traffic between points in said districts now isolated by water, and to and from communities adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Roads.

11006. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution of Council No. 15, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, deploring existing conditions which if not curbed threaten the very existence of our American Republic, opposing enactment of the Kerr bill and favoring the Reynolds-Starnes bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

11007. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, International Falls, Local No. 159; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

11008. Also, petition of Mother's Day, Inc., Philadelphia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

11009. Also, petition of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local No. 1445; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11010. Also, petition of the city of Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 29, 1936

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 1936)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 28, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 4533. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wikerson's Ferry, Miss.; and

S. J. Res. 262. 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.

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

H. R. 8442. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes;

H. R. 11916. An act to authorize the transfer of a certain piece of land in Muhlenberg County, Ky., to the State of Kentucky; and

H. J. Res. 589. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 255)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1937, amounting to $50,000 (salaries and expenses, General Committee of the Accident Prevention Conference), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY (S. DOC. NO. 256)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to remain available until June 30, 1937, for the Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture, amounting to $100,000, for the purchase of land and equipment and construction of buildings required in connection with sugarcane investigations, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture to liberalize the terms of the National Soil Conservation Act so as to permit farmers in areas wherein drought has prevented germination or growth of their principal money crop until it is too late to produce such crops, even if rain should come, to withdraw a greater percentage of such soil depleting crops from cultivation and to plant same to soil building or soil improving crops as outlined in the terms of said act

Whereas there is now and has been for well-nigh 2 months a serious drought affecting certain States of the Nation, particularly South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Virginia, and portions of Alabama, Florida, and other States so vitally and adversely as to make the growing of certain crops, such as cotton, tobacco, corn, and so forth, almost impossible for the year 1936, due to the lateness of the season; and

Whereas these crops are largely the money crops of the affected areas and vitally influence the business life of the said States and the individuals dependent upon them for sustenance, as well as the economic life of the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas, if some measure of relief is not devised for the farmers of the affected areas, the likelihood is that the relief rolls in these areas will be greatly augmented this fall as a result of money crop failures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina hereby strongly petitions, urges, and recommends to the national Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture that the National Soil Conservation Act be so liberalized or amended as to allow a greater percentage of soil depleting crops to be withdrawn from cultivation and planted to soil building and soil improving crops than is now allowable under the said act, such increased percentage of soil depleting crops to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

be allowed only to farmers in the aforementioned drought areas as may, because of such drought, desire to withdraw a greater acreage of their principal crops than they may now by law retire; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent the President of the United States, the Houses of the National Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the Senate and of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif.; the Board of Aldermen of the City of Louisville, Ky.; and the Council of the City of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Ellenbogen low-cost housing bill, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Sheep Creek (Nebr.) union of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 541) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of intoxicating liquors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS AND ELECTORAL COLLEGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present a petition on behalf of residents and organizations of the District of Columbia urging the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 12.

Early in the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress it was my privilege to introduce in the Senate a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. This proposed amendment would empower the Congress to grant unto the residents of the District of Columbia voting representation in the Senate and House of Representatives, the vote for President and Vice President, and the same rights to sue and be sued in the courts of the United States as possessed by the citizens of a State.

It was my expectation at that time to press for action this matter of plain American justice, but because of the urgent national issues engaging the attention of Congress the opportunity has been lacking.

These voteless and unrepresented fellow Americans are politically in a most difficult position, completely lacking any participation in the councils of their Nation. Their situation has been particularly distressing during the present Congress. They are absolutely dependent upon Congress for all legislation and for the appropriation of the funds, which are raised in greater part from their own taxation, for the support of the District. This is particularly true at the present time, when there is serious disagreement between the two Houses and there is no adequate remedy which these voteless and unrepresented ones can apply.

It must be remembered that the Congress is both the local and the National Legislature of the District of Columbia, with the very peculiar condition that the District residents are not represented in their own legislature.

These, our fellow Americans of the National Capital, in numbers exceed the population of each of eight States, and during the last fiscal year paid in Federal internal-revenue taxes an amount greater than that paid by each of 23 States, and more than the combined payment of 9 States. In such Federal taxes the per-capita payments of the District exceeded those of 38 States.

Here at the very heart of the Nation are half a million as good Americans as are to be found any place under the Stars and Stripes. They are intelligent, public spirited, loyal, and patriotic, and are always to be found meeting all of the obligations of American citizenship, both in war and in peace. In measuring up to these obligations of citizenship they are excelled by no other American citizens, but when it comes to their possession and enjoyment of vital and fundamental rights they are rated in the same class as the criminal, the idiot, and the lunatic.

These people, being subject to all laws enacted by Congress, are as vitally affected by and interested in all national legislation as are the citizens of the States, yet they are deprived of the right to participate in the enactment of those laws.

Mr. President, the plight of these fellow Americans of the Capital community is, indeed, a sad one, which is clearly violative of the principals expounded in the Declaration of Independence. Were these people satisfied to rest content in this deprivation of their natural-born rights, they would be unworthy of the name American. They realize fully that they suffer a grave injustice through the inaction of their fellow Americans in the States. They know that in fact and in truth they are really the subjects rather than the recognized equals of the other citizens of their country. They know full well that the only possible relief from their anomalous situation is to be found through the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 12.

I have the honor to present to the Senate, with a request that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this petition of the citizen organizations of the District of Columbia for the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 12.

This proposal in no way lessens the power of exclusive legislation exercised by Congress over the seat of the Federal Government. It does not, in the least particular, change the present form of the government of the District. It does, however, propose to give to the legal residents of the District of Columbia the right to participate, through their duly elected representatives, in the councils of their National Government. The Senate joint resolution is a just measure deserving favorable action by Congress and ratification by the States.

This petition is truly representative of the people of the District through their principal organized bodies. They thus speak to the Congress through their chief officers with the official authority of the organizations in question. No matter of legislation affecting the District has ever been presented to Congress with a more united front. These organizations represent the plain citizen, the businessman, working people, the veterans, the women, trade, labor, and welfare, and other groups. These local bodies have the support of a growing number of influential national, regional, and State organizations.

I appeal to my colleagues to give this question their attention and study, with a view to granting this boon to our fellow but voteless and unrepresented Americans of the District of Columbia, in the Seventy-fifth Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the petition be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD, including the signatures of the 38 officers of the 38 organizations that have signed the petition, together with the accompanying argument.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, and the accompanying argument, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Your petitioners, the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation for the District of Columbia, and the presidents of its constituent and cooperating organizations, whose names are subscribed below, hereby reaffirm the principles previously announced by the founders of our Republic that "taxation without representation is tyranny"; that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and in order that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" may become an accomplished fact for all the people of the United States, respectfully represent:

That the one-half million totally disfranchised people of the District of Columbia, who obey national laws, pay more national taxes than many of the States; who oversubscribed every wartime fund—including the Red Cross and all Liberty bond issues; who supplied to the Army and Navy of the United States nearly 18,000 men in the World War—a larger number than any one of seven of the States—and who are now living under an anomalous condition in which they have no voice in the National Government, are entitled to representation in Congress and in the electoral college, with access to the Federal courts upon the same terms as those enjoyed by other citizens of the Republic.

We, therefore, respectfully petition the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 12 and House Joint Resolution 461, both proposing a constitutional amendment empowering Congress to grant to residents of the District of Columbia representation in House, Senate, and electoral college, with the same rights before the Fed-

eral courts as are enjoyed by the residents of the States; and in support of this petition we submit the appended argument:

Theodore W. Noyes, chairman, Citizens' Joint Committee on District of Columbia National Representation; Edgar Morris, president, Board of Trade; Robert E. Buckley, president, District of Columbia Building and Loan League; Thos. E. Lodge, president, Federation of Citizens' Associations; Mrs. William Kittle, president, District of Columbia League of Women Voters; John Locher, president, Central Labor Union; Ford E. Young, president, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association; Ray H. Everett, president, Monday Evening Club; Walter M. Bastian, president, Bar Association; Jos. P. McCurdy, president, Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor; Theodore W. Noyes, president, Association of Oldest Inhabitants; William McK. Clayton, president, District Delegate Association; Evan H. Tucker, president, Northeast Washington Citizens' Association; F. Eliot Middleton, president, Washington Real Estate Board; Norman C. Kal, president, Advertising Club of Washington; Beatrice A. Clephane, president, Woman's Bar Association; Hazel Fenning, president, Twentieth Century Club; Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, president, Woman's City Club; Mrs. Lloyd W. Biddle, president, Federation of Women's Clubs; Fred A. Emery, president, Society of Natives of the District of Columbia; Mrs. Louis Ottenberg, president, Washington Section, National Council of Jewish Women; P. Julian Brylawski, president, Motion Picture Theater Owners' Association of the District of Columbia; E. Emerson Snyder, president, Associated Retail Credit Men of Washington, D. C.; Julian J. Chisolm, II, president, Washington Florists' Association; Elmer F. Neagle, president, District of Columbia Chapter, Rainbow Division Veterans; Clifford J. Cook, president, Hotel Greeters of America, Chapter 31; E. B. Woodruff, president, Newcomers Club; Ella C. Werner, president, Soroptimist Club; Thos. E. Lodge, chairman, Interfederation Conference; J. B. Dickman, Jr., president, Washingtonians; Edward H. Inman, department commander, Department of District of Columbia, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Joseph J. Malloy, department commander, Department of District of Columbia, American Legion; Amos E. McCalip, president, Federation of Business Men's Association of the District of Columbia; Raymond J. Walter, president, Young Democratic Clubs of the District of Columbia; John F. Costello, Democratic National Committeeman for the District of Columbia; E. H. Colladay, Republican National Committeeman for the District of Columbia; Gardner Jackson, president, Washington Branch, American Civil Liberties Union; Albert E. Conradis, president, Washington Junior Board of Commerce.

AMERICANIZE THE WASHINGTONIAN BY GRANT OF VOTING REPRESENTATION IN HOUSE, SENATE, AND ELECTORAL COLLEGE

ARGUMENT

The 486,869 Americans of the District of Columbia (1930 census) constitute the only community in all the expanse of the continental United States—populous, intelligent, public spirited, of adequate resources—which is denied representation in the National Government.

National representation is a distinctive basic right of the American citizen—in a government of the people, by the people, for the people—in a government which roots its justice in consent of the governed—in a representative government which inseparably couples taxation and arms bearing as a soldier with representation.

Since the 486,869 Americans of the District pay national taxes, obey national laws, and go to war in the Nation's defense, they are entitled on American principles to be represented in the National Government, which taxes them, which makes all laws for them, and which sends them to war.

In recognition and reaffirmation of the above-stated American principle we urge most earnestly the approval by Congress of House Joint Resolution No. 461 and Senate Joint Resolution No. 12, both proposing a constitutional amendment empowering Congress to grant representation in House, Senate, and Electoral College to residents of the District of Columbia.

We propose amendment of the Constitution of the United States by inserting at the end of section 3, article IV, the followng words:

"The Congress shall have power to admit to the status of citizens of a State the residents of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States created by article I, section 8, for the purpose of representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President, and for the purpose of suing and being sued in the courts of the United States under the provisions of article III, section 2.

"When the Congress shall exercise this power, the residents of such District shall be entitled to elect one or two Senators, as determined by the Congress, or such other representative in the Senate as Congress may provide for; Representatives in the House according to their numbers as determined by the decennial enumeration; and Presidential electors equal in number to their aggregate representation in the House and Senate, or as Congress may provide.

"The Congress shall provide by law the qualification of voters and the time and manner of choosing the Senator or Senators, the Representative or Representatives, and the electors herein authorized.

"The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing power."

We urge with confidence the approval by Congress of this amendment for these reasons:

First. Because we ask at this time merely that Congress shall be given a new constitutional power, without committing Congress as to when or how it shall exercise this power. We ask two-thirds of Congress to vote to give a majority of Congress a new power which harmonizes with and equitably rounds out the existing constitutional powers of Congress. No good reason can be assigned why Congress should not unanimously approve this proposal to enlarge on logical, wholesome lines its own powers.

Second. Because Congress, if and when in the future it shall exercise this power, will deservedly bestow upon the Americans of the District the highest privilege, right, and power of American national citizenship, and will relieve the Nation of the shame of un-American, totally nonrepresentative government in the Capital City, under the Nation's exclusive control, without disturbing in the least that exclusive control, without creating a new State, without altering the form of local municipal government, and without the surrender by Congress of a single power in respect to the Capital which it now possesses.

The Constitution as it stands either gives or empowers Congress to give national representation to the State and the Territory, or incipient States; in fact, to the whole area of the Republic except the seat of government, the National Capital. When the pending amendment is ratified the power of Congress to grant national representation will be rounded out and perfected and extended to every part of the Republic.

The District, with its 486,869 Americans, intelligent, public spirited, patriotic, is not merely the only area in the contiguous and continental United States which is without national representation and which does not participate in the National Government. It is also the only area in the whole expanse of the Republic to which Congress cannot extend the right of national representation.

This amendment corrects Congress' lack of power. It does not correct the District's lack of power. It empowers Congress to grant this national representation, and does not direct it or fix any time limitation within which the power must be exercised.

Why should any Congressman vote against giving Congress this new power? The power asked is not to commit a crime or a misdemeanor, or to do an injury, but to extend an equitable American right, and to harmonize and reconcile two great American principles—first, the principle that in our representative Republic, subject to limitations and conditions uniformly applied, all national Americans ought to have the opportunity to participate in the National Government which taxes them, makes laws for them, and sends them and their sons to war; and, second, the principle laid down by the forefathers as a national necessity that the Nation, through Congress, should have exclusive control of the Nation's Capital.

We think we can convince you that the District of today, with its 486,869 Americans, is in resources, population, intelligence, and patriotic Americanism, so well equipped that if Congress had now the power which we ask for it to grant District national representation, it could safely and wisely exercise that power at once.

But assuming that there are some Senators or some Representatives who are not yet convinced, who are not entirely satisfied that in resources and in population the District is today fully fit for national representation, they ought not on that account to vote against our amendment, for it is to be noted that they are not asked in voting for the amendment to declare that the District is now fit for such representation, but only that they empower themselves to grant such representation when in their judgment the District has become thus fitted.

And so we say that to deny or vote against our amendment is to declare not merely that the District is not now fit for representation, but that the defective and delinquent residents of the District will never become thus fitted, though the District multiply its resources and a population of a million or more be collected in it.

To vote for this amendment commits Congress to nothing. To vote against this amendment is a denial of the possibility of District representation, even though the District attain the resources and population and the other requisites of statehood which make it surpass a dozen of the States.

So even those who doubt whether the District will ever be fit for national representation should not vote against this amendment. Give the District a sporting, fighting, American chance at national representation. In our Republic majorities govern. Amend the Constitution so that a majority of Congress may, if it wishes, in the future, when it is convinced of the fitness of the District, give national representation to District residents. Give the people of the seat of government the same possibility of national representation that Hawaii and Alaska now possess.

Why should any Senator or Representative vote against an amendment which merely enlarges an existing power of Congress on equitable and wholesome lines, and which simply empowers Congress to remedy a political inequity whenever, if ever, it is disposed to do so? Why should Congress oppose the grant to itself of any new constitutional power with which those affected are ready to trust it? Surely Congress does not mistrust itself.

We seek national representation as a distinctive basic right of the American citizen—in a government of the people, by the people, for the people—in a government which roots its justice in consent of the governed—in a representative government which inseparably couples taxation and arms-bearing as a soldier with representation.

So far as we 486,869 residents of the District are concerned, the American Government is not a government of all the people by all the people. It is a government of all the people by a part of the people. The 486,869 District residents are among the people who are governed, but not among the people who govern.

The 486,869 Americans of the District do not give their consent to their National Government through elected representatives in accordance with American principles like all other Americans of the continental and contiguous United States.

In respect to the 486,869 Americans of the District, representation is divorced from taxation and soldier service. We bear all the national burdens of citizens of a State in national taxes, in subjection to national laws, and as national soldiers sent to war. In genuine representative government, rights and obligations are inseparably wedded. We meet fully the national obligation. We bear cheerfully our share of the national burden. We are entitled to all vital national rights and privileges.

We are meeting the same national obligation as Americans who are citizens of a State.

In the recent days of exalted Americanism Washingtonians were in the front rank of devoted Americans. They have ever been foremost when Americanism meant loss instead of benefit; when to be Americans meant to place both sacrifice of treasure and blood sacrifice upon the Nation's altar.

Washingtonians have paid their proportion of every national tax, direct or indirect, from the birth of the Nation. The only national taxes that fall directly and in ascertainable amounts upon the Americans are the internal-revenue taxes, including the excise and income taxes. In the fiscal year 1934–35 the District of Columbia contributed to these taxes $12,638,144, exceeding 23 of the States, though it exceeded in population only 8 of them. Its contribution was greater than those of 9 of the States combined.

Washingtonians have risked life and shed their blood in every national war. To preserve the Union the first volunteers came from the Capital, and Washingtonians supplied a greater percentage of troops in excess of their quota than nearly every State in the Union. In the War with Spain they sent to Cuba a fine regiment, exceeding their quota in numbers. The same response was made when the summons to the Mexican border came. At that time the percentage of men of military age enrolled in the Organized Militia was greater in the District than in any State of the Union. Washington sent more soldiers to the border than 22 of the States.

In the World War no other American community responded more enthusiastically and effectively to the call to arms and universal service. They were eager volunteers of money for war through the Red Cross and other agencies and of personal service through enlistment in Army, Navy, National Guard, or Home Defense League. They showed patriotic readiness to bear the burden of conscription, whether in the shape of taxes imposed on lines which caused the District of Columbia (1918–19) to contribute more than any one of 15 of the States and more than 5 of the States combined; or in the shape of universal personal service and the selective draft.

In the war with Germany the District of Columbia has made a record of which the Nation should be proud. The total voluntary enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps for the District was 8,314, a number greater than that in 7 States, namely, Nevada, Delaware, Arizona, Wyoming, Vermont, New Mexico, and New Hampshire, and only a trifle less than 3 other States. The number of men inducted into the Army under the first and second registrations was 9,631, making a total of voluntary enlistments and inductions into the service of the Government of 17,945. In other words, the percentage of voluntary enlistments was 46.33 percent of the total inductions into the service.

The proportion which the voluntary enlistments bear to the total number of enlistments and inductions by way of registration was greater for the District of Columbia than for every State of the Union except Rhode Island, Oregon, Washington, California, and Maine, and more than one-third greater than the percentage for the country as a whole.

To every demand of devotion and self-sacrifice made upon Americans, Washington has rendered, is rendering, and will always render full, hearty, and unstinted response.

In notable particulars we are deprived of the rights and privileges of Americans who are citizens of a State.

As a suitor in the courts of the United States the District resident has, the Supreme Court says, a lower standing than an alien.

In relation to national laws the sole function of the District residents is to obey. They take no part in making the laws which they must obey.

In relation to national taxes their sole function is to pay. They have nothing to say, like other taxpayers, concerning the amount and kind of taxes they shall pay and how the tax money shall be spent.

In relation to national war their sole function is to fight in obedience to command. They have no voice, like other Americans, in the councils which determine war or peace. They have no representation in the Government which requires them to fight, bleed, and perhaps to die.

Since the 486,869 Americans of the District pay national taxes, obey national laws, and go to war in the Nation's defense, they are entitled on American principles to be represented in the National Government, which taxes them, which makes all laws for them, and which sends them to war.

The favorable report of the Senate District Committee in 1922 admirably summarizes the characteristics of our proposed amendment when it says:

"Summarizing, we find and report:

"The proposed constitutional amendment does not reduce the power of Congress in respect to the Capital, but adds a new power; it does not propose the admission of the District into the Union as a sovereign State; it does not propose the destruction of the 'ten miles square' provision of the Constitution; it does not lessen in the smallest degree the control by the Nation through Congress of what remains of the 'ten miles square'; it does not disturb in any way the financial relation of Nation and Capital; it is not based upon either the abolition or retention of the half-and-half law; it does not propose or involve changes in the municipal government of the District.

"It plans to bestow upon the 486,869 Americans of the District a distinctive basic right of the American citizen—in a government of the people, by the people, for the people—in a government which roots its justice in consent of the governed—in a representative government which inseparably couples taxation and arms-bearing as a soldier with representation.

"This distinctive American privilege decorates the American with a badge of honor and arms him with power. Its lack slurs the Washingtonian as unfit and defective, and slurs the Nation as in this respect un-American and impotent.

"What the amendment proposes is equitable in itself and compulsory in accordance with American principles and traditions.

"It gives to residents of the District rights and privileges which, under our scheme of government, belong to all who pay national taxes and fight as national soldiers.

"It gives to residents of the District a self-protecting power in the national councils which is denied to the resident of no other community in all of the mainland and contiguous United States from Maine to Texas and from New York to California.

"In the matter of access to the Federal courts it raises District residents from a lower plane than that of aliens to the status of citizens of a State.

"National representation of the District will remove from the Nation the shame of impotency.

"It will proclaim to the world that the great Republic is as devoted to the principles of representative government and as capable of enforcing them as other republics with capitals in nation-controlled districts, like Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina. These nations have not found themselves impotent to give full national representation to the people of their capitals.

"It will proclaim to the world that the people of Washington are as fit to participate in national representative government as the people of Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires, and Mexico City. Washington will cease to be the only capital in all the world whose people, slurred as tainted or defective, are unworthy to enjoy the same national representation as that enjoyed by all other cities of the Nation.

"Washington will cease to be the only American community—numerous, intelligent, prosperous, public spirited, and patriotic—in all the expanse of continental and contiguous United States whose fitness to exercise national privileges as well as to bear national burdens is denied.

"National representation will clothe the Washingtonian with a vital American privilege to which he is undeniably in equity entitled, will cleanse him of the stigma and stain of un-Americanism, and, curing his political impotency, will arm him with a certain power.

"It will relieve the Nation of the shame of un-Americanism at its heart and of impotency to cure this evil.

"It will inflict no injury or hardship upon either Nation or Capital to counteract these benefits."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (S. 4370) to repeal a proviso relating to teaching or advocating communism in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and appearing in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2126) thereon.

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7025) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to furnish transportation to persons in the service of the United States in the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2127) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bill and joint resolution, reported them each with amendments and submitted a report thereon as indicated:

S. 4528. A bill to regulate the conduct of elections in Puerto Rico; and

S. J. Res. 270. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a committee to study the question of Puerto Rican independence (Rept. No. 2128).

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1392) to extend the provisions of certain laws to the island of Puerto Rico, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 2130) thereon.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 4352) to provide for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma at Clinton, Okla., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2129) thereon.

Mr. BURKE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 377) to enable the States of Maine, New Hampshire, New York, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, and Ohio to conserve and regulate the flow of and purify the waters of rivers and streams whose drainage basins lie within two or more of the said States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2133) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11140) to provide more effectively for the national defense by further increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 2131) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 4709. A bill authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Delaware River between points in the village of Barryville, Sullivan County, N. Y., and the village of Shohola, Pike County, Pa. (Rept. No. 2136); and

S. 4710. A bill authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the West Branch of the Delaware River between a point in the vicinity of the village of Hancock, Delaware County, N. Y., and a point in the town of Buckingham, Wayne County, Pa. (Rept. No. 2137).

Mr. AUSTIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10785) for the relief of John B. H. Waring, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2132) thereon.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4293) for the relief of George W. Middleton, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 2144) thereon.

Mrs. LONG, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2501) for the relief of Mrs. G. A. Brannan, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2134) thereon.

She also, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5368) to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chalmette National Monument in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 2135) thereon.

Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 4581. A bill authorizing the payment of certain salaries and expenses of employees of the General Land Office (Rept. No. 2138);

S. 4707. A bill for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in Harding town site, Florida, and for the relief of the heirs of Lewis G. Norton (Rept. No. 2139); and

H. R. 7930. A bill to eliminate certain lands from the Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho (Rept. No. 2140).

Mr. WAGNER also, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 4393. A bill to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Snoqualmie National Forest, in the State of Washington (Rept. No. 2141);

H. R. 11791. A bill to make available for national-park purposes certain lands within the area of the proposed Mammoth Cave National Park, Ky. (Rept. No. 2142); and

H. R. 12220. A bill to authorize the adjustment of the boundary of the Fort Marion National Monument, Florida, in the vicinity of Fort Marion Circle, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2143).

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 465) to amend the joint resolution of July 18, 1935, relating to the Seventieth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in the District of Columbia in September 1936, reported it without amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the following bill and joint resolution, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 4616. A bill for the relief of G. A. Trotter (Rept. No. 2145); and

H. J. Res. 415. A joint resolution to carry out the intention of Congress with reference to the claims of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota against the United States (Rept. No. 2146).

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, also from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4152) validating certain conveyances by Kickapoo Indians of Oklahoma, made prior to February 17, 1933, providing for actions in partition in certain cases, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 2147) thereon.

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. L. 807), reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 2148) thereon.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE RECEIVERSHIP AND BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS, ETC.

Mr. McADOO, from the Special Committee to Investigate Receivership and Bankruptcy Proceedings and the Administration of Justice in United States Courts, submitted a preliminary report (accompanied by hearings held before the special committee) relative to the activities of the committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 78, Seventy-third Congress, and Senate Resolutions 72 and 170, Seventy-fourth Congress, which was ordered to be printed as Senate Report No. 2125.

AMENDMENT OF SEAMEN'S ACT

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I desire to report from the Committee on Commerce a substitute for order of business on the calendar 2163, being the bill (H. R. 8597) to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea"; to maintain discipline on shipboard; and for other purposes.

We found defects and mistakes in the original report, and I am instructed by the committee to present a substitute for the bill now on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be substituted for the one now on the calendar.

PRINTING REVISED EDITION OF SENATE RULES

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 303, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 303), which had been reported by Mr. NEELY from the Committee on Rules on the 21st instant, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and that 1,700 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,200 copies shall be for the Senate, 200 copies for the use of the Committee on Rules, and the remaining 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

PRINTING OF TAX HEARINGS BEFORE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 305, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 305), submitted by Mr. KING (for Mr. HARRISON) on the 26th instant, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Finance of the Senate be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the said committee during the current session on the bill the Revenue Act of 1936.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO COTTON COOPERATIVES

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment Senate Concurrent Resolution 39, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39), submitted by Mr. MCKELLAR on the 15th instant, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the subcommittee of said committee of the Senate during the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, pursuant to the resolution (S. Res. 185) authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to conduct an investigation of the expenditures by the Federal Government for the cotton cooperatives, etc. These 2,000 copies are to be divided as follows: Fifteen hundred copies of volume no. 1 and 500 copies of volume no. 2.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on 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, 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 numbered (8).

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered (1) (4) (5) (6) (7) (9) (10) (11) (12) and (13); and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered (2), and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$14,000,000"; 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 "$14,000,000"; 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: By substituting in lieu of said amendment 14 the following:

"SEC. 10. (a) That all taxes levied by any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia upon sales of gasoline and other motor-vehicle fuels may be levied, in the same manner and to the same extent, upon such fuels when sold by or through post exchanges, ship stores, ship-service stores, commissaries, filling stations, licensed traders, and other similar agencies, located on United States military or other reservations, when such fuels are not for the exclusive use of the United States. Such taxes, so levied, shall be paid to the proper taxing authorities of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, within whose borders the reservation affected may be located.

"(b) The officer in charge of such reservation shall, on or before the fifteenth day of each month, submit a written statement to the proper taxing authorities of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia within whose borders the reservation is located showing the amount of such motor fuels not sold for the exclusive use of the United States during the preceding month."

And the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
LYNN J. FRAZIER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
LINDSAY C. WARREN,
WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON,
JESSE P. WALCOTT,
(except as to amendment no. 5),
C. MURRAY TURPIN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on May 27, 1936, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 209) authorizing the presentation of silver medals to the personnel of the Second Byrd Antarctic Expedition.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 4714) to complete the Point Pleasant Battle Monument, Point Pleasant, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McADOO:

A bill (S. 4715) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Carter, parents and guardians of Louise Marie Carter, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK:

A bill (S. 4716) for the relief of Daniel B. Meador (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4717) for the relief of Auguste C. Rabenau; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

A bill (S. 4718) to authorize the award of a decoration for distinguished service to William M. E. Hess; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 4719) for the relief of the Bridgeport Irrigation District; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BYRD:

A bill (S. 4720) to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936; to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide that its benefits shall not accrue to any alien in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

A bill (S. 4721) to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide that its benefits shall not accrue to any alien illegally in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4722) to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 277) to investigate corporations engaged in the manufacture, sale, or distribution of agricultural implements and machinery; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 278) to modify and extend the act entitled "An act to include sugar beets and sugar cane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Ad-

justment Act, and for other purposes", approved May 9, 1934, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and ordered to lie on the table or referred as indicated:

H. R. 8442. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes; to the table.

H. J. Res. 589. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12395) to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ASHURST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 12624, the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1936, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 6, line 3, to insert the following:

"UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For carrying out the provisions of the public resolution entitled 'A joint resolution to enable the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans, and for other purposes', approved ———, 1936, $200,000, to remain available until expended."

REPORT OF COUNSEL, SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE RECEIVERSHIP AND BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS, ETC.

Mr. McADOO submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 308), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the report of Percival E. Jackson, the legal counsel in New York, submitted to the special committee of the Senate appointed to make an investigation of the administration of bankruptcy and receivership proceedings and the administration of justice in the United States courts, be printed as a document.

BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE BIRTH OF PATRICK HENRY

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, there has just been sent to the Senate from the House of Representatives a bill passed by the House authorizing an appropriation of $10,000 to aid in the celebration of the birth of Patrick Henry. I should like to have the bill acted on now in order that an appropriation may be provided in the deficiency bill. That cannot be done unless we take this action, and the appropriation would not be available until after the date of the celebration if the item were not included in the pending deficiency bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 12870) to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936, was read twice by its title.

Mr. GLASS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill at this time.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider House bill 12870.

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

COLLECTION OF REVENUE FROM INTOXICATING LIQUORS—ADDITIONAL SENATE CONFEREES

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the bill (H. R. 9185) to insure the collection of the revenue on intoxicating liquor, to provide for the more efficient and economical administration and enforcement of the laws relating to the taxation of intoxicating liquor, and for other purposes, is in conference. A number of conferees have been appointed by the House, and three conferees have been appointed by the Senate. I ask that two more Members be added to the Senate conferees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair appoints the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] as additional conferees on the part of the Senate.

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BORAH

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, last evening the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System an able, instructive, and statesmanlike address dealing with the current political situation in the country. I ask unanimous consent that his address may be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

Ladies and gentlemen, no extensive contact with the voters of this country is necessary to convince one that the bitter experience through which the American electorate has passed in recent years has left its deep impress upon their hearts and minds. One reaches this conclusion even from a limited opportunity to see them and to hear them and from the deluge of mail coming to one's desk. I feel that this is one contest in which that which the voter thinks he will record by his ballot. There are always some who will be controlled by mere partisan feelings, some by the sinister influence of political machines, but when jobs and homes and farms and families are in the balance we may anticipate with what sincerity of purpose this high duty of the citizen will be discharged. The people are not always right, but it is a comforting fact to those who pin their faith to constitutional government, after debate and time for reflection, as American history amply proves, that, in their final judgment, they are seldom wrong. They have heard much debate. They will hear more. They have had many sad years in which to reflect on all matters pertaining to their interests—to them this election is something more than a mere party contest, and they constitute a tribunal from which there is no appeal. There are some whose conception of party loyalty will probably cause them to doubt my sincerity when I say I want to see the cause of the Republican Party placed before this tribunal in a way best calculated to win its approval. I may be in error as to the best way, but I hope to give ample proof that I believe in that way. No one familiar with the situation, as indicated by the poll books in the different States, can doubt that the party has reached a crisis in its history where "flattery and falsehood can no longer deceive and simplicity itself can no longer be misled."

In speaking of the position of the party with reference to public questions, as I do in the following remarks, it is not my view that its position can be determined, or even fully defined, by the platform alone. In this campaign, extraordinary as it undoubtedly will be in all its phases, the candidates of the respective parties will be the platforms. We shall find, in my opinion, the people will accept no other. It is undoubtedly right and proper and according to old custom to make platforms. But these platforms have no high standing at the present time in the minds of the American people. After all is said and done in this respect, the position of the party and the possibilities of success will be determined by the candidates. The old school of military leaders conceded that Napoleon was winning all the battles, but insisted he was violating all the established rules of military science in doing so. The tactics of the winner of victories were born of his own fertile and restless brain as he maneuvered in sight of the enemy. As seldom before, this campaign will be a campaign of candidates, and the attitude of the party on public questions can only be fully known when both platform and candidates are fully known and understood.

Owing to the situation in Europe, I feel justified in saying something about our foreign policy. This country needs peace; above all things, it needs peace. Without peace we cannot hope to adjust our domestic affairs. The nearest approach to a practical guaranty of peace for the people of this country is to remain wholly aloof from any and all foreign controversies or political commitments. No wiser words ever fell from human lips touching this subject than from those of Thomas Jefferson: "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." In spite of all the propaganda manufactured at home or abroad, in spite of all the sophistry of learned, or, rather, I should say, educated men, the policy enunciated in these words is as applicable to world conditions and as vital to the peace and happiness of the American people at the present hour as when the policy was announced. The Republican Party has trifled a long time with the question of surrendering our traditional foreign policy and all to its utter discredit. It has had neither the courage to wholly reject nor to wholly defend this policy—invaluable to the welfare of the American people and indispensable to the perpetuity of American institutions. It was the boast of Roman epicures that they could at one and the same time and in the same vessel roast half the pig and boil the other half. How palatable was the dish we do not know.

But the meal which our political epicures have dished up for the American people on this vital question of our foreign policy, half international and half American, is a mess. It is to be hoped that the position of the party will no longer be left in doubt, and that

all schemes, with whatever plausible pretense presented, designed to draw us into foreign controversies and foreign wars, will be put at rest. We want no part in any foreign wars. We want to devote the energy and patriotism of our own people to our own problems at home. I am particular to stress this matter, since we are advised that the League is to be remodeled with a view of inducing the United States to become a member. No league, no legal department of the League, euphoniously called the Court, no subtle, shadowy deception under the name of peace, calculated to involve us in foreign matters, can be anything but detrimental, and even dangerous, to the American people.

Undoubtedly important questions relating to government and the integrity of our Constitution will be debated before the voters during the coming campaign. There are those who seem to feel that these questions will be a determining factor in the coming election. I hope that anything I may say upon this subject will not leave an impression with you that I do not fully appreciate the importance of all questions which relate to the preservation of constitutional government in all its integrity. That subject is one to which I all too readily recur when it is up for consideration. I have expressed myself so often upon this phase of current happenings that even my severest critics understand and sometimes concede the correctness of my view. But we ought not to forget—indeed, we will not be permitted to forget—in this campaign that to the destitute share-cropper of the South, to the jobless millions in the North, to all who still live by help of the Government, to the farmer wrestling with his debts and taxes in the shadow of a threatened diminishing market, to independent business everywhere, to men and women all over the land, in business or in the professions, anxious to know how long they can carry the ever-increasing burdens of government—city, State, and National—to all these, debates over constitutional government and the integrity of the courts may seem strangely remote from their personal problems. No intelligent and effective presentation of the problems of maintaining our free institutions can be presented in this campaign or, in my opinion, at any time unaccompanied by an effective proposal which will relieve the citizen of his personal problems.

In the modern world social and economic problems are inextricably intertwined with all questions of government. If it was ever true in the world, and it has always been true, that economic and political freedem go hand in hand, it is true now. If we are not prepared as a party to strike down monopoly and price fixing and all monopolistic practices, to take this action in order that men may enjoy economic freedom, that purchasing power may be restored to the masses, the answer to the farmer hunting for a market and labor hunting for a job, if we are not prepared to deal with this issue, which means bread and clothing and opportunity to millions, we will get nowhere with the discussion of political liberty or of constitutional government as a campaign issue. These social and economic problems are bound up not only in the open field of endeavor but also in the hearts and minds of the people with the questions of government. It is so elsewhere. It is no different under our own flag.

We have witnessed in our own generation the effect of social unrest and economic distress upon government to an extent that we ought not to be indifferent to the effect of these things at home. The swift, incredible change in Russia, culminating in the Soviet regime; the Fascist coup in Italy, establishing a plutocratic government; the successive revolutions in Germany, a most conservative people, leading at last to Nazi Hitlerism, full of unsolved political riddles; these things cannot be wholly ignored when we are discussing the relation of social questions to government. I am neither prophesying nor defending revolution. I am saying that in the modern world social and economic problems are associated in the popular mind with the wisdom and efficiency of any form of government, republican or autocratic.

If one-quarter of 1 percent of all the corporations in the United States, as they have and do, control one-half of all corporate wealth and fix prices on many of the most essential things in our daily living, then, as to the most vital things in life, the means and standard of living, concentration of economic power is already established, and, if continued, concentration of governmental power to meet the situation will inevitably follow. Will we long, as a people, be able to maintain a situation under a Constitution which declares you may not fix prices on the farm or in the home because of State lines, but private corporate interests may fix prices throughout the entire country regardless of State lines? I mention these things, not to carry forward a discussion which might be supported by a multitude of facts equally applicable but to indicate my belief that underlying any and all questions touching the preservation of constitutional democracy are the economic problems which are now undermining democracy.

When the National Recovery Act, now held unconstitutional, was proposed, it was supported almost by the entire Nation, by 90 percent of the press, by an overwhelming majority of Congress, by the Executive. It is believed now that had this law become permanent it would have wrought fundamental changes in our form of government. Only five men stood in the way of its permanent adoption. Behind this measure at the time—and which alone made it possible—was business chaos, hunger, and threatened starvation. Something had to be done. How near we were to a most fundamental change in our whole constitutional structure! And why were we so near—because of economic and financial conditions that had become intolerable? What brought about these conditions? It was an economic and financial set-up that reduced one-half of our people to the ragged edge of want.

Ten years had gone by since the war. Our national income was over eighty billion. Neither drought nor famine had visited our people. Yet something was basically wrong. Monopolistic greed had robbed millions of a decent living or even an opportunity to make a decent living. All of this reacted upon the most fundamental principles of constitutional government and with practical approval of the entire Nation. No government can indefinitely withstand the attrition or the eternal urge of hunger or economic distress. When we take our constitutional problems to the voters we must be prepared to tell them how we propose to deal with the conditions, and the only conditions, which really imperil constitutional government. With anything like economic justice in this country, this Government and the great principles upon which it rests are not in the slightest danger of fundamental change.

On my desk is a letter from an independent oil company which says: "The Standard Oil and four other companies are out to secure the monopoly of the world's oil production. They have it now in the United States. We who are known as independents are permitted now to follow the oil business with the grace of the Standard Oil Co. and its associates." These oil companies, or some of them, have been extremely active in this preconvention campaign. Their representatives will sit in the convention. Some of us shall be interested to know where they throw their influence. If the Republican Party can find no way to control the economic power which these companies exert upon every person in the land, regardless of State lines, shall we hope to make effective with the voters our argument that State rights under the Constitution must be maintained? These oil companies are now, as private corporations, exerting a power over the private citizen in the respective States which the Constitution has declared the Government does not possess.

