiently they performed their duties in the flooded areas of my State during an emergency and overcame obstacles caused by swollen rivers, I realized to a greater degree the value of such service to the country. My observations inspired me to look further into the matter and to make these remarks.

Their loyalty and devotion to their work, their undeniable efficiency, and their spirit of helpfulness in relation to the people they serve and to their superiors, is highly commendable. It has made the Post Office Department the greatest business organization in this country.

Postal employees are not automatons. They receive a thorough training, and display that skill necessary to accomplish their work with maximum speed and accuracy. Only human beings can read and write, and no machinery could substitute for them.

Whether it be the substitute or the special carrier, the clerk working in the office or on the railway, whether it be the carrier in the city or village, or the rural- or star-route carrier, all perform their allotted duties ably and unobstrusively.

They are organized, and by means of their organizations have improved themselves and the Service. I believe the example they set in their relations with each other and with their superiors might well be studied by other industries and emulated, to the improvement of the economic and industrial life of our Nation, in order to effect better relations between labor and employers.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, such a remarkable state of affairs was not produced overnight. It is founded on traditions, and an enterprise such as this, which has grown with the country since the beginning of our Republic, necessarily becomes imbued with fine traditions.

Much of the successful operation of the Postal Service by its employees can be attributed to the civil service. In my opinion, the civil service should be extended in the most reasonable manner and wherever feasible. It strengthens the loyalty, sense of responsibility, and morale of the men and women who come under its jurisdiction.

Last year I voted for the restoration of the pay cuts of these men and women. I also voted for the institution of the 40-hour week in place of the 44-hour week, and I am glad I was afforded an opportunity to do this. Congress was justified in passing this legislation.

I am informed that 95 percent of the efficiency and success of the Postal Service is due to the human element. The work of postal employees combines both physical and mental ability, and in no business is the human factor so important as this one, where machinery cannot replace men.

I am also informed that the studies of experts disclose that the average postal worker produces three times as much revenue now as he did in 1913. In enacting legislation for the restoration of pay cuts and the establishment of a 40-hour week, Congress showed its recognition of the contribution of postal employees, and furthermore improved their morale, a matter of importance and benefit to the entire country. In this connection, private industry might also benefit from the example of the Government in recognizing the right of these workers to share in the profits resulting from their improved efficiency. We hear much of the need of increased purchasing power. This always follows where we effect a more just distribution of the benefits resulting from improved efficiency and productivity. And whenever we recognize this principle of fundamental justice, we find production and the number of producers increased and unemployment due to improved machinery and increased skill of operators, decreased.

Show me a person in our whole country who does not trust his message to the mails. In the heat and sandstorms of the South, and in the cold and snow of the North, men are daily treading streets and routes, delivering letters and packages to their destination. The sight is commonplace, and therefore we rarely think of the many coordinated units which go to make up this smoothly running public institution. Only when we particularly look into it do we recognize the true worth of the thousands of Post Office employees and the valuable service they are rendering our country.

THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR AND POVERTY

Mr. ECKERT. Mr. Speaker, in the confused and bewildered world of today there are two outstanding problems about which many Americans are deeply concerned. One is the problem of war, the other economic security. War has disturbed the happiness of the human race from time immemorial, and economic security has been a delusion and a snare. Those of our generation thought these two problems were settled and solved. At the turn of the century it was freely predicted that there would be no more war, and

as late as 1929 economists and statesmen gave assurance that prosperity was permanent; that we were living in a new era; that poverty was all but banished from the earth. Since these pleasant prophecies of peace and plenty, we have witnessed the greatest war of all time and experienced the most widespread and devastating depression of all the years of our national existence. The prophets were in error. Neither the problem of war nor the problem of poverty is settled or solved.

Inasmuch as the problem of war remains unsettled, even after our participation in a war to end war, the Congress of the United States is confronted with the task of providing a military establishment adequate for the defense of the Nation. There is a wide difference of opinion as to the necessary strength of the land and sea forces for adequate defense, while others question the good faith of the Government's professions in regard to her military preparedness, charging that the United States, in common with many of the leading Nations of the earth, is thinking in terms of aggression as well as defense.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that the world is still war minded, and as long as this mental condition obtains, there can be no peace and cessation of preparation for war. This is a fact accepted by all practical men and women, whether they be militarists or pacifists. As long as the world psychology is what it is today, no nation on earth will adopt the policy of unpreparedness. Whether we like it or not, the leading nations of the earth will continue to place upon the backs of the people the ugly and heavy burdens incident to preparation for war. The only question upon which there is a difference of opinion is as to how and to what extent war preparation shall be prosecuted.

The prevailing thought demands extensive preparation, and so we find that, in spite of the many woes of the average citizen, he still cries out for a large Navy and an adequate Army. This, of course, means a tremendous draft on the Treasury of the United States, as is amply testified by the Navy appropriation bill and the accompanying Army bill. Although the distress and tax burdens of the people are rapidly becoming unbearable, predictions are common that another major war is imminent and that such a war would plunge the world into an era of darkness and destruction. The distress and burdens of the people, the misery and demoralization of war, together with the suggestion of a return to semibarbarism in the event of another major war, are impelling earnest men and women in all walks of life to search for a solution not only for the age-old problem of war but of poverty as well.

The two problems, war and poverty, persist in their onward march and stubbornly refuse to yield to any of the nostrums and remedies proposed. Why this persistency? Can there be no solution? Are the problems too difficult for the human mind to fathom? In many lines of human endeavor man has demonstrated a high order of mental genius—so much so that in our modern world of invention many achievements seem weird and uncanny. In the light of man's progress in the various spheres of science, why such abject failure and defeat in social science?

There can be only one answer. In the physical sciences man seeks to discover and follow natural law. Not so in the social sciences. Here, with an abandon that is disconcerting, he flounders and fumbles and makes confusion worse confounded. In the light of our past experience, why not follow the example of the true scientist and seek the root cause of war and poverty? It is only by doing this that we may hope to find the true answer.

WHAT IS THE CAUSE OF WAR?

Wars are not waged for pleasure. There is a real, definite reason why war persists.

Why are men ready to fly at each other's throats and defy and violate every instinct of civilized behavior?

The war in Africa, the recent war in China, the fear of war that is disturbing the foreign offices of the leading nations of the world are due to reasons that are not far to seek. Charles O'Connor Hennessy, of New York, in a recent address, said:

> Men may cry "Peace! Peace!" but there can be no lasting peace until the root causes of war are recognized and removed; until the peoples may be led to accept a new and simple philosophy of human relationships—that of equal rights for all, freedom for all, justice for all. Political peace and economic war are irreconcilable. There can be no political peace at home or abroad unless it is founded upon cooperation in freedom and mutual friendship and respect.
>
> We propose to end the curse of war, with all its barbarities and brutalities and its grievous burdens upon the backs of the workers of the world, by leading nations to recognize and remove the true causes of international contention and strife. These have their roots not alone in hostile tariffs and the struggle for markets but in the economic imperialism which exploits the natural resources of distant and undeveloped lands for the enrichment of favored groups of capitalists at home.

Since the World War many laudable efforts have been put forth and machinery was set up in the hope of arresting the war madness of the world. There is the League of Nations, the World Court, the Kellogg treaties outlawing war, and many other measures designed to prevent war; yet, in spite of it all, the war spirit is still acute, and all attempts to stem the onward tide of aggressive armies in the Orient and the far-off regions of Africa have been in vain, while rumors of wars more devastating and terrible than any yet recorded fill the ears of men everywhere. There can be no political peace so long as great and valuable economic prizes can be obtained by the arts of corrupt, selfish, or ignorant governments. The true basis of both political and economic peace can only spring from a condition of social justice—a condition that abhors any and every form of privilege, which implies, of course, an economic order based upon the doctrine of equal rights for all, freedom for all, justice for all.

War and rumors of war still continue, and so with the problem of poverty. It, too, persists and remains unsolved. As with the problem of war, there are those who are seeking remedies for its solution. But all in vain. There seem to be insurmountable difficulties. So far both the problem of war and the problem of poverty have eluded the wit and genius of man. Wherever we chance to look, there is confusion and bewilderment. Is there any doubt about the facts pointed out by Mr. Hennessy? The way to peace, this thinker and economist declares, is for the people to accept a new and simple philosophy of human relationships—that of equal rights for all, special privileges for none. And how nicely this matches the doctrine proclaimed by the founders of the American Republic. Our great charter of liberty, the Declaration of Independence, breathes the very soul of this simple philosophy. Those who long for peace, those who would labor for peace, will find their hope for peace not in large armies and formidable navies, but in the deep philosophy of Him who bade men to love one another and the truths contained in the Declaration of Independence. Man's thoughts must be turned away from the doctrine of force and conflict to the doctrine of good will, natural rights, and social justice. It is only in this way that war may be outlawed and peace achieved. The problem of war must first be resolved and settled in the minds of men before any lasting peace can be established. Until this is achieved, the mad race for armaments will continue, and tremendous sums of the taxpayers' money will be spent annually for war and preparation for war.

And why poverty? It likewise has its roots in the absurdities of our economic order. Mr. Theunis, president of the Economic Conference of the League of Nations, called together a few years ago and attended by representatives of 51 countries to find the cause of war and industrial depressions, said:

> The main trouble now is neither in any natural shortage of the resources of nature nor any inadequacy in man's power to exploit them. It is all in one form or another a maladjustment, not in an insufficient productive capacity, but a series of impediments to the full utilization of that capacity.

Since both war and poverty have a common cause—a cause inherent in our economic structure, perhaps by answering the question, "Why poverty?" we will kill two birds

with one stone. A brief survey of the fruits of our disordered economic system reveals the extent to which the people have been reduced in the scale of poverty. The Brookings Institution of Washington, D. C., reports that 71 percent of the American people in 1929—at a time when incomes were at the highest point in the years of our so-called prosperity—received only enough of the products of their toil that enabled them barely to exist. The discovery of the Brookings Institution is not surprising. It is a fact known to everyone who stops to think. The question naturally arises, "Why this condition in a land of plenty?" The answer is found in Mr. Theunis's statement, that it is all in one form or another a maladjustment of our economic order.

And wherein lies this maladjustment? Many are of the belief that our money structure is at fault. Others contend that the machine is the culprit; while still others maintain that our productive process is too abundant; and so ad infinitum.

In the midst of this confusion of thought, let us call for counsel and light, Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, founder of the Democratic Party, and one of the world's great politico-social philosophers. Mr. Jefferson, in 1785, was stationed in France as Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States. This was Jefferson's first visit abroad. Before reaching foreign shores, Jefferson, in common with the great body of his countrymen, knew little or nothing about poverty. In the new America, every able-bodied and willing worker was employed. Here economic opportunities were open to all on equal terms, and none were so rich as to invite envy, and none so poor as to demand charity. Everyone was prosperous in proportion to his thrift, ability, and application. Not so in France. There Jefferson found the problem of unemployment and poverty in all its ugliness and despair—and this before the advent of the so-called machine age or the rise of the House of Morgan or the doctrine of economic abundance. Why then the problem of unemployment and poverty in all its horridness and magnitude similar to the problem now confronting the American Nation? Let the story be told in Jefferson's own words. In 1782, a few years before his first trip abroad, Jefferson, in answer to a letter from a friend in France inquiring about economic conditions in America, wrote:

> From Savannah to Portsmouth you will seldom meet a beggar. In the largest towns indeed they sometimes present themselves. They are usually foreigners who have never attained a settlement in any parish. I never yet saw a native American begging in the streets or highways.

As late as 1814 Jefferson wrote Thomas Cooper:

> The old and crippled among us who possess nothing and have no families to take care of them being too few to merit notice as a separate section of society.

As soon, however, as Jefferson set foot in France he saw the real thing in poverty. After a year's residence he wrote to an American correspondent, saying:

> Of 20 millions of people supposed to be in France, I am of the opinion there are 19 million more wretched, more accursed in every circumstance of human existence than the most conspicuously wretched individual of the whole United States.