The Supreme Court has declared the Federal Government has no power to control production nor any way to affect farm prices on the farm. That, it is declared, is a matter with which the States alone may deal. But five corporations, in no wise hindered by State lines, may, and do, control production and affect farm prices by fixing prices on the implements without which production cannot go forward. What the Government may not do affirmatively, or negatively, may not do for want of power, private corporations are permitted to do regardless of State lines or State rights.

There are no State lines and no State rights and no private rights apparently as against the practices and exploitation of combines and monopolies. As to them this is one vast consolidated empire, the richest prey that human greed ever seized upon. They sweep across State lines, defy State sovereignty, and undermine and destroy the prosperity of the citizen upon which the whole State rests. They shut the door of opportunity to millions and fix the prices that every housewife in the State must pay to maintain the family. The Federal Government cannot send an agent within the State to interfere, either for weal or woe, with the daily affairs of the people, and upon such principle alone can a Federal union endure. But we cannot long maintain a government with 48 States for purposes of government and an empire for purposes of exploitation. If we are to repossess the confidence of the people of this country, we must advise them in no uncertain terms what we are going to do about it, and do it. This Government was made for, and can be adapted only to, free men and free women, men and women with equal opportunities in life, with freedom to choose an avocation, or profession, and pursue it under general, just, and equal laws, and regimentation, private or public, means inevitably a change in the whole structure of government. Our Government will not work under either scheme.

This depression was something more than an economic breakdown. It was also a warning—a warning that an economic set-up which leaves one-half the Nation, in the midst of vast plenty, with the bare necessities of life is compatible neither with sound economics nor free government. What is the party going to do about it? Will it, under the malign influence of organization politics backed by corporate and monopolistic interests, disregard this question or seek to circumvent straight and effective action? Or will it meet it in the open?

The high place in the counsels of the party which corporate and monopolistic interests have long occupied is known to all the world. At one time these influences were challenged by a great Republican leader. They have again been able, however, to bring about a condition where the supreme party problem is this: Can and will the party drive these forces from its councils, disregard their satellites, and break their grip upon its policies and its deeds? If we are in this respect prepared to disregard the supreme interests of the people, it will be vain during the campaign to discuss constitutional questions and the validity of constitutional government or to offer direct insult to the people's understanding by telling them we are not able to protect them. The party has paid dearly for the demoralizing presence of these influences. At the beginning of this great campaign it is enjoying less power in national affairs than at any time in its history. In the name of the people and in the name of the party, the time is ripe for an accounting and a dissolution of the partnership.

Recently I received a letter from a distinguished person, in which he said: "Why keep up this fight against monopoly? You cannot win. Assuming you are right, you cannot succeed. The forces against you are stronger than you have any idea." Let us not be so sure we cannot win. Public opinion can do anything in this country. And public opinion, like the great Mississippi, may have its source among the pebbles.

In 1856, in a speech in Chicago, Abraham Lincoln declared: "Our Government rests in public opinion. Whoever can change public opinion on any subject can change the Government." We can all contribute our part, however small, to forming public

opinion. At the time this declaration was made the slave power was in control of the Government, from the bootblack on the steps of the Capitol to the Supreme Court of the United States. Eight years later public opinion had changed the whole situation, and the same slave power was on the brink of ruin. There was a time when the Republican Party was the most aggressive, progressive political organization in the history of party politics. But the insidious, deadening coils of monopolistic and corporate interests drained away its energy, its courage, hindering and embarrassing every effort within the party to meet the pressing problems of social justice, until today it is fighting for its very life. Public opinion can and will right these wrongs. It may not be today or tomorrow, but it is as inevitable as truth and justice. It is my hope that we will within a few days take a decisive step to separate the party from this body of death and reinaugurate, as Lincoln said in the same speech, "the good old central ideas and ideals of the Republic." No one need tell me that this great wrong may not be made to bend to the public will. A great political party, united and determined, can direct the public will to consummate victory.

The preconvention Republican campaign may or may not have determined the strength of the respective candidates for the Presidency. So far as I am individually concerned, that is and has been at all times a secondary proposition. But it has revealed beyond doubt that millions of men and women who have heretofore believed in and supported the party have registered their votes elsewhere, and at this time propose to cast them elsewhere. The combined vote or showing of all the candidates discloses but a remnant of that strength which the party has in previous campaigns displayed. The voters will tell you, and they do tell you, wherever you go throughout the country, to an extent as depressing as it is alarming, that they no longer accept or believe in the political views or the economic theories of the dominating influences of the party. The registration books, even in hitherto Republican strongholds, confirm these private statements. The supreme question is, How to repossess their confidence and to secure their support?

Talk to the farmer, to the independent businessman, to labor, and to the people generally, and they will tell you: "We are not satisfied with this or that, but we are not going back to the old conditions." You may speak of a balanced Budget and they will approve. You may speak of waste, of taxes, and debts, and the manner in which relief is being administered, and to all these things they may seriously object. But they will tell you, "We are not going back."

An effort is being made to convince the people that to vote for the Republican Party does not mean we are going back. But that depends. If the men who have dominated the party in recent years and who are seeking to dominate it still continue to control the party, it is a challenge to the common sense of the voters of the country to tell them we are not going back in case we are given power. We will go back. They do not know anywhere else to go.

Why is this fight being made by Mr. Hilles, Mr. Roraback, Mr. Schorr, and Mr. Brown, and the powerful financial and corporate interests behind them, except for the very purpose of going back? That is their great objective. Has anyone a right to assume that they have changed their political views or policies? On the contrary, we know that they have not. And if they have not, is there a single principle or tenet to be found in their whole political creed to which the average man or woman can pin his or her faith or rest a single hope for the future? The Republican Party has met more than one crisis in its history. It has held more than one convention of tremendous moment. But it has never met a crisis nor held a convention of greater moment than the one which will convene in a few days at Cleveland.

So far as I am personally concerned, there is nothing the convention may do, no action it may take, which will leave its impress upon me 1 hour after it shall have finally closed its doors. I have sought to make this plain from the beginning. But believing as I do, that the suffering of millions of American people during recent years is to be attributed in major part to the remorseless exactions of monopoly, believing as I do it is this which is imperiling our whole vast fabric of free government, its Constitution, and its courts, and the liberty of the people, the attitude of the party on this question, as evidenced by its platform and its candidate, must transcend all matters of a personal nature. I have watched the growth of monopoly and called attention to its effect for many, many years. The evidence is now all about us. We cannot be uninformed as to the situation. What the party does under present conditions, therefore, I must regard as final.

My friends, in conclusion, I venture to say that there is a political creed lying about in the hearts and minds of the American people which some political party will yet gather up and adopt. And when it does it will sweep the country. It is the creed of simple, sincere, loyal Americanism—the Americanism which covets the friendship of all nations, eager for advancement and progress in all things, capable of grasping and applying the highest conceptions of the human mind, and gathering the richest fruits of civilization, but always acting upon and within true and sound American principles. Saddened and tormented by a war which was none of their own, disheartened and impoverished by years of economic distress through no fault of theirs, baffled and confused by the constant narrowing of their rights and privileges, resentful as they see the opportunities of life more and more controlled by great economic power, there is, in my opinion, a rekindling among the people of the old-fashioned faith in American principles and an increasing belief in the American way and in the whole scheme of American life. There lies our great hope.

ARRIVAL OF THE POLISH SHIP "BATORY"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at Hoboken, N. J., last night by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] in honor of the arrival of the Polish ship *Batory*.

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

In Lafayette Park, in the center of Washington, stands a beautiful monument erected to the memory of that great Polish soldier, Kosciusko.

Another monument, erected to the memory of Count Pulaski, stands by the principal thoroughfare of this Nation's Capital.

These monuments commemorate the heroic sacrifices which were made by these great men for a nation yet unborn.

They also express the gratitude of that nation, grown great, for their aid in its hour of need.

The supreme sacrifice of Pulaski and the heroic conduct of Kosciusko cemented a friendship between two great peoples that has endured for more than a century and a half.

The end of the Great War saw the rebirth of Poland.

It was fitting, remembering the deeds of Kosciusko and Pulaski, that our wartime President should have contributed to the reunion of the Polish people.

It is equally fitting that this first maritime venture of the new Poland should join the shores of these ancient friends. We celebrate tonight the second step in the achievement of a worthy ambition of this new-old nation.

The arrival of the *Pilsudski* some months ago and now the *Batory* express the firm determination of the Polish people to resume an honor place among maritime nations.

This, therefore, is not a new venture on untried waters for our Polish friends.

We commemorate tonight a return to the sea by a people with a long and honored record of achievements in maritime affairs.

Indeed, this vessel, in which we dine tonight, bears the name of a Polish king who inaugurated three centuries of sea experience for his people.

He built a great port upon the Vistula and created a merchant fleet to carry abroad Polish products under the Polish flag.

That period of sea power is just as dear to the memory of the Polish people is as the period of the clipper ships to the memory of every American.

The ambition of the Polish Nation to have an outlet to the sea was therefore not a thing born overnight. It had its roots in memories that were centuries old. It was a part of the nation itself and was re-created with the nation.

When the peace treaty created the Polish Corrider, the will to build a great port and a new merchant fleet was already in existence.

It was an inheritance handed down from generation to generation.

As a result, the port of Gdynia and the Gdynia-American Line became realities with a rapidity that has astonished the world.

This beautiful ship, the *Batory*, came from a port that had no existence but yesterday.

Already it boasts of great docks and warehouses to handle its commerce, and spacious business buildings and beautiful homes to house its 50,000 inhabitants.

Thousands of ships visit its piers carrying annually over 7,000,000 tons of freight into and out of Poland and its neighbors to the southward.

Some of these vessels fly the American flag and carry thousands of tons of cargo to and from American shores.

We take pride, tonight, in having assisted in the upbuilding of this great new port, both with our ships and our products.

Ever since I was a boy I have had profound respect and admiration for the Polish people and have been in sympathy with their aspirations for their own beloved country.

This feeling on my part arose during my youth when I read my first great historical novel, Thaddeus of Warsaw. The impression I received from reading that story of Polish heroism and patriotism has always remained with me.

Moreover, in my own State of Pennsylvania we number thousands of Polish-American citizens, and I am proud to say that many of these fine people are my personal friends.

They are splendid citizens, and our State of Pennsylvania is proud to have them; and I am sure they join with me in wishing every success to this national venture which we commemorate tonight.

In welcoming the *Batory* to our shores, we renew old friendships and associations.

At the same time we give expression to new hopes and aspirations both for our friends and for ourselves.

Like the Polish people, we of America have sea traditions of which we are very proud, and we have ambitions for greater achievements in ocean transportation and commerce.

We welcome your Polish vessels as friendly rivals for our trade, and we feel assured our vessels will be welcomed in the same spirit when they seek cargoes in the ports of Poland.

May I wish the management of the Gdynia-American Line the success their great efforts merit, and the officers and crew of the

Batory a happy stay in America and a pleasant voyage back to the homeland. May there be many prosperous voyages of this ship and other Polish ships to and from America.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, line 24, after the word "farmers", it is proposed to insert the words "and livestock growers."

REGULATION OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have the floor, and was simply awaiting the attention of the Chair.

Yesterday on account of the unavoidable absence of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] the unfinished business was temporarily laid aside. In a colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] I consented to that order on account of the absence of the Senator from South Carolina. I observe he is present this morning. Therefore I think the Senate should dispose of the unfinished business, the commodities exchange bill, and I now ask for the regular order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6772) to amend the Grain Futures Act to prevent and remove obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in grains and other commodities by regulating transactions therein on commodity-futures exchanges, to limit or abolish short selling, to curb manipulation, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on account of a minor but unpleasant illness, which I had no power to avert, it was impossible for me to be here yesterday, and because of my physical condition I should not be here today; but for fear of the possible attitude of some generous and philanthropic people throughout the country, I was afraid the situation might be misunderstood, and hence I am here.

Mr. President, it was significant that the Senators, both Republican and Democratic, who attended the hearings were in favor of the amendments proposed. Those who were not present, of course, were more or less amenable to certain influences and gave the benefit of the doubt to the insistent and far-flung propaganda. But one's opinion of the truth does not change the truth, and one's opinion of a fact does not change the fact. The amendments which I have offered though have created a situation which menaces what many think is the salvation, in part at least, of the terrible condition in which agriculture finds itself. I do not care to enter upon the role of one endeavoring to defeat what others believe is a good thing, by insisting upon adequate relief for those whom I represent.

"A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." I never appreciated the full force of that old adage until we came to discuss this question. I think "a little knowledge" is the most dangerous thing, particularly in politics and in principle, that enters into the deliberations of this body. There seems to exist in some quarters just enough knowledge of the pending subject to become the element that turns the judgment of men in the most disastrous direction that can be imagined.

Mr. President, it seems to be the custom of this body that no measure shall be passed unless it has the baptism of approval of a department. Oh, no! If we have the "well done" of a department, then all is well.

I deplore the lack of knowledge on the part of those who come from States which produce cotton of the technical and involved manner in which it is marketed. They have no right, unless we abolish the exchanges and write different rules of sale and delivery, to question those of us who have spent a political lifetime in trying to understand the principle involved and to endeavor to secure the enactment of the just and adequate legislation which is needed. That is what I have endeavored to do, and so long as I am here I shall still fight to do it. I know that if my colleagues from the cotton-producing States were to take the same trouble as to cotton as those representing the grain States have taken in relation to grain, we would have had proper and adequate legislation without a word of protest.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement prepared by myself which I ask to have read by the clerk, and next a letter from the Department of Agriculture, signed by the Honorable Henry A. Wallace. With the reading of these I am through with this fight for this session, but Senators will take note that I am not through with it beyond this session, nor shall I, until my term of office expires, cease my efforts to secure the enactment of proper legislation on this subject.

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

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

MAY 29, 1936.

I regret that owing to illness, I was unable to appear yesterday before the Senate to make this statement regarding my position on the cotton amendments, which have been before the Senate since Monday.

After consultation with my colleagues in the Department of Agriculture and the leadership of the Senate, I have after careful consideration decided for several reasons, among which are that the Senate and the Department of Agriculture apparently need additional opportunity to study further cotton legislation and the evidence obtained in the recent cotton investigation before the Senate Agriculture Committee, to withdraw the cotton amendments to H. R. 6772, beginning with section 12, line 14, on page 31. I, however, still maintain that so imperative is the need of this legislation in addition to that which will now be provided in the General Commodity Act, that not only these amendments but the more elaborate and enlarged legislation originally proposed by me to the Committee on Agriculture deserve enactment at this session of Congress. I want at this time to serve notice that at the next session of Congress I propose to introduce the legislation originally presented by me to the Committee on Agriculture.

I do this because I am fully convinced that our cotton exchanges need this legislation and that the General Commodity Act about to be passed does not give it to them. The purpose of this legislation will be to make it as certain as the law possibly can that the cotton futures exchanges of this country whose trading fixes the price received by our cotton farmers for every pound of cotton they grow, will function more freely in their interest than they have in recent years due to their domination by the large interests who have for years manipulated and controlled them to the great injury and detriment of the cotton farmers and the rest of the cotton trade.

E. D. SMITH.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 27, 1936.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: My attention has just been called to the fact that you are considering the withdrawal of your cotton amendments to H. R. 6772, beginning with section 12, line 14, on page 31. The elimination of these controversial issues at this time will probably have the effect of assuring the passage of this important legislation, in which the Department has such a vital interest. We understand that cotton is now included as one of the commodities in section 3 of the bill and I am happy to learn that its inclusion, in the light of your contemplated action, now meets with your approval.

During the interval between this session of the Congress and the convening of the next, the Department will give thorough and sympathetic consideration to testimony developed before your committee as well as to our own experience in the administration of this act as it applies to cotton, should the bill become law.

Should a new bill be introduced at the next session of Congress dealing with any special problems relating to cotton, the Department feels that the study of these matters which it contemplates making in the meantime will place it in a position to be helpful to your committee should its judgment be desired on any such legislation.

Your contemplated action on this matter is deeply appreciated, and I feel that you will thereby render a distinct service to the farmers of the country.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, just a few words more and I am through. A careful reading of the bill, which now doubtless will become a law, will disclose that there is a provision in it which allows the Secretary of Agriculture, at his discretion, to permit straddles and spreads. Everyone who is familiar with the business knows that if there ever was a joker in a bill that constitutes one.

Another one is the unlimited privilege of so-called legitimate hedging. I said the other day, and I now repeat, that whenever a hedge is made, the person buying the hedge buys the commodity, and the person who sells the hedge may be very often both a broker and a merchant. So there are left in the bill two things that leave it wide open for the monopolists to have their sweet will. Of course, when we come here again, we may be met with the same propaganda which I understand now is directed against leaving cotton in the bill at all.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from South Carolina has withdrawn the amendment?

Mr. SMITH. I have.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is unanimous consent required to do that, or may the Senator withdraw it without obtaining unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair inquires of the Senator from South Carolina whether he desires to withdraw others of the amendments which are printed in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand it is all one amendment. It starts on page 31.

Mr. SMITH. It is all one amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments relate to the same subject, but they are in different sections of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Starting on page 31, I withdraw all the remainder of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, all the amendments on page 31 and following are withdrawn.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, the last section of the bill provides that the effective date of the measure shall be 90 days after its passage and approval. I submit an amendment which I ask to have read with reference to that particular section.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42 it is proposed to strike out lines 10 and 11 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 18. All provisions of this act authorizing the registration of futures commission merchants and floor brokers, the fixing of fees and charges therefor, the promulgation of rules, regulations, and orders, and the holding of hearings precedent to the promulgation of rules, regulations, and orders shall be effective immediately. All other provisions of this act shall take effect 90 days after the enactment of this act.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, I think the numbering should be changed in the light of the withdrawal of the amendments by the Senator from South Carolina. I believe the amendment should be section 13.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will correct the numbers of the sections.

Mr. POPE. From the reading of the amendment, I think its purpose is clear. The bill will go into effect 90 days after its enactment. Certain things will have to be done before the 90 days elapse. For instance, forms should be prepared and distributed, certain regulations should be made, and hearings should be had. The amendment merely provides that, prior to the 90 days, those preliminary matters may be attended to, so that when the bill goes into effect the officials may enter upon its administration in a proper way. For instance, 91 days after the bill is enacted, commission merchants and floor brokers will be acting illegally if they transact business without registering. These preliminary matters should be disposed of, so that these persons may be registered and comply with the law immediately upon its going into effect. That is the only purpose of the amendment. I will say that the amendment is requested by the Department, and the reasons I have given are the reasons for offering it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before the bill is disposed of, I wish briefly to insert in the RECORD some information which I think will be of general interest to the Congress and also to the public.

I have before me a list of traders having open accounts in wheat and corn futures on the Chicago Board of Trade at the close of business September 29, 1934. Neither I nor the Department can vouch in every respect for the accuracy of the list, although it does give a bird's-eye view of the vast amount of business that is done on the Chicago Board of Trade, and gives us a knowledge of the occupations of the different men and women who operate on the board of trade. The list has been taken from the books at the close of business September 29, 1934, for the purpose of giving this kind of a view. No attempt, of course, has been made to identify any trader, but the effort has been to give the nature of the business which the traders themselves give, and which is part of the records of the Chicago Board of Trade.

The date is taken at random. It is believed to be a fair sample. The total number of traders on that day was 18,783. The total number of occupations or professions was 593.

For instance, there were two abstractors. There were 119 accountants and auditors. There were 397 attorneys.

It is interesting to note the list of bankers. There was 1 bank appraiser; there were 9 bank cashiers, 1 bank director, 7 bank employees, 2 bank examiners, 1 bank executive, 2 bank managers, 6 bank officers, 10 bank presidents, 3 bank secretaries, 9 bank vice presidents, and 75 bankers.

There were 431 brokers, 17 butchers, 2 butlers, 1 buttermaker, 124 capitalists, 21 carpenters, 1 cartoonist, 16 chain-store operators and officials, 24 chemists, 1 cigar maker, 5 city employees, 1 clergyman—rabbi—5 clergymen—priests—18 clergymen—unclassified—56 coal dealers, 1,085 commission houses, 186 contractors, and so on.

There were 1,976 farmers, 100 retired farmers, 12 stock farmers, 5 farmers and bankers, 1 farmer who was a county officer, 1 farmer who operated a gin, 1 farmer-physician, 1 farmer-teacher, 1 farmer-undertaker, and 1 farmer in South Africa.

I shall not, of course, attempt to give the entire list.

There were 1,820 grain companies and elevators, 106 grain-elevator officials and employees; as I now remember the list, there were 3 Senators and 1 retired Senator; there were 523 physicians, 15 postal employees, 20 printers, 114 traders unclassified, 1,510 persons whose occupations were not given, 2 waiters, 1 watchman, 11 widows; but I believe there were no orphans. There were 6 writers, 1 employee of the Y. M. C. A., and 2 yardmasters.

Mr. President, I have given only a few of those included in the list. I ask unanimous consent that the entire list be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

Traders having open accounts in wheat and corn futures on the Chicago Board of Trade at the close of business Sept. 29, 1934

Total number of traders	18,783
Total number of occupations or professions	593
Abstractors	2
Accountants and auditors	119
Actors	2
Adding machine company employee	1
Adjustor	1
Administrators	3
Advertising	55
Agricultural and county agents	7
Ambassador	1
Ambassador (former)	1
Amusement agent	1

Traders having open accounts in wheat and corn futures on the Chicago Board of Trade, etc.—Continued

Antique dealer	1
Apartment-house owners	6
Apple business	1
Appraisers	2
Architects	13
Armorer	1
Army officers	10
Army officers (retired)	3
Art studios and supplies	4
Artificial flowers	2
Artists	4
Artists, commercial	4
Athletic directors	5
Attorneys	397
Auctioneers	7
Author	1
Automobile mechanic	1
Automobile manufacturers and agents	101
Aviation executives	5
Aviators	3
Aviators, Government	2
Backing and ties	1
Bag companies	3
Bailiff, United States court	1
Bakeries	23
Bakery equipment	1
Band leader	1
Bank appraiser	1
Bank cashiers	9
Bank director	1
Bank employees	7
Bank examiners	2
Bank executive	1
Bank managers	2
Bank officers	6
Bank presidents	10
Bank secretaries	3
Bank vice presidents	9
Bankers	75
Banker association secretary	1
Barbers' supplies	3
Barbers	24
Bartender	1
Baseball players	4
Battery agencies	2
Beans	1
Beauty-parlor operators	11
Beer taverns	8
Beer wholesaler	1
Belting	1
Beverage companies	9
Bicycle shop	1
Billiard-parlor operators	10
Bitumen paving	1
Blacksmiths	5
Board of Education member	1
Boat business	1
Boat line	1
Boat manufacturer	1
Boat rental	1
Boilermaker	1
Bond dealers	12
Bondholders' committee secretary	1
Book agents	2
Book-store operators	6
Bookers	4
Bookkeepers	45
Booth-company owner	1
Bottler	1
Box makers	3
Boys' work	1
Brewers	6
Brick-and-tile company official	1
Bricklayers	4
Bridge manufacturers and designers	2
Bridge tender	1
Broadcasting-company official	1
Brokers, insurance	29
Brokers, stocks, bonds, etc	431
Builders	15
Building-elevator operator	1
Building managers	11
Bulb buyer	1
Bulb grower	1
Business-college owners	2
Butchers	17
Butlers	2
Butter-and-egg dealers	10
Butter maker	1
Button manufacturers	2
Buyer, underwear department	1
Buyers	6
C. W. A. district supervisor	1
Cab-company proprietors	2
Cable-company manager	1

Traders having open accounts in wheat and corn futures on the Chicago Board of Trade, etc.—Continued

Cafe owners	18
Campaign manager	1
Can-company officials	2
Candy-company officials	2
Candy-store proprietors	12
Canners	11
Capitalist and ex-Governor	1
Capitalist and politician	1
Capitalist and rancher	1
Capitalists	124
Caretaker, match company	1
Carpenters	21
Carpet and drapery companies	2
Carton manufacturers	2
Cartoonist	1
Cash-register company	1
Cashiers	6
Casket company	1
Caterer	1
Cedar-chest manufacturer	1
Cement-company director	1
Cemetery proprietor	1
Chain-store operators and officials	16
Chamber of commerce secretary	1
Chamber of commerce officials	2
Chauffeurs	5
Cheese dealer	1
Chefs	2
Chemists	24
Chemical-company officials	9
Chicken business	1
Chiropractors	5
Cigar dealers	9
Cigar maker	1
City commissioner	1
City employees	5
City marshal	1
Civilian Conservation Corps official	1
Clam digger	1
Clay products	1
Cleaning and dyeing business companies	6
Clergyman (rabbi)	1
Clergymen (priests)	5
Clergymen (unclassified)	18
Clinic managers	2
Clothing merchants	38
Club owner	1
Coal dealers	56
Cocoa dealer	1
Coffee dealers	2
Cold storage	3
Collectors	7
College employees	5
Commerce Commission agent, Interstate	1
Commission houses	1,085
Comptrollers	3
Concessionaires	5
Conductors, railroad	12
Constable	1
Construction officials and employees	23
Contractors, construction, etc	186
Cooperative association manager	1
Cotton and cottonseed dealers	77
County clerks	2
County officials and employees	11
Court clerks	4
Creamery operators	24
Credit men	8
Custodians (lodge)	2
Customers' men	3
Dairy business	32
Dairy equipment	1
Dance-hall proprietor	1
Dealers	4
Deceased	6
Decorators	6
Dentists	112
Dental assistants	6
Department-store managers and employees	16
Detective-agency owner	1
Diamond dealer	1
Dilettante	1
Directors, miscellaneous	4
Dispatcher	1
Distillers	6
Domestic	1
Draftsmen	4
Drainage superintendent	1
Dredging	2
Dress cutter	1
Dress designers	2
Dress shops	2
Dressmakers	6
Dried-fruit dealer	1
Drillers, well	2

Traders having open accounts in wheat and corn futures on the Chicago Board of Trade, etc.—Continued

Drivers, bus	3
Drivers, cab	3
Drivers, truck	7
Druggists	86
Drygoods dealers	16
Duck raiser	1
Dye business	1
Economists	4
Editors	13
Educational director	1
Educators	3
Egg and poultry dealers	2
Electric company officials and employees	28
Electricians	10
Employment agency operators	2
Engineers, chemical	2
Engineers, consulting	5
Engineers, construction	6
Engineers, civil	11
Engineers, drainage	2
Engineers, electrical	5
Engineer, gas	1
Engineer, heating	1
Engineers, highway	5
Engineer, industrial	1
Engineers, locomotive	13
Engineers, mining	6
Engineers, mechanical	6
Engineers, miscellaneous	87
Engineers, oil	3
Engraver	1
Entomologist	1
Estimator	1
Examiner	1
Excavator	1
Executives, miscellaneous	60
Explosives	1
Exporters	12
Express agent	1
Farm hands	8
Farmers	1,976
Farmers, retired	100
Farmers, stock	12
Farmers and bankers	5
Farmer and blacksmith	1
Farmer and clerk	1
Farmer and county officer	1
Farmer and ginner	1
Farmer and physician	1
Farmer and teacher	1
Farmer and undertaker	1
Farmer, South Africa	1
Farmers and druggists	2
Farmers and feeders	55
Farmers and grain	20
Farmers and merchants	13
Feed dealers	25
Feeders	19
Fence factory	1
Ferry-company employee	1
Fertilizer dealer	1
Fiduciary official	1
Finance and loan companies	29
Financial directors	3
Financiers	14
Firemen	4
Firemen, city	2
Firemen, railway	2
Five-and-ten-cent-store manager	1
Florists	11
Flour and feed	21
Foods	6
Forecasters	2
Foreign	30
Foremen	5
Foundry companies	2
Fox farmers	2
Fruit wholesalers and dealers	30
Fuel companies	3
Fur dealers	6
Furniture	30
Garage owners and employees	31
Gardeners	10
Gas and oil	18
Geologists	10
Ginners	6
Glass-company officials	2
Golf-course operators	3
Golfers, professional	4
Government employee (Canadian)	1
Government employees (miscellaneous)	16
Grain companies and elevators	1,820
Grain-elevator officials and employees	106
Grain inspector	1
Gravel business	1

Traders having open accounts in wheat and corn futures on the Chicago Board of Trade, etc.—Continued

Greenhouse	1
Grocers	120
Guard	1
Guard, bridge	1
Guard, reformatory	1
Gymnasium operator	1
Hair treatment	3
Handyman	1
Hardware dealers	50
Harness shops	2
Hatchery operators	10
Hay and feed	4
Heating business	4
Hides	3
Hog buyers	5
Holding companies	5
Horse and mule business	3
Hosiery-mill operators	2
Hospital officials and employees	8
Hospital technician (psychopathic)	1
Hostess	1
Hotel doorman	1
Hotel operators and employees	53
Housekeepers	6
Housewives	1,025
Ice-cream business	9
Ice manufacturers and dealers	11
Ice skater, professional	1
Implement dealers	36
Importer, chinaware	1
Importer, coffee	1
Importers, miscellaneous	8
Importers, silks and rugs	2
Industrialists	4
Inspector, cattle	1
Inspector, grain	1
Inspector, plumbing	1
Inspector, Veterans' Bureau	1
Inspector, dining car	2
Inspector, miscellaneous	10
Instructor, cooking school	1
Instructors	4
Insurance	197
Insurance adjusters	5
Insurance department agent, State	1
Internal-revenue deputy clerk	1
Internal-revenue agents	7
Investment mining company	1
Investment business	179
Iron and metal company	1
Jail builder	1
Janitors	6
Jewelers	22
Jewish synagogue attendant	1
Jobbers	2
Journalists	2
Judge, court of appeals	1
Judges	7
Just fizzles around	1
Justice of the peace	1
Keeley Institute manager	1
Knife sharpener	1
Kodak Co. superintendent	1
Labels	1
Laborers	32
Lace business	1
Landowners	12
Laundryman	1
Laundry proprietors	15
Leather business	9
Letter service	1
Librarians	2
Linotype operator	1
Liquor dealers	3
Livestock raisers, buyers, etc	127
Locomotive company official	1
Lumber business	100
Lunchroom operators	2
Machinery dealers	8
Mail carriers	17
Mail-order business	1
Mail-order company official	1
Mail-order employees	6
Manicurists	19
Manufacturers' agents	6
Manufacturers, miscellaneous	245
Mariner	1
Market service	2
Masons	2
Masseurs	2
Mattress-factory employee	1
Mayors	4
Meat markets and packers	28
Mechanics	32

Traders having open accounts in wheat and corn futures on the Chicago Board of Trade, etc.—Continued

Medical supplies	1
Members	342
Merchants	506
Messengers	2
Metal business	8
Millers	438
Miner	1
Mining business	14
Miscellaneous employees	6
Mortgage business	15
Movie director	1
Munitions-corporation official	1
Musical director	1
Musicians	22
N. R. A. official	1
Naval officers	3
News agent	1
Newspaper employee	1
Newspaper officials and employees	43
Night-club operators	2
Nursery business	5
Nurses	18
Nut business	1
Office managers and employees	23
Officers	3
Oil business	188
Oil-company employee	1
Opticians	9
Oriental goods	1
Osteopaths	3
Ostrich feathers	1
Oxo-acetylene plants	2
Oxygen business	1
Oyster-shell business	1
P. W. A. employee	1
Packing-company employees and officials	29
Paint-company employees and officials	10
Painters	9
Paper dealers	6
Partners	18
Patent consultor	1
Pattern makers	2
Paving-company manager	1
Pawnbrokers	2
Paymaster	1
Peanut corporation	1
Pecan grower	1
Photoengraver	1
Photographers	12
Physicians	523
Physiotherapeutics	1
Pilot, unclassified	1
Plasterers	2
Plumbers	8
Plumbing supplies	8
Police chiefs	3
Policemen	5
Polisher	1
Politicians	3
Postal employees	15
Poultry dealers	23
Pressmen	1
Printers	20
Printing business	14
Probation officer	1
Produce dealers	50
Professional gambler	1
Professors	35
Prohibition officer	1
Pugilist, retired	1
Purchasing agents	8
Radio dealers	7
Radio operator	1
Radio technicians	2
Railway agents	24
Railway officials and employees	89
Ranchers	36
Real-estate brokers	8
Real-estate dealers, agents, etc	352
Refrigerator dealers	2
Reporters, court	3
Reporters, newspaper	5
Reporters, unclassified	4
Research director	1
Restaurant operators	63
Retired, miscellaneous	793
Rooming-house operators	5
Rotary club executive	1
Rubber-company employees and officials	7
Clerks, miscellaneous	188
Custodian, cemetery	1
Sales agents	3
Salesladies	6
Salesman, airplane	1

Traders having open accounts in wheat and corn futures on the Chicago Board of Trade, etc.—Continued

Salesman, burial vault	1
Sales managers	20
Salesmen, auto	14
Salesmen, bond	9
Salesmen, fertilizer	2
Salesmen, flour	8
Salesmen, insurance	22
Salesmen, miscellaneous	391
Salesmen, securities	4
Salesmen, shoe	3
Salesmen, traveling	16
Saloonkeeper	1
Salvaging	1
Sandwich shop	1
Sausage makers	2
School employees	6
Scientist	1
Seaman	1
Secretaries	74
Security dealers and officials	22
Seed dealers	32
Senators	3
Senator, retired	1
Service-station operators and employees	39
Sewing-machine company manager	1
Sexton	1
Sheriffs	5
Sheriffs, deputy	2
Shoe business	15
Sign companies	2
Silk business	3
Soap business	4
Social workers	3
Solicitors, miscellaneous	24
Speculators, unclassified	31
Spinster	1
Sporting-goods dealer	1
State employees, miscellaneous	12
Stationery business	4
Statisticians	15
Steamship agent	1
Steamship company, vice president	1
Steel business	14
Stenographers	30
Steward, dining car	1
Steward, hotel	2
Steward, private yacht	1
Stewards, unclassified	2
Stock-exchange member	21
Stonecutter	1
Storage companies	3
Stove-repair company	1
Students	36
Stylists	2
Sugar dealers	8
T. V. A. employee	1
Tailors	24
Tank business	2
Tanner	1
Taxi operators	2
Teachers	128
Telephone and telegraph company agents	3
Telephone and telegraph company employees	57
Textile business	2
Theater operators and employees	32
Ticket agent	1
Tile layers	2
Timekeepers	2
Tire-company operators and employees	10
Tobacco dealers and employees	27
Tombstone works	1
Tool makers and employees	8
Tour manager	1
Tourist-camp manager	1
Tractor-company manager	1
Traders, unclassified	114
Traffic managers	11
Transfer business	5
Travel agent	1
Truckers	18
Trustees of estates	2
Typewriter repairman	1
United States Department of Agriculture agent	1
Undertakers	18
Underwear-company president	1
Unemployed widows	4
Unemployed	530
Unknown	1,510
Upholsterer	1
Utility-business officials and employees	11
Vending-machine business	1
Veterans' Bureau rating chairman	1
Veterans' Bureau examiner	1

Traders having open accounts in wheat and corn futures on the Chicago Board of Trade, etc.—Continued

Veterinarian	16
Wagons	1
Waiters	2
Waitress	1
Warehouse operators	10
Watchmakers	6
Watchman	1
Watchman, night	1
Welders	5
Welfare-union manager	1
Widows	11
Wool dealers and employees	4
Writer	6
Y. M. C. A. employee	1
Yardmasters	2
Yeast company	1

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before the bill is voted on, I wish to ask a question or two. On page 26 is a provision giving the Secretary of Agriculture the right—

To make and promulgate such rules and regulations as, in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, are reasonably necessary to effectuate any of the provisions or to accomplish any of the purposes of this act.

I do not find anywhere in the bill any provision which would make a violation of the rules thus established by the Secretary of Agriculture punishable as a criminal act. Nor am I able to find in the original law any provision which would make the violation of such rules subject to criminal prosecution. Am I correct in assuming that there is no provision which would make the violation of the rules and regulations established by the Secretary a criminal act, or which would attempt to do so? If there is such a provision, I should want to be heard upon the question of whether such latitudinous power should be given to the Secretary. If there is no provision in the bill making a violation of the rules and regulations a crime, I have no objection to the provision; but if there is a provision making it a crime, I should have serious objection to it.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POPE. In my study of the bill I have not found any penalty provision which to my mind was broad enough to cover those who might violate the rules and regulations promulgated under the section to which the Senator has referred. That is my judgment of the matter.

Mr. BORAH. That is my opinion.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I may be wrong about this, but I am satisfied that no punishment of fine or imprisonment is provided for violation of the rules and regulations to which the Senator refers, but there are other provisions in the bill which would give the Secretary the power to deprive operators, for instance, of certain privileges, and so forth, and so on. I do not think there is any provision making violation of the rules and regulations a crime.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, that being true, I have no objection to the provision. I would not want to see a penalty attached to the violation of rules and regulations.

Before I take my seat, I desire to ask what commodities are now incorporated in the bill. Does the bill cover wheat, cotton, rice, corn, oats, barley, rye, flaxseed, grain sorghums, mill feeds, butter, eggs, and potatoes?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read the third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BILBO (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). "Here."

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH (when Mr. BONE's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is necessarily detained from the Senate. On the pending bill he has a pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea." I understand that if the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who is unavoidably absent. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are detained from the Senate by illness.

I also announce that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Finance.

I further announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], who is unavoidably detained. I understand that if present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. FRAZIER. My colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is absent. He is paired on this question with junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea", and I understand that if the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE] were present he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—62

Adams	Chavez	La Follette	Pope
Ashurst	Clark	Loftin	Reynolds
Bachman	Connally	Lonergan	Robinson
Bailey	Couzens	Long	Russell
Barkley	Davis	McAdoo	Schwellenbach
Benson	Dieterich	McGill	Sheppard
Black	Duffy	McKellar	Shipstead
Borah	Fletcher	McNary	Steiwer
Brown	Frazier	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkley	George	Murphy	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gibson	Murray	Truman
Burke	Guffey	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Caraway	Holt	Overton	
Carey	Johnson	Pittman	

NAYS—16

Austin	Gerry	Maloney	Tydings
Barbour	Hale	Metcalf	Wagner
Coolidge	Hastings	Radcliffe	Walsh
Copeland	Keyes	Townsend	White

NOT VOTING—18

Bankhead	Dickinson	King	Norbeck
Bilbo	Donahey	Lewis	Nye
Bone	Glass	Logan	Smith
Byrd	Gore	McCarran	
Costigan	Harrison	Moore	

So the bill was passed.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate resume consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 24, after the word "farmers", to insert "and livestock growers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 4, after the word "appropriation", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided further, That the lists of employable persons for work in the continental United States under the Works Progress Administration shall not knowingly contain the name of any alien illegally within the limits of the continental United States. It shall be the duty of the Works Progress Administration to make every reasonable effort consistent with prompt employment of the destitute unemployed who are not of the class hereinbefore mentioned to ascertain whether such lists contain the names of any such aliens and where disclosed they shall not be employed, and if employed and their status as such alien is disclosed they shall thereupon be discharged.

And to insert the following:

The President shall cause to be made a survey of the lists of employable persons for work in continental United States provided for by the appropriations made available in this act and shall not knowingly permit to remain upon said lists any alien who is illegally within the limits of the United States or who has not filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States, and wherever such a person has been employed he shall be dismissed.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am opposed to the pending amendment. My opposition is not directed specifically to the amendment on page 29, but is directed against all of title II—Relief and Work Relief. I voted for the emergency relief act of 1935 after it had been recommitted to the committee and after changes had been made in it which I then considered transformed it from a measure attempting to appropriate money to a person into one appropriating money to certain uses to be carried out by an agency, which in this case was the President of the United States. Since that time, events have changed my position relating to that method of relief. As my former vote shows, I favor relief. At the time the former bill was enacted we were under the impression that approximately $2,000,000,000, would be adequate for the first year, and approximately $2,000,000,000 would be adequate for the present year.

Events have shown that that was a fairly good estimate. The Director of the Budget, however, now indicates, as shown by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] yesterday, that these funds are likely to be increased in the future. I refer to RECORD page 8401, quoting from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], as follows:

The Budget Director says that for the current fiscal year we shall spend $9,915,709,874, less bonus, $2,237,000,000, net for ordinary expenses and for relief $7,678,709,874. For the current fiscal year our deficit will be approximately $6,000,000,000. For the appropriation year starting next July the Federal Government proposes to spend $8,272,554,370, an increase of nearly $600,000,000 over the present year. This means that we shall spend nearly $1,000,000,000 more than in 1935, and $3,000,000,000 more than in 1933; yet conditions today are greatly improved, and the need for relief and governmental expenditures much less than in these previous years.

In view of this experience, I feel that our policy must have been wrong, and that we should change it; and, as I have observed and studied it, I believe that probably the Vandenberg amendment will accomplish the type of change that should be made in the direction of economy and also in the direction of the efficient application of these funds to those for whom they are really appropriated.

Another reason why my position is different today than it was with reference to the emergency relief measure of last year is that there have been made applications of the authority which I think show that we were mistaken in believing that the law was specific in respect to the uses. We are in the position that either our legislation was bad because it was not specific and the uses were not designated, or the administration of the act by the President has been wrong, or the performance under the act has been unlawful.

We have one piece of evidence tending to prove, I think, very clearly that there has been an exercise of power which was not granted by the act of 1935. I believe that the Resettlement Administration is an instrument of power that was not granted by the act and not intended to be comprehended by implication or interpretation of the categories of that act. In order to consider whether the Congress would have granted that authority if it should have entertained the least notion that it was comprehended in the language of the act, I briefly refer to what ought to be as good evidence as can be offered to show what was done in the creation of this instrument of public power, namely, a statement issued by Mr. Tugwell on the birthday anniversary of the establishment of the Resettlement Administration. Mr. Tugwell made this statement as of the date of April 30, 1936, and in it he recounted some of the things that have been done under the Resettlement Administration. He said:

We have loaned this year nearly $100,000,000 to some 300,000 farm families in this way.

Again he said:

Incidentally we have been carrying on a program of debt adjustment for farmers all over the country who have come out of the depression with overwhelming debts contracted when prices were high.

Again he said:

Seventeen thousand farmers have taken advantage of this service and have secured a reduction of $16,000,000 in their debts.

Again he said:

So we made a start, while carrying on our urgent rescue work, in the retirement from farming of those poor lands upon which people are starving, land which is good for trees, for grass, for parks or wildlife, but not for arable agriculture.

We have accepted options on 10,000,000 acres and have finished the buying of 2,000,000. On these areas we are carrying on a reconstruction program. We are taking these lands on which people cannot make a living and making of them parks and playgrounds for city and country people alike. We have planted trees and grass; we have stocked them with game, and made refuges for the Nation's fast disappearing wildlife. We have created new forests, protected streams and set up camps by the wayside.

For the people on them we have provided new opportunities elsewhere. We have bought them out and enabled them to move to better land, or we have made them a loan, or we have placed them on a new farm from which some other farmer was ready to retire.

These are the things we have done during our first year. We have lent a helping hand, by loans or grants, to some 600,000 farmers and their families. We have bought 2,000,000 acres of poor land and optioned 8,000,000 more.

Again Mr. Tugwell said:

We have planned and are building 20,000 new home and work places for the people who were on the land we have purchased. This is the merest fraction of the numbers who would like to be relocated, but it is all we could do with our time and money.

Mr. President, this is the statement of the man who is in charge of this political power created by the President of the United States.

In order that there may be no doubt whatever that this is the responsibility of the President, I call attention to the order creating this public power. Executive Order No. 7027 provides, among other things:

By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, approved April 8, 1935 (Public Res. No. 11, 74th Cong.), I hereby establish an agency within the Government to be known as the Resettlement Administration, and appoint Rexford G. Tugwell, Under Secretary of Agriculture, as Administrator thereof, to serve without additional compensation.

In another order, no. 7200, the President prescribes the functions and duties of the Resettlement Administration to be performed by the Administrator, as follows:

To administer approved projects involving rural rehabilitation, relief in stricken agricultural areas, and resettlement of destitute or low-income families from rural and urban areas, including the establishment, maintenance, and operation in such connection, of communities in rural and suburban areas.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, if I had had any idea that there was to be set up such an instrument of public power as is described by the Executive order and as is illustrated by the birthday speech of Professor Tugwell, I will say that I would not have voted for that measure.

Another reason why the situation is different today than it was when we adopted the relief measure of 1935 is that the status of that emergency relief appropriation act has entirely changed. It has changed before the people of the

United States and it has changed before the Congress of the United States. This particular instrument of power came under the consideration of one of our highest courts, a court that is entitled to great consideration, a court whose judgment is often final. Probably in this case the decision will be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, but, until it has been overturned by that greatest of all judicial tribunals, the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia is the law of this land. A House of the Congress that is considering an appropriation bill so like the bill held to be unconstitutional by that court as to repeat the essential defects in it, should not take an incautious or intemperate position. So far as I am concerned I cannot in conscience take such position.

That court held not merely that the Resettlement Administration set up by the President under the terms of a law which I claim did not justify it, is unconstitutional and in violation of any right we have to grant, but it also held that all and every part of the act of 1935 was so vague, so lacking in specification of use, so lacking in the laying down of any rule to guide the discretion of the Executive, that the whole act is unconstitutional.

I invite attention to but two brief excerpts from the opinion which express those two ideas. On page 11 of Senate Document 242, which contains the opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the case to which I have just referred, appears this statement:

> Turning now to the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 and examining it in the light of the principles laid down in the decisions in the Panama and Schechter cases, it appears that, insofar as this case is concerned, there is a clearly unconstitutional delegation of legislative power.

Let us see what the Court said about the whole act. On page 12 of the same document appears the following, referring to the President:

> He is at liberty to set up agencies and to prescribe such rules of conduct and fix such standards as he may deem proper. There is no criterion to govern his course as to housing and the various other projects enumerated in the act.

That is, all of them.

> The only possible guide or policy laid down by Congress is in the words "in order to provide relief, work relief, and to increase employment by providing for useful projects", which appear at the beginning of the act. But this declaration of purpose is even more general and vague than the declaration of policy rejected in the Panama and Schechter cases. The act is silent as to any determination of facts by the President or by any administrative agency which he may create to carry out any of the projects set forth.

Mr. President, in view of that decision and the great amount and weight of authority cited in the decision, in view of the rationality of it, I feel that, so far as I am concerned, I could not do today, in the case of this particular proposed legislation, what I did with respect to the act of 1935. No matter how great the emergency, no matter how much a bill might appeal to our emotions and our desire to hold out a helping hand to an unfortunate citizen, we should not, and I could not, vote for a measure which has received a denunciation such as that uttered by one of the greatest courts of our land.

But, Mr. President, there is another reason why the bill should not pass; at any rate, title II of the bill. There are changes in it which, if not written in defiance of the judgment of this court, certainly are written without consideration of the reasonableness of the decision and of all the authorities cited in it and which support it.

Perhaps it will be remembered by Senators who are present that during the consideration of the act of 1935 I was interrogated with respect to the term "miscellaneous projects." I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11, 1935, at page 3342, where the following appears:

> We realize that in the decision of the Supreme Court in the Petroleum Code case the Court said this:
>
> "When the President is invested with legislative authority as the delegate of Congress in carrying out a declared policy, he necessarily acts under the constitutional restriction applicable to such a delegation."
>
> And if there are phrases contained in this amendment which leave to discretion the determination of what particular project within a category shall be adopted, we have the assurance so recently given by the Supreme Court that it is the duty of the President to save the people's rights and to make that allocation according to his constitutional obligation. So when we have such a phrase as that which has been inquired about heretofore, namely, "miscellaneous projects," to consider, I must say that, although I would prefer not to have the ambiguity raised by the inclusion of those words in this amendment, the danger of them is not sufficient to cause me to oppose the amendment, because I believe that, under the Constitution, the President must interpret those words according to the generic terms "work relief" and "relief"; and that he must also adhere to the specific terms that are the setting for the words, "miscellaneous projects." "Miscellaneous," according to the Standard Century Dictionary, means "consisting of a mixture, diversified, promiscuous." Those are the primary meanings of that word, and this phrase I interpret to mean—and I had some part in its drafting—miscellaneous projects within the classifications "sanitation, prevention of soil erosion, reforestation, forestation, flood control, and miscellaneous projects." For example, take "prevention of soil erosion." What projects could be comprehended under that term? There could be wind erosion, river erosion, coastal erosion, avulsion, accretion, and all the other phases and aspects of soil erosion, the prevention of which would be comprehended within the term "miscellaneous projects."

Mr. President, the text of the bill before us has been changed in a material particular. Undoubtedly, the statement which I have read from the RECORD of a year ago excited the change which I find in this bill today. Under the original act the language was this—and, by the way, it was covered by the same sublettered paragraph, "(h)":

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

It is a well-known rule of interpretation that when such general terms as "miscellaneous projects" are thrown into a phrase, which specifies certain categories and certain uses without being separated from them by any punctuation, the interpretation of the words "miscellaneous projects" must be governed and absolutely controlled by the category in which the words are used.

What do we find the present bill saying? The same letter "h" is put before the words "miscellaneous projects." There is absolutely nothing to qualify or define or specify the use that is to be made of the amount of $71,250,000 under this grant of legislative authority. Somebody, somewhere along the line, must decide upon the policy of the Government with respect to the expenditure of those seventy-odd million dollars. Somebody, somewhere, must legislate and define the use, or we shall have done a futile thing, and that is, an attempt to appropriate money to a person without any use.

For that reason, and for many others relating to the text of the bill and the changes made in it from the original act, I find myself today in a position where I cannot again vote for the proposal. I desire to make clear to the Senate my position with respect to my vote. I shall oppose title II of the bill, and, if it is not taken from the bill, I shall oppose the entire bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POPE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I think is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 19, after the word "act", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following:

and a separate list of persons who, because of illness or advanced age, are unemployable.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, we are still considering the committee amendments, and I make the point of order that that is not a committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. Very well.

Mr. ADAMS. I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee the meaning of the language on page 30, beginning at line 11? What is the significance of that language?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I suggest that if the junior Senator from Georgia is present, he can better explain the provision, because he is the author of that particular language.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, this section is not the pending business.

Mr. COPELAND. This is the matter before the Senate now, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the amendment on page 29, which is to strike out part of the original text.

Mr. COPELAND. Then the language to which I have referred is not before the Senate at the moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the pending amendment is to strike out certain language and to insert.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. COPELAND. Then, if I may repeat my question, What is the meaning of the provision?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I understand an amendment is to be offered to perfect the language, and I think the question would come better at that time.

Mr. BYRNES. My only reason for making the suggestion was that this section has not been reached, and when it is reached there will be an attempt to amend it in two or three particulars, which may possibly meet the objection of the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I was equally apprehensive about this section, and so, with others, I conferred with the author of the amendment, who, I understand, proposes to modify it so as to limit it merely to administrative employees.

Mr. COPELAND. I am glad of that, because otherwise it would mean there would be dumped on local communities thousands of persons, and perhaps with no possibility of taking care of them.

Mr. WAGNER. Exactly.

Mr. COPELAND. In view of the explanation which has been made, I shall not proceed further with the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the War Department could not operate if this section remained in the bill. It would be thoroughly disorganized. But the Senator from Georgia proposes, I believe, to except the War Department from the provisions of the section.

Mr. WAGNER. It would affect transient workers, and if that language were permitted to remain in the bill as it is, Florida would be one of the worst-hit States.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the entire provision ought to go out.

Mr. COPELAND. I can see that it would be the most inhumane amendment that could possibly be offered, and I am glad to hear that the machinery is operating with the prospect of turning out some better product than this particular amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I will say that in the meeting of the full committee the amendment was offered, and it was offered for the purpose of applying only to administrative employees. The Senator who offered it is not upon the floor at this time, but he has indicated his entire willingness to agree to a modification expressing clearly the intent, and removing any occasion for the fears the Senator from New York may have with reference to the amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. I am glad to hear that, because otherwise I should have to stand here as long as possible to protest against the language as written.

Mr. BYRNES. I should join with the Senator.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in my conference with the Senator who offered the original amendment he expressed very clearly the idea that he did not intend to do anything so inhumane as what my colleague has described, throwing transients off any relief roll. He intended merely to provide that the administrative officers in each State should be residents of the particular State.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 113, line 13, before the word "certified", to insert the words "and Private Act No. 192, approved February 14, 1933 (47 Stat., pt. 2, p. 1719),".

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, this amendment proposes to correct an error in the bill. The money has already been provided in the bill, but the reference was incorrect. I talked the matter over with the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, and I think he is agreeable to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, relief in America has heretofore been localized. The system was very simple. Those members of the community who had funds took care of those who did not, individually or through some central relief agency. Throughout the years these forms of relief have been coordinated, so that the municipal community chest has become an American institution.

There are three general classes of unemployed. There are the habitually unemployed. There are also those willing but unemployable persons who, by reason of physical or mental misfortune, are disbarred, perhaps permanently, from gainful employment. Finally, there are the willing and able who have been forced out of employment but who are anxious to return.

Of these three classes of unemployed, the first two cannot be accommodated in private employment under any system or any form of government. Charity cannot change their situation in the slightest. The one never does, the other cannot, work.

The third class—or the members of it at any particular time—are only temporarily unemployed. It is this class which offers the real relief problem. This group traditionally was taken care of by local means.

In the W. P. A. research monograph, The Transient Unemployed, this localized charity is given its historic background. The report states that it is—

The tradition in this country that each locality is responsible only for the care of its own needy citizens. The tradition is written into the statutes of most of the States, and has governed the poor-relief practices in all of them. The doctrine of local responsibility for relief has a long history reaching back to English poor-relief practices in the sixteenth century, when its avowed intent was to protect each parish from the inroads of "stalwart rogues" and "sturdy beggars."

The merit in a local system of relief is that each community is far better able to separate the wheat from the chaff among its own prospective relief recipients than is the State or Federal Government. To local officials, applicants for relief in a community are people, human beings. To the far-away administrators in Washington they are merely names on a card.

When local relief breaks down through a deficiency in brotherly love, or a nearly bankrupt treasury, something has to come from without. But so long as relief can be handled locally it will be in general applied more efficiently and economically than it ever can be from a distance.

I am only paraphrasing what President Roosevelt said on June 14, 1933, when the Governors and State emergency relief administrators came to Washington to learn how the new $500,000,000 relief money was to be distributed. He said then:

The Emergency Relief Act is an expression of the Federal Government's determination to cooperate with the States and local communities with regard to financing emergency relief work. It means just that. It is essential that the States and local units of government do their fair share. They must not expect the Federal Government to finance more than a reasonable proportion of the total.

The New Deal, therefore, began its relief policy by recognizing the importance of local responsibility and built its first structure on that foundation. In his report of July 1, 1933, Administrator Hopkins described the first relief act in these terms:

Under the terms of the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933, Congress made available $500,000,000 to be expended through the States as a means of cooperating with them in meeting the relief needs of the unemployed. This fund is divided into two parts. The first $250,000,000, under subsection (b) of section 4 of the act referred to, is made available to the States on a matching basis. One dollar from Federal relief funds is provided for each $3 of public moneys from all sources spent in the State during the preceding 3 months. The second $250,000,000, under subsection (c) of section 4, is a discretionary fund from which grants can be made to those States whose relief needs are so great and/or whose financial resources are so depleted that grants must be made without regard to the matching provisions of subsection (b).

Brave attempts may have been made to keep this policy a reality, but, with Federal money available, some States began to rest on their oars. At the end of December 1933, Mr. Hopkins was forced to report:

The Federal Emergency Relief Administration has followed the clear intent of the act by financing different proportions of the unemployed relief load in different States. In some States it has supplied only the matching funds provided under section 4 (b). In other States grants have been made from the discretionary fund to meet a temporary failure to act on the part of the State, but it has been insisted that, after the lapse of a reasonable time for the passage of legislation, these States should supply their proper share. In still other States the Federal Government has supplied proportions varying up to the point at which it has paid practically the total cost of unemployment relief.

As soon as the Federal Government began making outright grants to the States, and local sources of relief concurrently began to dry up, policies and practices that had once been determined locally came to be dictated by the Federal administrators.

Any initiative which communities and States might have shown to provide relief for their own unemployed was thwarted by the Federal Government. The Relief Administration in Washington had the money, and where the money is there the power lies also. So far as relief is concerned, the States delivered themselves into the hands of the Federal Government.

All during the year 1933 the share that the States furnished dwindled, particularly that portion which was distinctly local, and the Federal Government was forced to increase its share in proportion.

While the general average for December 1933 showed that local relief sources furnished 18.6 percent of the total, the States 33.2 percent, and the Federal Government 48.2 per cent, a more startling picture is revealed when we look at the record of individual States.

Local relief accounted for only three-tenths percent in South Carolina, seven-tenths percent in Arkansas, and 1 percent in Mississippi, and in those Commonwealths, State relief had broken down entirely. Numbers of other States were unable to furnish any appreciable amount of relief through either local or State agencies. Those States in which the Federal Government furnished more than 90 percent of the relief funds were New Mexico, 92.6 percent; Florida, 92.9 percent; Texas, 94.2 percent; Kentucky, 94.4 percent; Georgia, 95.1 percent; West Virginia, 95.2 percent; Tennessee, 97.1 percent; Alabama, 97.2 percent; Louisiana, 97.8 percent; Mississippi, 99 percent; Arkansas, 99.3 percent; South Carolina, 99.7 percent.

At the other end of the scale we find another story. The Federal Government was providing only 10.5 percent in Connecticut, 13.7 percent in Wyoming, 14.9 percent in Maine, 18.9 percent in Massachusetts, 23.1 percent in New Jersey, and 24.8 percent in Vermont.

I am not charging that the New Deal relief program deliberately demoralized the State relief agencies, but I do contend that such demoralization inevitably followed when the Federal Government turned on its tremendous streams of relief money. That it became impossible to withhold relief funds from States, despite their refusal to appropriate any money themselves, is admitted by Mr. Hopkins.

In his letter to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on May 4, 1935, Mr. Hopkins stated:

It is not the function of the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator to dictate within States to what standards of living they shall adhere. Nevertheless, when in the estimation of the Administrator the State is making inadequate effort to meet its responsibility, he may withdraw Federal funds. This is a threat neither easy to make nor easy to carry out. There are States where the stoppage of Federal funds as a means of forcing officials to do their duty would have no other result than to reduce the people on relief rolls to starvation.

It was that colossus of relief, C. W. A., which spent $900,000,000 in 4 months, which was responsible for the practically complete break-down of local and State relief systems. It was then that the Federal Government took all the unemployed in its fatherly embrace and told them the story of Santa Claus. The Baltimore Sun of January 24, 1934, had this to say about C. W. A.:

The Director now denounces the whole business. He charges waste, graft, and inefficiency. He lays the blame partly upon the politicians, partly upon the businessmen, partly upon our own people. The money will be exhausted February 15. He asks $300,000,000 to continue in a greatly reduced way until May 1. Then he urges abandonment. But at that notion there is an enormous howl. Governors, mayors, and communities violently protest. They say it is impossible for the Government to shift this burden back. To stop in May will be to throw 4,000,000 men and women, with their families, out on the streets to starve. Neither the States nor the cities are in condition to take care of them. They are all about broke. Private charity has dried up as a result of the dole policy. Industry could not possibly absorb any considerable number of these people. They beg for another and more adequate appropriation.

Following the short-lived C. W. A. experiment, the Federal Government was in the relief business to the hilt. Moreover, it could not withdraw, because the States had lumped everything with the Federal Government, and all attempts to distinguish between sources of relief funds were virtually abandoned. During 1934 and the early part of 1935 there was only one recognized source of relief—Washington.

According to many observers, the presence of Santa Claus in Washington was a factor in the success of the present administration at the polls in November 1934. Whether or not it considered that the concentration of activities in the Capital had accomplished its purpose, the New Deal early in 1935 made one of those dazzling reversals of policy which have always characterized it. It suddenly plumped into the laps of State governments the direct-relief problem for 1935–36. This turn-about is described in a recent report of Administrator Hopkins, as follows:

The passage of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 marked a new phase in delineating the responsibility of the Federal Government for the solution of the relief problem. Under the division of responsibility postulated by this act, the Federal Government recognized and assumed the obligation of caring for a large majority of the great group of persons in need as the result of industrial unemployment, while to the State and local governments was left the primary responsibility for the care of

other families in need of aid. This latter group represents for the most part unemployable persons and comprises the types of dependency to which local governments have traditionally provided assistance. To assist the State and local governments in meeting the increasing burden of the latter group, provision was made in the Social Security Act for grants-in-aid for two large groups of persons in need—the aged and women with dependent children.

The present proposal to continue W. P. A. envisions the perpetuation of this policy of State relief for unemployables and Federal relief for the able-bodied unemployed.

One of the results of a federally administered work-relief program is its mesmerizing effect on the tax-consciousness of communities and their citizens. When a municipality takes money from its citizens and uses it for public improvements, the citizen is in a good position to judge whether he is getting value for what he is providing. When the citizen sees the mighty Government in Washington shipping out money to his particular bailiwick, he loses all sense of personal liability for the blessings, and believes it is manna from Heaven. This curious deadening of the taxpayers' instinctive caution against unwise and unnecessary expenditure of the public moneys is manifesting itself all over the United States.

We have all of us seen a situation in a community where a public improvement is suggested by a handful of citizens. The community in general immediately condemns it as not worth the cost. Were it a case of local responsibility, the whole matter might stop there. However, with the Government apparently furnishing the funds, the little coterie who first suggested the improvement begins its manipulations. Contractors, architects, and builders' supply houses are given glowing accounts of the new project. The whole company begins to assail local politicians, whose resistance breaks down under the assault, and who then seek the cooperation of those higher up. From hand to hand the "buck" is passed. until the Federal Government is asked to approve the project, allocate the necessary funds, and to begin construction.

Perhaps the Federal administrator also turns down the project as unwarranted. Then comes a manifestation of hurt civic pride. Aroused and stung by the slur, the same citizens who first condemned the project now join in the common wail, "They can't do that to us", and the present administration, being particularly sensitive to partisan political pressure, very likely approves the project on second thought. Thus comes into being something that only a handful wanted at first and for which all will pay over a period of many years.

The relief administrators have always maintained that their made-work projects were important and valuable because they were sponsored by communities which were unable to undertake them themselves. There is evidence that the demand for these projects frequently do not originate with the communities themselves, nor do the communities always consider them desirable.

I have in mind an experience in my own State of New Jersey. The city of Summit is a community of about 15,000 population, with a reputation for managing its own affairs very capably. It has preserved its credit throughout the depression. Recently it successfully floated an issue of $600,000 in bonds at 3¾ percent. As I am informed, there is no pressing need for school construction at the present time. Whenever it feels it should expand in that direction it does so within its own financial set-up.

Sometime ago W. P. A. representatives, so it is reported, offered the School Board of Summit $25,000 of Government funds if the city would provide $75,000. This money was to go for school construction. The school board examined into the matter and declined the offer as being of no advantage to Summit. W. P. A. then raised its offer to $35,000, and this was likewise declined. These offers had been on the basis of loans at 5-percent interest but with 25 percent of the sum as a gift.

The next move on the part of the W. P. A. was to raise the offer to $45,000 and to reduce the interest charge from 5 to 3½ percent. I understand that there was an intimation that the sum offered could be increased if the city of Summit was interested. The city, however, did not want the money and washed its hands of the whole affair.

Upon receipt of the above information, I wrote the mayor of Summit, Hon. J. W. Bancker, as to the city's attitude. In return I have a letter from which I quote:

> The school board and I have been opposed to the Federal plan of offering bait of this kind, which in many cases has been swallowed and debt incurred for plant not really needed. I am opposed to the plan for the further reason that I think nothing should be done to encourage Federal participation in activities that should be entirely a function of local government. The present financial mess has resulted from too many participations of this kind.
>
> I have stated my position many times locally and have no objection to your using this letter if you so desire.

This is an illustration of the Government practically coercing a community into doing something it believes unmerited.

When Mr. Hopkins set up the C. W. A. in the latter part of 1933, he erected a banquet table for all the parasites in the land. He did not do this deliberately, of course. The strange thing is that he was surprised when the parasites appeared. In February 1934, before a Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. Hopkins said of C. W. A.:

> I am perfectly frank to say that when this enterprise was started it did not occur to me that people would do this kind of petty chiseling.

This experience with C. W. A. may have chilled somewhat Mr. Hopkins' inherent belief that all men are noble and upright. However, the lesson of that unfortunate experience appears to have been missed, for we find Mr. Hopkins before the Appropriations Committee of the House on April 8 of this year still protesting that he is astounded at manifestations of political manipulations in W. P. A. I give you a portion of his testimony:

> Ever since I first became identified with relief in New York State, I have found that some local politicians attempt to use this relief * * * for political purposes, and attempt to spread the word around the town that in order to get a job "I am the fellow that you have got to come to." Well, that pleases his vanity and his ego, and he will make loose statements like that. But we do not employ our men that way. One of the problems that we have to contend with is that of people who have nothing whatever to do with our administration trying to make the public and the voters believe that they are the people who need to be seen.

This is Mr. Hopkins being extremely naive. Recognizing as he does that relief is being used to further political ends, what does he do? He issues a series of orders to administrators in the field advising them, in effect, that they must not administer relief along political lines. That is about as effective an attack on the problem as the handshake that precedes a boxing match.

In the New York Times of Thursday, April 23, 1936, there appeared an editorial entitled "Proposing a Solution", from which I quote, as follows:

> The Economy League estimates that during the first quarter of last year, before W. P. A. was launched, the cost of the mixed system of work relief and home relief then being directed from Washington by F. E. R. A. amounted to $28.45 a month for each case on the relief rolls. At this rate it would cost $1,707,000,000 annually to carry 5,000,000 cases. If one-half of this sum were met by the States and local governments their share would be $853,500,000. Considered as a lump sum this is substantially more than they spent last year, but in this connection it must be remembered that many States and municipalities contributed so little to a solution of the problem in 1935 that their combined expenditures for relief amounted to less than 10 percent of the total sum spent for this purpose within their borders. It is fair to ask for a larger contribution. And if their contribution amounted to as much as one-half of a total relief bill of $1,707,000,000 the Federal Government would be able to shoulder the remaining half without difficulty. In fact, such a division of costs would automatically bring the Federal Budget closely into balance.
>
> Apparently the line of least resistance in Washington in dealing with this greatest of all current governmental problems is to muddle along with the present program simply because there appears to be "no alternative to it" and "nothing else to do." But here in this proposal of the National Economy League or some variation of it is an alternative, and a constructive one. It offers a method of decentralizing responsibility which ought not to be centralized in Washington of restoring local authority and of putting relief on a basis which will not risk Federal credit by an apparently endless addition of new billions to the national debt.

Division of responsibility in the administration of employment relief between the States and the Federal Government most certainly makes for inefficiency and waste. It is a duplication of effort. The States must maintain their own force of administrators and relief workers. The Federal Government must continue its large administrative and clerical staffs in Washington and in the field. With bulging bureaus and all the paraphernalia of forms, requisitions, and questionnaires it is no wonder that the Federal relief monster eats up much of the substance intended for the unemployed.

It appears to me that the remedy for all this confusion, duplication, and wastefulness lies in the proposal which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] makes in his amendment to the pending bill.

Under the provisions of the amendment, the Federal Government becomes the medium through which the larger proportion of relief money becomes available to the States. This is an answer to any argument that many States are unable to find sufficient revenue to furnish adequate relief within their own borders and that the Federal Government, with its greater revenue-raising powers, must be the chief fountain-head of relief funds.

The amendment sets up standards so that a uniform system is brought into being for the distribution of the relief appropriation to the States. It provides an elasticity that would permit payments to States under emergency conditions over and above the regular allocations on a matching basis. It leaves to the States themselves the mechanics of furnishing relief, thereby restoring local initiative and preventing duplication of effort and the inefficiency attendant upon relief centralized in the Federal Government. Under it State sovereignty again has some meaning.

The amendment also specifically prohibits—in fact penalizes—any attempt to make relief a political football.

Since the New Deal began its relief activities with an acknowledgment that in the States themselves lay the proper field for administering relief, and since it has, after a period of absolute centralization, returned to a partial recognition of this principle, it would seem to me logical that the present administration would welcome this amendment.

The New Deal has always taken the position that federally administered relief was to endure only so long as an emergency persisted; that with the return to normal conditions, the Federal Government would step out of the relief picture entirely; that it would step out not only from the administration of relief, but from providing the funds.

Normal conditions, of course, are not yet achieved. It is not yet time for the Federal Government to stop further grants to the States. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan does not propose that this be done. It does, however, provide for "breaking the jump" between centralized Federal relief and the ultimate return of the problem to the States.

To continue federally administered relief is to admit that there has not been sufficient recovery to restore to the States their traditional prerogatives. This premise is one a new dealer could hardly afford to admit, since the present boast of the administration is that recovery is practically at hand.

I intend to support the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and I urge its adoption by the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12870) to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CONSTITUTION SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, inasmuch as I purpose to ask the Senate to grant me the privilege of having considered at this time a joint resolution now on the calendar, I shall make a brief statement as to the nature of the joint resolution. I refer to Order of Business No. 2119, being the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 525) to enable the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans, and for other purposes.

It will be remembered that this Commission is composed of the President of the United States; on the part of the Senate, of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], and one HENRY F. ASHURST; on the part of the House of Representatives, of Hon. SOL BLOOM, of New York; Hon. CHARLES F. MCLAUGHLIN, of Nebraska; Hon. FRANK J. G. DORSEY, of Pennsylvania; Hon. GEORGE P. DARROW, of Pennsylvania; and Hon. JOHN TABER, of New York.

In addition there are Presidential Commissioners, who are C. O'Conner Goolrick, of Virginia; Daniel J. Tobin, of Indiana; William Hirth, of Missouri; Maurice E. Harrison, of California; and Harry Augustus Garfield, of Massachusetts.

As passed by the House the joint resolution authorized an expenditure of $200,000 for the purpose of making appropriate arrangements for the celebration. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary reported the joint resolution with an amendment to increase the appropriation to $250,000, but in view of the fact that the time is short and it is necessary to have this authorization become a law so that the appropriation may be included in the deficiency appropriation bill, if I can secure consent to have the joint resolution now considered, I purpose asking that the amendments recommended by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be rejected and that the joint resolution be passed in the form in which it came from the other House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LOFTIN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I tried to follow the historical statement of the Senator. As I understand, the joint resolution authorization has passed the other House?

Mr. ASHURST. It has.

Mr. MCNARY. In an amount of $200,000?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. MCNARY. Then the Senate committee reported the measure with an amendment increasing the amount to $250,000?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes. The Senate committee reported the House joint resolution with an amendment increasing the amount $50,000.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator now proposes to ask that the amendment be rejected so the joint resolution will carry the original amount provided by the House?

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator has correctly grasped the situation. There is another amendment proposed by the Senate committee, but if I can secure permission for the consideration of the measure, I shall ask the Senate to reject that amendment also, so the House joint resolution may be passed without amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 525) to enable the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 6, after the word "individuals", to insert the words:

And if the participation of other nations in the commemoration be deemed advisable, to communicate with governments of such nations.

And on page 4, line 13, to strike out "$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, established for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States by the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States", approved August 23, 1935 (hereinafter referred to as the

Commission), is authorized and directed to prepare and publish certain historical and educational material, as specified in the approved plans of the Commission, for distribution to libraries, schools, and organized study groups, as well as to Constitutional State and local commissions and individuals; and if the participation of other nations in the commemoration be deemed advisable, to communicate with governments of such nations.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission is authorized and directed to (1) prepare and provide for the general distribution of photolithographic copies of a painting of the Signing of the Constitution accepted by the Commission; and (2) prepare reproductions of approved portraits of the signers and the history of the Constitution, and of its time, together with their facsimile signatures and appropriate biographical sketches, for distribution to libraries, schools, organized study groups, Constitution State and local commissions, and other proper sources.

(b) To carry out the provisions of this section, the Commission is authorized to have printing, binding, photolithography, and other work done at establishments other than the Government Printing Office, as provided for in section 12 of the Printing Act, approved January 12, 1895 (U. S. C., title 44, sec. 14), as amended by the act of July 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 475): *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall preclude the furnishing of the necessary number of copies of all such publications for the use of the Library of Congress, and for international exchange, as required by the United States Code, title 44, sections 139, 139a, and 228.

SEC. 3. The Commission, in order to execute the functions vested in it by law, is authorized to employ, without regard to the civil-service laws, and fix the compensation, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of a historian and such assistants as may be needed, for stenographic, clerical, and expert services, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

SEC. 4. The Commission is authorized to prepare, and provide for the general distribution of, suitable medals and certificates for commemorating the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of this resolution or any other provision of law relating to the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution, the Commission is authorized to procure advice and assistance from any governmental agency, including the services of technical and other personnel in the executive departments and independent establishments, and to procure advice and assistance from and cooperate with individuals and agencies, public or private. The Superintendent of Documents shall make available to the Commission the facilities of his office for the distribution of publications, posters, and other material herein authorized, if so requested.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall have the same privilege of free transmission of official mail matter as other agencies of the United States Government.

SEC. 7. The members and employees of the Commission shall be allowed actual traveling, subsistence, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties.

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $250,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, and such sum when appropriated shall remain available until expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were rejected.

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

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget approved the proposed increase of $50,000 in the measure just passed. I ask that his letter may be incorporated in the RECORD. I am glad, even in a small and modest way, to help bring about a reduction of appropriations.

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

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, May 15, 1936.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: On May 8, 1936, you transmitted to me informally through your secretary a copy of House Joint Resolution 525, "To enable the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans, and for other purposes", and requesting information concerning its relation to the program of the President.

I have taken this matter up with the President, and he has directed me to advise you that the proposed legislation would not be in conflict with his program.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL, *Acting Director.*

INSTRUCTION AND INFORMATION ON CRIME CONTROL

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the bill (S. 4673) to authorize the Attorney General to provide instruction and information on the subject of crime control was introduced by the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary at the request of the Attorney General of the United States. The bill has been considered by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and reported favorably unanimously. A misconception as to the purport of the bill prevails on the part of some newspapers. I, therefore, ask that the bill, and the report of the Committee on the Judiciary in favor of the bill, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. 4673

A bill to authorize the Attorney General to provide instruction and information on the subject of crime control

Be it enacted, etc., That authority is hereby given to the Attorney General of the United States to provide instruction and information in methods of cooperation between the Department of Justice of the United States and the law-enforcement agencies of the several States, the subdivisions and municipalities thereof, and to provide for the collection and dissemination of information on the subject of crime prevention and control and identification.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from the Treasury of the United States such amount as may be necessary to carry out the provisions hereinabove set forth.

[S. Rept. No. 2111, to accompany S. 4673]

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4673) to authorize the Attorney General to provide instruction and information on the subject of crime control, after consideration thereof, report the bill favorably to the Senate with the recommendation that it do pass with the following amendment:

On page 1, line 9, after the words "and control", strike out the period and insert the words "and identification."

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1936.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Supplementing my oral statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday, with reference to S. 4673, permit me briefly to state the principal reasons for the passage of the bill, as follows:

Section 1 of the proposed bill would supply basic and specific authority for the following:

1. The maintenance of the system now in vogue in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in connection with the training of special agents.

2. The maintenance in the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the police school, which has already met with great success, and which should, in my judgment, be supported and strengthened. Under this system, training of the same type and character as that given to our special agents is supplied to carefully selected representatives of various police departments. This is a highly important work, not only of instruction but in furthering our program of cooperation, as it affords intimate contact with police agencies throughout the country and tends to the dissemination of information as to the technique, qualifications, and system approved by the Department of Justice.

3. The maintenance of the civil fingerprint section already established in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and which has become an important adjunct thereto. At the present time there are 130,000 fingerprints in this particular section, and the possibility of valuable work along this line is easily visualized.

4. The maintenance in the Federal Bureau of Prisons of the present system of training guards and other members of its administrative staff, with authority to extend this type of instruction to selected and specially qualified groups.

5. The supplying of instruction and information in methods of coordinating our activities, improving our standards, and in promoting a better understanding between the representatives of the Department of Justice and other law-enforcement agencies.

6. The collection and dissemination of information on the subject of crime prevention and control: This touches not only the highly important matter of the effective cooperation of all law-enforcement agencies—Federal, State, and local—upon which the success of the effort to deal with the crime problem is immediately dependent, but it would enable the Department of Justice, as a clearing house of information, to supply valuable data in connection with the work going on in various parts of our country in the matter of crime prevention. The Department is constantly in receipt of requests for information on this highly important subject, and efforts in this direction have the support of practically all competent authorities on the subject of criminal-law administration.

S. 4673 does not contemplate any reallocation of authority in the Department of Justice, or any radical departure from the existing practices and program. It is a constructive measure designed to support and justify the activities already under way, to make them more effective and to place the Department of Justice in a position to gather and supply information upon all aspects of the crime problem.

Very respectfully yours,

HOMER CUMMINGS, *Attorney General.*

PROTECTION AGAINST LOSS OF CHECKS IN THE MAILS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 9496, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
May 22, 1936.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 1 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 and concur therein; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 2 to said bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. There was a conference report and an agreement on House bill 9496. The Senate adopted the conference report, but when it went back to the House the House disagreed to the conference report and agreed to the amendment of the Senate no. 1, but insisted upon its disagreement to Senate amendment no. 2, increasing the salaries of certain Assistant Postmasters General. In order that we may have prompt disposition of the bill, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment no. 2.