And observed that the land of France was concentrated in a very few hands, and that the people had been expropriated from the land and huddled in cities and towns. The streets and highways were filled with beggars, which to Jefferson was a new and distressing aspect in human society. This impelled Jefferson to ask:

> What could be the reason that so many should be permitted to beg who are willing to work, in a country where there is a very considerable proportion of uncultivated lands?

and answered by saying:

> Whenever there is in any country uncultivated lands and unemployed poor, it is clear that the laws of property have been so far extended as to violate natural rights. The earth is given as a common stock for man to labor and live on.

The distress and poverty of the French people were so amazing that he, in a letter to Monroe, exclaimed:

> My God! How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of and which no other people on earth enjoy! I confess I had no idea of it myself.

The testimony of Jefferson, depicting in dramatic fashion the economic condition of the people of France as compared with the people of his own country, emphasizes the fact that the people of France were expropriated from the land, while in America there was no end of accessible land on equal terms to all. The conditions in France filled the land with beggars and mendicants and untold millions of wretched men and women, while in America there was neither poverty nor mendicancy.

The account of France's misery and woe and America's blessings and good fortune in the days of Jefferson points the way for the answer to the enigma of our time. Today the economic conditions in America are not unlike the conditions prevailing in France immediately preceding the French Revolution. In France property had been concentrated in a few hands. The major portion of the land of the country was in the possession of the nobility and the church, while the masses of the people were economically dependent upon the few who controlled the economic resources of the Nation. In America today the wealth is in the hands of the few. The natural resources—the wide open spaces of our western domain—are no longer free, and the masses of our people, as in France 150 years ago, are economically dependent upon the few who control the economic resources of America. We today have our beggars and mendicants, and millions of poor and wretched men and women. France had her social eruptions. We today are menaced with dire forebodings, and no one can tell whether or not America will escape her share of the world's civil commotions and eruptions.

A century and a half ago the economic condition of the two countries was vastly different, the one struggling with the problem of poverty and social insecurity; the other enjoyed plenty and social stability. Today the picture is different. The story of Jefferson is quite illuminating and suggests the answer to the question why a free, independent, and self-reliant people have been reduced to a condition of social insecurity and economic servitude.

Mr. Theunis calls attention to the fact that maladjustments in our economic order are the cause of war and industrial depressions. Wherein lies the maladjustment?

Jefferson observed that the earth is given as a common stock for man to labor and live on, and it might not be amiss to remind ourselves that here in America, as in France a century and a half ago, the laws of property have been so far extended as to violate natural rights. And again let us be reminded that in France during the hectic days of the Revolution, the National Assembly of France declared that ignorance, neglect, or contempt of human rights are the sole causes of public misfortunes and corruption of government. France, as a result of her delinquency, had her Revolution. America, like her sister Republic, has been blind and neglectful of the first duty of government.

We prate about natural rights, about the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and yet we have so far forgotten the primary function of government—which is to secure the people in the enjoyment of their natural rights—that millions of our fellow citizens, for all intents and purposes, are disinherited and strangers in the land of their birth. Herein lies the fundamental maladjustment, and thus our economic structure is set for the few to exploit the many, resulting, of course, in the few being inordinately rich and the many abjectly poor.

Those who seek to prevent war and abolish involuntary poverty have but one course to pursue if they wish to achieve their ends. War and poverty have their root causes in the maladjustment of our economic order. The impediments that stand in the way to the full utilization of the earth on which we live must be removed so that labor and industry may have unrestricted access to the resources of Nature and unimpeded exchange among all the peoples of the world. When this happy condition shall come to pass, then

and not until then, may we hope to enjoy the blessings of abundance and peace.

AGRICULTURE IN HAWAII

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I submit the following information about the agricultural industries of the Territory of Hawaii, pertinent to the discussion of H. R. 2066, the so-called Frazier-Lemke bill.

The Territory of Hawaii is predominantly an agricultural community, dependent upon the products of its soil for the livelihood of its people and for the maintenance of its position as an important element in the domestic economy of the United States.

The United States census of 1930 shows that 58 percent of the Territory's total population of 368,336 live in rural districts and that 40 percent of all persons gainfully employed are directly engaged in the agricultural work of its 5,955 farms.

The islands which comprise the Territory of Hawaii are of volcanic origin and are devoid of minerals, metals, and fuels suitable for industrial use. Hence, except for the commercial activity made possible by its strategic location in the lines of ocean transportation in the Pacific, its farm products are the sole basis of its economic life.

The agriculture of the Territory covers the range from small farms operated in part for the subsistence of the farmer and his family and in part for the local supply of foodstuffs through the scale of the larger farming units for the commercial production of rice, bananas, coffee, pineapples, and sugar.

Ranching and the production of meat and dairy products supply a considerable part of the local consumption of these commodities and are related to agriculture in importance to Hawaii.

The production of foodstuffs locally in sufficient amount and diversity to supply the needs of the civilian population and military forces in the Territory in the event of an emergency is an important factor in the national defense. For example, during the World War the Territory of Hawaii was asked by the Federal Government to grow, as far as possible, its own foodstuffs, thus avoiding the diversion of food products from other parts of the country and also to maintain maximum production of sugar in order to supply as much as possible of this essential commodity for the national purposes.

Agricultural enterprises in Hawaii and agencies of the Territorial and Federal Government carry on numerous activities, both individually and cooperatively, designed to promote diversified farming, especially in the production of foods for local consumption, in those sections which are suitable for such farming. The United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the University of Hawaii, through the Extension Service, the Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station, and in the field of education, carry on work which is of great benefit to agriculture in general in the Territory, and especially to small farmers. The Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, an agricultural cooperative composed of those engaged in the production of sugar, the major farm crop of the Territory, takes part in this work through its own experiment station and otherwise. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration, under the provisions of the Jones-Costigan Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act, has sponsored a number of projects for the benefit of agriculture generally.

The Territory of Hawaii, aside from its natural beauties of sea, plains, valleys, and mountains, the beneficence of its climate, and the hospitality of its people, is best known for its production of sugar and pineapples, which are the basis of its commerce in the interchange of goods with other parts of the United States. However, I have dwelt at some length on other types of farming in order to acquaint those not familiar with our local situation with these phases of our agricultural life.

The important commercial crops of sugarcane and pineapples are produced by larger-scale farming because of essential features inherent in the agricultural work of growing these crops under the conditions of terrain and natural environment in the parts of the Territory where these crops can successfully be produced. There is no conflict of interest between these larger farming enterprises and the other types of farming previously described, because the localities for which each is suited overlap to only a very slight extent.

The commercial farming of sugarcane and manufacture of sugar began in Hawaii on a small scale a little over a century ago. There has been a gradual and sound development from that small beginning to the present-day status of productive capacity. Two-thirds of the sugar produced annually in Hawaii is manufactured from sugarcane grown under irrigation in arid sections. The green, fertile cane fields which, on each of these farming enterprises, now stretch out for miles around its sugar mill, were before the development and application of irrigation water arid wastes or low-grade cattle range. In their original state these lands supported no agriculture, provided a source of livelihood for very few people, produced little of value, and were the source of small revenues through taxation for the support of government. With the application of irrigation water these lands produce large quantities of essential food, namely, sugar, provide a good livelihood for thousands of persons engaged in the production of sugar and its related activities, and are the source of large taxes for the support of the government. Water development under these conditions and on the required scale entails the expenditure of large amounts of money. It has been done entirely by the private farming enterprises of the sugar industry. Not only has the Government not been asked to spend any money for these developments, but the Territorial government receives a considerable amount of money annually as rents for water rights which it owns.

The producers who grow sugarcane in regions where the rainfall is sufficient had other difficulties of no less magnitude to overcome in developing their farming enterprises.

Of the total of 250,000 acres of land on which sugarcane is grown in Hawaii, about one-half is owned directly by the sugar producers, about one-seventh is under lease from the Territorial government, and the remainder is leased from private owners, most of whom are families of Hawaiian blood.

The sugarcane growers of Hawaii employ in year-round work on their farms and in their sugar mills almost 50,000 persons, whose earnings are considerably above the average for farm workers in other parts of the United States as reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture.

Sugarcane in Hawaii requires almost 2 years to grow to maturity. The compensation is found in the high yields obtainable in this natural sugarcane-growing section, provided the best farming methods are followed and the soils and other natural resources are conserved. However, this 2-year crop cycle is a dominant factor in the farm economics of sugarcane growers.

A little over 30 years ago pineapples grown in the Territory of Hawaii were shipped to other parts of the United States only as fresh fruit, and were there thought of as a luxury. At the present time millions of cases of delicious and healthful Hawaiian canned pineapple are sold annually. The growing of pineapples is next in size and importance to sugar in the farm crops of the Territory of Hawaii.

Pineapple plants thrive on the higher plains and plateaus in regions of low rainfall. They do not require irrigation. Sugarcane or other farms crops could not be grown successfully on the great majority of the lands devoted to pineapples, and, vice versa, pineapples would do well on only a small part of the lands devoted to other crops. Again, as in the case of sugar, without conflict with the interests of other farm crops, the growing of pineapples by large-scale farming enterprises has transformed unproductive areas into productive farm lands. Those conducting the farming enterprises, their employees, and the community generally have all benefited thereby, and consumers in all parts of the United States have available an excellent food product.

Coffee of fine quality is grown in the Territory of Hawaii, but the sections suitable for its production are limited in area. About 20,000,000 pounds of coffee are produced annually.

The United States Census of 1930 gives the total area of the Territory of Hawaii as 4,100,480 acres, the total number of farms as 5,955, the area under cultivation as 440,579 acres, the area of woodland included in farms as 747,636 acres, and the total area of land of all sorts in farms as 2,815,026 acres.

Approximately 300,000 acres are under cultivation by corporate enterprises which are adequately financed and in a position to obtain additional finances as required. Approximately 140,000 acres comprise small farms operated by homesteaders or others engaged in the production of small crops, foodstuffs, and dairying. There are over 5,000 small farmers in the Territory the average size of whose farms is about 25 acres. Hawaii has been working steadily toward diversifying its agricultural industries and is doing everything within its power to encourage small farming and the raising of food crops. The first necessity is long-time financing at rates of interest that the farmer can pay. There is no Territorial agency to serve this purpose. The Farm Credit Administration has but recently been extended to include Hawaii. So far it has limited itself to short-time chattel mortgages for feed and crop loans. The other facilities of the Farm Credit Administration should be extended to the Territory as soon as possible, so that Hawaii's farmers may have the same opportunity to procure proper financing as the farmer of the mainland. Any legislation designed to lessen the burden of the farmer is needed to the same extent in Hawaii as on the mainland.

The total amount of the farm-mortgage debt in Hawaii is $1,123,570, and the ratio of debt to value of the farms under mortgage is 52.3 percent. The farms under mortgage comprise 30.8 percent of all farms, but almost the whole of this mortgage debt is against the small farmer and is at a rate of interest from 6 percent up. Proper agricultural financing will have more influence than any other single factor in establishing the small farmer on a sound, economic basis.

The islands which form the Territory are mountainous. Much of their land is in rough mountain areas, in most cases covered by forests. It is of the utmost importance to our agriculture and to the general life of the Territory that these mountain forests should be preserved and improved, because of their effects upon conservation of rainfall and upon climate. In the past forests have suffered from dying out of trees, intrusion of cattle, pigs, and goats, and from erosion. For many years the Territorial government has done excellent work in setting aside and fencing forest reserves, reforestation, and the prevention of erosion. The members of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association have contributed both money and work to reforestation. The Federal Government, since the establishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps, has done much good work in our forests. However, much remains to be done, and the importance of preserving and improving our forests and checking the ravages of erosion in our forest areas must always be borne in mind.

The area of farm land in the Territory of Hawaii is limited, due to natural conditions. Agriculture is the economic backbone of Hawaii. The fertility and productivity of our soils is our most valuable natural resource. Our arable lands must be protected against any further diminution in either area or productivity due to erosion. The fertility and productivity of our farm soils must be conserved and improved by proper farming methods. The economic status of our farmers should be maintained at such a level that they are able to practice soil conservation in all of its long-term implications. It is only in this way that the Territory of Hawaii, dependent upon its agricultural resources, can continue to progress in the future as it has in the past.

It is the agriculture of the Territory of Hawaii which enables it to sell annually in other sections of our country, namely, the several States, about $100,000,000 of commodities, and to buy in the continental United States goods and services in the amount of about $90,000,000 a year.