The motion was agreed to.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, because of a communication I have just received from the executive director of the United States Conference of Mayors, and because the subject matter is one of very great importance to the cities of the country, I desire to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] in charge of the bill, if there is any warrant for the fears expressed by those who represent the organization referred to and whether or not direful consequences will ensue from an amendment which appears in the bill. May I read the statement so the question will be understandable:

In view of the provisions of that portion of the deficiency appropriation bill pertaining to P. W. A. loans and grants, which provision reads as follows:

"*Provided*, That not more than 30 percent shall be granted on any such project the cost of which is more than $100,000, and in no case shall the grant exceed 45 percent",

the United States Conference of Mayors believe it necessary to call to the attention of the United States Senate the following statement of facts:

This proposal alters fundamentally the basis upon which the applications from the major cities of the United States were submitted to the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works. Practically all the projects from this group of cities, as indicated in the list submitted to the Senate by P. W. A. Administrator Ickes and printed on pages 377–443 of the Senate hearings, were prepared and filed on the assumption that a 45-percent grant would be authorized. If the proposal now before the Senate is adopted, reducing the amount of the Federal grant from 45 to 30 percent, I am authorized to state on behalf of a substantial number of the major cities having project applications included in the already approved list that these cities will be unable to carry out their responsibilities and thus will be unable to participate in the W. P. A. program.

This inability to proceed on a 30-percent basis arises from the following:

1. In those cases where funds are available for the city share of 55 percent of the project, it is impossible overnight to secure the additional 15 percent required if a Federal grant of only 30 percent is authorized.

2. In those cases where the city share has been predicated on the incurring of debt to the extent of 55 percent of the cost of the project, the existing constitutional, statutory, and charter debt limitation renders it legally impossible to increase the city indebtedness up to 70 percent of the cost of the project.

3. A third group of cities involved are those which have by referendum vote of their citizens approved bond issues for 55 percent of the cost of the project or projects. These referendums have practically all been based on the proposition that a 45-percent grant would be authorized. The reduction of the grant to 30 percent invalidates most of these referendums, thus necessitating new elections. The time required under the various laws to hold new elections completely eliminates any possibility of participation due to the provision in the Senate bill requiring projects to be undertaken immediately.

The Conference of Mayors specifically points out that almost without exception the approved applications before the P. W. A. from the large industrial cities of the country involve amounts over $100,000. It is only in the small towns, villages, and rural areas where the projects consistently run under $100,000. Therefore, if the provision reducing the amount of the grant is adopted, it simply means the shutting out of participation on the part of those metropolitan areas in which the bulk of unemployment exists. The very purpose of the P. W. A. program is thereby defeated.

In view of the above the Members of the Senate should know that in approving the present P. W. A. loan-and-grant provision in the deficiency bill, the important cities in their States which have approved applications included in the list now before the Senate will be unable to carry out any responsibility and will of necessity have to withdraw their applications.

It is submitted:

1. That no logical reason is apparent for discriminating between the various projects on the basis outlined in the bill (namely, those over $100,000 and those under $100,000) in regard to the amount of the grant to be given.

2. It should be made clear that if the 30-percent grant feature is retained, the great majority of applications from the large industrial cities having the bulk of unemployment will have to be withdrawn, thus defeating the goal of the P. W. A. program.

The Conference of Mayors believes once this situation is brought to the attention of the Senate, the changing of rules in the middle of the game, at a time when the cities do not even have an opportunity, due to legal and financial limitations, of learning the new rules, will not be authorized. The P. W. A. program, waiting to go into operation only for the release of further appropriations, can only be preserved and carried out if the basis upon which the applications were filed, namely, a 45-percent Federal grant, is continued.

PAUL V. BETTERS,
Executive Director,
United States Conference of Mayors.

WASHINGTON, *May 29, 1936.*

I inquire of the Senator from Colorado if these results will follow the amendment which is referred to by the mayors of the larger cities of the country?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I think the gentlemen who constitute the conference of mayors have overlooked the actual situation.

The bill which came before this body from the House did not contain a single cent for public works. What we are putting in the bill is an additional grant. We are giving an opportunity which did not exist under the House bill. That is, the mayors are complaining of an increased beneficence on the part of the Government. There are no limitations whatsoever in the bill in reference to the W. P. A. appropriation. There is an appropriation of $1,425,000,000 which is turned over to the President. If he sees fit, with that money he may make 100-percent grants to these cities. There is no limitation. In the bill itself is a specification for buildings and other work relief.

The conference of mayors refer to the list of approved projects. They refer to the votes they have taken. All those approved projects, all those votes, were with reference to projects to be carried out under the $4,800,000,000 appropriation, which we are not now considering. We are providing an additional appropriation. If the mayors have a complaint, it is because they did not come within the original appropriation. The 45-percent grant which they are looking for was the rule adopted by the Administrator of Public Works in the distribution of the public-works funds.

It is not intended in this bill, as the Senate committee seeks to amend it, to tie the hands of the Administrator to this list. This list of projects—and I speak a little frankly—was gathered up hurriedly. It was gathered up at the time the $4,800,000,000 act was under consideration, to impress upon the Congress the necessity for making that great, and in my judgment that unwarranted, appropriation. It was not a carefully considered list. Some $800,000,000 have been approved; votes have been taken; but we have here an increase over the bill as passed by the House which will amount to $300,000,000.

The purpose of the committee in providing what is the equivalent of a new appropriation for this purpose was to make the money go as far as possible. If we permit 45-percent grants, we shall not put as many people to work as if we make 30-percent grants. In other words, take a $100,000 project: If the Government gives 45 percent, the money will run out sooner than if it makes 30-percent grants; and the

thing we have in mind in this bill is the employment of those in need. If we take off this limitation, we shall simply reduce the efficiacy of the appropriation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. Permit a word in response, just for a moment.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for his explanation, but I am unable to follow him in what he says about adding employment; for, after all, the big problem that presents itself to us today is employment. If up to this time 45-percent grants have been the rule; if the bill changes the 45-percent grant to a 30-percent grant; if it be true that elections have been held in the large cities of the country upon the theory of a 45-percent grant, then it seems to me that we are disrupting the trend of the endeavor to reemploy and, instead of giving more opportunity for employment, we are not only destroying what now has been entered upon or endeavored to be entered upon, the preliminary stages of which have been complied with, but we are making it more and more impossible for the larger cities to contribute the amount that is thus demanded, and thereby we increase unemployment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from California speaks of changing the rule. When the original act was passed appropriating $3,300,000,000, all of which was put in the hands of the then emergency administrator, the 30-percent grant was the rule that was applied in all the projects at that time. The 45-percent grant has been applied only in a much smaller amount, and that is in the allocation of some $400,000,000 or less out of the $4,800,000,000. That is, we are going back to the rule which was applied in the larger appropriation for public works, and which, in my judgment, operated satisfactorily.

So far as large cities, small cities, and rural districts are concerned, I am unable to see why there is or can be a necessity for discrimination. We are doing this, I will say to the Senator, and I know he will agree with that, because he thinks these matters should all be on the larger-grant basis: We are limiting the construction of projects to those that can be completed within 1 year. Necessarily, that limits construction to smaller projects. It was the hope of the committee to multiply the number of projects by putting a limit upon the cost involved in their construction; so if the Senator has in mind great city constructions, the type of constructions where bond issues will be authorized, they are not feasible under the 1-year limitation.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is all the more reason, I think, for the elimination of the 1-year limitation; but it does not answer the problem we are just considering.

Suppose, as I understand the Senator—and, of course, he knows the statistics; I do not—$400,000,000 of projects upon a 45-percent basis have been agreed upon. Some of those are now in process of construction. Some of them have passed merely the preliminary stages. If the bill changes the amount of grant that is accorded to those projects, it seems to me only confusion can result.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, there is no change in the grant to any project which is under construction. The bill does not apply to any project that is under construction. It applies only to new projects to be authorized. For all the projects that have been authorized, the money is now allocated, obligated, set aside. This provision is merely dealing with projects to be authorized after this money is made available.

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, yes; but there are many projects where the construction perhaps has not been undertaken nor the contracts made, but where elections have been held upon the theory, and the theory of the Government itself, that the grant was to be 45 percent. Now it is proposed to change it to 30 percent, and it makes confusion; it does not tend to diminish unemployment; and it seems to me it cannot accomplish any beneficial results.

Mr. ADAMS. If I may add one word, the Senator says the 30-percent basis does not increase employment. I think the mathematics of the situation is against him. If the Government gives $300,000 upon condition that $700,000 be provided by a city for a waterworks, there is a million dollars which will be expended, which will furnish employment. There will be left for another employment $150,000 which would not be available if the grant were 45 percent. In other words, we are spreading the money further, and in my judgment more persons will be employed.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BULKLEY. That conclusion is based on the assumption that the municipality can put up 70 percent. Suppose the municipality is so hard up, or so bound by debt limitations, that it cannot put up 70 percent. Then, in order to obtain the employment, the Government will have to have recourse to the W. P. A., and will be putting up 100 percent. That is the very suggestion the Senator himself made, that the W. P. A. is available for these projects.

I contend, with the Senator from California, that employment will be increased by a 45-percent grant. Furthermore, there is no doubt that in the form in which this provision appears it is a discrimination against the larger projects in the larger cities. The larger cities are the very places where unemployment is most distressful, and why there should be a discrimination against the larger cities is something that I do not think the Senator has explained.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the Senator that approximately one and a half billion dollars is available to meet unemployment wherever it exists. Necessarily the larger cities, where greater unemployment exists, will have the larger share of that amount. In this instance, a comparatively small amount is involved. It is an effort to encourage a different type of public-works improvement, a type which I think is less available to the great cities than to the smaller cities and the rural communities, where it is a question whether it would be better to have $600,000,000 for construction or a billion dollars for construction.

Mr. BULKLEY. We are asking to have it made available on terms that the cities can meet. I am sorry this matter has come up in such a hurry that I have not the specific facts; but I know in my own city there are embarrassments due to debt limitations, that there is difficulty in going up to these high percentages, and that we are very much distressed right now and obliged to keep a large number of otherwise unemployed persons on the W. P. A. rolls, which cost the Government 100 percent.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, I cannot understand that a donation from the Government would be an embarrassment.

The question is, How much shall the Government donate? Shall it donate one amount or another? It seems to me the donees ought to be a little more grateful and say, "Well, now, 30 percent will be helpful, though, of course, we should like more." I think, however, the Treasury has an interest in the matter; I think the unemployed of the country as a whole have an interest in the matter; and I think those interests will be subserved by imposing these limitations. If I were given my own choice in the matter, I should put the 30-percent limitation on all the projects.

Mr. JOHNSON. Why do you not?

Mr. ADAMS. I could not get votes enough in the committee, I will say.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is a good reason. I will not quarrel with the mathematics of the Senator from Colorado. I do not feel that I am able to cope with him in mathematics. The only thing in which I was "cinched" when I was in college was higher mathematics.

Mr. ADAMS. I doubt that very much, because, as I have observed the Senator on the floor of the Senate, nobody has dealt more in higher mathematics than has the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not obvious to the Senator that a policy has been started by the Government and that policy has been followed? The Senator says there are $400,000,000 of projects under that policy in connection with which communities which are hard put to it financially today have been able to pass, by the votes of their people, laws providing for participation in a policy of the Government. I am not

discussing that now, and I am not saying whether grants of one sort or grants at all should be accorded, but after these hard-put communities have voted upon the subject suddenly they are told, "Your vote is null. We will destroy its effect entirely. You must begin again. You must attempt again to do the thing you sought to do under the aegis of the Government. You must begin to do it all over."

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California inform the Senate how many such projects are involved in this matter?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not know.

Mr. GLASS. Do the mayors tell us how many?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; the communication I have received, which came only today, does not say how many.

Mr. GLASS. Do they know how many there are?

Mr. JOHNSON. Please do not ask me; I do not know. I was calling attention to a matter which was brought to my notice only today, and I was seeking information about it. I assume they do know, and, with time sufficient to ascertain, undoubtedly the information could be furnished to the Senator and to the Senate. I have no doubt on that score.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the information as to the various projects which were submitted under the former appropriations is in the record. The point I have been unable to make the Senator understand is that we are starting something new. This is a new bill; it is not part of that which has gone before. The projects which have been voted, the bond issues which have been authorized, have no relationship to the appropriation which is now under consideration.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, may I ask what the pending amendment is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the pending amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment on page 29, down to line 24, be agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. My inquiry is, What is the pending amendment?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment now pending.

The CHIEF CLERK. The pending amendment is, on page 29, line 4, after the word "appropriation", to strike out down to and including line 15, and to insert the amendment of the committee on page 29, beginning with line 16 and ending with line 23, as amended.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, one amendment to the amendment has been offered and agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the clerk stated that the question was on the amendment of the committee "as amended." How has it been amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment which has been offered and agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] offered an amendment, on page 29, line 19, after the word "act", to insert the words "and a separate list of persons who, because of illness or advanced age, are unemployable."

Mr. FLETCHER. Why can we not agree to the amendment down to line 24?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I do not know that I am going to agree to that amendment to the amendment. I did not hear the amendment offered.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish to apologize to the Senator, if he is interested in the pending amendment, for breaking in in the fashion in which I interrupted. I called the attention of the Senator from Colorado to the particular matter which had come to me, and asked him if I might interrogate him upon it. I did not desire to disturb the progress of the bill.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, in a very few moments we will reach the section in which the Senator is interested, and then we might act on it, if an amendment is to be offered.

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

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I should like to ask what amendment to the amendment has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated again.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 19, after the word "act", the Senator from Pennsylvania proposed to insert the words "and a separate list of persons who, because of illness or advanced age, are unemployable."

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber at the time that amendment was offered, and I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was agreed to. It has no relevancy to this particular section, so far as I can see. The amendment reported by the committee provides for a survery of unemployable persons and restricts the list to persons who are citizens of this country, or, if aliens, they must have filed declaration of intention to become citizens, and they must not have illegally entered the country.

As I understand the amendment as it has been read by the clerk amends that section so as to provide that a list of persons who are sick or of advanced age be made, and the rest of the section would provide that from such a list of persons who are sick or of advanced age should be stricken those who are aliens. It does not seem to me that that would make good sense at all.

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me with particular reference to the matter before us?

Mr. McNARY. Not for the moment. I am advised that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania offered the amendment to the amendment which was adopted earlier in the day.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I understood that; and that is why I have moved to reconsider the vote.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Pennsylvania is now absent from the Chamber, and I do not care to have any proceedings taken regarding the amendment during his absence.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I shall be glad to withdraw my motion temporarily, until the Senator from Pennsylvania returns, but I do not want the amendment to be adopted in the form in which it is at this time.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator will have 2 days in which to move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BYRNES. I will ask that the amendment be passed over until the Senator from Pennsylvania returns to the Chamber.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, prior to the departure of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] he talked with me in regard to this particular amendment to the amendment of the committee, at which time I understood from him that the acceptance of his amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreeable. As a matter of fact, if I do not misinterpret the construction of the words the Senator has added, they merely provide that when any person is disqualified for work under the amendment there shall be made for future reference a list of those who are not employable by reason of illness or old age or other disqualifications. That was the explanation given to me of the Davis amendment.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, that is simply asking for a factual statement, but it does not prevent the elimination of those people from the relief rolls.

Mr. BYRNES. If the Senator will take the language and read it, he will find that it has no reference to this particular section. I may be in hearty accord with the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, but it certainly seems to me that it has no relevancy to the language of this particular section. However, I shall ask that no action be taken until the Senator from Pennsylvania returns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is that the amendment, as amended, be passed over for the time being?

Mr. BYRNES. That is my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 29, after line 23, to insert the following:

No Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted with funds provided for in this appropriation unless and until an amount sufficient for its completion has been allocated and irrevocably set aside for its completion, and the President is hereby authorized to restore to the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works out of the funds hereby appropriated any sums which after December 28, 1934, were, by order of the President, impounded or transferred to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration from appropriations heretofore made available to such Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works and allocated by such Administration to public-works projects.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment. I had prepared the amendment so that it should come after line 10, on page 30, understanding that the paragraph to which reference is now being made was a single amendment. I offer the amendment to the amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the President of the United States is authorized to appoint two boards of three members each, one to be known as the Florida Canal Board and the other as the Passamaquoddy Board, the members of which shall be qualified members of the engineering profession who are not employees of the United States, or of the State of Florida, or of the State of Maine, and who have in no manner been connected with or have any financial interest, present or prospective, in what are known as the Atlantic-Gulf Ship Canal project, Florida, and the Passamaquoddy tidal power project, Maine.

The Florida Canal Board shall review the reports heretofore rendered in connection with the project for a sea-level ship canal across the State of Florida, with particular reference to the questions of (a) whether the construction of such a canal across the State of Florida between the St. Johns River and the Withlacoochee River would create any consequential or irremediable disturbance of the ground water levels of the State of Florida; (b) the estimated costs of constructing, maintaining, and operating such a canal; and (c) the justification for the expenditure of the Federal funds estimated to be required. The board shall make such further study of these and other pertinent questions relating to this project as it may deem necessary.

The Passamaquoddy Board shall review the reports heretofore rendered in connection with the Passamaquoddy tidal power project in the State of Maine, with particular reference to the questions of (a) the engineering feasibility of the project; (b) its justification, including the possibilities with respect to the establishment of industries requiring electric power in eastern Maine; (c) its scientific value from the knowledge and experience to be gained with respect to tidal-power development; and (d) estimated costs of construction, operation, and maintenance. The board shall make such further study of these and other pertinent questions relating to this project as it may deem necessary.

Each of the aforementioned boards shall report its findings and recommendations to the President on or before July 20, 1936. Should the conclusions of such boards be favorable to the continuance by the Federal Government of the two projects hereinbefore mentioned, or either of them, the President is hereby authorized to make allotments for carrying forward such project or projects during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, from any funds now or hereafter available for relief and work relief on useful projects, as follows:

For a ship canal across the State of Florida, not to exceed $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the total estimated capital cost of such canal shall not exceed $150,000,000, including all funds previously allotted thereto.

For the Passamaquoddy tidal-power project, Maine, not to exceed $9,000,000: *Provided*, That the total estimated capital cost of such project shall not exceed $42,000,000, including all funds previously allotted thereto.

The members of the boards herein authorized to be appointed shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per day for each day of service, including Sundays and holidays, together with their necessary traveling expenses, and each board is authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it may find necessary to assist in the performance of its functions, without regard to civil-service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to pay their necessary traveling expenses. The expenditures authorized by this section shall be paid from funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors.

The Secretary of War and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works shall make available to the boards herein authorized all reports, records, plans, estimates, or other data and information in their possession which in any manner relate to the two projects hereinbefore mentioned and shall render such aid and assistance as said boards may request in connection with the duties imposed upon them by this joint resolution.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the deficiency bill, throughout consideration of the bill, had to perform the somewhat disagreeable duty of making points of order. A good many proposals have come before our subcommittee which the subcommittee declined to put upon the bill, regardless of their merit, because they constituted what we regarded as legislation on an appropriation bill. We have endeavored to apply that rule uniformly. By reason of the direction contained in the rules of the Senate Appropriations Committee and by reason of the rules of the Senate, I feel obliged to raise what I regard as a point of order against the amendment. It seems to me that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill. Further, it seems to me that it is not germane to the section to which it is applied.

Let me illustrate what I mean. The amendment opens with the provision:

That the President of the United States is authorized to appoint two boards of three members each.

The amendment describes their duties and their functions. It seems to me that is clearly legislation. In years past appropriation bills were subject to many abuses. In many instances the necessity for the passage of the appropriation bills led to the coercion of Congress into acceptance of amendments. General legislation not dealing directly with the appropriation was placed upon appropriation bills. The result was that the Senate, in the course of a long experience, out of its wisdom, provided rule XVI, which forbids the inclusion of new or general legislation in an appropriation bill and provides that no amendment may be made which is not germane.

No one is more reluctant than am I to make points of order against various matters which have come before the committee; but, in view of the fact that points of order were made against project after project, against amendment after amendment, it seems to me I am obliged to make a point of order in the present case; and I therefore make a point of order against the pending amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, it is recognized that the Senator from Colorado has full right to make the point of order. However, I point out the fact, which appears to me to be incontrovertible, that the point of order is not well taken, for the reason that the committee has inserted in the bill a provision of general legislation which my amendment seeks to amend or modify.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator take the position that the adoption of an amendment by a committee invalidates the rule of the Senate—in other words, that a committee can make an amendment in order on a general appropriation bill which would otherwise not be in order?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, Mr. President; certainly not. However, the Senator from Colorado has not made the point of order to the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK. I was about to say, if the Senator will permit me, that the amendment which the Senator from Arkansas has offered seems to me one of the most remarkable ever presented to the Senate, because it is not only in contravention of the ordinary rule of the Senate against legislation on an appropriation bill, but it is even legislation in the second degree. In other words, I think clearly the committee amendment is subject to a point of order because it is legislation; and on the principle that two wrongs do not make one right, it seems to me the Senator from Arkansas cannot logically argue against the point of order made by the Senator from Colorado simply by reason of the fact that no Senator has as yet seen fit to make the point of order against the committee amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to state the case I think I can convince him that the position he has just announced is not well taken.

The committee has proposed the insertion of an amendment to the bill which itself is legislation, and the insertion of that amendment makes necessary the consideration of the amendment I have proposed, unless it is designed indirectly to prevent the allotment of funds appropriated in the bill for the two projects carried in my amendment.

The language which the committee has offered is:

> No Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted with funds provided for in this appropriation unless and until an amount sufficient for its completion has been allocated and irrevocably set aside for its completion—

And so forth.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him in order to make an inquiry?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes. I should like to have a chance to state my case, but I will yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I shall not interrupt the Senator if he would rather I should not do so.

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. My inquiry is directed to the particular part of the bill which the Senator was reading. It occurred to me that that was a limitation upon an appropriation rather than legislation. The Senate and the Appropriations Committee have authority, under the rules, to impose limitations upon appropriations, and I think that is the interpretation which is applicable to the section which the Senator is reading.

Mr. ROBINSON. No, Mr. President; that interpretation is not sound. Under the law which we passed last year the President made an allotment of funds for the two projects incorporated or referred to in this amendment, and he had full authority to make that allotment. The committee now proposes as an affirmative proposition to prevent the initiation of Federal projects unless the entire amount necessary for their completion is provided at the time they are initiated. That is not a limitation in the legal or proper sense of the word. It is an affirmative provision of law.

Under the existing law the President could allot any portion of the funds appropriated in this bill to carry forward the two projects which are under consideration; but the committee seeks to prevent that from being done by having enacted a provision of law that no project shall be undertaken unless all the funds that are necessary for its completion shall be supplied at once. My contention is that that is general legislation; under the indisputable precedents of the Senate it is subject to amendment; and the point of order that the amendment relates to general legislation does not lie; otherwise, the committee could violate its own rules and have immunity from the correction of such mistakes as it might be found to have made.

The committee seeks now to enact a general law on the subject of initiating projects, namely, that no project shall be commenced unless all the money necessary for its completion is provided at the time of its commencement. If that is not general legislation, if it does not come within the rule to which reference has been made, it is difficult to conceive a case in which that would occur.

So, I assume there is no question about the right of the Senate to amend this amendment. The committee cannot propose to legislate in a general appropriation bill and deny the right of the Senate to modify its proposition.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In other words, Mr. President, if I understand the Senator's position, it is that if the point of order is to lie at all, it must lie against the committee amendment after it shall have been perfected by such amendments as Senators may desire to offer to it, whether legislative in character or not.

Mr. ROBINSON. Possibly the point of order might be made against the committee amendment itself; but the committee amendment, constituting legislation, is subject to amendment.

I have made no point of order against the committee amendment, nor has any other Senator. What the committee apparently is seeking to do, or what the Senator from Colorado is seeking to do by the committee amendment, is to enact general legislation on an appropriation bill and then take advantage of the rule of the Senate to prevent any Senator from changing or having an opportunity to change that amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator's contention seems to me to be reasonable. The committee amendment itself is subject to a point of order. Does the Senator agree to that?

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly; it is legislation.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I wish to ask the Senator, as a practical matter, if the committee amendment is subject to a point of order—and I make the suggestion in order to save time as much as for anything else; for the Senator's amendment, of course, will excite a great deal of discussion and consume considerable time—would we not be wasting our time, knowing that, whether the Senator's amendment shall be agreed to or not, the entire provision is going to be subject to a point of order and that a point of order will certainly be made by some Senator opposing the amendment? Would we not be wasting our time to go ahead with the amendment?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I call attention to the rule, which reads:

> Or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate.

This amendment has been moved by a standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but it is not a committee amendment. The committee is subject to the rules of the Senate, and cannot report an amendment——

Mr. FLETCHER. The amendment has been reported by a standing committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Which, if offered by a Senator, would be subject to a point of order and itself escape, the only difference being under the rules of the Senate that when the committee proposes an amendment subject to a point of order on these grounds, and the point of order is sustained, the entire bill goes back to the committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not think the committee amendment is subject to a point of order, because it has been reported.

Mr. ROBINSON. The committee amendment has been reported by a standing committee of the Senate, the Appropriations Committee. The amendment to the committee amendment has also been reported by a standing committee of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce. The Senate Committee on Appropriations saw fit to incorporate legislation in this bill. Having done that, having brought in an amendment that otherwise would be subject to a point of order—that is to say, if the committee had not reported the amendment, the committee cannot now be heard to make a point of order against an amendment that is germane to its amendment.

Mr. GLASS and Mr. CLARK addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. As chairman of the Appropriations Committee, it was my opinion, and I so stated, that the proposal was legislation and subject to a point of order, and, that under the rules of the Senate, the committee had no right to report this amendment to the bill, because when the committee acted there had been no action by any standing

committee of the Senate, and the Committee on Appropriations has no right under the practice, as I have observed it for 16 years, and under rule XVI of the Senate, to incorporate legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. But it did do it.

Mr. GLASS. I know it did, and, therefore, in my judgment, it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The provision concerning general legislation is to be found in paragraph 2 of rule XVI and has nothing whatever to do with whether or not it is proposed by a standing committee of the Senate. The rule is absolutely explicit, and, if the Senator from Arkansas will pardon me, I should like to read that paragraph. It is as follows:

> The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

There is not a line in that paragraph dealing with general legislation which mentions the fact that it shall be reported by a standing committee of the Senate. That reference is found in paragraph 1 in relation to amendments proposing to increase items of appropriation.

Mr. GLASS. That is the very point I made as chairman of the committee, but the committee disregarded my views.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The truth is that the entire title II of the House bill as it came to the Senate deals with general legislation. It carries provisions that are legislative and not simply appropriations; and, in view of the fact that the entire title deals with legislative matters which are beyond the scope of mere appropriations, it cannot be held that an amendment to that title, which deals with a legislative matter, is, therefore, out of order.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is the point I am attempting to make, provided the amendment is germane.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I do not wish to interrupt the argument of the Senator from Arkansas, but it has been interrupted so much that, with his consent, I will trespass upon his good nature for one more suggestion. According to the argument of the Senator from Kentucky, any matter of legislation would be in order as an amendment to the committee amendment. In other words, many measures of great importance are pending in this body, and, for instance, the Wagner-Costigan antilynching bill would be in order as an amendment to this appropriation bill, if the contention of the Senator is correct; and a measure which has been pending in several committees of the Senate for the last year and a half to take the profit out of war also would be in order on this amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I think the correct test is whether my amendment is germane to the provision that is in the bill, whether it is germane to the committee amendment. I make no issue on that phase of the point of order which is raised by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS]. I think it is germane, and will proceed to argue that point when I have the opportunity to do so; but I do not think the point of order lies that it constitutes general legislation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that as soon as I can get the floor in my own right I intend to make a point of order against the committee amendment; and if the point of order be overruled, in conformity with the latest contention of the Senator from Arkansas—not the one he was making a few moments ago—then I intend to offer the Wagner-Costigan bill as an amendment to the committee amendment; and if that shall be voted down, I intend to offer other bills as amendments to the committee amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Of course, the Senator from Missouri may take his own course about that, but I hardly think it is appropriate during the time I am addressing the Senate on the point of order for him to say what he proposes to do if the Senate does not agree with him in the conclusion he reaches. He may take any course he pleases.

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

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] both partially rely upon the fact, they say, that the proposed amendment is in the form reported by a standing committee of the Senate. Is it not a fact that it is not in the form reported by the Commerce Committee?

Mr. ROBINSON. It is almost in the identical form.

Mr. VANDENBERG. "Almost" is not enough under the rule, is it?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes. I think it is substantially in that form. The only change that has been made in the amendment is with reference to the time of the report of the board. Of course, if the Senator chose to be that technical, I could very easily remove that objection by changing the amendment so as to conform to the exact date carried in the resolution. However, I do not anticipate anyone here wishes to pursue that course.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. I am not a parliamentarian. I have been here 34 years, and I do not know any more about parliamentary practice today than when I came, and therefore I am asking the Senator from Arkansas the question. Is it competent for the Appropriations Committee of the Senate to make a point of order against a provision in a House bill passed by the House?

Mr. ROBINSON. No.

Mr. GLASS. Therefore, we did not make the point of order against title II of the bill. It did not originate with the Senate committee. It came over from the House.

Mr. ROBINSON. But the Senator from Virginia is in error about that. I had not referred to the general legislation which is carried in the original House bill. I had referred to and had taken note of the general legislation which the Senator from Virginia reported when he reported the pending bill.

Mr. GLASS. I understood that was the position taken by the Senator from Arkansas, but my friend the expert parliamentarian from Kentucky, Mr. BARKLEY, took the position that the whole title was subject to a point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no, Mr. President. I did not take that position. I said that because the House included title II, which is legislation, the amendment to that legislative matter brought forward by the Senator from Arkansas is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the other body incorporates general legislation, and general legislation comes here in an appropriation bill, it is subject to amendment in this body. The only valid question that can be raised is whether the proposed amendment is germane to the provision in the bill. I have said that over and over again, and yet for some reason there are those on the floor of the Senate who do not seem to understand my position as I am endeavoring to define it.

That is not the point upon which I rely. The point upon which I rely is that, aside from any question as to whether the rule which has been invoked contemplates that the Appropriations Committee can report in a general appropriation bill a provision for general legislation without subjecting itself to the danger of the penalty provided in the rule against general legislation in appropriation bills, the committee has reported a provision which does constitute general legislation, and under every rule, both the rules of the

House of Representatives and the rules of the Senate, we have the right to modify that provision. The only legal limitation on that right found in our rules is whether the proposed modification is germane to the provision which it is sought to modify.

I do not know how to make the matter any more clear. I avert and avoid questions as to whether a point of order would lie to the original provision reported by the Appropriations Committee because that question is not here. I am directing my argument to the point of order made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS]. His point is that I have offered a provision of general legislation to a general appropriation bill. My reply to him is that the provision sought to be amended is itself general legislation and, therefore, subject to amendment. The only limitation on the right to amend is whether the proposed amendment is germane to the provision which is under consideration. I have never gotten far enough to state why I think it is germane.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, the precedents are unbroken, particularly since the time of Vice President Marshall, that once the House enters a field of general legislation in an appropriation bill which it passes, then the provision of the Senate rules providing against general legislation on a general appropriation bill cannot be invoked to stop either the Senate committee or the Senate itself from continuing in that field of general legislation which has been invaded by the House.

Mr. ROBINSON. So long as the continuation is germane.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; so long as the continuation is germane. I think an examination of the precedents will show that they are unbroken. I am certain they are unbroken since the time Vice President Marshall presided over this body.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think that is true.

Let me state now why I think the second feature of the point of order made by the Senator from Colorado does not lie, namely, that my amendment is not germane to the provisions to which it relates. I am seeking to amend the proposed general legislation reading as follows:

No Federal projects shall be undertaken or prosecuted—

And so forth. The provision has been read a number of times and I shall not again complete the reading of it. But for that provision the President, so far as the law is concerned, could make the allocation contemplated by my amendment, namely, $10,000,000 for the Florida ship canal and $9,000,000 for the Passamaquoddy power project. If that provision remains in the bill unchanged, he cannot do it.

The object is to change the law. The purpose of the provision which I am seeking to amend is to make it impossible for an allotment to be made on the two projects to which my amendment has reference. If the committee provision is not incorporated in the bill, if the law is not changed, it is still possible for the President, if he chooses to do so, to do substantially what he did in the beginning, namely, allot from the work-relief fund sums for carrying on the construction of the Florida ship canal and the Passamaquoddy power project. Is there any Senator who disputes that? But for this proposed change in the law, the proposed change to be made at the instance of the committee, the projects might be carried forward under this bill; but if that change is made in the law which the committee amendment contemplates, there can be no allocation of funds for either the Florida ship canal or Passamaquoddy. I like that name. There is something rather soothing about the name "Passamaquoddy." [Laughter.]

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I should not like to permit to pass unchallenged the Senator's statement that the amendment of the Appropriations Committee was intended to preclude any allocation either to the Florida ship canal or to the Passamaquoddy project. Neither of them was mentioned, and I do not think either one of them entered the mind of any member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, the Senator does not doubt that the legal effect of the language is as I have stated. I do not mean to imply that it was intended that the provision should be limited to these two projects. It is a general provision of law which would apply to all projects.

Mr. GLASS. That was intended; but we had not in mind Passamaquoddy or the Florida canal, because when we acted we had not any idea that those projects would be revived.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HALE. I should like to state that when the amendment which now appears in the bill was before the Appropriations Committee I moved to lay it on the table for the very reason that I thought it would block any appropriation that might be made for one or the other of these two projects. My motion, however, was rejected.

Mr. ROBINSON. I thank the Senator from Maine. The Senator from Maine, then, when the amendment was under consideration in the committee, recognizing its effect on these two projects, sought to lay the amendment on the table; and it is not, perhaps, of first materiality what was in the minds of the proponents of the provision, if it was not expressed. It is sufficient to say that the legal effect of the provision is to prevent an allotment for either of these projects.

Mr. HALE. I may say that at the time this matter came up, my impression is that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] was not in the committee room.

Mr. GLASS. I certainly was not, because not during the consideration of the deficiency bill did I hear of Passamaquoddy or the Florida ship canal. I voted for the Florida ship canal, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I know it.

Mr. GLASS. But I thought the amendment was subject to a point of order, and so stated in the general committee.

Mr. HALE. I am very sure the Senator from Virginia was not present.

Mr. ROBINSON. I unqualifiedly accept the statement of the Senator from Virginia that he did not have in mind these particular projects, and that he opposed the amendment; but the truth of the matter is that if the amendment should be agreed to it would so change the general law that these projects could not be carried on, and if it should not be agreed to they still could be carried on.

In my judgment, that is a complete answer to the point of order made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] that the amendment offered by myself is not germane to the provision to which it is sought to be attached. If the amendment I have proposed should be agreed to, it would modify the committee amendment so that as to these two projects already commenced it might be possible to continue them. It is true that their continuance is not made certain by the provisions of the amendment, but it is also true that if the boards proposed to be created, after they have made their studies, report that the projects are feasible and worthy—if, in other words, the reports of the boards are favorable—then the President will have an authorization for these projects to the extent that he may allot $10,000,000 for the one and $9,000,000 for the other for expenditure during the fiscal year.

I do not know why I should take more of the Senate's time in discussing the point of order. It seems to me clearly established that the Senate has the right to amend this provision if it chooses to do so; that it would be unreasonable to say that the committee may report an amendment constituting general legislation, as almost everyone concedes, and that that provision should not be subject to modification by the Senate itself. It is the well-established rule that even though general legislation may be incorporated in a measure by this House or the other House, or by a committee of this body, if the provision does constitute legislation it is subject to amendment just like any other

provision. The only limitation on the right to change it is that the changes must be germane to the subject matter of the proposed legislation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to enter a point of order against the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The point of order made by the Senator from Missouri against the committee amendment is overruled.

Mr. CLARK. I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Chavez	Johnson	Pittman
Ashurst	Clark	Keyes	Pope
Austin	Connally	King	Radcliffe
Bachman	Coolidge	La Follette	Reynolds
Bailey	Copeland	Loftin	Robinson
Barbour	Couzens	Lonergan	Russell
Barkley	Davis	Long	Schwellenbach
Benson	Duffy	McAdoo	Sheppard
Bilbo	Fletcher	McGill	Shipstead
Black	Frazier	McKellar	Smith
Borah	George	McNary	Steiwer
Brown	Gerry	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkley	Gibson	Metcalf	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Glass	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Guffey	Murphy	Truman
Byrd	Hale	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hastings	Neely	Wagner
Capper	Hatch	Norris	Walsh
Caraway	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Carey	Holt	Overton	White

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

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator from Missouri takes the floor, will he permit the Chair to make a statement as to his ruling?

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri made the point of order that the committee amendment amounted to general legislation. The Chair overruled the point of order made by the Senator from Missouri because title II of the bill as it came from the House of Representatives contained many matters of general legislation, and in such a case the rule laid down by Vice President Marshall is stated thus:

> Notwithstanding the rule of the Senate to the effect that general legislation may not be attached to an appropriation bill, still when the House of Representatives opens the door and proceeds to enter upon a field of general legislation which has to do with a subject of this character, the Chair is going to rule—but, of course, the Senate can reverse the ruling of the Chair—that the House having opened the door the Senate of the United States can walk in through the door and pursue the field.

In view of that ruling, the Chair announced that the point of order made by the Senator from Missouri was overruled. From the ruling of the Chair the Senator from Missouri has appealed to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire very briefly to discuss the appeal.

I had great affection in his lifetime and have great respect for the memory of Vice President Marshall. I cannot forget, however, that at one time when I was familiar with proceedings of that sort, and was parliamentarian of the other House, that great Vice President was overruled nine times in 1 week by the Senate of the United States, and therefore I do not think the matter is necessarily settled. Furthermore, it does not seem to me that the ruling of Vice President Marshall is in any way applicable to this situation.

The Chair holds, and holds properly, that title II of the bill does contain some legislation. Many appropriation bills come over here from the House that contain some item of legislation; but from the present ruling of the Chair it would follow that if any general appropriation bill contained any item of legislation, therefore any other item of legislation would be in order in the Senate on a general appropriation bill.

I do not believe that is sound. In other words, it seems to me the necessary application of the ruling of Vice President Marshall, which the Chair has just read, would be to the particular provision which it was sought to amend, and that from the ordinary artifice of dividing a bill into titles, it does not follow that if a particular title happened to contain matter of legislation it would open up the whole title to any other item of legislation. In other words, the question should be whether or not the provision sought to be stricken out by the pending Senate amendment is legislation, and whether that should be opened up by the Senate amendment.

Mr. President, I am thoroughly in favor of the general purpose of the Senate committee amendment, and there is no difficulty about making the committee amendment in order on any general appropriation bill by some very simple transformation in language turning it into a limitation. The committee had in mind to make this amendment as a limitation on this appropriation bill, but they have not done it in the apt terms of limitations on appropriation bills according to the text of the rules which for a generation have been established both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. The proponents of the amendment to the committee amendment seek to take advantage of the fact that the committee amendment itself is not in the aptest language to open up the general field of legislation. Therefore it seems to me that if the point of order which I have made should be overruled, the Senate should in all good conscience repeal rule XVI, and open up general appropriation bills to any sort of legislation which any Senator desires to offer at any time.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I am not an expert on parliamentary law, but I know the intent of the Senate committee in reference to this provision to be that which the Senator from Missouri describes. It was an effort to put a limitation upon the use of the particular appropriation contained in the bill. It is not general legislation, it is not new legislation. We merely state that the money appropriated by this bill shall be so used that any project to which it is allocated shall be completed within the limits of this appropriation.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As I have said, I am in entire sympathy with what I conceive to be the purpose of the Committee on Appropriations. Does not the Senator agree with me that if advantage be taken of a possible inappropriateness in language, converting this committee amendment from a limitation in a general appropriation bill into an excuse for opening up the committee amendment to amendments of a general legislative character, it opens the door wide to any sort of legislation which may be contemplated by any Member of the Senate?

Mr. ADAMS. I am thoroughly in accord with the decision of the Chair, but I beg to differ with the reasoning. My understanding of the terms "new legislation" and "general legislation" is that they should be construed to mean something alien to an appropriation bill. In other words, title II does not contain within it that which I think can be correctly defined as new or general legislation. Every part of an appropriation bill is legislation. An appropriation bill is legislation. What the rule seeks to forbid is attaching to an appropriation bill legislation upon other subjects which are new, and which are matters of general legislation, rather than the regulation, the control, and the direction of the particular appropriation. In that sense I do not believe that a limitation, however inaptly framed, which is directed exclusively to the appropriation made by the bill, is either to be termed "new" or "general" legislation. Therefore, it has seemed to me that the premise upon which the Senator from Arkansas argues is unsound.

I should be willing to concede that if this be legislation opening the gates, it would open them to germane legislation, and to germane legislation only. I cannot see that proposed legislation providing for the appointment of a commission, that commission to go out and engage in scientific undertakings, scientific investigations, to determine the commercial feasibility of a project, is germane to an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not ruled on the question as to whether or not it must be germane. The only question on which the Chair ruled was the point of order made by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ADAMS. I wanted it made clear that my original point of order was submitted on the ground that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas was general legislation and that it was not germane to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, what is the decision of the Chair on the point of the germaneness or nongermaneness of the proposal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not passed on that question, and the Chair cannot pass on the question of whether or not it is germane. That must be submitted to the Senate. The Chair has ruled only on the point of order made by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mc McNARY. Mr. President, I was just about to express my approval of the ruling of the Chair, which does not indicate that I am at all favorable to the project on its merits.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, may I ask the Chair to make a further explanation? There seems to be a good deal of misunderstanding among Senators about me as to what the issue is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question raised by the point of order made by the Senator from Missouri goes only to the committee amendment. The Chair overruled the point of order made by the Senator from Missouri, holding that, while the amendment did amount to general legislation, nevertheless title II of the bill itself contained many items of general legislation, and under the ruling of Vice President Marshall, the Chair, having been advised that that ruling has been uniformly followed, held that the House of Representatives having opened the door, the Senate could go in. Those were the words of Vice President Marshall. A vote to sustain the ruling of the Chair should be in the affirmative; a vote against the ruling of the Chair should be in the negative.

Mr. BILBO. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BILBO. My understanding is that if the Chair is overruled in his position, that would send the bill back to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BILBO (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who is unavoidably absent. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. METCALF (when his name was called). Owing to the absence of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], with whom I have a pair, I withhold my vote, not knowing how he would vote if present.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate on account of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. COOLIDGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LONERGAN] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. FRAZIER. My colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], who, I understand, if present, would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—53

Adams	Davis	McGill	Russell
Bachman	Duffy	McKellar	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Fletcher	McNary	Sheppard
Benson	Frazier	Maloney	Steiwer
Bilbo	Gibson	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Black	Guffey	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Hale	Neely	Truman
Bulkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Bulow	Johnson	Overton	Walsh
Byrnes	Keyes	Pittman	Wheeler
Caraway	La Follette	Pope	White
Chavez	Loftin	Radcliffe	
Connally	Long	Reynolds	
Copeland	McAdoo	Robinson	

NAYS—19

Austin	Capper	Glass	Norris
Barbour	Carey	Hastings	Shipstead
Borah	Clark	Holt	Townsend
Burke	Couzens	King	Vandenberg
Byrd	Gerry	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—24

Ashurst	Dickinson	Hatch	Moore
Bailey	Dieterich	Lewis	Norbeck
Bankhead	Donahey	Logan	Nye
Bone	George	Lonergan	Smith
Coolidge	Gore	McCarran	Tydings
Costigan	Harrison	Metcalf	Van Nuys

So the decision of the Chair was sustained.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, by the vote just taken the Senate has to all intents and purposes repealed rule XVI and thrown open the door to any sort of legislation on a general appropriation bill. In other words, the Senate has complete jurisdiction to construe its rules in any way it pleases. However, it certainly seems, in view of the action just taken by the Senate, that the argument of the Senator from Arkansas against the point of order of the Senator from Colorado is entirely sound, and therefore the point of order of the Senator from Colorado ought to be overruled, because if the committee amendment proposing legislation is not subject to a point of order, then clearly the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, or any other amendment on any other legislative subject, is not subject to a point of order under the recent ruling of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands from the Parliamentarian that the question before the Senate is, Is the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment germane to the committee amendment?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Colorado, as I understood, made two points of order. The first point of order, unless the Senator has withdrawn it—and if he withdrew it I failed to hear him do so—was that the amendment was legislation on a general appropriation bill and in contravention of rule XVI. His second point of order was that the amendment was not germane to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has just voted on the question whether or not the amendment proposed by the Appropriations Committee to the bill is in order. The Senate decided, by a vote of 53 to 19, that it was in order. The question now is whether or not the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment is germane to the amendment held by the Senate to be in order. The Chair understands that that is the parliamentary situation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire again to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the first point of order made by the Senator from Colorado against the amendment

of the Senator from Arkansas was that it amounted to general legislation on an appropriation bill. His second point of order was that the amendment was not germane. The mere submission of the question of germaneness, which under the rules of the Senate must be submitted to the Senate, does not dispose of the first point of order made by the Senator from Colorado; and I am now inquiring whether the Senator from Colorado adheres to the first point of order.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, my point of order is based upon two grounds: First, that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas constitutes general legislation, in that it provides for the creation of boards, describes their powers and their functions, delegates to the boards the power to make scientific investigations and economic researches, and provides an appropriation contingent upon the reports which the boards make. The second point of order is that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is not germane to the amendment of the committee.

Upon the question just voted on, I must say that I voted to sustain the ruling of the Chair. I disagreed with the reasons which the Chair gave. I think the amendment to which the point of order was made was a limitation upon an appropriation bill; that it was not general legislation.

I think the contention that it is general legislation cannot be justified by reason of anything contained in the provision. The Senator who preceded the Vice President in the chair felt that the amendment was general legislation, but was justified by other things in the bill. My own judgment is that his ruling was correct but that the reasoning upon which it was based was incorrect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The present occupant of the chair understands that the Senate voted to sustain the ruling of the Chair, which was that the amendment in question was legislation, but that it was justifiable on account of the general legislative propositions contained in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. GLASS. But, Mr. President, that decision related solely to the committee amendment, and not to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not referring to the amendment now proposed to the amendment of the committee. He is merely stating his understanding of the situation with respect to which the Senate just voted. The point of order was made, and the Chair held that, while the amendment in question was legislation, it was in order, and the Senate sustained the ruling of the Chair. Now the Senator from Colorado makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas is general legislation and, in addition thereto, that it is not germane to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the whole of title II is, in effect and in many respects, general legislation. It comes that way from the House to us. It has been held by the Senate that we have a right to amend it. The Senate has held that the committee amendment is in order. Now the question is whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas is germane. It certainly is germane, and it certainly is relevant to the committee amendment. That being true, the point of order should not be sustained.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I presented my views on the point of order at length while another than the Vice President was occupying the chair. I do not wish to repeat what was then said, but will point out to the Vice President that the language which is sought to be amended is as follows:

> No Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted with funds provided for in this appropriation unless and until an amount sufficient for its completion has been allocated and irrevocably set aside for its completion—

And so forth. That amendment would have the effect of changing the law, or preventing the allotment of funds which may be hereafter appropriated to the two projects that are referred to in the pending amendment to the committee amendment. If it were not adopted, the President could still, as a matter of law, if he chose to do so, make allotments from the funds in this bill.

What the pending amendment seeks to accomplish is to modify the committee amendment so that if the boards to be created under the authority of the amendment to the amendment shall report favorably on the projects, after making certain specific investigations called for by the language of the amendment, the President may then have authority to make additional allotments to the Passamaquoddy project and the Florida ship canal project, notwithstanding the general provision contained in the committee amendment that no project shall be initiated unless at the time of its initiation a sufficient amount of money shall be provided for its contention. Plainly to me, it is a provision which the Senate has a right to amend, and, unless it can amend it, the committee would have the right to incorporate provisions of law in appropriation bills without any opportunity to the Senate to change the language or to modify the effect of the provisions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair once more state his understanding of the parliamentary situation. The present occupant regrets he was not in the chair at the time the original point of order was made. The Senate by a vote of 53 to 19 has determined that the committee amendment to the appropriation bill is in order. Therefore, any amendment that is germane to the legislation is in order. The question of germaneness of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas is the question now before the Senate.

Apparently, as the Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian, whoever drew the rules of the Senate was not willing to trust the presiding officer to determine the germaneness of an amendment of this kind, as, under the rules, the Chair does not have the right to determine the germaneness of an amendment to legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair, therefore, submits to the Senate the question, Is the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas germane to the amendment of the committee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BILBO (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous roll call with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Again referring to my pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate on account of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. COOLIDGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LONERGAN] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—53

Bachman	Couzens	McKellar	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Davis	McNary	Sheppard
Barkley	Duffy	Maloney	Shipstead
Benson	Fletcher	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Bilbo	Frazier	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Black	George	Neely	Townsend
Borah	Gibson	Norris	Truman
Brown	Hale	Overton	Wagner
Bulow	Hatch	Pittman	Walsh
Byrnes	Johnson	Pope	Wheeler
Caraway	La Follette	Radcliffe	White
Chavez	Loftin	Reynolds	
Clark	Long	Robinson	
Connally	McAdoo	Russell	

NAYS—21

Adams	Capper	Hayden	Murphy
Austin	Carey	Holt	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Copeland	Keyes	Vandenberg
Bulkley	Gerry	King	
Burke	Glass	McGill	
Byrd	Hastings	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—22

Ashurst	Dieterich	Logan	Smith
Bankhead	Donahey	Lonergan	Steiwer
Bone	Gore	McCarran	Tydings
Coolidge	Guffey	Moore	Van Nuys
Costigan	Harrison	Norbeck	
Dickinson	Lewis	Nye	

So the Senate decided Mr. ROBINSON's amendment to be germane to the amendment reported by the committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Odessa Mason;

H. R. 4148. An act for the relief of the Thomas Marine Railway Co., Inc.;

H. R. 6163. An act for the relief of Mrs. Murray A. Hintz;

H. R. 9125. An act for the relief of Dr. F. U. Painter, Dr. H. A. White, Dr. C. P. Yeager, Dr. W. C. Barnard, Mrs. G. C. Oliphant, Amelia A. Daimwood, the Sun Pharmacy, Bruno's Pharmacy, Viola Doyle Maguire, Louise Harmon, Mrs. J. B. Wilkinson, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Grace Hinnant, Dr. E. O. Arnold, and Jennie Chapman; and

H. R. 10565. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William O'Brien.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 267) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11418) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 16, and 71 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 85 and 86, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had concurred in Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January next.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

S. 4533. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wilkerson's Ferry, Miss.;

H. R. 4148. An act for the relief of the Thomas Marine Railway Co., Inc.;

H. R. 9125. An act for the relief of Dr. F. U. Painter, Dr. H. A. White, Dr. C. P. Yeager, Dr. W. C. Barnard, Mrs. G. C. Oliphant, Amelia A. Daimwood, the Sun Pharmacy, Bruno's Pharmacy, Viola Doyle Maguire, Louise Harmon, Mrs. J. B. Wilkinson, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Grace Hinnant, Dr. E. O. Arnold, and Jennie Chapman;

H. R. 12120. An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories;

H. R. 12527. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12870. An act to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry, to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936; and

S. J. Res. 262. 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.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I should perhaps make an explanation of the amendment. During the course of the debate on the parliamentary questions which were raised, there were references to some of the provisions of this amendment. If I may have the undivided attention of Senators, I should like to condense my discussion of the amendment as much as may seem practicable.

It is perhaps not necessary to state the circumstances which have prompted the introduction of this subject at this time. Every Member of the Senate, probably, is familiar with the essential features which are involved in the questions raised by the amendment.

Last year the Congress passed a large work-relief bill, and gave the President authority to initiate the construction of projects with one controlling purpose in mind, namely, to provide employment for a large number of persons who were on the relief rolls. Among the projects which were initiated under that authority were two very large ones, namely, the one pertaining to the Florida ship canal and the other relating to the Passamaquoddy tidal-power plan. The completion of these projects, it appears from the record, would require, in the case of the first project, the Florida ship canal, approximately $150,000,000, including the amount that has already been expended under the allotment made by the President; and as to the second project, Passamaquoddy, the total is estimated to approximate $42,000,000.

There was no question as to the legal right of the Executive to initiate the projects. So far as my information goes, no question has ever been raised of the legal right to initiate

the two projects. Questions have arisen which involve the subjects of public policy, the feasibility of the projects, their adaptability to the purposes for which they are to be constructed, and other related questions.

The time is approaching when the question must be determined whether work on the projects shall be suspended or continued. The object of presenting the amendment at this time is to resort to a method by which a conclusion may be reached as to those questions. If the amendment should be agreed to it would result either in a continuation of the work or an abandonment of the projects. In all probability the latter outcome would be the result if the report contemplated by the amendment should be unfavorable to the project. While the Executive would have the power, unless the law is changed, to make new allotments, I am sure he would hesitate to do so on the state of the record as it now exists.

It has seemed to me fair and proper to present the questions involved in the amendment for the consideration of the Senate, inasmuch as unless something is done great confusion will result. There are now something like 5,000 laborers employed at Passamaquoddy and approximately 6,000 engaged in work on the Florida ship canal. If the work is to be continued it should be done, of course, without interruption or with as little interruption as may be permissible.

In an effort to work out the controversy fairly it is proposed that the President shall appoint two boards consisting of three members each, all the members of the boards to be engineers. In order to insure impartial reports, reports not biased or prejudiced by conclusions heretofore reached, it is also provided that no one who is employed by the Government of the United States or by either the State of Florida or the State of Maine, or who has an interest direct or indirect, present or prospective, in the financial transactions incident to the two projects, shall be eligible to membership on either board.

It is also contemplated that if the boards shall be created and constituted as just stated, they shall discharge certain functions. They would have available, of course, for their study all the investigations and findings which have been made heretofore either by the engineers under the jurisdiction of the War Department or by those connected with the Works Administration. In addition to that they would have certain functions which would be specially imposed upon them.

With respect to the Florida ship canal, there are four aspects of the duties of the members of the board to which attention is now directed.

First, the board is to consider whether the construction of the canal would create disturbance of the ground-water levels of the State of Florida. One of the objections urged to the project is that it will disarrange the ground-water levels of the State; and this new board will be expected to give special attention to that phase of the matter.

The second function relates to the estimated cost of construction, operation, and maintenance.

The third is a very broad one and an important one insofar as the future fate of these projects is concerned. It relates to the justification of the expenditure of the Federal funds necessary in connection with the project.

The fourth requirement is that the board shall make such further study of these and other pertinent questions as it may deem necessary.

The President's view is that it will be informative and helpful to have the study and the advice of a board whose judgment may be relied upon as unbiased and unprejudiced in determining these fundamental questions, which have relationship to the merits of the projects and which should govern in determining whether they should be carried forward.

With respect to the Passamaquoddy project, while the duties of the board to be created to consider that project are somewhat different from those of the board to study and report on the Florida ship canal, the duties are closely analogous.

First, the board is charged with the direct duty of passing on the feasibility of the project from an engineering standpoint. Certainly this phase of the inquiry has been involved either directly or indirectly in all the examinations that have been heretofore made; but it is believed, in view of the contentions that have been raised respecting the proposed tidal-power project, that it would be advantageous to have the matter studied and passed upon by such a board as the amendment contemplates.

The second duty of the Passamaquoddy board relates to the justification of the project, including the possibilities relating to the establishment of industries requiring electric power in eastern Maine. In the debates here much of the controversy has revolved around this question, and it seems appropriate and helpful to have definite information relating to it.

The third obligation on the board involves a study of the scientific value from the knowledge and experience to be gained with respect to an experiment in tidal-power development. At this time it does not appear to be necessary to elaborate upon that aspect of the subject. It involves a field inviting to research. It is a subject that is intimately connected with the development in a large portion of the State of Maine where development apparently is greatly needed.

The fourth task of the board will be to estimate the cost of construction, operation, and maintenance; and it is also provided in the amendment that unless the estimates come within a certain limit—a limit of $150,000,000 with respect to the Florida ship canal, including the amounts already expended, and $42,000,000 as to the Passamaquoddy project, including the amounts spent there—the allotments may not be made by the Executive under the authority of this measure.

Fifth, as in the case of the ship canal, the Passamaquoddy board is authorized to make such further studies as it may find necessary to the proper performance of its duties. In the original joint resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and reported a few days ago by that committee to the Senate, it was provided that the reports should be made on or before June 20, 1936. I doubted at the time whether that limitation gave sufficient opportunity for the boards to complete their tasks; and in this amendment the time has been extended until July 20. While it is desirable that the boards shall have full opportunity to study and reach conclusions concerning the specific questions that are submitted to them under the amendment and the other general subjects which they are at liberty to inquire into, it is also desirable that the issue should be brought to a conclusion as speedily as circumstances reasonably permit.

As already indicated, there are approximately 11,000 persons at work on these two projects. If the projects should be suspended indefinitely, it would be necessary as to many of those laborers to provide other employment, and to break up the organization and then reestablish it, as would have to be done if the reports were unduly delayed, which would, from the standpoint of every person, be undesirable. So the policy of the amendment is to invite and to cause as prompt a decision as the circumstances will permit.

It is provided in the amendment that if, as to the projects or either of them, the report is favorable, the President may make allotments from the funds in this bill for carrying on work on the project that has been so approved. In the one case, the Florida ship canal, the allotment that would be authorized is $10,000,000; in the case of Passamaquoddy it is $9,000,000; those sums being sufficient for present requirements.

There are other provisions in the amendment of comparatively slight importance. All the departments which have information on these subjects are required to supply that information to aid the boards in the discharge of their duties. They are also instructed to render any assistance the boards may request.

In view of the controversy and present status of these projects, it seems to me that the amendment provides a fair and satisfactory way to determine the issues which have arisen. I should hope that the Senate will keep the projects

alive by adopting the amendment. There would thus be given a further opportunity to study them, with the assurance that they would not be carried forward unless the reports justified that course, and with the assurance that they will be carried on if the facts appear to justify doing so.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. As I have understood the matter, in our discussions in the committee it was distinctly understood that, whatever might be the fate of the proposal here today, it has no bearing upon any future action the Congress may take. In other words, if there should be favorable action upon the amendment, the action would not bind the Congress in any sense, and it is not to be considered as an authorization of the ultimate completion of these two projects. Does the Senator from Arkansas agree with me in that statement?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, clearly, as a matter of law, there is no express authorization of the projects in the amendment. Such a provision would be inconsistent with the purpose of the amendment. As to how any Senator would regard the action of Congress in authorizing an allotment for these projects to be expended during the next fiscal year, the Senator from New York is as able to reach a conclusion as am I. I agree with him that there is no legal obligation on the Congress to make additional appropriations.

Mr. HALE obtained the floor.

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

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I complete my colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from New York? He desires to further inquire of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, it is our practice in connection with river and harbor projects and water-control projects, after due consideration by the appropriate committees of the Congress, to make a definite authorization for the completion of a project. I want it distinctly understood that the testimony brought out before the Committee on Commerce—and, as I understand the Senator from Arkansas today, he confirms this statement—if the Congress should take favorable action and vote $10,000,000 and $9,000,000, respectively, for these projects, such action would not bind in any sense the present Congress or any future Congress in the sense in which a Congress may be bound by the ordinary appropriation for a river and harbor or water-control project.

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

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine has the floor. After the Chair recognized the Senator from Maine the Senator from New York said he desired further to interrogate the Senator from Arkansas. The Senator from Maine has the floor. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HALE. I will yield if it will not take any considerable time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. I am going to permit the Senator to proceed immediately, if he will just permit me a moment.

I do not want the statement just made by the Senator from New York to stand, even for one moment, without my distinct and complete dissent. I think it would be perfectly absurd to take any action which would authorize another year's work upon these projects unless the Congress is prepared to see them through to the finish. Therefore, this decision is a conclusive decision, and no amount of camouflage and no amount of weasel-worded arguments can make it anything else.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there is no possible connection of any kind between the two projects included in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] I am about to ask that the amendment be divided, and before doing so I wish to address the Senate briefly, giving my reasons for asking for a division.

The situation in regard to the Passamaquoddy project is as follows:

Under the powers given him in the $4,880,000,000 relief bill, which became a law in 1935, the President started and has already spent on the Passamaquoddy project in the neighborhood of $6,000,000. Extensive surveys have been made, lands and options have been acquired, buildings for the employees have been built, and improvements in the grounds connected with the buildings have been made. An actual start has been made on the construction of one of the main dams, and two of the smaller dams have already been constructed. The peak of employment was some 5,000 employees, largely taken from the relief rolls.

When the War Department appropriation bill came before the Congress last March along with it came a Bureau of the Budget recommendation for an appropriation of $29,000,000 for the Passamaquoddy and four other projects, including the Florida ship canal project. The House refused to include the appropriation because, as its Committee on Appropriations stated, these projects had never been authorized by the Congress. The appropriation for Passamaquoddy, as recommended by the Budget Bureau, was $9,000,000.

When the bill came before the Senate, the friends of Passamaquoddy, on the ground that the President had the authority to start the project, that he had started it, and had in his hands the necessary funds for carrying it on and, therefore, needed no further legislation for carrying it on, asked the Committee on Appropriations to leave out the $9,000,000 for Passamaquoddy, should the committee decide to adopt the Budget Bureau's recommendations.

The committee accepted our recommendation to leave out the $9,000,000 for Passamaquoddy, and thereupon turned down the Budget Bureau's recommendation for the remaining four projects. Later, on the floor of the Senate, when a floor amendment was offered to take care of the other four projects, and which still left out the nine million for Passamaquoddy, the floor amendment was beaten. Subsequently, a similar amendment, but leaving out appropriations for both Passamaquoddy and the ship canal, was adopted by the Senate. The bill, as enacted, included the final amendment passed by the Senate providing appropriations for the three other projects.

As a result of the tactics of the friends of Passamaquoddy, no action was taken by the Congress on the project other than the action of the House Committee on Appropriations, which refused to approve the Budget Bureau's recommendation for the five projects because none of them had previously been authorized directly by the Congress. The appropriation asked for was a direct congressional appropriation, and not a relief allotment.

The Florida ship canal project, on the other hand, while still open to an allocation to it of relief funds by the President, as the Senator from Arkansas has stated this afternoon, has against it the adverse vote in the Senate.

I cannot see that the situation has changed so far as Passamaquoddy is concerned. The President has full power to take care of it if he sees fit so to do. I regret that pending amendment has been offered.

Much abuse has been heaped on the Passamaquoddy project. Senators have referred to it repeatedly with scorn and ridicule. It is no matter for scorn or ridicule. Long before the depression hit our country, great power interests in this country were considering the very practical question of harnessing the tides on both the American and the Canadian shores of Passamaquoddy Bay to develop a great tidal power, through the use of private funds. For that purpose these power interests, cooperating with the originator of the project, Mr. Dexter Cooper, a prominent engineer, the brother of the Cooper who built the great dam at Muscle Shoals, had expended nearly a half million dollars in preliminary soundings and surveys, and the purchase of abutments and land options.

A charter had been secured from the State of Maine in 1925, and from the Government of Canada in 1926 to erect and operate a great tidal electric plant. This tidal plant would produce, it was estimated, from a million to a million and a half horsepower, and produce it at a very low cost per kilowatt-hour.

The development on the Canadian side of the project was held up on account of a possible injury to Canadian fishing interests, and a commission was appointed by the two countries to investigate the question of injury. That was in the winter of 1930, as I recall. I was instrumental in getting legislation through Congress authorizing the investigating commission. This, of course, was long before any question of the Government's financing the proposition had been suggested.

The commission held lengthy hearings on the question of injury to the Canadian fishing industry, and made a report which was somewhat unfavorable, but not conclusive; and more time was asked by both governments to go on with the investigation. No further survey has since been made. In the meanwhile the parties interested went ahead to develop, through the use of private capital, a smaller unit on the American side.

The hope of the whole eastern section of Maine and the adjacent Canadian territory is to get this international power project started; and, had it not been for the depression, it might well have been started with private capital by this time. Always there has been a question in the minds of many persons whether power can actually and practically be developed by the tides. The engineers are agreed that it can be developed. A practical demonstration through the starting of the smaller Passamaquoddy power would give the real impetus that is needed to get the greater international project started, and the one proposition would fit into the other.

The region where the plant is located is settled by as fine a class of people as we have in the State of Maine—people whose families have been on the land for more than a hundred years. Many of them come of seafaring stock. In the days of wooden ships this was a great shipbuilding community, but with the passing of the wooden ship that industry has gone; and so it is with the lumber industry, the sardine industry, and other industries in which these hard-working, thrifty people once flourished. I know of no locality in the country which would better warrant rehabilitation than this county on our extreme eastern frontier or which would pay better dividends for rehabilitation. That a great developed power in this vicinity, in connection with their excellent harbor facilities, will bring manufactures from other parts of the country to Eastport and its vicinity is the expectation of those who favor the project. The work that has already been done has been of infinite value to the community and to the State at large.

That the present project by itself is a low-cost power unit, I do not claim. That by itself, unless one credits to relief a considerable part of the cost of the installation, it is warranted economically, I do not claim; but as an initial step toward the starting of a much larger and much more beneficial private project I believe it is most certainly warranted.

I have favored the Passamaquoddy project from its inception. I favor it now, and I wish to have an opportunity to cast my vote in its favor. Unfortunately, under the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, the project is linked up with another project in which I do not believe, and against which I have cast my vote in the Senate. It has been estimated that this second project, the Florida ship canal, will cost the Government upward of $150,000,000. It has been suggested to me by friends of Passamaquoddy that in order to insure the legislation for its continuance I should change about on the ship canal and also vote for its continuance.

Mr. President, I cannot reconcile myself to any such change of front. I will have no part in saddling on our Government an ultimate expenditure of more than $150,000,000 for a project in which I do not believe in order to save the Maine project, dearly as I should like to see the latter put through. If the two projects are coupled together, therefore, I must vote against the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask that a separate vote may be had on the two questions at issue. Under rule XVIII I believe I am entitled to such division. I ask that the amendment be divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON in the chair). The Senator from Maine asks for a division of the amendment. In the opinion of the Chair, he is entitled to a division.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as the vote is not to be had now, I suggest that we meet that question when we reach it. Consideration of that question may properly be deferred until we are ready to vote.

Mr. HALE. Under rule XVIII, I have a right to a division, have I not?

Mr. ROBINSON. It is merely suggested that we can determine that question when we are a little nearer ready to vote. There is no use going into it this evening.

Mr. HALE. Is it not the ordinary procedure to determine the question when the request is made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentarian advises the Chair that under rule XVIII it is the right of the Senator from Maine to have a division of the question. No action need be taken by the Senate upon it.

Mr. ROBINSON. The question will arise again when we reach the point of voting. The Senator need not raise the question now, unless the Senate is ready to vote.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, unquestionably rule XVIII accords the Senator the right to demand a division of the question. The demand can be made at any time before the vote. The Senator from Maine desires to raise it at this time. I think the proper attitude on the part of the Chair is to declare that there shall be a division of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opinion of the Chair is that no action need be taken at the present time. The Senator from Maine has a right to a division of the question.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the amendment is before the Senate and will be voted upon in due course. Any Senator has a right to raise the question suggested by the Senator from Maine, but not beforehand and not until a vote is reached. We have not reached the point of agreeing or disagreeing to the amendment. When action is to be taken upon the amendment, then the request of the Senator will be in order. I do not see any need of raising the question at this time.

Mr. McNARY. It is plainly the right of the Senator from Maine, under rule XVIII, to demand a division of the question. It becomes pertinent at this time because, as the Senator stated, he favors the Passamaquoddy project and is opposed to the Florida canal project. Consequently, there is no need of doubling the argument when he wants to state clearly his position with respect to one of the projects on the motion. I think it would be proper for the Chair to declare that the Senator from Maine has a right to a division of the question and, therefore, set at rest any issue about the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair, as has been stated twice, is that the Senator from Maine has the right absolutely to a division of the question.

Mr. HALE. I call for that division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no further action to be taken at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is the Senator from Maine ready to vote now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no necessity for calling for a division now. Notice has been given. The present occupant of the chair rules that the Senator has a right to a division of the amendment, and the matter rests there until the question comes before the Senate for a vote and then the question will be divided.

Mr. HALE. I want the amendment to come before the Senate. The amendment is going to be debated. Of course,

I want to have something further to say about the Passamaquoddy project.

Mr. ROBINSON. It happens Passamaquoddy comes last in the amendment.

Mr. HALE. Not in my request for a division.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator may present his request if he desires to do so, but he cannot have a vote upon the amendment while it is being discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair state that in the opinion of the Chair, according to the amendment, the first question to be voted upon is the Florida ship canal.

Mr. HALE. I have simply gone about it in the other way, and have stricken out the provision relating to the Florida ship canal, leaving Passamaquoddy to be acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment which has been presented obviously applies first to the Florida ship canal. Upon that amendment, in the opinion of the Chair, the vote will first be taken on the Florida ship canal and subsequently upon Passamaquoddy.

Mr. HALE. Very well.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, today the Finance Committee agreed to report what I believe will prove to be the worst tax bill the Senate has ever been called upon to consider. I will modify that statement slightly by saying that I think probably the worst tax bill ever presented was the one which came to us from the other House.

Now we are trying to see how much money we can spend; not doing it in a legislative way, but by turning it over to some individuals to do with just as they wish. Is it not time that we went back to proper legislative procedure and that Congress should know where and how the money is to be spent?

Students will some day study the past 4 years of American history with wonder and amazement. It has been a period of chaos and political upheaval. I say the past 4 years, because it began with the party conventions of 1932. Immediately following those conventions, the present occupant of the White House made a series of vital speeches in which he entered into a solemn contract with the people of this country. We had every reason to believe that this contract would and should govern the course of events in this Nation during the 4 years which were to follow his inauguration.

These policies were outlined in the following solemn remarks made in the campaign of 1932:

> I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues in this campaign. It is the most direct and effective contribution that Government can make to business.

In September he solemnly promised:

> I shall use this position of high responsibility to discuss up and down the country, in all seasons, at all times, the duty of reducing taxes. * * * This I pledge you, and nothing I have said in the campaign transcends in importance this covenant with the taxpayers of this country.

In October 1932 Governor Roosevelt said:

> Federal extravagance and improvidence bear a double evil; our whole people and our business cannot carry its excessive burdens of taxes.

In Chicago Candidate Roosevelt outlined his views on bureaucracy by saying:

> We must merge; we must consolidate subdivisions of Government; we must abolish useless offices.

In July 1932 Governor Roosevelt said:

> Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet deficits. Stop the deficits!

And he added:

> Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy.

I call the attention of the Senate to the phrase "liberal governments."

Upon the pledges and program roughly outlined in these speeches, the American people went to the polls in November 1932, and placed the present administration in complete control of the economic and social policies of this country.

On the date of the anniversary of the Russian revolution, President Roosevelt is said to have cabled to Soviet President Kalinin the following words:

> I am happy to extend sincere felicitations on this memorable anniversary.

Very soon the Democratic Party will celebrate the anniversary of its nomination of the President of the United States. Will a return greeting be sent by President Kalinin? Most certainly the placing in a powerful W. P. A. position of Katherine Kellock, wife of the propaganda agent for the Soviet Embassy, should please the heart of the Russian President. Certainly the adherence to socialistic doctrines on the part of the administration merits the felicitations of a Communist government. Surely the fight on the part of Secretary Perkins to retain radical aliens in this country should merit the approval of a Nation openly, instead of secretly, communistic; and surely the vast destruction of capital and private property through deliberate waste and extravagance merits a kind word from Communists all over the world.

It is a long, long way from the promises of the Democratic candidate in 1932 to legislation such as we have before us today. We were promised economy, and we have received extravagance. As the able Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] pointed out yesterday, relief appropriations up to the next fiscal year will total $13,187,675,000. We are now about to appropriate nearly $2,500,000,000 for the C. C. C., for general public works, and for boondoggling. Instead of reducing taxes, we have been working 4 months on a billion-dollar tax bill; and we are faced with the probability of enacting a tax law which no one can understand, which few businesses can withstand, and which is much more in keeping with communism than with the individualistic beliefs of the American people.

No one really knows where this relief money is to go. We know that much of it will be wasted, and we know that much of it will be used for political purposes. Old Boondog will take most of it for useless and silly projects.

The boondog bays. He tears crazily through the country on his mission of boondoggling, dragging the political tin can tied to his tail by General Farley and feeding on the few remaining assets of a fast-disappearing race of taxpayers. Mr. President, I am afraid he has the rabies.

Old Boondog took Wigwam Brook at West Orange, N. J., in an unguarded moment, and left $14,962 of taxpayers' money to pave the bed of Wigwam Brook:

> How peacefully should the waters sleep,
> With Boondog's mattress in her deep!

Harry Hopkins sent his Old Boondog into Allentown, Pa. He should have known that a boondog afflicted with rabies would dash straight to the nearest institution for mental observation, and so he did. When he left Allentown, the W. P. A. started giving facials, manicures, and hair waves to the patients in the Allentown State Hospital. So gratifying was Old Boondog's sense of well being that he announced beauty treatments would be given to the inmates of the Philadelphia General Hospital and the Torrance State Hospital; and all at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. President, I have heard of W. P. A. schools for tap dancing, for opera, for housemaids, and sewing circles, but this adventure within the portals of mental institutions at last brings Old Boondog into a sphere of activity more directly related to his nature.

Old Boondog had a hard day in Vermont. At Burlington he allotted $24,000 to repair the walls of the reservoir, only to find there was nothing wrong with the reservoir. How Old Boondog must have growled and tossed his froth! But he would not leave until he had taken at least one more bite out of Mr. Taxpayer. Not Old Boondog! So he allotted $62,000 to repair the community center. When he could not find a community center anywhere, he left in disgust and made a mad dash for Massachusetts.

At Waltham, Mass., $10,000 of the taxpayers' funds were left to boondoggle the water and filth from a piggery.

Five hundred thousand dollars of taxpayers' money has been allotted for a school for housemaids. Oh, how nice it will be for the hungry families on relief to have servants with Parisian finesse, who know all the delicacies of the table and how to serve them. "Friandises, Madame?"

Old Boondog is trying to find out how much of everything we eat and wear. Thousands of dollars in public funds are being spent to determine how much we have paid for crutches and hot-water bottles. I have one of the schedules. Here is what the W. P. A. worker is supposed to find out when he canvasses the American home: How many sun suits, bathing suits, pairs of drawers, shirts, ties, pajamas, rubbers, you own; what they are made of, and how much you paid for them; how much you pay for shoeshines; what your underwear is made of, and whether it is knit or woven, in suits or shirts and drawers. Old Boondog wants to know how many pairs of shoes you have, what kind of shoes they are, and how much you paid for them. How many cigarettes do you smoke, and what do you spend for candy and ice cream and whisky.

This schedule, printed as part of a W. P. A. project and costing thousands of dollars, seeks the answers to something like 700 questions about the personal habits of American families. A memorandum from the Department of Labor says this investigation will be made into the habits of all groups of people. Senators, Old Boondog may be at your front doors one of these days!

In West Virginia Old Boondog announced that the President had approved $45,066 to repair Johnny Cake and Panther Creeks and to improve 3 miles of road from Mohawk to Isban.

Espanola, N. Mex., has 314 inhabitants, and gets a W. P. A. gymnasium costing $19,000.

Mr. President, I am going to vote against this wanton extravagance. I suppose there is little possibility of doing so, but I should like to get down to the business of legislating instead of taking orders from the executive branch of the Government. All of us know that very little legislation originates on Capitol hill, and a very few of these appropriations are actually approved by us at heart. I should like to cut the deficits; to reduce the cost of government by 25 percent; to go up and down the land at all seasons and declare the necessity for cutting taxes; to carry out the pledge of absolute loyalty to the economy program; to regard Federal spending as one of the most important issues in public life; to stand by the philosophy that economy is the most direct and effective contribution that government can make to business; to adhere to the belief that nothing transcends in importance the economy covenant with the taxpayers of the country; to adopt and live under the philosophy that Federal extravagance and improvidence bear a double evil; and that our whole people and our business cannot carry its excessive burdens of taxation. I should like to accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetime in all our history. Mr. President, we must legislate; we must consolidate subdivisions of Government; we must abolish useless offices. Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet deficits. Stop the deficits!

I am indebted to President Roosevelt for many of these words. They are words out of the dead past—a past which has been forgotten, but a past which will be a skeleton in the closet of the Democratic Party for many years to come.

Mr. President, of course, we should see that no one suffers or goes hungry or cold; but why throw away the money of the taxpayers as it is being thrown away today?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senate adopted an amendment presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] to an amendment of the committee, on page 29, line 19. At the request of the Senator from Oregon, I asked that the amendment as amended be passed over. Since that time I have communicated with the Senator from Pennsylvania and I have his authority to state that he has no objection to a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment which he offered to the committee amendment was agreed to, relating to the preparation of a list of unemployables. I therefore move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have not had opportunity to confer with the able Senator from Pennsylvania. However, I am advised that his wishes are that the motion to reconsider shall prevail. Is it not the understanding of the Senator from South Carolina that the Senator from Pennsylvania desires that the amendment be inserted at another place in the bill?

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator from Pennsylvania stated that he was vitally interested in the adoption of the amendment which he offered; therefore he did not want to have any doubt about it being included in the bill, and that he would desire to offer it at some other place in the bill. If the Senator from Pennsylvania does not return, I shall be glad to offer his amendment at another point in the bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania and I are in accord as to this matter. He is very much interested in this subject and is entirely willing to withdraw his amendment after the vote by which it was adopted shall have been reconsidered.

Mr. McNARY. I think that is very fair, and certainly would protect the Senator from Pennsylvania, which is all the interest I have in the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] to the committee amendment, on page 29, line 19, was agreed to, be reconsidered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have authority from the Senator from Pennsylvania to withdraw his amendment, the vote by which it was agreed to having been reconsidered.