Hawaii became a part of the United States by voluntary action of both countries in 1898, and was incorporated into the United States as a Territory. Since that time it has shared with all the States in every national obligation and burden, pays substantial amounts of taxes into the Federal Treasury upon the same basis as do all the States, asks for no exemptions not equally applicable to all the States of the Union, and asks only that all legislation designed to benefit the people of the States shall be so drawn that it includes on the same basis the Territory of Hawaii as an integral part of our great Nation.

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, many inquiries have come in to me since my election in January 1935 to membership on the Ways and Means Committee as to the duties of that committee, so I desire to take up these few minutes allotted me in a very brief explanation of the interesting and valuable work that that committee performs.

News writers invariably refer to it as the "powerful" Ways and Means Committee. If that adjective is deserved it is because of the manner in which its members are selected, the continuity of their service—which is not interrupted save by retirement or death—and to the thoroughness with which they consider bills referred to it. Service on this committee is an education as well as an honor. From its ranks have come Speakers of the House, Governors of States, Supreme Court Justices, Vice Presidents and Presidents.

As constituted at the present time it consists of 25 members—18 Democrats and 7 Republicans—being divided in proportion to the party membership of the House. On the Democratic side members of the committee are elected by their Democratic colleagues in caucus, and it is therefore safe to say that every man who is placed on the committee by his fellow Democrats has received the approval of more than half of his colleagues. This approval not only honors him but places upon him a severe responsibility. Under the seniority traditions of the House, once elected to the Ways and Means Committee, a Member will retain his position thereon as long as he is reelected to Congress. Of course, his value there to his constituents becomes increasingly greater with each term of office that he may serve.

The work of the committee concerns the lifeblood of the Federal Government—its revenue. All bills that purport to raise revenue or which affect the bonded debt of the United States are referred to the Ways and Means Committee. It is the oldest committee of the House, having been established at the first session of Congress in 1789. It was made a standing committee in 1802. Originally both the raising and spending of money were considered by it, but since 1865 appropriation bills have been given to the Committee on Appropriations. Certain other legislation involving Government credit, such as that creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other similar organizations, has been given to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Yet the financial support of the United States Government depends on the Ways and Means Committee. Without the measures which it considers and acts upon the Government could not live for 5 minutes.

Its revenue jurisdiction includes not only internal-revenue taxation, such as the income tax, stamp taxes, beer, wine, and liquor taxes, and other excise taxes, but customs duties of all kinds. This tax jurisdiction brings with it collaterally the consideration of many bills which broaden the jurisdiction of the committee materially. For instance, all bills affecting the administrative regulations of the beer, wine, and alcohol industries come before the committee; also, such subjects as transportation of dutiable goods, collection districts, ports of entry, customs unions, antismuggling legislation, and other similar matters fall within the jurisdiction of the committee. California is vitally concerned with all of these questions. As the only Californian on this committee, I have been in a specially advantageous position to safeguard her interests.

The revenue relationships of the United States with the Philippines and Puerto Rico come before it. All subjects relating to the Treasury of the United States and the deposit of the public moneys are within its jurisdiction. Its assent is necessary to laws regulating the classes and amount of the bonded debt of the Government. Legislation affecting the seal

herds of Alaska and other revenue-producing animals of that Territory is under the jurisdiction of this committee. Legislation on narcotics and firearms is also under its jurisdiction.

Because taxation or revenue is involved, often subjects of legislation come before the committee which might at first sight be thought to belong elsewhere. As an example, it was this committee that considered and reported out the Adjusted Compensation Act affecting World War veterans which became law in 1936. The bill setting up planned control of the bituminous-coal industry, commonly called the Guffey coal bill, was referred to and reported from the Ways and Means Committee because it was based on a tax feature. The Social Security Act, one of the greatest and most forward-looking pieces of legislation ever enacted by Congress, was the subject of 4 weeks of open hearings and 7 weeks of executive sessions and study thereafter before it was reported and passed. This act has not had an opportunity to go fully into effect, and many who are now urging other social remedies will be surprised to find just how far this act does go in aiding all classes of the helpless, destitute, and aged. It is by no means a finality—it can be, and probably will be, amended from time to time, but it has gone as far as it is possible to go at the present in setting up social-security standards.

These examples which I have cited will serve to give you some idea of the very broad scope of the committee's activities, and will, perhaps, enable those of you who hear me or read this in print to understand why the committee is referred to as "powerful." The legislation which it considers and controls affects the very heart of the Nation, not merely by controlling the lifeblood of revenue but in all the various correlated activities which spring from association with revenue problems.

Of necessity its members are hard workers, meeting almost daily in sessions to consider bills pending before it. During the Seventy-fourth Congress some 401 House bills, 47 House resolutions, and 9 Senate bills have been referred to this committee. Frequently in the consideration of important legislation it is necessary to hold night sessions as well as to meet during the day.

Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee have one duty not shared by their Republican colleagues. They act as a committee on committees, and it is their duty to fill any vacancies in the Democratic membership of the other standing committees of the House which may occur. This requires them to exercise to the full the discretion and judgment which their colleagues felt they had when they voted them membership on the Ways and Means Committee.

It has been my privilege as a member of the Ways and Means Committee for the last 2 years to serve under the very able leadership of Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, due to whose tact and generalship it has not been necessary since he has been chairman to ask for any special rule for the consideration of a bill reported by the committee. What is even more remarkable is the fact that during this entire period the confidence of the House in Chairman DOUGHTON and the committee has been so great that no amendment to any bill reported by it, other than corrections which the committee itself has made, has been voted by the House.

This legislation has included, since I have been on the committee, besides the bills above referred to, the act establishing the Federal Alcohol Administration, the Antismuggling Act, the railway retirement pension legislation, amendment of the Second Liberty Bond Act, the Liquor Tax Administration Act—which I had the honor of piloting through the House and which contains legislation of great value to California's wine industry—the Revenue Act of 1935, the Treasury Service Reorganization Act, and the Revenue Act of 1936, as well as numerous minor measures.

I am proud of my service on this committee; I am proud of the legislation which I have helped to prepare, and particularly of the Social Security Act. I hope that those who thoughtfully consider the great work that this committee is doing will be equally proud of the part that their Representatives in Congress on this committee are contributing to it.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE PROSECUTION OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN H. HOEPPEL, OF CALIFORNIA?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it is not an easy role for a Member of this body to stand convicted of a crime while still serving the people who sent that Member to this Congress. That is the present situation in which Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL, of California, finds himself today.

No one has presented to the House any of the surrounding facts and circumstances with reference to this conviction, and from all that appears on the surface, this Member of Congress, in the estimation of his political enemies, is unworthy of a seat here; in the estimation of his friends, who do not know the facts, there is expressed sympathy for him; but friends and enemies alike acknowledge the conviction and let the matter rest at that.

If Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL did in fact sell an appointment to West Point for the consideration of $1,000, or any amount, I would be the last Member to condone it. At the outset let me say that he has not been convicted of any law violation so far. A jury has found against him, the trial court has denied a motion for a new trial, and the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia has found against him. Be that as it may, there is no conviction in law until there is a final conviction. Not until this case has been reached by the Supreme Court of the United States and decided adversely to him can there be said to be a conviction. A verdict of guilty is not a conviction.

Until the time there is a final conviction the Congressman, as a matter of right, can participate in the proceedings of the House, but doing so with the facts and circumstances unexplained the situation is embarrassing to the Congressman and to the House itself. For these reasons, and in the interest of fairness, I desire to make the following statements:

Congressman HOEPPEL was elected as a Democrat from the Twelfth California District. I have served with him since my election to the Seventy-fourth Congress. Congressman HOEPPEL was a staunch friend of the Townsend old-age-pension plan, soldier's bonus, the Frazier-Lemke bill, and other progressive measures, and fought the National Economy Act. He clashed with the administration and often took the floor against the plans of his party. He was independent and fearless. Before the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress had been completed it was apparent that HOEPPEL was not in the good graces of the administration or the leaders in Congress. The first thing that happened to indicate that his independence was not approved was the taking away of his political patronage in the State of California. This was handed over to the junior Senator from that State.

This act of punishment did not deter this Congressman from taking decided issue with the administration leaders.

The next thing that happened was the indictment of Congressman HOEPPEL and his son, charged with conspiracy to violate section 150, title 18, of the United States Code, which reads:

> It shall be unlawful to solicit or receive from anyone whatsoever, either as a political contribution, or for personal emolument, any sum of money or thing of value, whatsoever, in consideration of the promise of support, or use of influence, or for the support or influence of the payee, in behalf of the person paying the money, or any other person, in obtaining an appointive office under the Government of the United States.

It is obvious that a cadet in training at the Military Academy at West Point is not an officer under the Government of the United States. For this reason, no final judgment can be based on a conviction for conspiracy under this section, under the facts in this case. The Government knows that as well as anyone else.

In addition to that, what was the evidence adduced at the trial against this Congressman? The only witness was the intended cadet, who testified that he made all of his arrangements with Charles H. Hoeppel, the son of the Congressman. He had no conversation of any kind with the

Congressman until after the note was given and until after the intended cadet refused to go through with the agreement to pay $1,000 for the appointment. The only testimony in the whole record which, even by insinuation, implicates the Congressman is found on page 51 of the transcript.

CADET. We then had a conversation [with the Congressman]. He said he knew what I was there for. Then he sat down and typed a letter which I read and then realized it was my resignation. It was then we had a conversation. When I read the letter I asked Congressman HOEPPEL, if I couldn't receive the appointment legally. He said, "Well, as long as you don't wish to carry out the agreement, you cannot have the appointment."

This is the only evidence in the whole case that by inference might implicate the Congressman. The evidence of a confederate in the violation of law is the only evidence against the Congressman. No evidence of his demanding a note; no talk between him and the cadet about a note; nothing in the whole record.

Remember, too, that this portion of the cadet's story was denied by the Congressman and by his other son, who was present on the occasion. No other evidence in the case whatever. There is nothing in the whole record indicating the Congressman ever knew anything about the conversation between Charles Hoeppel and the cadet. Not one word.

The law seems well settled that no one can be convicted upon the testimony of an accomplice, unless that testimony is supported by other credible evidence in the case. The record is silent on any corroboration of the cadet's story.

Yet the Congressman was convicted of a conspiracy—an agreement to violate this section of the code.

I have been a public prosecutor for many years, serving both as State's attorney in North Dakota and as assistant United States district attorney for North Dakota. I was also interested in the Congressman, as he was an independent actor in Congress. I read the record of that trial. I know what it contains and I submit here what that record discloses in reference to any connection the Congressman had with the case.

I am absolutely convinced that no final judgment of conviction ever will be entered against Congressman HOEPPEL for the simple reason that there is no competent evidence upon which a final conviction can be based.

In addition to the fact that there is no evidence in the record implicating Congressman HOEPPEL in the actual conspiracy there remains the further fact that this conspiracy must be proved. In Federal court it cannot be guessed at—it cannot be based on conjecture. The agreement must be proved. In this entire record there is absolutely no evidence of any agreement between Congressman HOEPPEL and his son. That evidence is not there. If they had been charged with receiving a bribe, the proof would have to be made. It could not be made for the reason there was no such proof. This particular case will be dismissed, so I am advised, and the "conspiracy case" will stand. The gist of that case is the agreement to violate the law, and nowhere in the whole transcript is there any evidence at all proving any such agreement.

I do not know whether the administration in some roundabout way influenced the proceedings thus far or not, but it does seem peculiar that one who was openly opposed to the administration should be the one who was proceeded against.

In all our history no administration had had such recourse to that special type of criminal prosecution known as indictment for conspiracy as the present one. The administration employed this process in North Dakota, in Louisiana, and was about to use it in Ohio. Ohio has a Governor named Davey, and Harry L. Hopkins was about to ask for one of these "handy indictments" against this Governor because he did not suit Hopkins. The Governor beat him to it and had a warrant issued for Hopkins, so that fight ended in a draw. Harry L. Hopkins, W. P. A. Director, seems to have used the "conspiracy indictment route" as his chief weapon of defense.

I do not know who in the administration was responsible for the Hoeppel indictment, or if anyone was, but the same charge was used against HOEPPEL as was used against the other disturbers.

Hopkins in his frequent calls for indictments "for conspiracy" indicated the perfect earmarks of a dictator. That is what all dictators do. They hush up criticism. He did not go as far as a Hitler or a Stalin, but he went, apparently, toward a course that would destroy his enemies, yet not "summarily purge" society of their presence.

The Supreme Court of the United States exists to protect the liberties of the people. Sometimes their decisions do not suit my fancy, but I will swallow it all before I shall be willing to turn a dictator loose in this country. As our history is now being written, the Supreme Court of the United States is the greatest bulwark for the protection of the liberties of the people of all our institutions of government. Where is the real American citizen who would not prefer the judgment of the Supreme Court to the ignominious intrigues of Harry L. Hopkins?

Mr. Speaker, under our form of government the one thing that distinguishes it from all other forms of government today is its constitutional guaranty of free speech. This one thing—free speech—is not found in Fascist forms nor in the Soviet of Russia. In respect to free speech the one is as bad as the other. In those countries where free speech is attempted, the aftermath is sure to be death to the one who attempts free speech. In this Government the Constitution guarantees free speech. While the original Constitution was silent on the subject, the very first amendment to the Constitution provides:

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peacefully to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Speaking on the subject of free speech, Thomas Jefferson said:

I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against any form of tyranny over the mind of man. I am for freedom of speech and freedom of the press. I am opposed to silence by force instead of reason, any complaint or criticism, just or unjust, by our people against the Government.

If this case was in fact engineered to put HOEPPEL out of the way and stop his free speech, then I say a great crime has been committed. Just as soon as the American people learn that there is no more free speech, then the days of this Republic can be numbered. If this Hoeppel case is another one of the administration's political purge cases, then we can thank God that there is still a Supreme Court.

VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS SHOULD CONSIDER THEIR OWN INTERESTS ABOVE PARTY

Mr. HOEPPEL. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of the Spanish-American War and also the World War, and as a publisher of a national periodical devoted to the interests of veterans and their dependents, I feel competent to present to the Members of Congress and the American people many discriminations which our veterans suffer under the so-called Economy Act.

It is supposed to be an unwritten law of the Congress that a new Member is to remain in the background and permit the old timers to carry on until such time as the new Member has earned his spurs, so to speak. My record in Congress will show that I am not this type of Representative, and no one can keep me silent when the interests of the American people are involved or the welfare of my comrades is at stake.

MEMBER OF PENSION AND WORLD WAR VETERANS' COMMITTEES

I am a member of the Pensions Committee of the House and the second man from the chairmanship. This committee considers all legislation pertaining to veterans and their dependents, except that affecting World War veterans and their dependents. I am also a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and thus have been called upon in the past to consider questions pertaining to all of our veterans. I have always evidenced the fullest sympathy for our veterans in their problems and have transmitted such sympathy into action. During my service in

Congress nothing has pleased me more than the opportunity afforded me to assist in securing the restoration of pensions to our Spanish War veterans. When this legislation was under consideration I took the floor on at least eight different occasions to speak in support of this restoration and organized a movement to override, if necessary, the President's anticipated veto of that measure. Fortunately, the veto was not forthcoming and on August 13, 1935, the anniversary of the capture of Manila, I was more than elated to find that the President affixed his signature to H. R. 6995, restoring to my comrades of the Spanish-American War and their dependents the pensions which were so ruthlessly taken from them in the Economy Act of 1933.

It is self-evident that, with my experience as a veteran, my membership on the Pension and World War Veterans' Committees, and my prestige as chairman of an important committee of the Congress, I will be in a position to serve my comrades and their dependents better than would any new Member, inexperienced in congressional affairs, and without my veteran committee assignments. I will be a candidate for renomination on August 25, and I am satisfied that my comrades of the Spanish-American War and World War, and all other veterans and their dependents, whose interests I have vigorously championed in the Congress, will remember the service I have given them when they cast their votes.

THE NEW DEAL CONGRESS

Two days after I was sworn in as a Member of the New-Deal Congress, I was on the floor, fighting against the economy bill and espousing the interest of my comrades of the Spanish-American and World Wars. I was one of the 11 Members of Congress, headed by the Honorable WILLIAM P. CONNERY, of Massachusetts, who voted throughout in the interest of the veterans and in opposition to the Economy Act. The average veteran today knows how unfair was the first Economy Act, and it was only by the determined stand which the friends of the veterans took in Congress, under the leadership of Congressman CONNERY, that we were able finally to bring about repeal of many of the obnoxious features of the Economy Act.

Thousands of our aged veterans and their dependents were bereft of pension entirely under the terms of the Economy Act; others received drastic reductions to only $6 per month, and there was utter chaos in veteranism. Hundreds, if not thousands, of veterans and their dependents died because of want or worry due to the financial strain which they were forced to undergo under the guise of economy. I personally know that many individuals are with us no more, and their last days were made, in a sense, a horrible nightmare because of the injustice perpetrated against them in the so-called Economy Act. Had it not been for the Honorable WILLIAM P. CONNERY and others in the Congress who knew the veteran question and who had such a heartfelt interest in their welfare, I fear the tragedy would have been more pronounced. Much of it still exists, especially in the case of the peacetime veterans, whose predicament I will discuss presently.

OPPOSED ONE-MAN CONTROL OF VETERAN WELFARE

Most disturbing to me in connection with the Economy Act was the fact that authority was vested in one man—the Chief Executive—to stipulate pension benefits and decide other questions pertaining to the veteran issue. Regardless of how well disposed the Chief Executive may be, the facts stand out clearly and positively that he was ill advised in the Economy Act, and as a result many veterans lost their homes and their closing days were indeed dark and gloomy.

I have it authentically from a Member of Congress that he advised the President as to the regulations pertaining to Spanish War veterans, and as a result of his advice all Spanish War veterans under the age of 55 years were taken from the pension lists. This was under the mistaken assumption on the part of one Member of Congress that few, if any, Spanish War veterans were under 55 years of age. Imagine the utter chaos, terror, and suffering which must have invaded the homes of 9,657 Spanish War veterans over 50 years of age and under the age of 55, some of them receiving as much as $50 per month, who were peremptorily taken from the pension lists. The President issued this order causing acute distress within this group of our veterans, but to his credit it may be stated that after I called upon him personally in January 1934 and laid before him the desperate plight of these 9,657 Spanish War veterans, and after I took the question up with General Hines, an Executive order was issued granting to Spanish War veterans under 55 years of age the same rights and benefits as Spanish War veterans over 55 years of age received under the Economy Act. In my presence the President figured out the cost of restoring these men to the pension lists and I am satisfied that those of this group of 9,657 who today survive are thankful to him for their restoration to the pension lists.

PEACETIME VETERANS

As I served 20 years as an enlisted man in the Army, I know the condition of the peacetime disabled, and it was largely through my efforts that the pensions which they heretofore received of $30 per month for total disability were increased by the President to $45 per month. This increase of 50 percent, however, was more than wiped out by subsequent Executive orders and regulations, so that, instead of receiving 50-percent increases in pensions, the peacetime veterans actually suffered a loss in monthly pension payments because of the manner of rating disabilities.

The Regular Veterans' Association, with headquarters here in Washington, D. C., has furnished me with a voluminous list of individuals who lost a leg or a hand or both, and also blind men who lost their sight in the service, who are suffering reductions in pensions as high as 92 percent. These maimed veterans are now suffering an average reduction of 62 percent in their pensions on a basis of the pensions they received for their service-connected disabilities before the New Deal Congress. In this instance we Democrats are more than living up to our platform declaration, wherein we proposed 25-percent savings in Federal expenditures. We are taking an average of 62 percent from maimed and blind veterans, disabled in service!

Others known to me, suffering from tuberculosis, now arrested, are suffering pension deduction periodically so that some of them who were at one time rated totally disabled because of tuberculosis, when they attain the age of 55 to 70 years, will receive only $6 per month. Under the Security Act we provided $15 per month from the Federal Government for nonveterans. Maimed veterans will thus be in a position where it will be to their advantage to surrender the pensions they receive for their disabilities incurred in service in order to receive the greater pension provided for them as civilians in their old age. This certainly is not dealing fairly with our service-connected disabled veterans.

SPANISH WAR VETERANS

Many Spanish War veterans are receiving inadequate pensions for their disabilities. It is impossible for them to prove service-connection for their disabilities 35 years after the Spanish-American War. One of the President's Executive orders appeared to be liberal in this respect but in application it was the exact opposite, and thousands of our Spanish War veterans, with disabilities incurred in the Philippines, Cuba, and so forth, are not being adequately pensioned. I am in favor of legislation which would grant service connection to every Spanish War veteran for the present degree of his disability.

This would, in a sense, be synonomous with the consideration accorded to Civil War veterans, and I do hope that our Democratic platform, as well as the Republican platform, will include a plank—which will not be ignored—providing for the removal of existing discriminations against our veterans through the enactment of an adequate, just, uniform pension law. From my close study of the subject I feel that we can treat our disabled veterans more fairly with little or no additional expense, provided we will enact uniform pension legislation and at the same time effect economies in the Veterans' Administration, which I know can be brought about without a decrease in the efficiency of the service to veterans.

CONSOLIDATION OF SOLDIERS' HOMES

I will not go into details on the economies which could be effected in the Veterans' Administration, but will merely mention one item as proof conclusive of my contention. Today, the Veterans' Administration is maintaining too many soldiers' homes, some of them only half full. Some of them could be closed immediately. There is no reason why the Veterans' Administration, the Army, and the Navy should maintain separate soldiers' homes. All men who are in these homes served in either the Army or Navy and we should have only one soldiers' home administration, and that should be entirely under the Veterans' Administration.

Instead of having a large number of soldiers' homes of small capacity we should have fewer soldiers' homes—with up-to-date facilities. The United States Soldiers' Home here in Washington occupies over 500 acres of the most desirable section of the city. Less than 150 acres are utilized for the soldiers. The balance of this valuable property is utilized in the raising of chickens and high-grade dairy cattle and for a private golf course for the myriad of Army officers on duty in Washington and their friends. I understand that the milk and meat products from the dairy herd at the home cost the home management about twice as much as would milk and meat from private sources. I would suggest that the Soldiers' Home, situated in the very heart of Washington, be enlarged for the disabled veterans under the Veterans' Administration; or if this cannot be done, that at least 300 acres of this valuable land be turned over for municipal playgrounds and other recreational purposes for the children of Washington. This property is too valuable and the need for additional playground facilities for our children is too imperative for us to utilize a large portion of the Soldiers' Home grounds—which belong to the enlisted men and are maintained by them—for a golf course for the officers and as grazing fields for a herd of high-bred dairy cattle.

One member of the home at one time played a few games of golf on this course, but it was not long before the management found it convenient to show him the gate, and he is no longer a member of the home. It should be borne in mind that the Soldiers' Home here in Washington was bought from enlisted men's funds and is maintained entirely by enlisted men. I am satisfied that these men would rather see 300 or more acres of this valuable property utilized for a municipal playground for all citizens than as a golf course for the officers and a home for high-grade milk cattle.

SOME OF THE MANY DISCRIMINATIONS OPERATING AGAINST VETERANS

Is there any man in America who would be so unfair as to say that an enlisted man who lost his eyesight in France and who becomes a member of a soldiers' home should receive only $15 per month pension while he is in the Soldiers' Home? Is there any citizen so short-sighted and so unfair from the standpoint of humanity that he would say that we are doing the fair thing with our disabled veterans by reducing the pension of a tubercular veteran who lost a lung from gas in France to $15 per month while he is trying to regain his health in a Government hospital? To give his health in the service of his country is a heroic sacrifice on the part of the individual, and for our Government to reduce his compensation to $15 per month only while he is fighting the battle of life and suffering the tortures of hell is certainly not my concept of justice to our veterans.

This same protest pertains to Spanish War veterans, with whom I served in 1898, and who have suffered physical agonies since that period. Now, when they must go into a soldiers' home or Government hospital, are we giving them a square deal when we reduce their pensions to $6 per month while they are undergoing treatment? Was it a square deal to their widows to reduce their pensions to $15 per month, as we did in the economy act? Think of it—$15 per month for an aged widow to subsist herself! Only last year, we provided $15 per month Government gratuity to our aged citizens, many of whom may have been citizens of a foreign nation, when the Spanish-American War widow was married to her soldier husband during the time of his service in the Philippines or Cuba. Is this treating the widows of our disabled veterans with just and equitable consideration?