I now desire to offer an amendment on page 29, line 21, which was offered in the Committee on Appropriations. It does not appear in the text, having been omitted through some oversight. After the word "not", on line 21, I move to insert the words "prior to the date of the approval of this act."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. This amendment now having been perfected, I ask whether we cannot at least dispose of it this afternoon.

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

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should not want final action taken on this amendment today. I think it is rather understood that the Senate is to take a recess at this time.

Mr. BYRNES. Very well.

Mr. McNARY. The request of the Senator and his inquiry may well be renewed tomorrow at 12 o'clock, but I do not want further action taken this evening.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BULKLEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 267) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature, 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 amendments of the House numbered 1 and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,745.33"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,592.25"; and the House agree to the same.

KEY PITTMAN,
ROBERT J. BULKLEY,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

S. D. MCREYNOLDS,
SOL BLOOM,
HAMILTON FISH, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of David W. Ling, of Arizona, to be United States district judge, district of Arizona, vice F. C. Jacobs, retired.

Mr. McGILL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of John W. Holland, of Florida, to be United States district judge, southern district of Florida, vice Halsted L. Ritter.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the nominations of Harry A. McBride, of Michigan, and Herbert C. Hengstler, of Ohio, to be Foreign Service officers of class 1, consuls general, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported favorably the nomination of Second Lt. John Burroughs Cary, Corps of Engineers, for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army, to the Air Corps.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the nominations of several officers for promotion in the Regular Army.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported favorably the nominations of Midshipmen Frederick R. Dowsett and Ted E. Pulos to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, revocable for 2 years, from the 4th day of June 1936.

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the nominations of sundry persons to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank as such from June 8, 1936.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON in the chair). The reports will be placed on the calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the first nomination in order on the calendar will be stated.

WILLIAM RIDDELL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Riddell, of Montana, to be register of the land office at Billings, Mont.

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

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

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

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

RECESS

The Senate resumed legislative session.

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, May 30, 1936, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 29 (legislative day of May 12), 1936

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

William Riddell to be register of the land office at Billings, Mont.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Max B. Wells, Ashford.
James E. Summerour, Henagar.
Lucie L. Parnell, Maplesville.
Leslie Booker, Phenix City.

CALIFORNIA

Harry S. Sumners, Artesia.
William W. Truby, Cross Roads.
Manuel C. Joseph, Irvington.
May C. Baker, Paradise.
Thomas Budd Van Horne, Jr., Reseda.
John Ira Fiscus, Rio Vista.
Sydney W. Balding, Willowbrook.

COLORADO

Henery C. Showalter, Olathe.

GEORGIA

Robert C. Ayers, Royston.

IDAHO

James B. Poynor, Council.
Wallace H. Hanson, Shelley.

MARYLAND

Elsie V. Botts, Darlington.
Michael G. Labuda, Fort Howard.
John W. Murray, Hampstead.
Alfred F. Gough, Leonardtown.
Madeleine L. Bosher, Riverdale.

MISSISSIPPI

Luna C. Davis, Belmont.
Marshall Duell Wall, Calhoun City.
DeWitt D. McEachern, Ruleville.

MONTANA

Esther M. Evenson, Broadview.
Orion A. Tellifero, Browning.
Alfred T. James, Cascade.
Robert S. Nicholson, Darby.
Jeanette Ross, Fromberg.
William C. MacCallum, Geraldine.
William Alfred Brown, Great Falls.
John E. Brennan, Harlem.
Lewis H. Rutter, Hinsdale.
George H. Hidding, Hysham.
Henry Clay Patterson, Lima.
Ferd W. Tucker, Victor.

OKLAHOMA

Anson J. Woods, Arnett.
John J. Skinner, Cleveland.
Joseph R. Homsey, Depew.
Ernest C. Morris, Drumright.
James W. Kincaid, Glencoe.
Grace A. Phillips, Maud.
William G. Bunyard, Roff.
Sam Cunningham, Wellston.

VIRGINIA

Bard E. Fitzgerald, Gretna.
Charles F. Shumaker, Lovettsville.

WASHINGTON

Dewey Harvel Baker, Naches.
William H. Ross, Richmond Highlands.
Daisy M. McDowell, Toledo.

WEST VIRGINIA

Anna F. Cole, Hundred.
Richard Ivan Hargett, Kimberly.
Patrick J. Burke, McMechen.
Alva O. Shelton, Peach Creek.
J. Leo Holsberry, Rainelle.
Robin A. Hood, Rivesville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 29, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Open our eyes, O Lord, that we may see wondrous things out of Thy law. Give us not the spirit of fearfulness, but of power and love and discipline. Look upon us in our limitations and transgressions with divine compassion and mercy. We rejoice that there is a God who has adapted Himself to the wants of men; that there is a ruling spirit in the center of power and wisdom that knows how to love the unlovable and will endure more and more gloriously through the ages of time. Almighty God, as sin is a rebuke to any people, we beseech Thee to shed abroad Thy peace in all this troubled world and make it radiant with righteousness, truth, and wisdom. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. 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. 12120. An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4549. An act authorizing the State Highway Board of the State of Georgia to replace, reconstruct, or repair the free highway bridge across the Savannah River at or near the city of Augusta, Ga.; and

S. 4618. An act 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. There are two special orders this morning. With the indulgence of the gentlemen who are to be recognized under those special orders, the Chair will recognize Members to prefer unanimous-consent requests which will not involve any time.

GOOD HOUSEKEEPING URGES THE WOMEN OF AMERICA TO SUPPORT THE PEACE AMENDMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a magazine article which deals with a bill I have introduced.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the article very long?

Mr. LUDLOW. It is not. My remarks and the article will probably not consume more than a page and a half of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, with the whole world in a state of seething restlessness; with greed and hatred fanning the flames of strife in many lands; with dictators thrumming the strings of war; with the tramp, tramp, tramp of marching feet echoing and reechoing throughout Europe, Africa, and the Orient; with portentous and unmistakable signs indicating the imminence of a conflict that may almost, if not quite, destroy civilization; are we going to sit idly by and permit this Seventy-fourth Congress to adjourn sine die without doing something of an effective nature to save our precious boys from being dragged into the slaughter pens of foreign wars?

I once knew a great man who, in spite of his patrician birth and ancestry, and his high position of wealth and distinction in society, always took compassionate interest in the problems of the poor, and the most stirring eulogy in a deluge of laudatory comment on his life and works after he had passed to the Great Beyond was a simple sentence expressed by a member of the bar of my home city:

He had a conscience that never slept.

Realizing the frightful possibilities of the world situation I cannot refrain from expressing the fervent wish that the consciences of Members of Congress would never sleep until we enact legislation at this very session of Congress to protect America from involvement in the terrible tragedies that lurk just beyond our visible horizon. If we think hard and prayerfully we will have to admit that we have done nothing worth while at this session to keep our country out of war.

The neutrality law we have enacted is so weak a four-horse team could be driven through it. It is no protection. Our well-meant McSwain bill to take the profit out of war by statute has struck the reefs and floundered in the Senate. We are driving rapidly toward the close of the Congress, leaving America pathetically exposed to war.

It is not, even now, too late to do something if we will take up and pass House Joint Resolution No. 167, the war-referendum and anti-war-profits resolution I have introduced. It provides for an amendment to the Constitution: (a) To permit the people of America to vote on a declaration of war except in the case of attack or invasion and; (b) to take the profit out of war.

Take the profit out of war and there will be few wars. The referendum part of my proposed amendment is based on the philosophy that those who have to suffer and, if need be, to die and to bear the crushing burdens and sorrows of war, shall have something to say as to whether war shall be declared.

Not through pride of authorship but from a firm conviction I am certain that this is the best proposal so far advanced to keep our country out of foreign wars. I believe that if it is adopted America will never enter another war except righteous wars of self-defense.

The magazine, Good Housekeeping, which numbers its readers by the millions, has placed its powerful influence back of my proposed peace amendment, and it has entered upon a patriotic campaign to introduce my resolution to the women of America as a measure that will serve effectively to keep America out of war. Who has a better right to vote on a declaration of war than the wives, mothers, sisters, and sweethearts of the men whose lives will be thrown into the holocaust if there is another war? Women go down into the valley of the shadow of death to bring our boys into the world. Why should they not have something to say as to whether their flesh and blood shall be hurled into the hell of foreign conflicts?

Mr. William F. Bigelow, the distinguished and wise editor of Good Housekeeping, has undertaken to point out to the women of America how very important it is that my resolution shall pass as a protection to the homes and firesides and the lives of our fine young Americans.

He is urging women all over this country to request their Members of Congress to sign discharge petition no. 28 which I have filed at the Speaker's desk as the only means available under parliamentary procedure to bring my proposed peace amendment out of committee and before the House for action at this session. The discharge petition will not become effective unless, or until, 218 Members of the House sign it.

Under the caption "Good Housekeeping Advocates a Peace Amendment" the following appears in the June issue of that magazine:

On the 14th of February 1935, Mr. LOUIS LUDLOW, Representative from Indiana, introduced the following joint resolution in Congress:

"SECTION 1. Except in the event of an invasion of the United States or its territorial possessions and attack upon its citizens residing therein, the authority of Congress to declare war shall not become effective until confirmed by a majority of all votes cast thereon in a Nation-wide referendum. Congress may by law provide for the enforcement of this section.

"SEC. 2. Whenever war is declared, the President shall immediately conscript and take over for use by the Government all the public and private war properties, yards, factories, and supplies, fixing the compensation for private properties temporarily employed for the war period at a rate not in excess of 4 per centum, based on tax values assessed in the year preceding the war."

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. A hearing on the bill was held June 19, 1935. Mr. LUDLOW has made several attempts to have the bill reported out so that it can be debated on the floor of the House, but the bill was still in committee on May 1st. A letter to your Congressman urging him, or her, to sign discharge petition no. 28 at the Speaker's desk may force the reporting of the bill. As this is the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, no bills will hold over; the peace amendment bill will die with all the others bottled up in committees. It will therefore be necessary for a new bill to be introduced when the Seventy-fifth Congress convenes in January 1937.

Such a bill will be introduced; we can promise our readers that. It may, probably will, be worded differently, but its chief purpose will be the same: so to amend the Constitution as to give to the people the right to pass judgment on any proposal to go to a war outside our own borders. Note that no attempt is made to curtail the authority of Congress "in the event of an invasion." No sensible person would want to delay action by our armed forces in such an emergency. We should at all times be prepared to strike, and strike hard, if we are attacked.

Now a peace amendment is not going to be passed by Congress unless voters demand that it be passed. It means giving up power that Congress has always held unrestrictedly. Many Congressmen think that that power should be given up, that no small group should hold in its hands the destiny of a people—possibly the death sentences of millions of our youth. So here is something for women to do—mothers of sons, wives, sisters, sweethearts. Men who will vote for a peace amendment—the beginning of the end of war for this country—can be elected in November—if the women say they must be.

Mr. Eby (Kerr Eby) replied as follows when we told him about the peace amendment:

"By the Lord Harry, I believe you may have nailed something! Not because such an amendment seems right and proper to me, but because it would drag the question right out into the open to be fought for and against. It is a concrete issue. Something to get hold of. It has the beauty of being truly democratic American in that it uses our own institutions in our own way. * * * Your idea is grandly democratic to me. Those who are about to die can vote on it.

"At the risk of being officious, I'd suggest that the idea of the President and Congress being wholly at liberty in defense should be heavily stressed, and (this I most sincerely believe) neither our Army nor Navy should be weakened in the least—until the time all nations acquire some sense. I'm just nut enough to believe that time will come. The world is literally dying for peace."

In its May issue Good Housekeeping published the following powerful appeal which I wish every woman in America—especially every mother—might read and ponder over:

A PEACE AMENDMENT

We are suggesting a big thing for Mothers' Day—for the Mothers' Days of all the years to come. Flowers our mothers have had in profusion, and flowers they will have as long as flowers are given as tokens of love. Another significance is becoming attached to the day: A solicitude for all mothers, that they may have the care that belongs to every woman who brings a child into the world. And now we are ready to consider the next big forward step: To say to mothers that, without the consent of the majority of the voters in a referendum, their sons and daughters may not be drafted for war purposes, unless the country is attacked or invaded. This assurance should come, can only come, through an amendment to the Constitution. Let us call it the peace amendment.

The power to declare war is, in the Constitution, given unrestrictedly to Congress. In the beginning there was nothing else to do; the people were so widely scattered, the means of communication so slow and unreliable, that it was impossible to discuss with the Nation the things that might seem to be driving it to war, and ask for a referendum vote. Now all that is changed. By means of the radio every voter may sit at the President's desk and listen to his reasons for asking a declaration of war. It is no longer necessary for a small group of men and women—531 at present—to have the power to make the decision that may mean to millions of young men that they are to be offered as bloody or gassed sacrifices to the god of war, that their bodies may be left, as useless to the world as to themselves, on foreign battlefields. They who will have to do the fighting will know, as well as do the Members of Congress, the reasons why the fighting should be done. And their lives should not be pawned without their consent.

The question as to whether Congress has ever abused its power need not enter here. It is the question of a larger right that we are discussing. There is so much evidence that all wars are useless and that they not only waste lives and livelihoods but fail to settle disputes between nations, that there is abundant reason for declaring that the people themselves should decide whether they want the Nation to go to war. That does not touch the matter of defense in case of attack. As commander in chief of the Army and Navy, the President can use these forces at any time. And in the world as it is now and seems likely to be for a long time to come, those forces should be sufficient to meet any emergency, any possible combination of nations against our own.

There is now pending before the House of Representatives a bill proposing a peace amendment. At a hearing on the bill its author, Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, said: "The decision as to whether there shall be war or peace should be made * * * by the 125,000,000 people who comprise the American Nation * * *. This proposal reaches to the very fundamentals of equality as defined in the Declaration of Independence. It makes me indignant to think that a man, just because he happens to hold an official station, may order me out to be shot and killed without consulting me; and in the interest of justice, in the interest of perpetuating the principles of equality on which this Nation arose in majesty out of the oppresssions of the past, it is time to revise the fundamental law of the land so that every citizen of the Republic, however poor and humble, shall have an equal right with every other citizen to decide whether or not this Nation shall go to war."

Yes, there are arguments against a peace amendment, and lots of them—perhaps as many as were raised against any amendment ever proposed or ratified. One of them is that a referendum would cause delay. Gen. Smedley D. Butler—you will remember that he was with the marines at Chateau Thierry and Belleau Wood—is for it just for that reason. "I believe it will delay action", he said, "and that therefore all these adjustments can be made. There is no necessity for fighting except in cases of invasion." And there are many more objections. But we are not so much concerned with the negatives based on the difficulty of going to war that this amendment would impose—for we think they are largely mechanical and could be solved—as we are with the fact that killing men to settle disputes is a senseless pastime, as outmoded as it is costly. This whole thing is not a question of whether power should be taken from Congress, but whether there should not be given back to the people the right to decide whether or not they are willing to have their sons killed in battle or die of wounds or disease or spend a lifetime in pain.

Women have asked Good Housekeeping what they can do to end war. We believe that work for a peace amendment promises better results than anything else they can do, for with such an amendment war, so far as this country is concerned, will be a thing of the past. The people will not vote for the United States to take war to another nation. And if we give no cause for war—and keep our powder dry—we will not be attacked.

Now, you mothers * * *.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the address of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER], I may address the House for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], I may address the House for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

DON'T LET THEM FOOL YOU, MR. FARMER! HERE ARE THE FACTS

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, for months now we have been hearing from certain newspapers and certain politicians that as a result of the policies of this administration the plight of the American farmer has become more and more unbearable.

We are told that he has not really made any progress in the last 3½ years, and that, on the contrary, the American farmers' precious home market is being taken away from them by tariff negotiation which let in a flood of competitive farm imports.

We are subjected to sensational stories of how Chinese coolies and South American peons are unfairly competing with the American farmer in his own front yard.

LET US LOOK AT THE RECORD

Mr. Speaker, I would not for a moment deny to these sensationalists the right to make all the ridiculous statements they wish to about the policies and accomplishments of this administration, but I would humbly suggest that every once in a while in a political campaign there ought to be a breathing spell during which a few indisputable, unassailable facts could be introduced and examined by the electorate.

I believe that the people of my district wish more than anything else to know the facts on these controversial issues, and I consider it both a duty and a privilege to present these facts.

WHAT TABLE NO. 1 REVEALS

The figures I use are the official statistics made public by the Department of Commerce and analyzed by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture.

Table 1 shows agricultural imports classified between noncompetitive and competitive products.

Referring to the last column of competitive imports minus sugar, it will be noted that, while these imports were considerably larger in 1935 than in immediately preceding years, they were substantially smaller than in the years prior to 1931.

TABLE 1.—*Value of United States agricultural imports, 1921–35*

Calendar year	Agricultural imports				
	Total	Noncompetitive	Competitive [1]	Sugar	Competitive minus sugar
	Million dollars	*Million dollars*	*Million dollars*	*Million dollars*	*Million dollars*
1921	1,323	584	739	235	504
1922	1,638	773	865	252	613
1923	2,038	933	1,105	380	725
1924	1,918	927	991	364	627
1925	2,355	1,339	1,016	246	770
1926	2,415	1,444	971	232	739
1927	2,219	1,225	994	258	736
1928	2,106	1,145	961	207	754
1929	2,218	1,201	1,017	209	808
1930	1,468	769	699	130	569
1931	1,007	561	446	113	333
1932	668	372	296	97	199
1933	743	366	377	108	269
1934 [2]	858	408	450	118	332
1935 [2]	1,106	483	623	134	489

[1] Competitive agricultural imports include imports similar to agricultural products commercially produced in the United States or directly substituted to a significant extent for domestic agricultural products.
[2] Imports for consumption.

Foreign Agricultural Service Division. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States and official records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

The United States has for many years imported regularly and in large volume a number of competitive agricultural products, such as wool, sugar, and flaxseed. But it is not these "regularly imported" products which have aroused general interest in recent months. Most of the recent discussion in regard to agricultural imports has been concerned with such products as grain and feed, meats, dairy products, and eggs.

IMPORTS DECREASE

When the monthly statistics of imports of these latter products are examined for the period January 1934 to date, it will be found that these imports started to increase in the middle or latter part of 1934. They reached their peak, taking the groups as a whole, during the middle of 1935 and have since shown a marked recession. Generally speaking, the imports of grain, which started in 1934, declined abruptly or ceased as soon as the crops of 1935 became available. The imports of livestock products have held up longer simply because it takes more time to restore livestock numbers than to increase the production of annual crops.

WHEAT, CORN, OATS, BARLEY, RYE

TABLE 2.—*United States: Import quantity, 1922–33 and January 1934 to March 1936* [1]

SPECIFIED GRAINS

Year (ended Dec. 31) and month	Wheat, grain [2] [3]	Corn, grain	Oats, grain	Barley, malt [2]	Rye, grain [2]
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Pounds*	*Bushels*
1922	10,560,000	113,000	1,299,000	60,000	126,000
1923	8,930,000	203,000	317,000	397,000	1,000
1924	6,895,000	4,107,000	6,964,000	765,000	1,000
1925	1,308,000	1,086,000	178,000	836,000	1,000
1926	451,000	1,055,000	157,000	1,028,000	(4)
1927	21,000	5,458,000	85,000	810,000	(4)
1928	224,000	565,000	489,000	865,000	2,000
1929	36,000	407,000	112,000	1,025,000	(4)
1930	317,000	1,556,000	183,000	4,309,000	7,000
1931	54,000	618,000	576,000	39,875,000	82,000
1932	3,000	344,000	59,000	52,533,000	(4)
1933	31,000	160,000	132,000	109,183,000	8,006,000
1934:					
January	9,000	18,000	6,000	11,520,000	0
February	37,000	15,000	2,000	9,788,000	276,000
March	24,000	17,000	(4)	14,724,000	173,000
April	51,000	11,000	4,000	17,943,000	869,000
May	1,000	14,000	1,000	18,265,000	572,000
June	1,000	77,000	7,000	22,499,000	2,054,000
July	2,000	24,000	152,000	25,407,000	1,021,000
August	432,000	195,000	27,000	20,056,000	241,000
September	2,779,000	445,000	210,000	14,283,000	521,000
October	1,087,000	501,000	1,087,000	11,441,000	455,000
November	1,407,000	470,000	1,672,000	12,876,000	1,307,000
December	1,907,000	1,172,000	2,412,000	14,926,000	133,000
Total	7,737,000	2,959,000	5,580,000	193,728,000	7,622,000
1935:					
January	843,000	1,887,000	1,644,000	17,449,000	1,009,000
February	1,055,000	1,826,000	2,118,000	15,459,000	1,177,000
March	1,458,000	3,304,000	2,596,000	27,197,000	1,613,000
April	1,611,000	1,445,000	2,167,000	30,701,000	670,000
May	847,000	3,036,000	1,124,000	37,794,000	2,283,000
June	625,000	6,122,000	406,000	43,728,000	799,000
July	793,000	5,649,000	29,000	42,041,000	357,000
August	2,570,000	8,554,000	1,000	27,136,000	1,464,000
September	3,644,000	2,986,000	7,000	27,566,000	65,000
October	5,324,000	4,690,000	5,000	16,933,000	204,000
November	4,348,000	1,651,000	2,000	18,916,000	1,000
December	4,321,000	2,092,000	8,000	15,703,000	1,000
Total	27,439,000	43,242,000	10,107,000	320,623,000	9,643,000
1936:					
January	2,231,000	1,869,000	0	15,190,000	0
February	2,398,000	583,000	6,000	15,554,000	20,000
March	2,673,000	1,186,000	5,000	18,153,000	0

[1] General imports prior to 1934; beginning Jan. 1,1934, imports for consumption.
[2] Imports for consumption.
[3] For domestic consumption includes only wheat full duty paid and 10 percent ad valorem.
[4] Less than 500.

NO IMPORTS IN JANUARY

Table 2 shows the imports of certain selected products, by months, since January 1934.

It will be noted that the imports of oats began in small volume in July 1934 and reached a peak of 2,600,000 bushels in March 1935.

Imports of oats have been insignificant since July 1935, there being no imports whatever in January and only 6,000 bushels in February 1936.

A similar situation is shown in the imports of rye, which have been negligible since August 1935.

CORN IMPORTS EXPLAINED

The imports of corn continued longer than those of oats as the 1935 corn crop did not become available until November of that year.

Not only was the 1935 corn crop about 350,000,000 bushels below normal but the quality in many of the Corn Belt States was exceedingly poor, thus making a large part of it unfit for shipment.

The reduction below normal in last year's crop occurred largely in certain Corn Belt States which normally ship out considerable quantities.

Even with the reduced numbers of livestock in the United States the 1935 corn crop was inadequate, because existing stocks had to be replenished, feed requirements per animal unit were larger as a result of the severe winter, and, in addition, industrial utilization of corn increased.

FARMERS MAKE MONEY ON CORN

As a result of the above factors, domestic corn prices continued at a level sufficiently high to permit the importation of corn from Argentina, where prices were very low as a result of a record crop last year.

These imports were confined largely to the coastal regions.

Nevertheless, imports of corn have been running substantially smaller during the current marketing season than in 1934–35, and the imports in March 1936, the latest month for which figures are available, were about 65 percent less than in March 1935.

The imports of barley malt, which started to assume significant proportions in 1934 after the repeal of prohibition, showed a considerable increase in 1935.

These imports reached a peak of almost 44,000,000 pounds in June 1935, but have since fallen off, amounting to 18,153,000 pounds in March 1936.

VERY LITTLE WHEAT IMPORTED

Imports of wheat continue at a higher level than in the 1934–35 season.

This is due to the fact that our spring wheat crop in 1935 was much below domestic requirements for this type of wheat and was also of unusually poor quality because of serious rust damage.

Nevertheless, imports of wheat from the 1st of July 1935 through March 1936 totaled only 28,000,000 bushels, or a little more than 4.5 percent of our total wheat production in 1935.

Imports through March were still below the estimated deficit in our spring wheat supplies this year.

ANIMALS AND ANIMAL PRODUCTS

Turning to animal and animal products, it will be observed in the following table that imports of cattle started to increase in February 1935 and continued throughout 1935 considerably above the corresponding months of 1934.

The total imports in 1935, however, of 378,000 head were substantially less than the imports in the years 1927 to 1929.

Imports of canned beef, most of which came from Argentina and Uruguay, have for many years been substantial.

Imports in 1935, however, were larger than in any year since 1929, and imports during the first 3 months of 1936 were somewhat larger than those of a year earlier.

CATTLE AND ANIMAL PRODUCTS

Year (ended Dec. 31) and month	Cattle, live	Beef, canned [1] [2]	Butter	Tallow [1]	Egg products [3]
	Head	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
1922	238,000	894,000	6,957,000	1,831,000	[1] 27,768,000
1923	140,000	4,496,000	23,741,000	10,823,000	[1] 12,565,000
1924	145,000	7,028,000	19,405,000	2,440,000	19,723,000
1925	175,000	7,969,000	7,212,000	1,828,000	33,987,000
1926	221,000	21,045,000	8,029,000	13,647,000	25,737,000
1927	445,000	35,999,000	8,460,000	12,908,000	15,341,000
1928	563,000	52,748,000	4,659,000	14,239,000	23,474,000
1929	505,000	79,899,000	2,773,000	16,803,000	26,030,000
1930	234,000	56,105,000	2,472,000	591,000	16,156,000
1931	95,000	19,586,000	1,882,000	1,365,000	7,661,000
1932	106,000	24,639,000	1,014,000	502,000	3,085,000
1933	82,000	41,344,000	1,022,000	239,000	3,664,000
1934:					
January	8,000	1,568,000	58,000	----------	255,000
February	7,000	1,344,000	59,000	----------	223,000
March	9,000	2,995,000	45,000	----------	221,000
April	16,000	3,782,000	55,000	----------	151,000
May	6,000	3,470,000	69,000	----------	216,000
June	5,000	2,519,000	74,000	----------	239,000
July	4,000	4,279,000	74,000	0	297,000
August	1,000	6,195,000	95,000	0	342,000
September	3,000	4,227,000	114,000	5,747,000	286,000
October	1,000	4,586,000	172,000	8,515,000	304,000
November	2,000	4,440,000	189,000	16,661,000	356,000
December	4,000	7,269,000	249,000	11,890,000	288,000
Total	66,000	46,674,000	1,253,000	42,813,000	3,178,000
1935:					
January	6,000	4,142,000	539,000	14,687,000	363,000
February	38,000	4,225,000	3,071,000	16,929,000	398,000
March	53,000	7,690,000	4,929,000	28,769,000	420,000
April	51,000	9,496,000	8,860,000	28,090,000	370,000
May	49,000	7,076,000	2,665,000	33,206,000	1,022,000
June	34,000	5,911,000	1,437,000	25,635,000	1,199,000
July	18,000	5,220,000	177,000	29,290,000	790,000
August	16,000	5,740,000	149,000	16,126,000	646,000
September	14,000	7,752,000	122,000	14,236,000	602,000
October	32,000	5,379,000	108,000	16,074,000	668,000

[1] Imports for consumption.
[2] Includes corned beef.
[3] Excludes eggs in the shell.

CATTLE AND ANIMAL PRODUCTS—continued

Year (ended Dec. 31) and month	Cattle, live	Beef, canned	Butter	Tallow	Egg products
1935—Continued.	*Head*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
November	40,000	6,811,000	277,000	13,475,000	613,000
December	27,000	6,867,000	341,000	9,325,000	540,000
Total	378,000	76,309,000	22,675,000	245,851,000	7,631,000
1936:					
January	22,000	7,642,000	860,000	8,828,000	650,000
February	28,000	7,218,000	2,191,000	9,827,000	470,000
March	52,000	7,978,000	577,000	5,374,000	555,000

Foreign Agricultural Service Division. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States and official records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

TALLOW

Imports of tallow, which is also a beef product, commenced in September 1934 and rose to a peak of 33,000,000 pounds in May 1935.

Since that time imports have shown a definitely declining tendency, amounting to only 5.4 million pounds in March 1936.

BUTTER

Imports of butter were substantial during the first 6 months of 1935 but they were of very small volume during the last half of the year.

While the imports of butter in 1935 reached a relatively high level of 22,675,000 pounds, they did not equal the record imports of 23,741,000 pounds reached in 1923.

The imports of butter in the first 3 months of 1936 were 58 percent less than in the same months of 1935.

DRIED EGGS

Imports of egg products, chiefly dried eggs from China, were larger in 1935 than in any year since 1931 but were considerably smaller than in the years prior to 1931.

So far as 1935 is concerned these imports reached their peak in May and June.

This review of the principal agricultural import products shows clearly that imports are receding from the peaks reached in 1935 and in some cases are now of negligible proportions.

INSIGNIFICANT PROPORTION

While the imports of these products were larger in 1935 than in the immediately preceding years, they represented in most cases an insignificant proportion of the production of similar products in the United States.

A comparison of the imports of certain competitive products with our average production is shown in table 3.

TABLE 3.—*Volume of certain agricultural imports compared to average production*

[Average 1928–32 and year 1935]

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Production	Imports			
			Average, 1928–32		1935	
		Average 1928–32 quantity	Quantity	Percent of average production	Quantity	Percent of average production
Grain:						
Corn	1,000 bushels	2,562,147	698	0.03	43,242	1.7
Wheat	1,000 bushels	850,570	[1] 127	.01	[1] 27,439	3.2
Oats	1,000 bushels	1,217,646	284	.02	10,107	.8
Barley	1,000 bushels	282,841	[2] 688	.2	[2] 13,413	4.7
Rye	1,000 bushels	38,655	18	.1	9,643	24.9
Meats:						
Beef, canned	1,000 pounds	----------	46,595	--------	76,309	--------
Beef and veal, fresh.	1,000 pounds	----------	22,691	--------	8,757	--------
Beef, pickled, etc.	1,000 pounds	----------	4,442	--------	1,472	--------
Total beef	----------	[3] 6,884,616	[4] 143,621	2.1	[4] 201,002	3.0

[1] Includes full duty imports and imports unfit for human consumption.
[2] Grain plus malt converted to bushels of grain at the rate of 37.4 pounds of malt to 1 bushel of grain.
[3] Estimated dressed weight of total United States beef and veal slaughter. Federally inspected slaughter was 67.7 percent of this figure.
[4] Canned beef converted to meat equivalent at the rate of 2.5 pounds dressed meat to 1 pound canned.

TABLE 3.—*Volume of certain agricultural imports compared to average production*—Continued

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Production	Imports			
			Average, 1928–32		1935	
		Average 1928–32 quantity	Quantity	Percent of average production	Quantity	Percent of average production
Hogs	1,000 pounds		897		3,414	
Pork, fresh	1,000 pounds		3,088		3,923	
Hams, shoulders and bacon.	1,000 pounds		2,319		5,297	
Pork, pickled, etc	1,000 pounds		1,750		1,274	
Total pork		[5] 9,270,000	[6] 7,830	0.1	[6] 13,055	0.1
Dairy products and eggs:						
Butter	1,000 pounds	2,152,160	2,560	.1	22,675	1.1
Casein	1,000 pounds	30,883	15,888	51.5	3,230	10.5
Cheese	1,000 pounds	489,055	68,742	14.1	48,933	10.0
Eggs	1,000 dozen	2,751,333	[7] 34,721	1.3	[7] 21,771	.8

[5] Estimated dressed weight, excluding lard, of total United States hog slaughter. Federally inspected slaughter was 63 percent of this figure.

[6] Hogs converted to meat equivalent at the rate of 100 pounds live weight to 75 pounds dressed weight.

[7] Includes imports of frozen eggs converted at the rate of 7 pounds frozen to 6 dozen fresh and imports of dried eggs converted on the following bases: 1 pound of dried whole eggs to 3.56 pounds liquid; 1 pound dried yolk to 2.23 pounds of liquid; 1 pound dried albumen to 7.3 pounds liquid; 35 pounds liquid to 30 dozen eggs in the shell.

Foreign Agricultural Service Division, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

PERCENTAGE SMALL

It will be noted, for instance, that our imports of corn in 1935, amounting to 43,242,000 bushels, represented only 1.7 percent of our average corn production during the period 1928 to 1932.

Last year's imports of oats amounted to eight-tenths of 1 percent of the average production, wheat 3.2 percent of our average wheat production, and barley and barley malt 4.7 percent of our barley production.

SHORT ON RYE

Rye is the only one of the grains the imports of which reached a substantial percentage of our average domestic production.

The proportion of imports in 1935 to average production was approximately 25 percent.

The reason for these relatively large imports of rye is to be found in the fact that in both 1933 and 1934 the rye crops in the United States were less than half of our average previous production.

These very short crops, coming at a time when the repeal of prohibition led to some increase in consumption, made it necessary for the United States to import substantial quantities of rye in order to satisfy our domestic requirements.

As previously indicated, the imports of rye have been negligible since our 1935 crop became available in July of last year.

Incidentally, the production of rye in the United States in 1935 was in excess of our domestic requirements, so that we now have an export surplus of this grain.

BEEF AND PORK

With respect to meat, the total imports of beef in 1935, most of which consisted of canned beef, represented only 3 percent of our average total federally inspected production of beef and veal.

The imports of pork represented only one-tenth of 1 percent of our average total inspected pork.

In fact, these pork imports were only 11.3 percent of our reduced exports of cured pork in 1935, excluding lard.

CHEESE AND BUTTER FOR 1935

Imports of butter in 1935 were substantially greater than the average imports in preceding years but they represented only 1.1 percent of our average production of butter in this country. Imports of cheese and casein in 1935 each represented about 10 percent of our average production. It will be noted, however, that imports of both of these items in 1935 were considerably below average.

Imports of egg products, chiefly dried eggs, in 1935 were much smaller than average, although they were larger than in immediately preceding years. The imports in 1935 represented about eight-tenths of 1 percent of the average egg production of the United States.

WHAT I HAVE SHOWN SO FAR

I have shown that there was a substantial increase in the imports of certain agricultural products in 1935, compared with the immediately preceding years, that these imports have shown a definite recession, and finally that they have, in practically all cases, represented an insignificant part of our domestic production. Now let us consider in more detail the relationship of the drought of 1934 and also of the agricultural-adjustment programs to this increase in agricultural imports.

WHAT THE DROUGHT HAD TO DO WITH IT

To understand the significance of the drought in relation to imports, it is necessary to know the extent to which our production in 1934 was reduced from normal. The drought of 1934 was the most widespread and serious in the history of the United States and affected seriously the production of all of the major crops in this country except cotton and tobacco.

The products principally affected were feeds and fodder. It has been estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics that the drought of 1934 caused a reduction from average in our production of feed of 50,000,000 tons.

In other words, in order to have had a normal supply of feed during the latter half of 1934 and up until the crops of 1935 became available it would have been necessary to import 50,000,000 tons.

But, as a matter of fact, the United States, during the full 18 months from July 1934, when the effects of the drought first became apparent, until December 1935, when the 1935 corn crop became available, imported less than three and one-half million tons of all types of feeds and fodder, or only 7 percent of the shortage.

BEEF CATTLE AND CALVES

A similar situation exists with respect to the imports of livestock and livestock products.

Beef cattle may be taken as an example. The number of beef cattle and calves in the United States in January 1934 was estimated to be 36,000,000 head.

The number in January 1935 was estimated at 32,000,000 head.

This reduction of 4,000,000 head may be compared with our imports of beef cattle in 1935 of only 368,000 head.

In the case of imported beef, which consists principally of canned beef, the situation is much the same. The federally inspected slaughter of cattle and calves in the United States in 1934 produced six thousand seven hundred and twenty-seven million pounds of beef and veal, compared with five thousand two hundred and sixteen million pounds in 1935, a drop of about one thousand five hundred million pounds.

Figures for both years include provisional estimates of beef produced from relief slaughter. The imports of beef and veal in 1935, including canned beef on a dressed-weight basis, were just short of 200,000,000 pounds, or 13 percent of the reduction in our Federal slaughter between 1934 and 1935.

HOW DID A. A. A. AFFECT IMPORTS?

These are only a few of numerous examples that might be cited of the tremendous decrease in production of agricultural products in the United States resulting from the drought and of the relatively small part that imports played in making up this loss in production.

The question is frequently raised, however, as to the effect of the agricultural-adjustment programs on imports.

Many people who do not realize the overshadowing importance of the drought in reducing domestic supplies of food, feed, and livestock in 1934 and 1935 seem to be under

the impression that the imports have been a direct result of the agricultural-adjustment programs.

They are unable, as they put it, to see the justification of paying American farmers to reduce production and then permitting imports to come in to take the place of American products.

A MINOR FACTOR

First of all, it must be admitted that the adjustment programs, by helping to raise American farm prices, were to some extent a factor in making the American market more attractive to imports; but they were only a minor factor, since the reduction in production that may be attributed to the adjustment programs is very much less than the reduction that may be attributed to the low yields resulting from the drought.

Furthermore, there were no production-adjustment programs with respect to certain products, such as rye, barley, oats, dairy products, beef cattle, and eggs, the imports of which showed large increases.

These facts will be best brought out by an examination of individual products.

REDUCED PRODUCTION OF WHEAT

The United States production of wheat in the crop year 1934–35 was 497,000,000 bushels, a drop of 364,000,000 bushels from the annual average of 861,000,000 bushels for the 5-year period 1928 to 1932.

Of this reduction about 310,000,000 bushels were chargeable to the drought and 54,000,000 bushels to acreage reduction, in accordance with adjustment contracts under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

WHEAT UNFIT FOR USE

Wheat imported into the United States for consumption in 1934–35 totaled 14,000,000 bushels, or only 5 percent of the loss caused by the drought.

These imports represented only 3 percent of the United States wheat production for the crop year.

Furthermore, of this total importation of 14,000,000 bushels, over 57 percent represented wheat unfit for human consumption brought into the country chiefly as feed for livestock in the drought-affected areas.

In the 1935–36 crop year, production of all wheat in the United States totaled 603,000,000 bushels, or 257,000,000 bushels less than the 5-year—1928–32—average.

The reduction in production during this crop year was also due primarily to unfavorable weather conditions and particularly to serious rust damage in the spring-wheat States.

Imports of wheat during the first 9 months of the crop year—July through March—amounted to 28,000,000 bushels.

AT LAST FARMERS ARE MAKING MONEY

In the last analysis, the most important phase of this whole import subject is the effect of these imports upon the income of American farmers. Are imports really coming into the country in such volume as to depress our prices and result in a serious decrease in farm income?

It has already been shown that the imports since 1934 represent, in most cases, a very small part of our domestic supply.

It is for this reason that in the vast majority of cases they have had no significant effect in depressing American farm prices.

The most that can be attributed to imports is that in certain cases such as, for example, butter, seasonal imports during the period when our butter supplies are shortest in the winter prevent prices of butterfat in this country from rising as much as they otherwise would.

In other words, the tariff of 14 cents a pound on butter is, under these circumstances, effective in maintaining American prices above world prices by substantially this amount.

One way of considering the signficance of imports to farm income is to compare the value of the imports of competitive products year by year with the gross farm income of the United States for the same years.