I consider pensions granted to disabled veterans and their dependents as an inherent right, based upon the recognition of our obligation to provide for those who have suffered injury and who have served our Nation in war throughout the years.

Unfortunately, such pensions have been considered as an income by the W. P. A. and as a result thereof, just because they received a small pension from the Government, many of our disabled comrades and their widows have been denied relief work and thus were placed in a more disadvantageous position than the foreigner, inasmuch as foreigners, many of whom never even wish to become citizens, were considered as fit subjects for relief and obtained relief employment, whereas our own disabled comrades and their widows were left to eke out an existence with the insignificant pensions received.

OLD-AGE SECURITY SHOULD BE ADDITIONAL

I am afraid the same condition will apply in the administration of the Security Act whereby our aged citizens are to receive up to $30 per month pension from the respective States, of which amount the Federal Government appropriates $15 per person. In order that veterans and their dependents may not suffer discrimination in the Security Administration, I propose that each pensioner receiving less than $60 per month pension, including widows and other dependents, should have added to such pensions the $15 gratuity which we have provided for individuals over 65 years of age. Unless this is done, we will find that some veterans and widows will receive less pension than will civilians and widows of nonveterans under the Security Act. This would be discriminatory indeed and unless corrected, would wipe out the beneficent effects of our veteran pension laws.

A SQUARE DEAL TO EMERGENCY OFFICERS

I am opposed to the present provisions of the Economy Act whereby emergency officers, with direct war service-connected disabilities were taken from the emergency officers' retired list under the provisions of a New Deal term, "causative factor." Under this term several thousand emergency officers who served valiantly in France, many of them in the front lines, have been removed from the retired emergency officers' list and their pensions reduced to a figure of penury. Think of it! Are we fair and just with our emergency officers? Are we fair and square with the American people if we will remove from the emergency officers' retired list men who served in the front-line trenches and who went through the horrors of hell in so doing while, at the same time we enact legislation whereby officers of the Regular Army, at the age of 37 years, thoroughly able-bodied and competent, are placed on the retired list at $149 per month? To deny retired pay to war-disabled officers and to give such high retired pay to young men who did not serve in war and were not disabled one iota is certainly not my concept of a square deal. Further than this, we are putting through legislation whereby these able-bodied 37-year-old officers, receiving $149 per month, may take positions in civil life to further augment their income.

In other words, the taxpayer is being called upon to pay these able-bodied men $149 per month to compete with him for a job. What chance has an unemployed civilian against this competition of men who have been educated at Government expense and at this early age are retired for life? The emergency officers have a just grievance, and we can ill afford to permit this discrimination to exist between war-disabled emergency officers and peacetime able-bodied officers only 37 years of age.

DISABLED VETERANS SHOULD BE REIMBURSED FOR LOSSES

I am in favor of returning to every veteran and dependent the amount of money withheld from them during the operation of the Economy Act. While I am not an attorney, I am inclined to believe that the Economy Act, in itself was unconstitutional. It is almost synonymous with much other

New Deal legislation which has been thrown overboard by our Supreme Court.

Whether we as veterans recognize it or not, nevertheless the fact is that the average nonveteran, as a good, loyal, patriotic citizen, will uphold us in our just demands. This was evidenced in the Congress by the outstanding support given to the veterans by nonveteran Congressmen, which support in some instances eclipsed that of veteran Members of Congress themselves.

For that reason, when veterans go to the polls in the primaries and in November, I would suggest that they first examine party platforms, and especially the records of the candidates themselves before casting their votes. Veterans not receiving pensions have always evidenced the fullest measure of cooperation and helpfulness in the problems of the disabled, and with this background and with the further strength which the veterans have in their family relations and personal contacts, I feel the veterans of our country owe it to themselves, in helpfulness to our disabled comrades, to vote for the interest of the disabled rather than to permit blind partisanship to influence them when they cast their ballots. If we veterans will do this, there is no doubt that in the next session of Congress uniform pension legislation will be enacted which will eliminate the present discriminations against our disabled and their dependents and restore to the Congress its constitutional right and obligation to provide specifically for our disabled comrades and their dependents, rather than to permit such authority to rest in the hands of the Chief Executive or the Veterans' Administrator.

The Veterans' Administrator advises me that since the economy bill became a law there have been 11 different enactments of the Congress itself to correct discriminations resulting from this measure, and, in addition, the President has issued 12 Executive orders, with 29 amendments to these Executive orders, making a total of 41 Executive orders issued by the President as a result of the Economy Act. In addition, the Veterans' Administration has rendered 261 Administrator's decisions, and there have been revised wholly or in part 815 paragraphs of regulatory material used by the Veterans' Administration in carrying on its activities.

Addressing my comrades and the citizens of the Nation, may it not be said that this voluminous paper work adds confusion to confusion, the veterans never know where they are, and the taxpayers are called upon to pay for additional employees in the Veterans' Administration who are required because there are so many conflicting angles under the present Veterans' Administration set-up? The administration of veteran affairs could be simplified and millions of dollars saved to the taxpayers through the enactment of a sound, uniform pension bill, which I have been advocating since 1926.

PROBLEMS OF THE REGULAR VETERANS' ASSOCIATION

It is my desire to bring before this body the cause of the enlisted men of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. I can speak of those men because I am one of them through having served for more than 20 years as an enlisted man in the Army. Many thousands of fine young men from splendid homes in my district are now serving or have served in the regular service as enlisted men. They are proud of that service, and their families at home are proud that their son or brother is honorably wearing the uniform of his country. The military service is no place for a weakling, either physically or morally, because the enlisted men are subject to severe tests by the recruiting officer, and should a man slip through who is not up to the moral standards of the Army or Navy, he is quickly discovered and dropped. We may well feel proud of our regular services, and those services have always performed when called upon according to the highest standards and traditions. Those men have never complained, and have always obeyed orders no matter how distasteful has been the job assigned to them, or how hard it has been. Hundreds, if not thousands, of graves today bear the mangled bodies of enlisted men who have given their lives in the development of our air defenses during the past two decades. Yes; only the other day the President approved a bill to erect a monument to the men who gave their lives on the *Shenandoah*. Just over the river in Arlington Cemetery is a beautiful monument to the men who lost their lives on the *Maine*, 14 men gave their lives on the *Shenandoah*, and 260 gave their lives on the *Maine*, and we erect monuments to their memory, yet we pension the survivors of those disasters as inferior Americans. A man totally disabled on the *Maine* is entitled to only $30 a month.

When the World War started, all men who had been disabled in the service were equally pensioned, and this included all groups, such as the Civil War disabled, the Indian war disabled, the Spanish War disabled, and the disabled of the Regular Establishment. All those groups had organizations, except the enlisted men of the Regular Establishment, and those organizations were quick to follow the World War organizations in asking for pension increases to a place where the pensions would be reasonable and proper in consideration of the increased living costs. The Regulars had no organization and no voice, and the result was that they did not get any increase in pensions, except for a very minor group. They were declared inferior by Congress and given lower pensions; they were simply neglected by Congress. Looking back from the World War period, we are unable to find a single instance where there has been any discrimination in pensions awarded for service-incurred disability, and we can trace pension legislation back through American history, through English history, and through Roman history.

In America we have always recognized war service as eminent service, and have given something extra for such service. We have given land grants, service pensions, and cash bonuses. During war periods we have paid the soldiers more, and have given them other valuable considerations, such as family allowances, which have been taken away after the war periods have ended. This is perfectly proper, and, in my opinion, we cannot do enough for the men who have fought our wars. However, everything that we have given the war veterans for war service has applied to all equally, and prior to the New Deal we never have adopted the theory that part of the pension for the war-period disabled is for war service and part is for disability.

THE NEW DEAL ECONOMY ACT THREW ALL PRIOR VETERAN LEGISLATION OVERBOARD

The first official declaration that we are doing this has come from the White House in the form of the regulations and rates provided by the President under authority of the Economy Act.

The Economy Act, which I am proud to have voted against, repealed all public pension laws affecting men disabled in the service, as well as service pensions affecting men who had served subsequent to April 20, 1898, and the President was given power by the act to provide rates and regulations "as he shall deem equitable and just." In other words, the President was given the power to eliminate the great number of inequalities then existing in the pension laws, and his standard, as set by Congress, was equity and justice. Under that authority the President caused terrific reductions to be made in all groups of disabled, and Congress quickly stepped in and restored the war-period disabled groups and also the Spanish War service pensions. The Regular service disabled have been left right where they fell when the ax hit them.

In 1933 the administration proudly proclaimed that it had increased the pensions of the Regulars who had been so neglected since 1883, and as a matter of fact the rate for total disability was increased from $30 a month to $45 a month, which on the surface appears to be a considerable raise; however, on March 20, 1933, the average pension of the disabled Regulars was $19.65 a month, and 2 years later, notwithstanding the fact that a large number had been dropped in the meantime, the average had dropped to $18.42 a month, and this latter figure includes the men disabled prior to the War with Spain who suffered only small temporary reductions. It is estimated that instead of a raise

that the group who were disabled after the War with Spain were reduced about one-third in their pensions; in other words, they are now getting one-third less than they previously got under the standards of 1883.

THE BLIND, MAIMED, AND HELPLESS VETERANS SUFFER GREATEST LOSS IN PENSIONS

Every man who suffered the loss of his eyesight in the performance of duty suffered a reduction of more than 30 percent, while the men who suffered anatomical losses were given reductions which averaged about 60 percent. Think of it; we Congressmen suffered a temporary 15-percent reduction in our salaries and thought it was a lot, but compare that temporary 15-percent reduction with the permanent reductions in pensions to the men who lost their arms and legs in the performance of duty, which reductions went as high as 92 percent.

The President has caused a study to be made by the Veterans' Administration, and in the course of this study the Veterans' Administration called upon the War and Navy Departments and the Coast Guard for recommendations and comment. It is significant to note that the War and Navy Departments recommended equality in pension rates as between all men disabled in the service, whether in a war period or not, while the Coast Guard recommended retirement for disability for its enlisted men, which it has had since 1915, and which the officers of all the services have had for more than a generation. There we have the War and Navy Departments recommending equality in pensions, and concurred in, but in a different manner, by the Coast Guard. We see, then, the Veterans' Administration as being the only entity which recommends against such equality, and it is very significant to note that there is not one single individual in the upper councils of the Veterans' Administration who is qualified by experience to raise his voice in behalf of the disabled enlisted men of the Regular services.

In the year 1897 a young man named Alexander Wagner, who may be identified by the pension number, C-886136, entered the United States Army, and he continued to serve therein until the year 1907, when he was dropped for disability which consisted of having lost a leg at the hip in the performance of duty. Wagner was given a pension in 1907, and in the year 1933, which was 36 years after he had entered the service and when he was 36 years older, his pension was reduced 62 percent. At first he did not complain of the extreme hardship forced upon him, because he was told that the reduction was necessary to maintain the credit of his country. He had a hard time getting enough to eat, because the economic stress had caused sharp competition for every dollar that was to be earned, and the young, healthy men won in that competition. As time went on he saw all other groups restored in full, none of which were given such a reduction as he was, and he became bitter. He felt that the United States had broken faith with him in his hour of need, and that preyed on his mind together with the fact that he could not properly provide for himself and last summer he was found with a bullet through his head and a holographic will by his side in which he directed that his pension be given to the President. That is the story of one old man who in his youth gave 10 years of service and who lost a leg in that service. The pension reduction given to Wagner was not unusual, even though it amounted to 62 percent, because the average pension reduction to that group was about 62 percent for all men who had lost arms and legs.