TABLE 4.—*United States competitive agricultural imports compared with domestic farm income*

Year ended Dec. 31	Value		Value index (1921–30=100)	
	Gross income from farm production	Competitive agricultural imports [1]	Gross income from farm production	Competitive agricultural imports [1]
	Million dollars	*Million dollars*		
1921	8,927	739	82	79
1922	9,944	865	91	92
1923	11,041	1,105	101	118
1924	11,337	991	104	106
1925	11,968	1,016	109	109
1926	11,480	971	105	104
1927	11,616	994	106	106
1928	11,741	961	107	103
1929	11,941	1,017	109	109
1930	9,454	699	86	75
1931	6,968	446	64	48
1932	5,337	296	49	32
1933	[2] 6,406	377	59	40
1934	[2] 7,266	[3] 450	66	48
1935	[2] 8,110	[3] 623	74	67

[1] Competitive agricultural imports include imports of agricultural products commercially produced in the United States or directly substituted to a significant extent for domestic agricultural products.

[2] Includes income from rental and benefit payments of $278,000,000 for 1933, $594,000,000 for 1934, and $480,000,000 for 1935.

[3] Imports for consumption.

Foreign Agricultural Service Division.

AMAZING GAIN TO FARMERS

The income of farmers in the United States in 1935, when the competitive agricultural imports were valued at $623,000,000, was $8,110,000,000.

The income of farmers in the United States in 1932, when competitive imports were valued at only $296,000,000, was only $5,337,000,000, the lowest in the recent history of this country.

The table also shows that in the years prior to the depression, when imports of competitive farm products were running at a total value in the neighborhood of $1,000,000,000 a year, the income of the farmers of the United States was much larger, running between $11,000,000,000 and $12,000,000,000 a year.

In other words, the American farmer has been better off from the standpoint of total income in the years when competitive imports have been large than in the years when such imports have been small.

In the more prosperous years farm prices are high enough so that imports are attracted into the American market over the prevailing tariff wall.

In the years of very low farm income prices are so low in this country that the American market is not attractive to imports.

ANOTHER WAY OF LOOKING AT IT

Another way of considering the significance of imports is to relate the changes in volume of imports to the prices received by American farmers. Just as in the case of gross farm income, the prices received by farmers have been higher during periods of large imports than they were when imports were small.

A few specific examples will suffice to make this clear. The average farm price of wheat in the United States in both the calendar years 1934 and 1935 was 84 cents a bushel.

In those years the imports of wheat for consumption in the United States were approximately 8,000,000 and 17,000,000 bushels, respectively.

In 1933 the farm price of wheat was 67 cents a bushel and imports were 32,000 bushels.

In 1932 the farm price was only 38 cents a bushel and imports amounted to the negligible figure of 3,000 bushels.

MORE MONEY FOR CORN

The average farm price of corn for the calendar year 1935 was 77 cents a bushel. Imports of corn in that year totaled 43,000,000 bushels. The farm price of corn in 1934 was 65 cents a bushel, and imports were 3,000,000 bushels.

In 1933, when the farm price of corn averaged only 38 cents per bushel, our imports of corn amounted to only 160,000 bushels.

BETTER PRICE FOR OATS

The farm price of oats in the United States during the crop year 1934–35, when imports amounted to approximately 16,000,000 bushels, was 48 cents a bushel.

But the average price to producers of oats thus far in the 1935–36 season, when imports have amounted to only 63,000 bushels, has been 28.5 cents a bushel.

RYE ALMOST DOUBLES IN PRICE

The farm price of rye was 71.3 cents a bushel during the marketing year 1934–35, when imports amounted to 11,000,000 bushels. The average farm price of rye thus far in 1935–36, when we have had practically no imports, has been only 38 cents a bushel.

The fundamental fact that should be borne in mind in considering imports in relation to farm income and farm prices is that prices received by American farmers for most of those drought-affected products are determined primarily by the domestic supply-and-demand situation, and that increased imports are a result of relatively high prices and decreased imports are a result of relatively low prices.

FALSE STATEMENT CORRECTED

I have seen statements that the increase in imports of competitive agricultural products during 1934 and 1935 has been due in large part to reductions in duties made in connection with reciprocal-trade agreements.

This simply is not true.

Generally speaking, there have been no changes in our tariff rates on the principal imported items.

In other words, reciprocal-trade agreements have had little, if anything, to do with the increase in imports.

The only trade agreements that have been signed up to the present time in connection with which the United States made any significant reductions whatever in duties on agricultural products are those with Cuba, Canada, and the Netherlands.

Of these three trade agreements, the only one that was in effect throughout the year was the one with Cuba.

TRADE AGREEMENT WITH CANADA

The trade agreement with Canada has been in effect only since January 1, 1936.

It is, therefore, obvious that this agreement could have had nothing to do with the increase in agricultural imports in 1935.

With respect to the possible effects of the agreement in causing larger imports into the United States during 1936 and future years, it is important to note that the duty reductions made on the Canadian agricultural products which would be likely to offer the most competition, namely, cattle, cream, and seed potatoes, were on only a limited quantity.

For example, the duty on beef cattle weighing 700 pounds or more was reduced on a quantity equivalent to three-fourths of 1 percent of our domestic slaughter of cattle and calves, namely, 155,799 head.

Incidentally, imports of cattle of this weight from Mexico or any other countries at the reduced rate have to come within a total of 155,799 head.

The duty on calves weighing 175 pounds or less was reduced on a quantity equivalent to one-fourth of 1 percent of our total annual slaughter of cattle and calves, or 51,933 head.

During the first 3 months of the operation of the agreement the imports of cattle weighing 700 pounds or more from both Canada and Mexico have totaled 44,031 head or 28 percent of the total customs quota.

The imports of calves have totaled 4,458 head or 8.5 percent of the total quota.

ONLY 1,293 GALLONS OF CANADIAN CREAM

In the case of cream the duty was reduced on a quantity of 1,500,000 gallons.

During the first 3 months of the agreement, however, the actual imports of cream have total only 1,293 gallons, which indicates that in spite of the duty reduction the American market is not attractive to shippers of Canadian cream.

Cheese is the only important agricultural item the imports of which have shown any significant increase since the signing of the Canadian trade agreement.

It is true that imports of cheese in the period January through March were considerably larger than in the same period of the immediately preceding years and somewhat larger than in the corresponding months of years prior to 1930, when the same rate of 5 cents a pound applied.

But even though these imports showed some increase, they represented only 3.3 percent of the Cheddar cheese production in the United States during the same 3 months.

Incidentally, the total imports of all kinds of cheese from all countries were only 7 percent larger in the first 3 months of 1936 than in the corresponding months of 1935.

EXPORT MARKET GAINS

Against this possible small disadvantage of increased cheese imports must be set the very substantial gain in the exports of a considerable number of agricultural items from the United States to Canada, which may be directly attributed to reductions in duties made by Canada in connection with the trade agreement.

For example, our milled-rice exports to Canada totaled 2,746,000 pounds in the first 3 months that the trade agreement has been in effect, compared with 331,000 pounds in the same months of 1935, a gain of 730 percent.

Our exports of grapefruit to Canada totaled 191,000 boxes, compared with 139,000 boxes in January through March last year, a gain of 37 percent.

Exports of oranges to Canada amounted to 722,000 boxes during January through March of this year, compared with 568,000 boxes during the same months last year, a gain of 27 percent.

There were equally substantial gains in the exports of a large number of dried and canned fruits and nuts.

Our egg exports to Canada rose from the negligible figure of less than 7,400 dozen in January through March 1935 to 78,000 dozen in the same months of 1936. Exports of American cured pork to Canada—bacon, hams, and shoulders—totaled 118,000 pounds in the first 3 months of the year, compared with only 2,000 pounds in the same months of 1935.

At the same time the exports of cured pork to the rest of the world were 41 percent smaller than last year. The 1936 exports of other pickled and salted pork to Canada increased sharply, the figures for the first quarter being 151 percent larger than in 1935.

INCREASED BUYING POWER

Looking at the matter from the standpoint of farmers in the United States as a whole it seems clear that the gains in our exports of farm products to Canada much more than offset any losses resulting in increased imports of Canadian agricultural products into the United States. And beyond this, account must be taken of the increased purchasing power in the industrial sections of the country for such things as dairy products and beef, which results directly from our larger sales of manufactured goods to Canada under the trade agreement.

NOW YOU HAVE THE FACTS

Now that you have the facts you can see for yourself how much of the misleading propaganda by certain newspapers and by certain politicians is vicious, untrue, and intended to deceive you. The test of any policy in behalf of farmers or any other group is determined by the results. The fact that farmers are making more money today than at any previous time in years is the final answer to all the enemies of the Roosevelt administration who are trying to prejudice the farmers by substituting false propaganda for the truth. Do not let them fool you, Mr. Farmer! Make them stick to the facts!

MR. AND MRS. WILLIAM O'BRIEN

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10565) for the relief

of Mr. and Mrs. William O'Brien, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and insert "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CENTRAL VALLEY WATER PROJECT AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER. Under the special order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein a report to the P. W. A. with reference to the Central Valley Water Project Authority of the State of California by B. W. Thoron, Assistant Finance Director of the P. W. A., dated July 26, 1934, and certain correspondence that I have had back and forth between the P. W. A. and the Secretary of the Interior.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when we had the reclamation projects under consideration a week ago, I attempted to obtain from the Public Works Administration in time so that I might use it during the debate, the report of B. W. Thoron, the Assistant Finance Director of the P. W. A. on the Central Valley project. I have just procured permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include that report.

My office first asked for that report a week prior to that date, and on the 16th day of May, the Saturday prior to the date when the matter was coming up in the House, a letter was written to the P. W. A. Administrator, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, requesting it, because at that time they said that they would require such a letter. Not having received it on Tuesday, the day before the matter came up, I called Mr. Ickes myself and was promised that I would receive it. It arrived after my time had expired on the floor. Immediately thereafter I wrote the P. W. A. and complimented them on their efficiency in seeing that the documents did not arrive until it was too late to use them in the debate.

What does that report disclose with reference to this project? It discloses that the administration itself, in its own investigation from inside sources, did not have a proper basis for submitting such a proposition to the President or for making an allotment for it. It discloses that this director, after his investigation, said that the estimates of power revenues by the applicant, by the Federal Power Commission, and by the engineer examiner are widely at variance; that the dependable market for power does not appear to us to justify the estimates of revenue of the applicant, as it appears that there must be a very large development of the market for power to absorb all of the available power which may be developed in connection with the project. On the other hand, he states the use of water for power must be subordinated to the other requirements if the water is to be available as and when needed for the other purposes of the project. This means that there will be a large variation in the amount of water released from the so-called Kennett Reservoir, and that that is absolutely true, because the reservoir is so near the head of the Sacramento Basin and the water stored must be used to equalize the flow from the tributary streams entering the Sacramento below the reservoir, that it will result in drawing down the water level of the reservoir in such way as to materially affect the operating head.

As to the plan of financing, it discloses that it does not appear that any estimate of assured revenues can be made which would warrant the conclusion that a loan for the construction of this project, payable solely from the net revenues derived therefrom, would be reasonably secured.

The project, if economically sound and carried to completion, would be of far-reaching benefit to the whole State of California, and more particularly to the counties which will receive its benefits, as well as to the particular lands directly affected. It therefore seems entirely reasonable to suggest that the cost of the project and the responsibility for financing it should be apportioned in some way commensurate with the benefits.

The report further states that a conservative estimate of reasonably assured revenues could be used as a basis for issuing a limited amount of revenue bonds to finance the plans at cost. The report further states that, in addition, proper account has not been taken of surplus crops that are now available and the question as to whether we should enter into that kind of reclamation project at a time when we have a surplus of the crops which that particular project would raise.

It appears from this report—and the entire report will be in the RECORD, under my permission to extend remarks—that this is absolutely being entered upon without regard to the question of its economic necessity and the economic efficiency of bringing more land into cultivation at such a time as this.

I am not surprised, in view of the manner in which allotments are being made by the P. W. A. and by other outfits in connection with the Government out of relief funds, that this allotment has been made so far as it has been made by the P. W. A. and other governmental authorities. It is so ridiculous that we should spend all this money at this time, a time when we have such a surplus of all these crops that are raised in this valley, further to develop irrigation projects. It appears in this report that it is absolutely unnecessary to go into such a large-scale project to take care of land already under cultivation, and that there can be no justification for it except as new lands are brought under irrigation. Those people who have irrigation projects would be fairer to the country and to themselves if they would not come here with such outlandish and such ridiculous projects; and I hope the Congress will have all these things in mind when they come to vote on these matters again.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. Does the gentleman understand that there are between 400,000 and 500,000 acres in the upper San Joaquin Valley in a high condition of productivity which, unless they receive water from the building of this project, will revert to the condition of the desert and become utterly worthless?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further; I have not the time. I will tell the gentleman the situation. The situation is that it is absolutely unnecessary to take care of the lands that are under high cultivation to have this great big expensive project. A few things could be done in the upper San Joaquin Valley that would entirely provide for and take decent care of these lands that are under cultivation; but there is absolutely no excuse for this big project, and the reports of the engineers all the way through sustain this viewpoint without conflict, stating that it is absolutely unnecessary to have this expense lay-out in order to take care of the lands already under cultivation.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I may say to the gentleman from New York that I live within a few miles of the land I just described, and I know, personally, that no definite plan has been offered by any engineer of consequence, or any engineer whose opinion is worthy of consideration, for the saving of these parching lands of the upper San Joaquin other than through the utilization of some, if not all, of the units of the Central Valley project.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman recognize the State engineer of California as an authority? He has studied the project and has demonstrated it clearly in his report.

Mr. GEARHART. I recognize Mr. Edward Hyatt, the State engineer of California, as the most able, consistent, and eloquent advocate of the Central Valley project in the

United States today. We are in constant consultation with him. You cannot cite one in whom we have greater confidence.

Mr. TABER. And he has said that what the gentleman has asked is not necessary. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the special order the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I trust that what I am about to say will not be misunderstood or will not seem out of place. I assure you I am most sincere. My service here the last 4 years has become such a vital part of my life that for some reason or other I do not feel I can sever my connections with this honorable body without expressing myself in these very few remarks before I leave.

While I have not served in Congress very long—there are many who have served so long they are considered veterans—I have been here and taken part in the affairs of our National Government during one of the most critical periods of our Nation's history. It has been my pleasure to have labored with, to have been personally acquainted with and met men and women who are destined to go down in history as our great leaders.

It has been a very great pleasure to have served with you, my colleagues, during these critical years. And while we may have had our differences in regard to legislative matters, you have always been so very courteous and considerate of me at all times.

I have never before witnessed men and women for the most part with such an earnest desire to serve their fellow men—so willing to give every matter presented to them their serious consideration or who had such sympathetic understanding of the needs and desires of the people of this country. I have never seen individuals to such an extent dedicate all their energies and even their very lives to those they represent, and to the general welfare. Would that I had the ability and the skill of a great artist to paint the wonderful battle scenes of the great struggles that go on here daily and to truly portray the heroes who patriotically, earnestly, and conscientiously carry on in these very chambers from day to day, whether they be leaders or merely buck privates in the rear ranks.

No one can appreciate the many duties and responsibilities that go with the office of Congressman until he has been elected to that high office. There is great joy and honor in attaining such position. After it has been reached the road is rough and rocky, with many pitfalls, and the woods are full of relentless savages. Honest and conscientious actions can be so misconstrued as to make them appear in an opposite light. Unfavorable news items, no matter how unfair, or whatever the motive, leave a wound that never heals.

Why do men aspire to such undertakings, you may ask me, if they have to undergo such strain, such hardships, and such humiliation? They seek the office. No one compels them to do so—it is voluntary on their part—and having attained it, why do they cling to it? It is that human ambition engendered in the spark of life that makes one desire to live, and in desiring to live to desire others to live. Living is not merely existing. It comprises those attributes which have ever been dominate among human beings—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as pronounced at the birth of our Nation, to secure which it is written that governments are instituted among men. It is irresistible, like the force of a glacier that sweeps all before it till the course is completed even out to the sea.

May our descendants never arrive at that period when they no longer desire leadership, or having attained the same they are not willing to make the sacrifices that go with it, as well as to enjoy its honors.

It is, therefore, with great reluctance that I leave these halls at this time. I have enjoyed every minute of my stay. I say again in conclusion it has been a great privilege to have been among you. Your political affiliations have made no difference to me, so that you were sincerely working for the best interest of those you represent and the best interest of our great country as a whole. When the Seventy-fourth Congress is declared adjourned sine die, may I extend to each and every one of you my best wishes and a fond adieu. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield for that purpose?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I voice the sentiments of the entire membership of the House when I say that we have learned with very deep regret of the determination of the gentleman from Kansas voluntarily to retire from Congress. He has served here with us for 4 years, and during that period of service he has been a useful Member of this body. He has been modest, but able and indefatigable in the discharge of his duties as a Representative of his own district and also as a Representative of the entire country.

We regret very much the prospect of continuing our service without his presence. I am sure all of us extend to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER] as he retires from this House the wish of great happiness in private life, and he carries with him the assurances of the profound esteem, respect, and affection of all Members of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker and Members, the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas, which has been represented for 4 years by my congenial and able colleague, RANDOLPH CARPENTER, is the middle district of the State. It is bounded by five of the other six districts. It includes the Flint Hills, the prairie-grass grazing country, with the rich valleys along the streams. To the north and the east of his district is the corn and the alfalfa section, to the west and south the great wheat region.

RANDOLPH CARPENTER is a native son. He is a lawyer, and a son of a distinguished lawyer, a World War soldier with distinction, and the head of a delightful family. His grasp of legislative matters has been comprehensive, and he has the fine, quiet courage to follow his convictions. He is doing the unusual and remarkable thing of retiring voluntarily. To us he is the inscrutable. However, since he made his decision he has exhibited no evidence of regret.

He belongs to the opposite party from mine, and his withdrawal increases my party's chance to rerepresent the district. But, laying aside all those things, being our honest selves for a moment, we regret his going. He has been a credit to the fine traditions of our State, and our agricultural people will remember him as having been an active and true friend.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 3 minutes.

THE TOWNSEND PLAN AND OLD-AGE SECURITY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the Townsend plan is just another chain-letter racket. Nickels and dimes were taken from credulous old people for the benefit of Clements, Townsend, and racketeers who then lived in newly acquired luxury. That was cruel and uncalled for. Townsend plan leaders claimed to welcome a congressional investigation. Then Dr. F. E. Townsend, after a showing had been made of use of the mails to defraud by his organization, contemptuously refused to answer questions. He was a contumacious witness. He should be punished for contempt. That very night the entire Townsend old-age organization of 75, occupying 13 offices in Washington, cleaned out the offices of files and furniture and, like thieves in the night, stealthily stole away. Dr. Townsend claimed that the investigating Congressmen were persecuting him. He declined to answer further questions and walked out. He said the House of Representatives was unfriendly and unfair. Then, when

the House of Representatives yesterday voted to refer the contempt charges to the United States attorney of the District of Columbia for investigation by that official with a view toward prosecution upon contempt charges and an impartial trial in a court of justice, Dr. Townsend said:

The House of Representatives was afraid to bring me before it for an open discussion of this notorious case.

He is a charlatan, a faker, a racketeer, a fraud. [Applause.]

The Townsend plan has become the cruelest hoax ever perpetrated upon our fathers and mothers. The entire scheme is so fantastic—the taxation feature is so burdensome, so cowardly and cruel—that many worthy people who now believe will eventually meet with bitter disappointment. This is unnecessary and uncalled for. It is most reprehensible. Conscienceless agitators and demagogic politicians may thrive momentarily by espousing this phantasmagoric plan claiming to give $200 per month to every elderly individual. Their ascendancy will be brief and their downfall sudden and certain.

The Townsend plan provides for money to be taken from wage earners, producers, and salaried people by a tax of 2 percent upon all business transactions plus a slight increase in inheritance, gift, and income taxes. This money is turned over to elderly people, regardless of need, to force its expenditure within 30 days "to keep a constant demand for production and consumption" and to take care of the needy aged.

Of 127,000,000 people in this country, 10,000,000 or more would seek these old-age annuity payments. The annual cost would be $24,000,000,000, plus the tremendous expense of administration, if every elderly individual were to be paid $200 per month. This would be equivalent to an added tax of $190 per year for each man, woman, and child in the United States. A man earning $100 per month and having a wife and two children would pay $760 in added taxes. At present the American people are overburdened with taxes. The average annual per-capita tax of every individual in our country is now $122.

There are already too many Government employees. Under the Townsend plan there would necessarily be a vast increase. Unfortunately the McGroarty bill (H. R. 7154) provides that the proceeds from the transaction tax shall first pay the cost of administration before anything whatever is paid to elderly people. I personally do not believe in bureaucrats first.

Supposing, instead of pensioning 10,000,000 men and women our Government would employ that additional number or increase the standing Army to that number, paying every soldier of the 10,000,000 $200 per month, requiring the expenditure of that salary within 30 days. Would that restore prosperity? Or would it bankrupt the Nation?

Prudence in the expenditure of this money is not within the theory of the plan. What is the opinion of Dr. Townsend as to the necessity of prudently spending money? When before the Ways and Means Committee he was interrogated by a member of the committee, as follows:

Mr. HILL. He could not go out and squander it in order to get rid of it, so that he may be eligible to receive $200 the next month?

Dr. TOWNSEND. We do not care what he does with it. That is immaterial. Let him have carte blanche. Let him buy whisky with it if he wants to kill himself off as quickly as he chooses. That is immaterial. It is commerce—business—that we want in the country. We are not going to regulate people's morals in the least when we give them money to spend.

Mr. HILL. Suppose a husband and wife qualify to receive this pension. They would be receiving $400 per month. Let us say they have a family of grown-up children. Would it be permissible for those children to live with them and be supported from the provisions supplied with this pension money in the home?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Why not? Why not let elders buy commodities and give to their children if they like? That is immaterial.

All taxes are burdensome. The transaction tax is a multiple sales tax. Such a tax is heartless and cruel in its operation. Childhood, youth, sickness, poverty, and misfortune do not escape it. I favor liberal old-age pensions. I consider a transaction tax atrocious. Nearly 50,000,000 men and women who work for wages and salaries, and their dependents, the farmers, middle-class people, and the poor must bear its burdens. Every tax imposed upon producers, upon industry, and business transactions adds to the cost of producing and distributing products and must be paid by the consumer. The farmer would be a chief victim of the transaction tax. He buys and sells out of proportion to his net income. Workingmen and children would be sufferers from the Townsend plan. Prices of necessities would increase much more than wages of workers, and even from the low wages would be deducted this transaction tax. Young and middle-aged parents and their small children would feel the pinch of restricted earning power under the Townsend plan. It is cruel and unconscionable to apply a multiple transaction sales tax upon the food and clothing of 36,000,000 children under 15 years of age. We must not decrease the opportunity for our children nor make their lot harder. The last place we should send the tax collector is into the homes of young men and women who are bringing up the future citizens of this Nation. Unfortunately the Townsend plan makes no provision whatever to raise wages corresponding with increased prices of commodities.

This depression has been prolonged because of the vast load of taxes and interest charges. The Townsend plan provides for a universal tax, a tax to raise a greater sum than was ever before collected in the same length of time anywhere in the world. The alleged benefits of the plan are speculative. The burden of the tax is definite, certain, and unescapable. No such burdensome tax has ever been proposed for the poor since the French Revolution. The real burden of the tax would be passed on to the workers in the form of higher prices. This, in effect, would further reduce wages already reduced by the transaction tax.

The proper administration of the plan would require a Government check-up every month to learn whether or not each beneficiary has spent the money given him and the amount of the individual income, if any, which should be deducted from his $200 pension. As there are over 10,000,000 eligibles scattered throughout the country, it would require an army of snoopers, sneaks, spies, informers, supervisors, collectors, and bureaucrats to supervise its administration.

If our people etablish a practice of using their political power to vote themselves pensions, regardless of need, then we are cultivating an appetite that is insatiable. The demand will grow and grow. Already it is suggested that the pensionable age be reduced to 55 years and that several other million beneficiaries be brought within the plan. If 10,000,000 people can live in idleness off others, why not 20,000,000?

About 350 years ago, while Elizabeth was Queen, somebody thought of the poorhouse. Since then we have found better ways of doing everything. We have exchanged the quill pen for the fountain pen and printing press; the candle for the electric light; the horse for the railroad, automobile, and airplane. Stagecoaches, tallow dips, flintlock muskets are gone, never to return. Nevertheless, we still tolerate the poorhouse. We care for our needy aged by methods in vogue in 1588.

After years of depression this problem is particularly acute. Savings of thousands of aged people have been wiped out, despite the fact that they providently and thriftly saved for their future. They are destitute. Their sons and daughters, lacking jobs in many instances, cannot help. Younger people and the middle aged may never be able to accumulate sufficient for their own old age. Certainly they are not able to adequately provide for their aged and infirm parents. This depression, like war, leaves its toll for future generations to pay. The question is, Shall we provide for our aged extravagantly and cruelly in poorhouse, or humanely, economically, and scientifically by old-age pensions?

Old-age pensions provide an open road for happiness and contentment for men and women who have through no fault of their own beheld the savings of a lifetime swept away as a result of ill-founded trust and abiding faith in big city bankers, in manipulated insurance companies, in exploiting building-and-loan associations, or have been swindled in any manner through the connivance of others, or who have by

reason of economic conditions been unable to lay aside sufficient for the rainy day that awaits us all. Local communities now overburdened, relatives now unduly burdened caring for the less fortunate, and county poorhouses will be displaced. A new era is at hand. The aged and infirm will face security and contentment instead of uncertainty, humiliation, and misery.

The need for old-age security legislation is largely due to the congestion and intensity of modern industrial processes. Either aged people, in honorable poverty, must be supported by private charity or by society. I favor old-age security legislation because it is the duty of the Government, and also because the reliance upon private charity is an unequal and insecure dependence for men and women who have earned the right to live their few remaining years in modest independence and enjoy repose.

The hope we all cherish is an old age free from care and want. To that end people toil patiently and live closely, seeking to save something for the day when they can earn no more. And yet the same fate awaits the majority. In the life of the worker there are weeks, often months, of enforced idleness, weeks of unavoidable sickness, losses from swindling, and then as age creeps on there is a constantly declining capacity to earn, until at 60 many find themselves destitute. There is no more pitiful tragedy than the lot of the worker who has struggled all his life to gain a competence and who at 60 faces the poor house. The black slave knew no such tragedy as this. It is a tragedy reserved for the free worker in the wealthiest and greatest nation on earth.

There is nothing radical about the old-age pension idea, though personally I do not fear being termed a "radical." The word "radical" is derived from the Latin word meaning "root." We ought to go to the roots of our social and economic troubles. As a matter of fact, payment of old-age pensions by the State or National Government involves no new policy nor any innovation of principle. In 1913, as a member of the General Assembly of Ohio, I participated in the enactment of Ohio's first mothers' pension law. Before that time the State had dealt in haphazard fashion with children of destitute widows. Children were sent to children's homes and the mother to work. This blighted the lives of children and brought misery to the mother. Instead of cruel separations of mothers and children, we now have the enlightened system of mothers' pensions, with regular payments to mothers to take care of their children. The family is kept together. Furthermore, the cost to the State is less. No State that has adopted mothers' pensions has reurned to the old inhuman methods. I urge the same principle for the needy aged who, after a lifetime of industry and struggle, at 60 becomes in need of assistance from the Government or from public or private charities. It is time to free white hair and wrinkled brows from dread and anxiety. Instead of "over the hill to the poorhouse", the Government should lend a helping hand in a scientific and adequate manner to our deserving and needy aged as they go down the sunset side of life.

Private charities, bread lines, and soup kitchens must not be the only answers of American intelligence and sense of justice to the problem of unemployment and indigent old age. Out of the hardships of this depression when millions of people sought work which they could not find, let us hope that a better future may come for aged men and women whose condition is desperate even in the best of times and through no fault of their own.

The truth is that if the Townsend plan means $200 per month for every elderly individual of 60 or over then there is no bill pending in the Congress that would provide such pensions. The size of the monthly payment to elderly individuals depends, under the McGroarty bill, H. R. 7154, on the amount of money the taxes produce after cost of administration has been deducted. Of course, this may be very fine for the bureaucrats and the administrators of the plan, but it would not be so good for the elderly people who are dependent. How can we say to the people we represent that we are providing old-age security for them unless we definitely write into the statute laws some substantial minimum as a certain amount that every worthy elderly person of this country will receive? Under this McGroarty bill, which is the latest Townsend plan, the annuity payment to the elderly people that we represent may be from nothing up. Of course, as a sop and because they have been talking so much about $200 per month, the bill states that in no event shall the payment exceed $200 per month, but everyone knows that after the cost of administration has been deducted, the payment will be but a fraction of that amount.

H. R. 3977, Mr. McGROARTY, was abandoned by its author. He stated that he would not vote for this bill.

H. R. 7154, Mr. McGROARTY, clearly states that the pensions shall be "in such amount not exceeding $200 per month." The pension may be from nothing up. Unfortunately no minimum is provided.

Townsend-plan leaders in Congress estimate the 2-percent transaction sales tax might provide sufficient money to enable old-age-pension payments to provide $50 per month. Members who have studied the bill carefully estimate the amount would not exceed $28 per month. This is less than is provided in the Social Security Act of 1935.

Townsend-plan leaders frequently refer to Dr. Robert Doane, a political economist, as favoring the Townsend plan. Dr. Doane stated before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives as follows:

> Mr. FULLER. You have studied the Townsend bill, have you not?
> Dr. DOANE. I have not. I have never read the Townsend bill.
> Mr. FULLER. You know that the general purpose of it is to pay $200 a month to every person over the age of 60? [Referring to H. R. 3977, Mr. McGROARTY, since abandoned.]
> Dr. DOANE. Yes; I know that.
> Mr. FULLER. As an economist, do you think that this Government would stand that financial strain and burden?
> Dr. DOANE. Not at the present level of income and the present rate of production; no.
> Mr. FULLER. That is all (p. 1119 of official record of hearings).

Since that time, Dr. Doane has testified that the scheme is fantastic, would result in the wildest inflation, and that the cost of bread and other necessities would skyrocket. He said:

> The Townsend plan for raising the required revenue is not only decidedly not feasible, but is filled with formidable danger to the entire American fiscal, social, and economic structure. * * * Any heavy tax on mass consumption always checks and lowers the consumption powers of labor. As a matter of common-sense fact, known to every man or woman possessed of any knowledge whatsoever of economics, it would be utterly impossible to raise any such sum proposed by the Townsend plan under any form of taxation. A 2-percent tax on all transactions is an entirely different thing once it works its way through the entire fabric of a nation's economic life. Through the sheer multiple effect of its cumulative action, as it is passed on as a cost factor from one transaction to another, it really becomes a 50-percent tax upon the wealth and income of the consumer.

He added:

> The Townsend plan, if put in effect, can only serve to vastly increase unemployment.

Many thoughtful individuals believe that a 2-percent transaction tax would prove ruinous to every small-business man in this country. They believe that it would be impossible for the independent merchant, for example, to compete with the chain-store system, because the independent merchant buys his merchandise through a system that requires many transactions, with the result that there would be multiple taxes; whereas the chain-store system has a more simplified system of distribution that avoids many transactions and would have a decided advantage over the independent merchant. It is stated that large industrial organizations that own the complete unit of production would have a decided advantage over small organizations. I do not want great corporations to become larger and more powerful. I personally believe that small business institutions have done much to develop the progress of our country.

Mr. Stuart A. Rice, Acting Chairman of the United States Central Statistical Board, states that in 1934 transactions

subject to a 2-percent transaction tax amounted to only $105,000,000,000, and that a 26-percent transaction sales tax would be necessary to provide pensions of $200 per month.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ], a member of the "McGroarty bill 7154, the Townsend-plan steering committee", said in the House of Representatives, January 15, 1936:

> Dr. Townsend has stated before the Ways and Means Committee that if the age of 60 is not practicable to start out with, he would be willing to start at the age of 75. He has told me personally the reason he has advocated $200 per month is that no politician can come along and raise the "ante."

Congressman MORITZ is one of the Townsend plan leaders in Congress. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 428, Jan. 15, 1936, issue.)

On January 17, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MONAGHAN], chairman of this steering committee, stated:

> I wish to say that I have not defended the sales tax in any speech on this floor. I have condemned it. There is a vast difference between a sales tax and a transaction tax, the one proposed in the revised McGroarty bill. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 615.)

Dr. F. E. Townsend flatly contradicts this statement. Read page 1016 of the report of the Senate Finance Committee (Feb. 18, 1935). Following are excerpts from Dr. Townsend's testimony:

> Senator BARKLEY. So it is really a sales tax.
> Dr. TOWNSEND. There is a distinction, but there is very little difference. A sales tax has to necessarily be a tax on a transaction. All taxes on transactions of a financial nature are sales taxes.
> Senator BARKLEY. So it is a distinction without a difference.
> Dr. TOWNSEND. Well, the public conception of a sales tax is a limited-transactions tax. That is the only difference.
> Senator BARKLEY. The transactions tax would be unlimited; it would apply to all transactions involving sales?
> Dr. TOWNSEND. That is what we propose to do.
> Senator BARKLEY. The name is changed in order to get away from the term "sales tax"?
> Dr. TOWNSEND. That is all.

The Townsend plan to pay $200 per month to every individual of 60 years of age or older is really an emotional adventure in the field of economics. It is the capitalization of a wish. It has nothing to do with reality. If $400 a month to every elderly couple of 60 years will bring about recovery and prosperity, why not demand $1,000 per month for each elderly couple and so bring about a boom?

It is unconscionable and despicable for any man to elevate himself into public office by capitalizing upon the suffering and the credulity of old people who are in need. Yet there are individuals who are deceiving thousands of worthy old people into believing that they will receive $200 per month. Some of these so-called Townsend leaders have been living in luxury at the expense of impoverished but trusting elderly people. The cruel part of this performance is that a few unworthy men will deceive worthy elderly men and women, secure dimes and quarters from them, and secure their trust and confidence for a time, and perhaps some will win election to high public office.

This Townsend plan which is being urged is thoroughly and completely unconstitutional. The pitiful part of the whole thing is that the proponents are not even proposing to repeal the social-security law; but they are, in fact, greatly impeding the progress of proper old-age security laws. The Supreme Court would hold unconstitutional the imposition of a transaction tax upon the wage earners of our country for the benefit of a small group—about 8 percent of the people.

The Townsend plan, in fact, is not an old-age-pension plan. It is a scheme for further increasing the burdens of the poor. A 2-percent tax on every transaction will increase the cost of the necessaries of life tremendously. Salaried men and wage earners would not only pay taxes upon their small salaries, but they would pay, under this scheme, a tax upon anything they buy. Nothing escapes. They must pay taxes on the food and the clothes they buy for the children, medicine for the sick, milk for the babies, all to enable an elderly couple over 60 years of age to receive $4,800 per year. Ten million persons in this country of 60 years or over would be beneficiaries of this plan as long as it lasted. Exclusive of the cost of the administration, which would be tremendous, an amount sufficient to pay elderly people $200 per month each is more than six times the present normal annual revenue of the Federal Government from all sources of taxation.

The tax on transactions is a tax on every step of the processing, transportation, and sale of commodities, as well as a tax on all business transactions of every kind. On many articles 2 percent would be collected 12 times or more. Consider a loaf of bread. The farmer who grows the wheat would pay 2 percent in selling it to the grain elevator; the railroad that carries it to the elevator pays another tax; when a flour mill buys the wheat a tax is paid again; the miller is assessed another 2 percent when he sells the flour to a baker; and the railroad that carries it to the baker pays; the trucking is another transaction, and so on. The final buyer, who proposes to eat the bread, will find that its price has gone way up.

The farmers of our country under the Townsend plan would be forced to submit monthly reports showing every transaction they made—every basket of eggs sold, every quart of grain marketed, every coop of chickens taken to the produce house, each load of wheat sold to the grain dealer. On each transaction the farmer would have to pay a 2-percent sales tax. I represent all the farmers of Ohio. I would never vote such a burden on my constituents. Think of the wage earner paying this enormous tax on the clothing he buys for his family and upon every morsel of food he places on his table. This is the heaviest, most burdensome, most outrageous pyramided sales tax ever proposed to any Congress. It is amazing that many people have been so deceived that they are urging Congress to tax themselves out of existence. The McGroarty bill does not provide an economic panacea. It does not give a short cut to prosperity. It does not answer the prayers of our aged. It proposes an unbearable transaction sales tax which, if forced upon the people of the United States, would only pay a pension amounting to approximately $28 per month.

In 1934 the entire national income was approximately $50,000,000,000. The Townsend plan would take more than 40 percent of it. A man on a salary of $40 a week would contribute more than $16 of his pay every week—not directly, of course, but indirectly through the transactions tax.

On the basis of current income it simply cannot be done. It is impossible. The rainbow in the sky is too far beyond the horizon. Through the medium of indirect taxes the $40-a-week man will contribute $16 a week, which will be given to an elderly person to spend. The buying power of the $40 man will be reduced accordingly. The cost of the scheme will fall almost entirely on those who are least able to afford it—on the people who live on wages and small salaries. The income of this class is now consumed almost wholly in living expenses, and it is they who will have to bear the heavy load of the tax on all transactions.

Why stop at $200 per month? Anyone who believes it would work at $200 would believe it still better at $300. So, in order to get Dr. Townsend's following away from him, a political demagogue would only have to raise his ante.

Wage earners and salaried employees would suffer a lower standard of living because their purchasing power would decline, due to higher living costs, and 2 percent of their earnings would be regularly taken away by the tax.

The Townsend plan would drastically redistribute the national income, but at the expense of millions of wage earners, salaried employees, farmers, and owners of small businesses.

If prosperity could be restored by taxing 92 percent of the population in order to give money to the other 8 percent to spend, would it not be better to give this money to young married people? They have greater obligations and responsibilities. They have homes to build and children to rear and educate.

Those who advocate the Townsend plan include bank transactions. Therefore, every check issued, every withdrawal, would cost 2 percent additional. Such a tax would destroy our banking structure.

The total business transactions, exclusive of bank transactions, during 1935 amounted to less than $500,000,000,000. In fact, a sound economist estimated that the total business transactions in 1933 amounted to $250,000,000,000 and that the total for 1935 was much under $500,000,000,000.

Furthermore, if 10,000,000 men and women, or 1,000,000 men and women, over 60 years of age were taken from their jobs and younger people given these same jobs, how does it help to restore prosperity by substituting one group of unemployed for another?

Common sense, social vision, and an intention to do justice to our elderly people dictate that our energies should be applied in the coming years to liberalizing and making effective the beneficent provisions of the Social Security Act of 1935. Old-age pensions should commence at the age of 60. They should be adequate to provide real security for those who go down the sunset side of life.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

JAPANESE-AMERICAN TRADE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress I have heard this administration repeatedly denounced for its trade policy with Japan by members of the minority party. The Secretary of State is held up to scorn and ridicule, and a casual reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be led to believe that Japan has overrun our Nation with cheap goods, and outgeneraled the American businessman, intimidated the State Department, and routed the Tariff Commission and the President. This is far from the truth.