EVERYTHING FOR THE OFFICER—NOTHING FOR THE ENLISTED MAN

Strange as it may seem, it is true that of all groups of people entitled to pensions, compensation, or disability benefits, the Regular services represent the two groups who get both the highest and the lowest. The Regular officer is given better treatment than is any other group, while the Regular enlisted man is given worse treatment than any other group. If we estimate that the captain in the Army represents the average disabled officer in pay status, which I believe is conservative, we find that the average disability benefit of the Regular officers is $187.50 a month, and we already know that the average disability benefit of the disabled enlisted men entitled to pension is $18.42 a month, so that the average officer gets much more than 10 times as much as does the average enlisted man for disability, and they serve together on the same ships and the same aircraft. I would not say that the enlisted man of the Regular services is entitled to as much for service-incurred disability as is the Regular officer, but I do submit that the ratio shown is all out of proportion according to American standards of fairness and justice.

Let us again compare the officers and enlisted men; this time of those now in service. We remember how all officers and men were given a 15-percent reduction, and then the enlisted men were given an additional reduction by having their reenlistment bonus taken away. This reenlistment bonus had been enjoyed by them for a considerable period, and it was the only time the average enlisted man could, because of his small pay, get together enough money to visit the home and his kinfolks that he left when he entered the service.

TWENTY-ONE DOLLARS PER MONTH ENLISTED MEN SUFFER FURTHER REDUCTIONS

When the restoration came the officers were fully restored but the enlisted men were left with the loss of their reenlistment bonus. Then it was discovered that promotions in the Army were slow, and as a result the morale of the officers was low, so, without also considering the promotions of the enlisted men, we promoted a large group of officers and gave to them the increased pay that goes with promotions. The final result, as it now stands, is that we have increased the officers and reduced the enlisted men.

What a record we have made during the past 38 months in the care and treatment given to the enlisted men of our military and naval forces. We have taken or sharply reduced the pensions of the sick and the maimed, and we have reduced the pay of the enlisted men while increasing that of the officers. This administration will live forever in the minds of the enlisted men of our services as being in direct contrast with the administration of another Roosevelt who caused raises in pay to the enlisted men and greatly improved their lot. Those disabled in the Regular services are comparatively few in numbers and the United States may well take steps to save its face in the treatment it has accorded that group. We may well take steps to clear our skirts of the charge that we have broken faith with the sick and the maimed of our services who we promised to care for and for whom we assumed the hazards of the service.

Let us consider that an enlisted man who adopts the service as a career does so on the definite assurance that the Government assumes the hazards of the service as to disability, and that the Government also guarantees to him a comfortable old age through retirement pay. Therefore, with each year of service the enlisted man acquires an increased equity in a life annuity, which he cannot collect on unless he completes the required number of years of service. Under the present set-up a man may complete as much or more than 90 percent of the required service, then become disabled, and be lucky to get a pension of $6 a month, even though he has grown gray in the service and is totally unfit to enter a strange commercial world and compete with young and able men for a living.

Notwithstanding the fact that enlisted men of 20 or more years' service are discharged from the Army because of physical disability incurred in line of duty incident to the service as shown by the certificate of Army doctors, we find the Veterans' Administration denying these disabled enlisted men pension benefits, as the Veterans' Administration frequently does not recognize the findings of service-connected disability incident to the service, as shown by the Army surgeon's certificates on disability. Our own "fighting Teddy Roosevelt", if living, would quickly correct this type of inhuman treatment to veterans.

PROPOSED THAT OFFICERS LIVE ON THE BACKS OF ENLISTED MEN

And now we find legislation proposed to add a number of officers on the retired list as members of a board at the Sol-

diers' Home, who are to be paid extra compensation above their retired pay, which compensation is to be taken from the contributions of 25 cents per month which the enlisted men are forced, against their will, to pay to the home each month.

The Soldiers' Home at Washington has approximately 343 civilian employees, whose organization forced through in this Congress the iniquitous bill taking from each $21-a-month enlisted man 25 cents per month. The enlisted man now receives $20.75 per month and the civilian employees at the home will very soon obtain an increase in pay—if this consideration has not already been shown them—all at the expense of the poor enlisted man.

NOT ONLY LAWS BUT INTERPRETATION OF LAWS DIRECTED AGAINST DISABLED ENLISTED MEN

We do not stop with discriminating against the disabled of the Regular Establishment in our laws, but instead we discriminate against them in the interpretation of the laws. In the veterans' regulations, which were promulgated by the President pursuant to the Economy Act, there is the provision that when a pensioner is being furnished domiciliary or hospital care by the United States his pension shall be limited in amount. The pensioners who are resident in the Soldiers' Home, Washington, are so reduced or limited in their pensions. Yet there is no instance where the United States has ever appropriated money for the maintenance of the Soldiers' Home, and, in fact, the home is maintained by the enlisted men of the Army, who in the past have suffered deductions in pay for the maintenance of the home and who are now contributing 25 cents per month for the Soldiers' Home fund. The Attorney General of the United States in volume 20, Opinions of the Attorney General, page 350, after carefully reviewing the source of the Soldiers' Home fund, rendered it as his opinion that the money and property flowing from the Soldiers' Home was not money and property flowing from the United States. In taking away the pensions of the residents of the Soldiers' Home because of such residence, the Veterans' Administration is overruling the Attorney General of the United States and is placing the United States in the position of making money out of the Soldiers' Home by taking the pensions of the men resident therein and keeping that money in the Treasury of the United States.

In conclusion I appeal to the Congress to consider the facts which I have stressed herein. I have in my files a list of over 150 blind, maimed, and helpless veterans whose pensions today, on an average, are 62 percent less than they were before the New Deal came into power. The New Deal, which created this havoc among our war service-connected, peacetime veterans, is obligated, in my opinion, to correct this injustice before this Congress adjourns. It should be recalled that in the last session of Congress we promoted approximately 9,000 able-bodied, well-paid officers of the Army, giving them increases in pay. This legislation was rushed through the Senate in 15 minutes and taken to the President so he could sign it on the same day to put about $100,000 extra money in the pockets of these officers. The pockets of the blind, maimed, and helpless peacetime veterans are empty.

THE ALAMO, MISSIONS, GOVERNOR'S PALACE—COME TO SAN ANTONIO—THE TEXAS CENTENNIAL

DRAMA SURGES THROUGH HISTORY OF TEXAS

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, Texas is celebrating its centennial; it happens that I live in and represent San Antonio, where in the middle of the city stands the Alamo, one of the greatest historical monuments in the entire world. It is quite true, I suppose, that when a Texan tells of his history, he may be given to what seems extravagance of expression.

This, however, is usually under the strain and stress of emotion produced from our dramatic past. However, my story will be accurate, and I state this not only that the record shall be kept in the national annals but that those who will this year visit Texas may know something of its history. Naturally I know something of the history of Texas, but I have made research and have had the direct assistance of Hon. Fred C. Chabot, well-known Texas historian, whose material I have used and whom I shall also directly quote, and whose help I now gratefully acknowledge.

YANAGUANA, INDIAN VILLAGE, NOW SAN ANTONIO, MODERN CITY

San Antonio is a great modern city; historically, however, it goes back to the village of Yanaguana of the Indians; for how long previous to written history, we do not know. The first written history was the christening of the village of San Antonio de Padua in 1691.

Today San Antonio de Bexar is the gateway to Mexico and the center of great farming, ranching, truck-growing, and fruit regions and the greatest military and aviation district in America. It has Kelly, Duncan, and Brooks Fields, which are, respectively, training, mechanical, and tactical units; also Randolph Field, "the West Point of the air", and numerous other military and civilian aviation fields; also Fort Sam Houston, Camp Travis, "the Arsenal", other military units, and Camp Stanley, the greatest maneuvering field for size and topography in the entire world.

THE SIX FLAGS OF TEXAS

Over the city of San Antonio and the State of Texas, now a progressive part of the American Nation, have flown six flags: that of Spain, France, Mexico, the Republic of Texas, the Confederate States of America, and the United States of America, and as Mr. Chabot says:

> We may even count more, for the Freedonian Republic of Edwards was in Texas, as was the Republic declared by James Long, when the colorful Lafitte reigned the buccaneer camp on Galveston Island.

TEXAS, ONE-THIRD BIGGER THAN GERMANY

Texas a hundred years ago was nearly twice the size that it is at this time, taking in what is now part of New Mexico, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, Wyoming, and had a population of only 35,000 men, women, and children thinly scattered over the widest areas. There were no roads as we understand them now. It is astonishing to know that in that primitive age there was such a unanimity of spirit and of revolution. Today, Texas, stripped of much of its territory, is still one-third larger than Germany, and its wealth, by virtue of natural resources, is incomparably greater than that of Germany. That Texas, once a sovereign nation, is a vassal principality to a little street in New York is not so pleasant to think upon—but I must stick to our history.

It is customary for people to dream about their mighty history. And every Texan who really knows Texas history, and who realizes the tremendous implications of Texas' formation as a sovereign State, has heard the shrill cry of empire.

PEACE WITH LATIN AMERICA AND THE WORLD

But our dream of empire is dead. This is only a fancy long since passed. For the people of Texas are peaceful with all Mexico, Latin America, and all of the world, and though willing to fight, despise war. Our people want to develop the "arts of peace", to work, to conserve what God gave us, and promote science, industry, and good government.

In San Antonio there are hotels (I swear the Chamber of Commerce is not inspiring this) that are the best—but not far from these very hotels are the ancient "chili stands" where food is served in the open in bright-colored stands—just as we did 200 years ago—and where Mexicans actually play guitars and sing the folk songs of Mexico and Texas ranches.

> (NOTE.—The stands now have screens and are sanitary. The hot chili may burn you, but you will not get ptomaine poisoning.)

SPANISH MISSIONS; PLAZAS; OLD CATHEDRAL; MODERN BUILDINGS

Near the city are the great Spanish missions, established by the sacrifice of the Franciscan Fathers. In the vicinity of Military Plaza, named by the Spanish "Plaza des Armas", and Main Plaza, named also by the Spanish "Plaza de Mayor", one sees the old cathedral, and by its side a beautiful modern bank building, and on the different squares the city hall, the county courthouse, and bright tropical parks. Directly facing the Military Plaza is the old Governor's Palace, in a perfect state of reconstruction, rehabilitated through the leadership of the Conservation Society of San Antonio, of which the

architect was Harvey P. Smith, through funds supplied by the city of San Antonio.

The centennial celebrates the 100 years of liberty, and I shall first describe that phase.

Having lost the Battle of San Antonio in 1835 when General Cos was driven from San Antonio, the Republic of Mexico, under the leadership of the Mexican tyrant, Santa Anna, decided to concentrate her military forces in San Antonio in view of the rising tide of armed revolt of the Texans.

TEXANS OCCUPY THE ALAMO—ALL TO DIE

In fact, from a strategic viewpoint, the Mexicans could not afford to lose San Antonio, then and now the key and heart of the State of Texas. As the concentration proceeded the few Americans who lived there occupied the Alamo, fortified it again, and made ready to fight with blood and guns.

In this far-distant empire now being established the Americans who had formed the government of Texas disagreed among themselves and there was a lack of discipline in the volunteer troops. Only one-hundred-and-eighty-odd men were available, but all went into the Alamo. Enthusiastic historians say the Texans were attacked by a Mexican army of 5,000. The Mexicans claim there were 1,500 only, and no doubt the real number was around 2,000 to 2,500, if unbiased military estimates are correct.

THE SIEGE—REINFORCEMENTS NEVER CAME

Bowie and Neill were in command at San Antonio, and although Neill had orders to demolish the Alamo, he did not do it. He was given a furlough. Governor Smith then ordered William Barrett Travis, who was in charge of recruiting at San Felipe de Austin, to raise a company and go to Neill's assistance. Then Bowie learned through his Mexican relatives of the approach of the Mexican Army. He pleaded for help. David Crockett, fresh from Tennessee, entered the Alamo with about 15 men from his State.

The siege of the Alamo began. Travis asked for help, but never got it. Completely surrounded, nevertheless, on March 1, 32 brave men from Gonzales—also an historical spot which will celebrate the centennial, and which all should visit—led by Capt. Albert Martin, rode to Bexar, dashed through the Mexican lines, knowing that as they entered the walls that death rode with them.

"EL DEGUELLO", "NO QUARTER"—THE TYRANT'S BUGLES SCREAM DEATH

On March 6 the final attack was ordered by Santa Anna, the Mexican dictator. Messages had passed between the lines, and preceding the attack Santa Anna ordered the playing of El Deguello, which meant "no quarter." Some of those near there tell the bugles made a horrible noise in that screeching symbol of death. Old historians say, "They put the Texans to the sword, and not a single combatant was left alive to tell the story."

TRAVIS, BOWIE, BONHAM, AND CROCKETT DIE FOR LIBERTY

Colonel Travis, a young man with a flair for romance and military heroism, who is said to have been a student of the Latin poets, died in the breach, slaying the Mexican officer who had wounded him to death. James Bowie, dying of pneumonia, was slain in his bed. David Crockett fought valiantly; his ammunition giving out, he fought to the death with a broken gun. It is said that Santa Anna twice stabbed with a poniard the corpse of Evans, the man who might have ignited the powder magazines had he not been killed in the attempted act, thus burying Santa Anna and himself beneath the ruins of the citadel. Bonham was killed while working the cannon.

A JEW DIES IN THE ALAMO

The racial backgrounds of the soldiers of the Alamo were various; most of them were native-born Americans, but there were Irish, English, Scotch, Welsh, Danish, Mexican, and one of the heroes who died for liberty at the Alamo was a Jew, Aaron Wolff.

A full story of the contributions to Texas liberty, its growth, industry, and culture, by Jews was recently made in an address by Rabbi Ephraim Frisch, of Temple Beth El, San Antonio. He quoted the book of Leviticus, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land, to all the inhabitants thereof", and gave name after name of Jews in Texas history, including that of Wolff.

I mention the Jews in Texas history, and especially that of Wolff, not to please that race, but to show all of us that humanity loves liberty and will fight for it. Racial persecution is a horrible thing, and we Americans must never permit ourselves to travel the road of bitterness and persecution.

DR. FRISCH, RABBI, APPEALS FOR TOLERANCE

On the occasion of Dr. Frisch's address, which was March 6, 1936, in commemoration of the Alamo, he said:

> Here may we all, under God, Catholic, Protestant, and Jew, men of all faiths and all lineages, continue to live and prosper, cherishing our precious American traditions and ideals of liberty, of brotherhood, of justice, and of peace; everyone in the words of Scripture "sitting under his own vine and fig tree, with none to make him afraid"; each one eager to be his brother's keeper.

TEXAS BECOMES A SOVEREIGN NATION

Throughout the wide expanse of Texas the news of the fall of the Alamo spread consternation and horror. However, the men of Texas assembled in small companies. Then, by intelligent military tactics which he had learned in Indian campaigns, Gen. Sam Houston, former Governor of Tennessee, retreated over the face of Texas, engaged the Mexicans at the Battle of San Jacinto near the city of Houston, and a great victory was won by the Texans. This field, with a magnificent monument, will be a part of the great celebration.

The story of the establishment of the Republic, its trials, tribulations, and its paper money, the intrigue of the French Ambassador, all indicate to the historian events interesting enough to inspire years of study and research. And all these places representing this great epoch in American history are worthy of the pilgrimage of any American.

And Texas is the only State that was once a sovereign nation, recognized as such by the other countries of the world. This status was enjoyed for nearly 10 years, when it voluntarily accepted statehood in the United States of America.

But I am telling principally the story of San Antonio, although San Antonio is the history of early Texas.

WAR; BLOODY FEET; PRISONERS OF PEROTE

Texas' wars were not over. Although a treaty had been signed by the Mexicans and Texans and Texas had been recognized in every respect by Mexico, it decided it would annex Texas; so she began to harry the new republic and make military invasions. In 1842 Mexico made war. Vasquez came into San Antonio and departed with loot and treasure and Mexican sympathizers. Again General Woll and the trained regulars of the Mexican Army entered the city. The Mexicans under Antonio Menchaca took post in the old cabildo, and the Americans fortified the home of Samuel A. Maverick, a prominent citizen and signer of the Declaration of Independence, which place was located on the northeast corner of Main Plaza. The Texans attempted to defend the town but were finally captured by overwhelming numbers. Barefooted, they were then taken to Mexico, marching over deserts of cactus, tropical lands, and freezing mountains nearly 1,800 miles to the State of Vera Cruz and imprisoned in the Castle Perote. Castle Perote is near the village of Jalapa. It is one of the largest and most beautiful castles on the American continent. It is said that the Spaniards spent 15,000,000 pesos in building it, and I have never seen a more forbidding, though simple and beautiful piece of architecture.

TEXAS GIVES ITS STAR TO THE UNITED STATES

But Texas, composed of Americans, desired the security, prestige, and honor of their mother country, so it became a part of the Union in 1845. United States troops were moved in and quartered on Military Plaza. Later Major Babbitt occupied the Alamo as a quartermaster depot, and it was so occupied, except for the Civil War, until 1878. In 1849 General Worth, after whom the city of Fort Worth, also substantially participating in the centennial celebration, was named, resided in the old Justice John James home on Commerce Street, which I can remember as a child, and

which stood at the corner of Presa Street. The troops were in temporary barracks in Concepcion Mission on one side of San Antonio and at the head of the San Antonio River on the other. These latter springs were called Worth Springs, but this name is now forgotten.

SAN ANTONIO EARLY MILITARY CENTER

At the corner of Houston and St. Marys Streets stands the modern Gunter Hotel. On this location a hotel was built in the fifties by John and William Vance, which served as officers' quarters and barracks. They were first occupied in 1856 and then later were used as Confederate headquarters. The old French Building, which existed until just a few years ago, still lives in the minds of San Antonians, was built during the Civil War and was known as the Confederate Aid Store. In its place stands a modern police building.

The Maverick Hotel was built on Houston Street, and was constructed for Federal headquarters of the Army and occupied by General Ord in 1875. From 1875 on, San Antonio began to develop as a great center. Major Belknap, famous in Texas, began the building of Fort Sam Houston May 6, 1875, or over 60 years ago. It is today the finest military post in North or South America and should be visited by all Americans.

The history preceding the fall of the Alamo and the establishment of the Republic of Texas in 1836 is an interesting one in that it was more or less a "republican movement" which started in 1790.

SOME EVENTS PRECEDING TEXAS REVOLUTION

Let me quote Mr. Chabot:

The first revolutionary tendency in San Antonio seems to have been in 1790, when the "Republicans" here had the audacity of holding a junta without permission from the authorities. Four years later Philip Nolan arrived.

Then in 1803 came the company of the Alamo of Parras, Mexico, which was stationed in the old San Antonio de Valero mission, which had been secularized some years before. They gave their name to the mission, when it was used as a fort, the Alamo. With the war of independence from Spain, San Antonio suffered all the horrors imaginable. Each faction outdid the other in cruelty.

ROYALISTS OF SPAIN DEFEATED

In 1813 San Antonio surrendered to the Americans under Kemper, as a result of the defeat of the Spaniards on the Rocillo. The Royalists under Elisondo were defeated, and the Americans returned to San Antonio. Toledo was elected commander in chief. The Americans, or Army of the North, were defeated on the Medina, and only 93 Americans were able to escape to Natchitoches. Arredondo marched triumphantly into San Antonio and sought revenge on the Republicans. By 1814 San Antonio had become a desolate place, suffering from the heel of a ruthless tyrant within, and surrounded by ferocious Indians without. Prices became prohibitive and food very scarce.

A great flood came down upon the town on July 5, 1819, destroying lives and property alike. Those who could fled to higher ground on the east bank of the river; they started the new villita, or little town, and gradually occupied the properties which had belonged to the Indians and soldiers who had squatted around the Alamo.

As the American colonists came into Texas, San Antonio, the capital of the Province, received the most prominent of them, who came to petition the Governor. The Austins, Moses, and Stephen F., were here; Baron Bastrop lived here, and helped them. Then the leaders of the Irish immigration, McGloin and McMullen were here, the latter making San Antonio his permanent residence. James and Rezin Bowie arrived, the latter the inventor of the "Bowie knife", the former, Jim Bowie, Alamo hero, who married Ursula, the charming daughter of Governor Veramendi, one of San Antonio's richest merchants, and whose home, the Veramendi Palace, was a famous spot for hospitality, beauty, and political intrigue. Here Sam Houston visited when on an Indian jaunt.

In 1834 the first strictly revolutionary meeting to discuss Texas independence from Mexico was held in San Antonio.

WHO WILL FOLLOW OLD BEN MILAM?

The following year an attempt to disarm the Americans at Gonzales was the inauguration of actual warfare. General Cos was driven from San Antonio by the western army of Americans, under old Ben Milam, who lost his life when taking the Veramendi House. The capitulations for the surrender of the Mexicans and San Antonio to the Americans were signed in the Cos House, or the old Martinez House on Villita Street, in December 1835, when Gen. Edward Burleson was glad to terminate a campaign against such great odds.

CANARY ISLANDERS CAME IN 1731

Thousands of the people of San Antonio are descended from what is known as the "Canary Islanders." John W. Smith married a lady who was a member of a Canary family. He was the first mayor of San Antonio, and his grandson, John W. Tobin, was one of the most distinguished recent mayors of the city. Smith's friend, Samuel A. Maverick, married a lady from Alabama, and he was the first Congressman of the Texas Republic, representing the district of Bexar. His grandson, MAURY MAVERICK, became the first Congressman of the United States of America representing the single district of Bexar a hundred years later.

But let me tell the story of the Canary Islanders who came in the year 1731 from the Canary Islands, arriving on March 9. They formed the first municipality or civil settlement in the province of Texas, naming the villa San Fernando in honor of the Spanish Prince of Asturias, who later became king of Spain. San Fernando was located at the side of Main Plaza, then called the "Plaza of the Islanders" adjoining the Plaza of the Presidio, or Military Plaza. Chabot says:

According to the vice-regal decree for the founding of this villa, it was to be the capital of the province. This was the first political settlement, as we have said, and it received the usual royal protection and encouragement. The colonists, as first settlers, were made Hidalgos, those who had something or who were somebody: hijos de algo, in accordance with the laws of the Indies.

By 1734 the first foundation stone for their parish church was laid. This holy temple was then called San Fernando, in honor of the Spanish saint and king. It was finished in about 1746, and erected under the invocation of the Virgin of the Candelaria and Our Lady of Guadalupe, for whom the inhabitants had a particular reverence. This was the beginning of our present historical landmark, San Fernando Cathedral.

THE FLAG OF FRANCE

It must be remembered that Texas had six flags; one of those was that of France. The French had come down the Mississippi River from Canada and had established themselves in Louisiana. They claimed all the lands drained by the great Mississippi. Sieur de Robert La Salle landed on the Texas coast in 1685 and established a fort and settlement on the Garcitas Creek which he called St. Louis. Savage tribes soon destroyed the fort and La Salle was murdered by his own men.

Then St. Denis had a trading expedition from Louisiana to Mexico, and the Spanish governors were alarmed at the French encroachment. In the year 1719, French forces crossed the Louisiana frontier and drove the Spaniards out of east Texas. Let Mr. Chabot continue the story which largely concerns the beautiful Spanish missions of southwest Texas.

This train of events called for the appointment of the Marquis of Aguayo as Governor of Texas. He was the most powerful feudal lord of north Mexico, and soon organized a military expedition, entered Texas, and drove back the French, reestablishing the Spanish missions.

While the missionaries were in refuge in San Antonio, Father Margil founded the beautiful mission which he named in honor of the Governor, San José de San Miguel de Aguayo. This was in 1720. Now Aguayo removed the Presidio of San Antonio to the site of the present military plaza, and had a fortification built of adobe and stone, fireproof, and strong, with a residence for the commander or governor, and quarters for the officers. This was the beginning of our Governor's palace, and it was completed in 1722.

THE MISSIONS—THEY STILL STAND

Then the east Texas missions were abandoned and reestablished on the San Antonio River. On March 5, 1731, the captain of the San Antonio Presidio proceeded to the first mission ground, accompanied by his officers, and Father Vergara "grasped the hand of the captain of the tribe, in the name of all the other Indians who had attached themselves to the mission, and led him about over the locality, and caused him to pull up weeds, throw stones, and perform all the other acts of real possession", when the first mission, La Purisima Concepción, was founded here.

Then followed the founding of the San Juan and the Espada missions. In serving the Indians of east Texas Concepción had originally taken their name; now it was called Our Lady of Purisima Concepción de Acuña, in honor of the viceroy, Juan de Acuña, Marquis of Casafuerte. San Juan of the Nazones was rechristened San Juan Capistrano; and the Espada, the first mission established in Texas, as Our Father San Francisco of the Texas, was now rechristened San Francisco de la Espada.

These missions stand today. It is said that the Concepción Mission, from the viewpoint of massive beauty and outline, is the best. San Jose is recognized as the most beautiful in America, famous for its stone façade and its rose window. With the cooperation of several societies and the church, most of this mission church and surrounding quarters are

being preserved and restored. All of these missions should be visited by those attending the centennial.

The missions around San Antonio are not all that there are in Texas. In Goliad one finds two, and there occurred the massacre of Fannin's men.

REVOLT IN NEW MEXICO—MISSIONS—EL PASO

Among the missions in excellent shape are those near El Paso, which are still older than those around San Antonio. They were established because of the great revolt of the Indian tribes in New Mexico in 1690, when the Spanish Governor of New Mexico, Otermin, and a number of survivors of the revolt escaped from Santa Fe and came down the Rio Grande River to Ysleta, near El Paso, where one mission had already been established in 1682.

During the same period the missions of Socorro and San Elizario were established. Ysleta appears to be the first church in Texas. There is a farm near which El Pasoans claim is the oldest in the United States of America from the viewpoint of continuous cultivation.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMASON HAS SPECTACULAR AND BEAUTIFUL DISTRICT

The Texas Centennial is not intended as a celebration of its early period as a State of the Union, but the early period will naturally be considered. Every Texan and every visitor should know of the great forts in the western part of Texas, the Big Bend country, and the missions just mentioned, all of which are in the congressional district of Hon. R. E. THOMASON, of El Paso.

Fort Davis, named for Jefferson Davis, who was then Secretary of War, was established October 7, 1854, and is in Jeff Davis County. Congressman THOMASON is now establishing a great national park in this area, which, for spectacular scenery, high mountains, and wide plains, is one of the most beautiful areas in America. There is already the Fort Davis State Park, and this would be increased in size by several million acres.

This fort was established because of its being the center of wild Indian tribes, the Mescaleros, Apaches, and Comanches. It was continuously occupied until the Civil War, when Texas Confederate troops took command under Colonel Baylor. Any centennial visitor traveling between El Paso and San Antonio might stop overnight in such cities as Marfa, Van Horn, Alpine, and Fort Stockton. Not far from El Paso are the great Carlsbad Caverns and a national park.

TEXAS COLONIES—MOSES AUSTIN—"CONNECTICUT YANKEE"

To include in this statement a story of the Texas colonists is impossible. Representative CITRON, of Connecticut, urged me to do this, telling me of Moses Austin, from Durham, Conn., which is in his Congressional District. Moses Austin was a "Connecticut Yankee", and his son, Stephen F., took up his colonization work in Texas when he died and made the name of Austin immortal. There were many colonizers called "Empresarios", and they formed the background and support of the Texas revolution.

In telling history an interested party is likely to exaggerate and make of his ancestors gods and angels. It is true to Texas came ministers of the Gospel, priests, poets, musicians; but likewise came adventurers, rowdies, duelists, men who sang loud songs as they drank tequilla (a powerful Mexican distillate of cactus, putting whisky to shame, and well known to the descendants of our Texas heroes), and these men rode horses high, wide, handsome, and fancy-free. This is the true background of Texas. San Antonio is a great American city, but its cosmopolitanism, flash, and color are outstanding.

COSMOPOLITAN, INDUSTRIAL, HISTORICAL

The early Anglo-Americans of the forties and fifties were the true pioneers of the present industrial development. In this group were many Germans who left the tyranny of Europe and came to Texas for freedom and liberty, and they were a wholesome leavening to our Anglo-American speculation and extravagances. Many of our present banks, the pioneer lumber and housing concern, the pioneer flour mills and businesses are owned and operated by the descendants of these German pioneers. Throughout southwest Texas and in the trade territory of San Antonio are numerous German farmers, and their farms can be noted for their neatness and excellent condition.

In the cosmopolitanism of San Antonio is the Italian colony, many of whom have been born in San Antonio to the third generation, others who were born in Italy. Of course, many other nationalities are represented.

In celebrating the Texas Centennial the element of Mexican extraction and Spanish background must not be forgotten. In the city of San Antonio there are some 80,000 Americans of Mexican extraction. They maintain much of their racial and cultural heritage, although by education and patriotism they are American citizens. Historically, however, it must be remembered that the republican movement—the movement for a constitutional and free government was also of Mexican origin—and in the siege of San Antonio in 1835 on the side of liberty were Mexicans, as there were among heroes of the Alamo. There were Mexicans who fought for Texas in the Battle of San Jacinto.

The Anglo-American leaders were anxious to receive the cooperation of such great leaders as Erasmo Seguin and his son Juan—a town now being named after him; of Antonio Navarro, after whom the county of Navarro is named, as well as the city of Corsicana since he came from a Corsican family; Antonio Menchaca; Francisco Ruiz, and son, after both of whom well-known streets are named in San Antonio, and dozens of other cities; but old Spanish and Mexican families of San Antonio who cherished liberty and independence fought side by side with the Americans or Texans.

Reuben Rendon Lozano, a native-born citizen of Mexican extraction, a schoolmate of mine, and now a prominent lawyer in San Antonio, has written "Viva Tejas!—The Story of Mexican-born Patriots of the Republic of Texas." This book gives in detail what its title indicates, as well as the part played by the Mexicans as I have just outlined.

ON TO TEXAS

In visiting San Antonio the traveler should pass through Houston (see the battlefield of San Jacinto and monument), Dallas, or Fort Worth—or all of them; likewise through Austin, the State capital, where can be seen one of the greatest State capitals in America, a beautiful and well-planned city, an excellent university, the old Texas State Cemetery, the French Embassy and other sites, historic and modern. One should visit Gonzales and Goliad. If one travels west, they should not fail to see El Paso, passing through the Davis Mountains, and seeing near the city the two missions described elsewhere. One should always include San Antonio in any trip.

San Antonio is by automobile 3½ hours from the border of Mexico and 7 hours altogether from the city of Monterey, far in the interior of Mexico, an old, historic, but like San Antonio, modern metropolis. San Antonio is also 3½ hours from the Gulf of Mexico, the greatest place for tarpon fishing in southern waters. The city is the center of a great area, and from a viewpoint of history, modernity, and hope of future progress, is a valuable place for any American to visit to round out his knowledge of all the traditions that make up American history.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order just adopted, adjourned until Monday, May 18, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

835. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 210 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of interstate and foreign communication by wire or radio, and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1934, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HILL of Alabama: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10640. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, Panama Canal Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Alabama: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12511. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 12244. A bill to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of 1917, relating to the compensation of certain Immigration and Naturalization Service employees, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONNERY: Committee on Labor. H. R. 12599. A bill to provide more adequate protection to workmen and laborers on projects, buildings, constructions, improvements, and property wherever situated, belonging to the United States of America, by granting to the several States jurisdiction and authority to enter upon and enforce their State workmen's compensation, safety, and insurance laws on all property and premises belonging to the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 2656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITE: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 12698. A bill relating to the establishment and operation of grazing districts in the State of Nevada; without amendment (Rept. No. 2657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7086. A bill to establish the Mount Olympus National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11922. A bill to amend the act of May 25, 1933 (48 Stat. 73); without amendment (Rept. No. 2659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 3247. An act to amend title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, as amended, by the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, and as extended by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935; with amendment (Rept. No. 2660). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COSTELLO: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3334. An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract disease while engaged in military training, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DUFFY of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 12612. A bill 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 2664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 582. Joint resolution 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 2665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER: A bill (H. R. 12714) for the relief of former employees of the Federal subsistence homestead corporations; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEMKE: A bill (H. R. 12715) to liquidate and refinance agricultural indebtedness at a reduced rate of interest by establishing an efficient credit system, through the use of the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Reserve Banking System, and creating a Board of Agriculture to supervise the same; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAMSAY: A bill (H. R. 12716) to prevent the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded liquors, and regulating traffic therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLAN: A bill (H. R. 12717) to provide for the right of election by employees subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of a joint and survivorship annuity upon retirement; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. TONRY: A bill (H. R. 12718) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 12719) for the relief of the Southeastern University of the Young Men's Christian Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DEROUEN: A bill (H. R. 12720) granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free or toll highway bridge, or a railway bridge in combination with a free or toll highway bridge, and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETTENGILL: A bill (H. R. 12721) authorizing the sale of approximately 5,000 acres of land in the Gogebic purchase unit to the University of Notre Dame; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARMICHAEL: A bill (H. R. 12722) to aid the several States in making certain toll bridges free bridges, to authorize an appropriation for such purpose, to make such appropriation available for matching with funds apportioned under the Federal Highway Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEOD: Resolution (H. Res. 513) to amend section 5 of rule XXII of the rules adopted as the rules of the Seventy-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DISNEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 588) for the designation of certain streets or avenues in the Mall as Ohio, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Maine Avenues; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENNEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 589) 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 Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BEITER: A bill (H. R. 12723) for the relief of Helmuth Heyl; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLSON: A bill (H. R. 12724) for the relief of Maj. Wilbur Rogers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHANDLER: A bill (H. R. 12725) for the relief of Arthur J. Ellwood; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DARDEN: A bill (H. R. 12726) for the relief of Jeremiah A. Kennedy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 12727) granting a pension to Ella May Farris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: A bill (H. R. 12728) for the relief of Isidore Ferzig; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORITZ: A bill (H. R. 12729) for the relief of the General Electric Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 12730) to authorize the payment of an annuity to William H. Moran, Chief of the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department, upon his retirement, in recognition and appreciation of his services to the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 12731) for the relief of Benjamin Weisenberg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF: A bill (H. R. 12732) granting a pension to Alice Waste; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALLGREN: A bill (H. R. 12733) for the relief of George Parker; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

10885. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the Lackawanna Housing Authority, endorsing the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill, known as the United States Housing Authority Act of 1936; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10886. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution unanimously adopted by the Bricklayers' International Union, Local No. 9, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring improved housing conditions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10887. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Oscar H. Falkenberg, of St. Louis, Mo., and other residents of the Thirteenth Congressional District of Missouri, favoring pensions for the blind, as provided in House bill 7122; to the Committee on Pensions.

10888. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Lackawanna City Housing Authority, of Lackawanna, N. Y., urging the passage of the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10899. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of the Detroit Community Fund, suggesting a national policy for relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10890. Petition of the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 15, 1936

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 1936)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 13, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8287) to establish an assessed valuation real property tax in the Virgin Islands of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2982. An act for the relief of Sarah Shelton;

H. R. 7110. An act to authorize the President to bestow the Navy Cross upon Brig. Gen. Robert H. Dunlap, United States Marine Corps, deceased;

H. R. 8262. An act for the relief of Tom Rogers and the heirs of W. A. Bell, Israel Walker, Henry Shaw, Thomas Bailey, and Joseph Watson.

H. R. 8431. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort Frederica National Monument, at St. Simon Island, Ga., and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9496) to protect the United States against loss in the delivery through the mails of checks in payment of benefits provided for by laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MEAD, Mr. DOBBINS, Mr. HAINES, Mr. GOODWIN, and Mr. DOUTRICH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11687) to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. WARREN, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. TURPIN, and Mr. WOLCOTT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to 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, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. UMSTEAD, Mr. THOM, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. MCLEOD, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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 amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3483) to provide for rural electrification, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 8372. An act to authorize the acquisition of lands in the vicinity of Miami, Fla., as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon; and

H. R. 10267. An act to provide for adjusting the compensation of division superintendents, assistant division superintendents, assistant superintendents at large, assistant superintendent in charge of car construction, chief clerks, assistant chief clerks, and clerks in charge of sections in offices of division superintendents in the Railway Mail Service, to correspond to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

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. 10919) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 26 and 49 to the said bill, and concurred therein each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 48 and 52 to the said bill.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3789) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the city of Charleston, S. C., disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLAND, Mr. SIROVICH, and Mr. WELCH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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