The truth is, last year we sold Japan $203,000,000 worth of American goods and bought from Japan only $153,000,000 worth of goods. By far the largest item in our purchases from Japan was raw silk, which we, of course, do not produce. The truth is that Japan is our best customer in the world for raw cotton. For years Japan has bought more than a million and a half bales of raw cotton per year from us. Last year she bought 1,518,000 bales of cotton from us for $98,587,000. The truth is that Japan is the third best customer in the world for American goods. The truth is that during each year of the Roosevelt administration we have sold much more American goods to Japan than Japan has sold to us. During the past 3 years we have sold $156,000,000 more goods to Japan than Japan has sold to us. The truth is that during the administrations of the Republican Presidents Hoover, Coolidge, and Harding, Japan flooded us with goods, we buying from Japan each year during those administrations many millions of dollars in goods in excess of our sales to Japan. During the 4 Hoover years of 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932, the value of Japanese sales to us exceeded our sales to Japan to the extent of $336,000,000.

The truth is that for the first time in 50 years we have a so-called favorable balance of trade with Japan. When I consider the excess of our purchases from Japan over our sales to Japan during the former Republican administrations and the fact that for the first time in history we sell Japan far more than she sells us during this administration, I find myself wholly unable to concur in the attacks made on this administration by certain Republican critics.

Oh, but it is said by a Member of the minority party in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, 1936, that, though we sell large quantities of raw products to Japan, Japan fabricates the great majority of the products we sell her and ships them back to us. This is extremely and unpardonably inaccurate.

This brings me to a brief consideration of our textile purchases from Japan. As heretofore stated, last year we sold Japan 1,518,000 bales of raw cotton. Japan shipped back to us in textiles and cotton products of all kinds the equivalent of 17,000 bales of cotton. Japan failed to ship back to us in fabricated products 1,501,000 bales of cotton of the aggregated weight of about 750,500,000 pounds. Of course, if we compare bales of cotton we sell to Japan to yards of cloth we buy from Japan, we might mislead those who do not know that a bale of cotton weighs 500 pounds and represents hundreds of yards of cotton cloth.

Mr. Speaker, I do not advocate the importation of cotton textiles from Japan. I much regret that any cotton textiles are imported from Japan. But as long as we can sell Japan more than a million and a half bales of cotton per year and buy back from her only about 17,000 bales of cotton per year in goods, I can see no cause for hysteria.

We have got to sell our cotton somewhere, and I will not be one to endeavor to drive away the best foreign customer the Texas cotton farmer has left.

But it is pointed out with alarm that the importation of certain textiles from Japan has increased several hundred percent within the last year. That is bad, but with the increase we still receive in textiles and cotton goods from Japan the small comparative amount which I have indicated.

Japan's export of cotton cloth to the United States last year amounted to less than 2 percent of the Japanese export of cotton textiles. According to Secretary Hull, imports of countable cotton cloths from Japan in 1935 were equivalent to about one-half of 1 percent of the total yardage of American production.

We export more cotton cloth than we import, but Japan is decidedly the largest cotton-textile exporting nation in the world, with England in second place. It is true that the New England textile manufacturers cannot compete in foreign markets with Japan for reasons that are well known. This is regrettable, but it is not the fault of the southern cotton farmer. Most certainly it is not the fault of this administration.

May I quote the following very striking and encouraging statement of March 9, 1936, by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture:

> Domestic cotton consumption in December (1935) is reported by the Bureau of the Census at about 498,000 running bales. This is 2 percent less than consumption in November, but nearly 20 percent greater than consumption in December 1934 and the largest consumption for the month since 1928. Consumption in January amounted to about 591,000 bales, which was nearly 8 percent greater than last year, and the highest for the month since 1929. Consumption for the 6 months ended January 31 of 3,007,000 bales is the highest since the same 6-month period ended January 31, 1930. Mill activity during both December and January and the first half of February has been at a level about equal to the 1922 to 1927 level, inclusive, according to the New York Cotton Exchange. * * *

The merciless critics of our Japanese trade policy should not be ungrateful for the improvement made in our domestic textile trade during this administration. They should be willing to look at the whole picture and note that for the first time in history the value of our exports to Japan exceed the value of our imports from Japan. However, this alert administration, in its endeavor to further assist the domestic textile industry, has within the last few days increased the tariff on certain Japanese textiles an average of 42 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican tariff policy "bottled up" American agriculture, deprived us of our foreign markets, did irreparable injury to the cotton farmer, and did a great deal, directly and indirectly, to stop the commerce of the nations, and thereby impeded world progress. This administration, in this respect, has performed no miracles and has made some mistakes, but on the whole our foreign and domestic trade has increased and the American farmer and businessman can feel and see at least a little ray of hope.

CELEBRATION OF THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF PATRICK HENRY

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I introduced day before yesterday a bill appropriating $10,000 toward defraying the expenses of the celebration of the bicentennial of Patrick Henry, to be held in the county of Hanover in my district in the State of Virginia. The committee very promptly reported this bill favorably, and I understand it was a unanimous report. I have not the report with me, Mr. Speaker, but it is rather illuminating and interesting, and I hope the membership may find time to read it. I do not desire to take up any further time of the House at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this bill (H. R. 12870) to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the

birth of Patrick Henry, to be held in Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936, such sum to be expended for such purposes by the Patrick Henry Bi-Centennial, Inc., Ashland, Hanover County, Va., and without regard to any other provision of law.

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.

MRS. MURRAY A. HINTZ

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6163), for the relief of Mrs. Murray A. Hintz, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and insert "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the amendment, it simply provides for getting the money through another channel.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is to be taken out of the Conservation Corps fund rather than out of unappropriated funds in the Treasury.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and following any special orders on the calendar for that day, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the 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", 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 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 21, 28, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, and 35, 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: "$1,147,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$3,395,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from is disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "including plant, $1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes"; 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 "$7,645,575"; 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 sum proposed insert: "$3,985,509"; and the Senate agree to the same.

WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
WILLIAM R. THOM,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM
(except as to amendment no. 14),
CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,
J. WILLIAM DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES F. BYRNES,
ROYAL S. COPELAND,
DAVID I. WALSH,
FREDERICK HALE,
HENRY W. KEYES,
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. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service 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 as to each of such amendments in the accompanying conference report, namely:

On amendment no. 1: Appropriates $1,147,500 for "Miscellaneous expenses", instead of $1,142,500, as proposed by the House, and $1,162,500, as proposed by the Senate, the agreed increase being for the collection and classification of information.

On amendments nos. 2 to 5, inclusive, relating to the appropriation "Training, education, and welfare, Navy": Appropriates $130,000 for the Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I., as proposed by the Senate, instead of $125,000, as proposed by the House, and appropriates $3,379 to carry out the provisions of the retirement law touching civilian instructors at the Post Graduate School at Annapolis, Md., as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 6 and 7, relating to the Naval Reserve: Appropriates $7,868,469, as proposed by the House, instead of $8,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides for 19 Reserve officers above the grade of lieutenant to be employed on continuous active duty at full pay, as proposed by the House, instead of 20, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 8 to 11, inclusive, relating to the Naval Academy: Appropriates an additional $15,793 for pay of civilian professors and instructors, as proposed by the Senate, $15,593 being for carrying out the provisions of the retirement law touching such personnel, and $200 for pay of physical instructors, and appropriates for other classes of personal services $585,623, as proposed by the House, instead of $590,866, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 12: Restores the limitation proposed by the House upon expenditures from the appropriation "Engineering" for Diesel-engine development.

On amendment no. 13: Appropriates for "Ordnance and ordnance stores" $21,700,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $22,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 14: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation of $5,000,000, proposed by the House, looking to the establishment of a reserve supply of strategic minerals of domestic production. In taking this action it was the sense of the managers on the part of both Houses that the Navy Department should appoint a board of officers to make a study of the need of acquiring stocks of domestically produced strategic minerals and that the report of such board should be presented to the Naval and Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate at the commencement of the next regular session.

On amendment no. 15: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate touching the pay and allowances of the present incumbent as attending physician at the Capitol.

On amendments nos. 16 to 21, inclusive, relating to public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks: Appropriates $3,395,300, instead of $2,990,300, as proposed by the House, and $5,000,000, as

proposed by the Senate, the increase of $405,000 being occasioned by the addition of the following projects proposed by the Senate: Improvement of interior illumination, Naval Academy, $270,000; improvement of water front, naval operating base, Norfolk, Va. (total cost, $300,000), $135,000; increases total cost of harbor and channel improvement project at Pearl Harbor from $900,000, as proposed by the House, to $1,500,000, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and makes such sum of $1,500,000 available for the procurement of dredging equipment, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation of $295,000 of the Naval Hospital fund, proposed by the House, toward new and improved Naval Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia.

On amendments nos. 22 and 23, relating to the appropriation "Aviation, Navy": Increases from $24,000 to $50,000, as proposed by the Senate, the amount of the appropriation that may be employed for traveling expenses of service personnel in ferrying new airplanes from point of production to point of operating base, and, with respect to Government production of airplanes and engines, strikes out the inhibition proposed by the House against the Navy engaging in the production of other than primary training airplanes and of airplane engines, other than experimental engines, but retains that portion of the House limitation denying the use of the appropriation for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes.

On amendments nos. 24 to 30, relating to the Marine Corps: Increases by $11,250 the maximum amount that may be expended for flying pay of officer personnel, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional $32,073 for the Marine Corps Reserve on account of 45-day trainees, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates $300,000 for transportation, as proposed by the House, instead of $319,600, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 31 to 33, inclusive, relating to the appropriation "Replacement of naval vessels": Provides specifically that the President shall determine as a fact that capital-ship replacement construction has been commenced by any of the other signatory powers to the London Naval Treaty of 1930 before the Navy may begin capital-ship replacement construction, and provides for the merger of unexpended balances on June 30, 1936, of "Increase of the Navy" appropriations with the appropriations proposed under the head of "Replacement of naval vessels", all as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 34 to 36, inclusive, relating to salaries, Navy Department: Appropriates $117,720 under the Office of the Judge Advocate General, as proposed by the House, instead of $120,920, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates $61,660 under the Office of Naval Intelligence, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,080, as proposed by the House.

WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
WILLIAM R. THOM,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM
(except as to amendment no. 14),
CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,
WILLIAM DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN].

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in every year since the close of the World War the United States has spent more money on its Navy than any other nation on earth with the exception of one year, when Great Britain spent slightly more than we did. In every year since the close of the World War the United States Government has spent more money on its Army than any other nation on earth. A few weeks ago I put into the RECORD figures that show that for the fiscal year 1937 the United States Government is going to spend for past wars and in preparing for future wars more than $4,200,000,000. There is no use of this Congress or any political party talking about economy in government or about cutting down expenses or about reducing the burden of the taxpayers if we vote this kind and size of appropriation.

A year ago the Congress passed the so-called Vinson bill, which committed this country to enormous naval armament. Immediately the newspapers carried reports of this action of ours being used in Japan as a reason for voting more money for the navy in Japan. This year, when our naval appropriations bill was being discussed, patriotic people in this Congress—we know they are patriotic because they testify to it themselves—told us that the foreign countries are spending so much money on their navies that we have to spend more money on ours.

After we passed this naval appropriation bill in the House, the following Associated Press dispatch, under a Tokyo date line, appeared in one of the daily newspapers:

TOKYO, JAPAN.—Japan's naval secretary, Admiral Osami Nagano, told parliamentarians Monday Nippon must build more ships soon or be outdistanced by America.

Japan may have a naval strength 80 percent of that of the United States, the admiral said. But, he added, unless a new construction program soon is undertaken, Japan's ratio will fall to 58 percent of American strength by 1941.

Steady progress in United States naval building, said Nagano, is the reason.

Large appropriations here are being used as the excuse for increased appropriations in Japan and then increased appropriations in Japan are used on this floor as the excuse for our increased appropriations, and the record still stands that no one has come onto the floor of the House and attempted to defend these appropriations from the standpoint of defense. We all talk about appropriations for defense, but on the basis of defense they cannot be defended or excused. There is no second lieutenant in the Army and there is no ensign in the Navy who will sign his name to a statement proposing any manner by which this country can be successfully invaded.

These appropriations cannot be excused on any other ground than that the United States is going to engage in war on some foreign shore and I do not imagine there are a dozen Members of the House who want that. [Applause.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD regarding the services of my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER], following the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I assume the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN] endeavored to impress the House with a startling statement when he said that we were spending more money on our Navy than is being spent by Japan. This is an old story.

Whenever the appropriation bill comes before the House, with regularity and precision, with such regularity that we might even measure the day of the week or the month by it, the gentleman from Iowa makes the startling disclosure about the money spent for the Navy.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Not now; I will yield later. If the gentleman wants to measure the United States Navy and the personnel of the United States Navy and the pay of the United States Navy and the subsistence which the United States Navy enjoys by a Japanese yardstick, he may do so; but speaking for myself I am not willing to have the boys of the United States Navy provided with a subsistence of fish and rice and kept on a beggarly pittance. [Applause.]

Nor am I willing to lower the standards of the men that work in the navy yards, the men who contribute with their brawn and brain to build up the national defense—I am not willing to measure their standard by the standard prevailing in Japan. [Applause.]

I am proud of the United States Navy. I am proud that the majority of Congress has evinced a spirit that will place them in the fore rank—not in the rear rank of the navies of the world. [Applause.]

Now I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman quoted me as saying that we have spent more money on our Navy than Japan. What I said was that this country in every year since the World War had spent more money on its Navy than any other country on earth with the exception of 1 year, when England spent a little more. The gentleman said——

Mr. DITTER. I am not yielding to the gentleman for a speech. If I misquoted the gentleman or if I have not made an accurate statement in relation to what he said, I hope the gentleman will correct me.

Mr. BIERMANN. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. DITTER. Did the gentleman make the statement that we spent more money on our Navy than Japan did?

Mr. BIERMANN. I did not make it that way. I said we spent more money.

Mr. DITTER. Oh, this is an old matter. The gentleman and I have fought this out before. If the gentleman from Iowa did not leave the impression on other Members, he left the impression on me, that the United States Navy is paying too much of the taxpayers' money for the maintenance of the Navy, and he made a comparison with Japan by which he tried to emphasize the fact that we spent too much on our Navy.

Based on that, if he wants to stand for that kind of a program he may, but, speaking for myself, I want the needs of the boys of the United States Navy and everyone who contributes to the building, maintaining, and operating of our Navy to be based on the standard of living in America rather than the standard of living in Japan. And it is my conviction that the overwhelming majority of the people of the district which I represent have a patriotic fervor which will not be bartered on a Japanese bargain counter. If, as a pacifist, the gentleman from Iowa feels that it is a proper indictment to lay against those of us who are defending a national-defense program, that we spend more than Japan, I am willing to accept the indictment.

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

Mr. DITTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he is not one of those in this Congress who believes in sinking the Navy and destroying the Army as a matter of national defense.

Mr. DITTER. That is correct. Just a word or two about the bill. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the committee really should be commended for this bill. We have really provided some economy, and I believe every member of the committee has been careful to safeguard the interests of the taxpayers and mindful at the same time about national defense. I must express a regret with respect to one item in the bill. I wish we had provided in the bill—and not having provided for it this year I think in another year we will—for a model basin, which I believe to be necessary. I think it should be provided for our Naval Establishment. I believe that the money that that will entail—an expenditure of approximately $3,500,000—will be money well spent. It seems to me that at the present time there is inadequate provision for that kind of work which such an experimental station would bring to us. At the present time we are sending to foreign shores some of the vessels that should be tested here at home, and speaking for next year's naval appropriation, I think there is little doubt but that a testing, experimental basin will be provided, and an appropriation brought into the House in connection with it in next year's bill.

Just one other word about another feature of the bill mentioned during this discussion. The Naval Affairs Committee was challenged during the discussion with a matter of the selection board. I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the members of his committee, have a definite duty to bring in legislation to correct the conditions that presently prevail in connection with the operation of the selection board. It is my fervent hope that we will have some corrective measures next year, to do away with the criticism presently directed against the operation of that board.

Mr. Speaker, I hope when action is taken on this conference report today there will be a unanimity on the part of those who believe in national defense, to support the report, and that there will be no encouragement given to those individuals who want to measure the United States Navy by the measure of Japan. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it is necessary to appropriate over half a billion dollars to give the sailors and the personnel of the United States an American diet. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], in speaking of the rice diet of Japan, has in mind the diet on which the unemployed of this Nation are now subsisting. This very week 11,000 unemployed of the W. P. A. in New York City have been discharged. Before a month is over the number will be 40,000 discharged from the W. P. A. in New York City. Throughout the country by July 1 over 700,000 unemployed now working on W. P. A. will have been discharged—discharged on the ground of reduction of personnel and for the reason that there are not sufficient funds to carry them on the W. P. A. pay roll. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to please explain to the unemployed in his district just what kind of diet he expects the unemployed in his district to live on, whether it is going to be a Japanese diet or an American diet, after they have been discharged from the W. P. A. by June 30 of this year. Here we are appropriating over half a billion dollars under the guise of so-called national defense. It seems to me that national defense means defense against invasion, defense against a foreign foe who may invade our shores and come into the United States and attack our homes; but does any man with any amount of common sense believe that we need over half a billion dollars to protect our homes from invasion? Are we preparing here for a defensive war, or are we preparing here for an imperialistic war and an offensive war? While we are throwing away over a billion dollars on the Army and the Navy for war purposes, we find we have not sufficient funds to keep 700,000 unemployed on W. P. A. pay rolls. W. P. A., I repeat, is discharging 700,000 unemployed. Let us pause and give some thought to the diet on which they will have to subsist after June 30, 1936.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

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

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are now discussing the naval appropriation bill. At the same time we are talking about the welfare of the people in the Navy. No one wants to see the men employed in the Navy kept as well as those in any other department of Government more than I. I am not going to yield to anyone in reference to national defense. I believe we should protect our country, we should have adequate defense. But what is adequate defense? No one has yet defined it, but I do believe that in this naval appropriation bill, where we are spending over $532,000,000, we are going away beyond what we need to spend at this particular time for adequate defense. When you increase the naval appropriations bill by $72,000,000, when you are spending $4,000,000 laying down a couple of keels that the President says may be necessary, when you build two battleships that will cost $104,000,000 or more; if there ever was a Congress that put this country on the rocks of financial disaster, this Congress is doing it—the greatest spenders in the Nation's history. I do not care whether you are Republicans or Democrats, or what you are, you are spendthrifts and you will regret it. The situation is simply this: You must curb your spending. If you increase your naval appropriation this year you will have to increase it next year. That is the history of the Navy and every other department of the Government. Every time an appropriation bill is increased, the next year it is increased again, because there are more people on the pay rolls.

The only way we are going to get ourselves into a position whereby we can regulate the affairs of this Nation is by economizing in Government department spending.

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

Mr. RICH. I will yield if you will give me a minute when my 3 minutes have expired.

The statement of Mr. Morganthau, Secretary of the Treasury, several weeks ago, was that by the end of 1937 we will be $40,000,000,000 in the red. The fact of the matter is, according to statements that were given out in yesterday's Post, after they pay the bonus and a few other things which this Congress has appropriated, we will be close to $40,000,000,000 in the red by the end of 1936, a year ahead of

when it was contemplated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Think of it.

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

Mr. RICH. If you will give me more time I will.

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

Mr. RICH. If you will give me 5 minutes, I will yield.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Did the gentleman vote for this naval appropriation bill when it was before the House?

Mr. RICH. I did not. No. I am opposed to the great expenditures that we are voting in this House of Representatives. There is not a Member of this House, and the gentleman will be one of them, who will not, within the next 3 or 4 years, wish that we had economized.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. RICH. I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Would the gentleman tell us in what way this sum should be reduced? Will he specifically indicate to the House those items which, in his judgment, should be deleted from the bill?

Mr. RICH. Well, the amount you are spending for laying down these new keels. [Applause.]

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman tell us how much that is?

Mr. RICH. I do not care if it is only $50, the principle of it is wrong. The trouble with those who are for a large Navy is they cannot help but spend more to build up a greater naval organization, so they have more power in affairs of Government. I do not believe we need to spend $100,000,000 for battleships for national defense. One-fourth of the amount for airplanes will, in my judgment, do four times the good in national defense.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] in the matter of expenditures, but I pretend to know but very little about the merits of this bill. As I have said before, we have to go along with our committee.

Before we returned this year we were often invited to meetings on the subject of neutrality and military expenditure, and we must make a report of our legislative action. We found in framing neutrality laws that it was like climbing a tree to put out a forest fire, and we passed legislation that seemed far from being effective. We have to yield now to the judgment of the committee. They say we need a Navy sufficient for national defense. We do not know exactly what is necessary or the type of defense that may be most needed. I live near Boston, and I cannot sympathize with the danger the gentleman does not fear in case of attack. But is there not something more than the national defense in this bill? Do you big Navy men really mean that you want a Navy large enough to assert our rights on the high seas? Do you want a Navy large enough to protect and preserve our honor? No one seems to dare make that assertion. You simply say, "We want a Navy for national defense." Why cannot someone here be courageous enough to say, if this expenditure means it, "We want a Navy large enough to protect our honor"? I just want to call attention to the fact that no one seems to have discussed this phase of the argument.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. Gladly.

Mr. RICH. If we would protect our honor, we would stay at home and attend to our own business and we would not be afraid of foreign nations. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. That is a very important question, and I wonder what attitude this Congress would take, representing our people, if a question of our honor really was at stake. The impression I now have is that only enough money should be asked for that will insure our safety within our own boundaries.

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

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is not a precedent but it is an unusual experience to present a conference report which, if adopted will result in the total of the naval appropriation bill carrying $4,522,175 less than the bill carried when it was sent from the House to the Senate. As passed by the House the bill carried a total of $531,068,707. If the conference report is adopted, the total will be $526,546,532. The amount carried in the bill is $23,044,767 below the total proposed in the Budget.

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

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 was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 267) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature, and ask that the statement 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 267) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature, 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 amendments of the House numbered 1 and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$19,745.33"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$19,592.25"; and the House agree to the same.

S. D. McREYNOLDS,
SOL BLOOM,
HAMILTON FISH, Jr.
Managers on the part of the House.

KEY PITTMAN,
ROBERT J. BULKLEY,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
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 House to S. 267, authorizing an appropriation for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon:

The Senate receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the House nos. 1 and 4. The no. 1 amendment added in the House was "Gustava Hanna, widow of." Matthew E. Hanna, the husband, died during the consideration of the pending bill and it was necessary to insert the name of his widow. Amendment 4, made by the House, struck out "$1,006.82" and inserted "$821.92." This was the loss represented by Willard L. Beaulac, secretary of the American legation at Managua, Nicaragua, when the earthquake occurred. This was agreed to by the Senate. Amendments 2 and 3 in conference were in reference to the amount of the loss sustained by Matthew E. Hanna, American Minister to Nicaragua, during the earthquake which occurred on March 31, 1931. The bill as passed in the Senate gave the amount of this loss as "$25,368.58", which was amended in the House by inserting "$16,122.08", and the amount agreed upon in conference was "$19,745.33", which is amendment no. 2. The Senate bill

called for "$25,215.50", which was amended in the House by inserting "$15,969", and the amount agreed to in conference was "$19,592.25", which is amendment no. 3.

S. D. McREYNOLDS,
SOL BLOOM,
HAMILTON FISH, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee explain the conference report?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I shall be pleased to do so. This is a bill providing for payment for certain property destroyed by a volcano in a foreign country, personal property of Mr. Hanna, who was the representative in that country of this Government at that time. As the bill passed the Senate it carried $25,368.58. The original claim was $36,971.50. A subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House to which the bill was referred recommended $15,969, but the full committee overrode the action of the subcommittee and reported $25,368.58. The bill was objected to in the House and went back to the committee, being finally reported out carrying the minimum amount of $15,969. It was passed by the House and went to the Senate in that form.

The conference report represents a compromise between the two Houses with the amount agreed upon about halfway between the figures of the two Houses. The main question of difference came on the matter of what items were necessary for these people to have at that location at that time for the service of this Government.

Mr. TABER. What position did Mr. Hanna occupy?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. He was our minister.

Mr. TABER. And he claimed to have lost $35,000 of personal effects?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes. We held that that was more than necessary in his status at that time.

Mr. TABER. And the House finally allowed $15,969?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes; that was the action of the House; and the compromise between the two Houses fixed the amount at $19,745.33.

Mr. TABER. Is not that an excessive amount for personal and household effects?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. We thought so in the House at the time, but there was such a difference of opinion as to what was necessary that no one could reach a definite conclusion in the matter.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman really think Mr. Hanna had that amount of personal and household effects?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. He did; he had that and more.

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

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. Is it our policy for the Federal Government in effect to carry insurance on the personal effects of members of the Foreign Service?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. No. In this case the building was furnished by the minister himself because we had no furnishings there. It has been the policy to take care of losses in such cases.

Mr. THURSTON. I assume the other employees would have to carry their own insurance on their personal effects.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I do not know. They did where this office was located.

Mr. THURSTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, 1936, page 7954, is a statement to the effect that on June 12, 1930, the first speech ever made in the American Congress on old-age pensions was delivered by Congressman T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH. This was, of course, a statement inadvertently made, since it is not in accordance with the facts.

On December 6, 1915, a bill, H. R. 233, was introduced by me for the pensioning of American citizens who had reached the age of 65 years, were incapable of manual labor, and whose incomes were less than $200 per annum.

On September 8, 1916, page 2253 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will be found a speech of some length I delivered in this House in support of my old-age pension bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOCHT. Let me add, that soon after introducing my old-age-pension measure and speaking on it and urging the justice and humanity and righteousness of properly caring for the aged, America entered the World War, when everything else was laid aside to win that war. After retiring from Congress in 1923 and having been the first to, in a legislative way, call the attention of the country to old-age pensions, my activities for the help of the aged were continued in Pennsylvania, where legislative action was being inaugurated by the State legislature.

In July 1933, Governor Pinchot proposed an extraordinary session of the Pennsylvania Legislature for the purpose of enacting old-age-pension legislation. Some of the Republican leaders did not realize the importance of accepting the Governor's challenge, and the next year lost the State to the Democrats for United States Senator, 22 Congressmen, the Governor, and State offices. On this date I sent the following telegram to Republican State Chairman Gen. Edward Martin, and which appeared in the daily press of the State:

Assuming the challenge of Governor Pinchot as it appeared in the evening papers to be correct, I would urge upon you the acceptance of this challenge to call the legislature in extra session and pass the old-age-pension bill, conditioned that the senators and members serve without salary the same as Members of Congress do who are called to attend extra sessions. This will clarify the attitude of the Republican State organization toward the old-age-pension law and other humanitarian enactments. As you know, the bill can be readily put through under suspension of the rules in less than a week.

It will be recalled that Congressman Focht first introduced an old-age-pension bill in Congress in 1915 and now has a bill on the calendar there for the same purpose to be considered at the next session to convene in January. Mr. Focht has been identified with the Republican organization for 50 years and is a hearty supporter of progressive organization politics.

Again, on December 30, 1935, my attitude on old-age pensions was solicited by the press, and the following is my answer:

"I am in favor of old-age pensions—safe and sane old-age pensions—just as I was in 1915, when I introduced in Congress the first bill to provide pensions for the aged", Congressman BENJAMIN K. FOCHT, of Lewisburg, representing the Eighteenth District, declared today following the use of his name as one of 39 Members of the House who are claimed as supporters of the Townsend $200-a-month old-age-pension plan at the coming session.

"I have not committed myself to the Townsend plan, nor will I", Congressman FOCHT said. "I was queried upon the measure and stated my position as I am stating it now. I asked that my letter be used in setting forth my position, but this apparently has not been done." The Townsend National Weekly, official organ of Old Age Revolving Pensions, Ltd., cited the names of 39 Congressmen who were claimed to be in favor of the Townsend plan, and the name of Congressman FOCHT was included.

"My record on old-age pensions speaks for itself", Congressman FOCHT said, "and it has not changed. However, to say that I am in favor of the Townsend plan, when it has not yet been formulated, is just shooting too many stars. I am afraid that Dr. Townsend is overleaping the horse, and to definitely commit myself before the Townsend plan is presented in definite form would be rank folly."

In speaking of a safe and sane pension plan Congressman FOCHT suggested a proposition whereby the Federal Government, the State, and county would each contribute a reasonable sum.

SUFFRAGE FOR RESIDENTS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been handed a petition signed by prominent citizens of the District of Columbia, representing the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation and cooperating organizations proposing a constitutional amendment empowering Congress to grant to residents of the District of Columbia representation in the House, Senate, and electoral college with the same rights as are enjoyed by residents of the States, with the request that it be brought to the attention of the House. The Chair does so, and refers the petition to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11418) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11418) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes," 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 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 18, 21, 26, 42, 52½, 54, 57, 60, 63, 74, 77, 83, 89, 90, 93 and 94.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 22, 29, 47, 53, 55, 58, 61, 75, 76, 78 and 79, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$22,107,870"; 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: "$1,494,089"; 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: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$3,861,024"; 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: "$769,503"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$669,935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$5,258,194"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$10,063,963"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$629,099"; 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 sum proposed, insert: "$697,094"; 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: "$1,140,454"; 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: "$4,551,206"; 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: "$565,232"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$1,803,445"; 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: "$950,984"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$964,487"; 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: "$1,180,069"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$1,663,590"; 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 sum proposed, insert: "$1,665,988"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$559,307"; 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: "$1,019,304"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$897,817"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$110,959"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$10,815,950"; 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: "$608,361"; 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: "$200,000"; 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: "$91,295"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$269,152: *Provided*, That $170,000 of this appropriation shall be available only for maintenance in nurseries of existing stocks and for the free distribution thereof to farmers, in liquidation of the so-called shelterbelt project of trees or shrubs in the plains region undertaken heretofore pursuant to appropriations made for emergency purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$13,462,919"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$1,655,007"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat., p. 961), as amended (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 500, 513, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 521, 552, 563), $2,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 of the sum appropriated in this paragraph may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$17,738,505"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposd, insert: "$1,398,272"; 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: "$173,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$5,317,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$95,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$138,149"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$130,798"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$335,772"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$79,753"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$1,961,224"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$400,669"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$438,269"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$321,665"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$5,966,244"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$5,992,896"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$601,512"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$22,853,485"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$24,869,265"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$21,364,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 16, 71, 85, and 86.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
W. R. THOM,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
LLOYD THURSTON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Jr.,
CARL HAYDEN,
E. D. SMITH,
HENRY W. KEYES,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
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. 11418) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Credit Administration 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:

ADJUSTMENT OF TOTALS, ALLOCATIONS, CLARIFICATION OF TEXT, ETC.

The following amendments relate to the adjustment of totals, allocations, clarification of text, etc.: Amendments nos. 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 23, 25, 28, 29, 48, 51, 52, 53, 56, 61, 62, 63, 70, 73, 81, 87, 88, 92, 93, 94, and 97.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

On amendment no. 1: Salaries, office of the Secretary: Appropriates $432,271 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $411,311 as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 3: Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates $120,748, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $119,248, as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

On amendment no. 5: Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: Appropriates $188,801, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $159,729, as proposed by the House.

LIBRARY

On amendment no. 7: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $103,800, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $101,806, as proposed by the House.

EXTENSION SERVICE

On amendment no. 8: Supplementary Smith-Lever fund. Extension Service: Appropriates $1,185,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,580,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 9: Additional cooperative agricultural extension work: Appropriates $750,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and retains the House provision, stricken out by the Senate, directing the Secretary to so allot the appropriation to the several States that, taken into consideration with the allotments of other Federal funds appropriated for payments to States for cooperative extension work, the total allotment to each State from all funds so appropriated shall not be less than for the fiscal year 1936.

WEATHER BUREAU

On amendment no. 13: Aerology, Weather Bureau: Appropriates $1,494,089 instead of $1,443,789, as proposed by the House, and $1,544,389, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 15: Detail of Weather Bureau employees for training at civilian institutions: Strikes out the provision, inserted by the Senate, authorizing the Secretary to detail annually not to exceed 10 employees of the Weather Bureau for training, at civilian institutions, in advanced methods of meteorological science.

On amendment no. 17: Animal husbandry investigations:

(a) Strikes out the Senate increase of $31,500 for additional expenses in connection with the new animal-husbandry laboratory at Beltsville.

(b) Retains the Senate increase of $3,500 for maintenance of new facilities at the poultry experiment station, Glendale, Ariz.

(c) Appropriates $7,500, instead of $15,000, as provided by the Senate, for mule-breeding investigations.

On amendment no. 18: Eradicating cattle ticks: Appropriates $513,940, as proposed by the House, instead of $613,940, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 19: Inspection and quarantine, Bureau of Animal Industry: Appropriates $669,935, instead of $658,695, as proposed by the House, and $681,174, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 20: Meat inspection: Appropriates $5,258,194, instead of $5,161,253, as proposed by the House, and $5,355,135, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 21: Packers and Stockyards Act: Appropriates $381,879, as proposed by the House, instead of $428,779, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 22: Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals: Reappropriates the entire unexpended balance (estimated at approximately $1,315,000) of the appropriation for eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals, as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed $500,000 of such unexpended balance, as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

On amendment no. 24: Dairy investigations: Appropriates $629,099 instead of $607,099, as proposed by the House, and $636,099, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

On amendment no. 26: Spring-wheat investigations: Retains the House increase of $15,000, stricken out by the Senate, made in the appropriation for cereal crops and diseases for spring-wheat investigations.

On amendment no. 27: Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases:

(a) Appropriates $6,000, as proposed by the Senate, for pecan investigations.

(b) Appropriates $16,000 for deciduous fruit-breeding investigations and tomato-plant diseases instead of $25,000 for deciduous fruit-breeding investigations and $30,000 for tomato-plant diseases, as proposed by the Senate.

FOREST SERVICE

On amendment no. 30: General administrative expenses: Appropriates $565,232 instead of $532,163, as proposed by the House, and $598,300, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 31–41: National forest administration: Appropriates $10,815,950 instead of $9,925,561, as proposed by the House, and $11,706,335, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 42: Range investigations:

(a) Provides an increase of $20,000 for grazing-management investigations in California and the Pacific Northwest, as proposed by the House, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the Senate.

(b) Provides an increase of $7,500 for reseeding investigations, intermountain region, as proposed by the House, instead of $15,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 43: Forest products: Appropriates $608,361 instead of $499,022, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 44: Forest survey: Appropriates $200,000 instead of $150,000, as proposed by the House, and $250,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 45: Forest economics: Appropriates $91,295, instead of $81,295, as proposed by the House, and $129,295, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 46: Plains shelterbelt: Strikes out the Senate increase of $1,000,000 in the appropriation for forest influences, to be used in further work on the plains shelterbelt project, and inserts in lieu thereof a provision which contemplates the discontinuance of the project and provides an increase in the appropriation in the sum of $170,000 for liquidation of same by free distribution to farmers of young trees still in the nurseries.

On amendment no. 47: Prohibition against the use of any money appropriated in the bill for the plains shelterbelt project: Strikes out the House provision, as proposed by the Senate, prohibiting the use of any money appropriated in the bill for the plains shelterbelt project.

On amendment no. 49: Forest-fire cooperation: Appropriates $1,655,007, instead of $1,578,632, as proposed by the House, and $1,731,382, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 50: Acquisition of forest lands: Appropriates $2,500,000, instead of $10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for acquisition of forest lands; strikes out the Senate provision that $5,000,000 shall be immediately available, and makes $50,000 of the appropriation, instead of $100,000, as provided by the Senate, available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY AND SOILS

On amendment no. 52½: Agricultural fires: Strikes out the Senate increase of $10,000 for additional studies of the causes of farm fires.

On amendment no. 54: Soil survey: Appropriates $301,208, as proposed by the House, instead of $381,208, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 55: Soil chemical and physical investigations: Appropriates $78,081, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $68,081, as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

On amendment no. 57: General administrative expenses: Appropriates $162,288, as proposed by the House, instead of $164,288, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 58: Japanese beetle control: Appropriates $350,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 59: Forest insects: Appropriates $173,625 instead of $159,415, as proposed by the House, and $187,835, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 60: Dutch elm disease eradication: Appropriates $261,156, as proposed by the House, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. This action is predicated upon assurances contained in a letter from Mr. Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator, Works Progress Administration, that the Dutch elm disease work is an eligible project for that Administration and suitable for inclusion in a works program, and the belief of the conferees that this work will be cared for next year out of emergency funds as is being done the current year.

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY

On amendment no. 64: General administrative expenses: Appropriates $95,000 instead of $79,595, as proposed by the House, and $125,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 65: Game-management surveys: Appropriates $138,149 for game-management surveys under the appropriation "Biological investigations", instead of $128,149, as proposed by the House, and $158,149, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 66: Protection of migratory birds: Appropriates $300,000 instead of $279,978, as proposed by the House, and $322,978, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 67: Enforcement of Alaska game law: Appropriates $130,798 instead of $96,596, as proposed by the House, and $165,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 68: Maintenance of mammal and bird reservations: Appropriates $335,772 instead of $300,672, as proposed by the House, and $370,872, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 69: Migratory-bird conservation refuges: Appropriates $79,753 instead of $74,853, as proposed by the House, and $84,653, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

On amendment no. 72: Agricultural engineering investigations:

(a) Strikes out the Senate increase of $10,000 for farm mechanical equipment pertaining to the cultivation of cotton.

(b) Provides an increase of $15,000 for cotton-ginning machinery, instead of $19,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment no. 74: Farm-population and rural-life studies: Provides an increase of $7,500 for farm-population and rural-life studies, as proposed by the House, instead of $17,500, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 75: Analysis and statistical research on agricultural conditions and trends, marketing and distributing farm products:

(a) Retains the Senate increase of $6,250 for gathering and analyzing tobacco statistics.

(b) Retains the Senate increase of $6,250 for statistical analyses on fats and oils.

On amendment no. 76: Crop and livestock estimates—poultry and eggs: Retains the Senate increase of $25,000 for crop and livestock estimates on poultry and eggs.

On amendment no. 77: Market inspection of farm products—cottonseed: Strikes out the word "cottonseed" inserted by the Senate in the list of farm products in the appropriation "Market inspection of farm products."

On amendment no. 78: Market news service—cottonseed: Retains the word "cottonseed" inserted by the Senate in the list of farm products in the appropriation "Market news service."

On amendment no. 79: United States Grain Standards Act: Appropriates $723,941, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $708,941, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 80: United States Warehouse Act: Appropriates $321,665, instead of $316,665, as proposed by the House, and $326,665, as proposed by the Senate.

ENFORCEMENT OF GRAIN FUTURES ACT

On amendment no 83: Enforcement of Grain Futures Act: Appropriates $196,500, as proposed by the House, instead of $201,640, as proposed by the Senate.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

On amendment no. 84: Enforcement of Food and Drugs Act: Appropriates $1,600,000, instead of $1,537,459, as proposed by the House, and $2,062,079, as proposed by the Senate.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

On amendment no. 89: General administrative expenses: Appropriates $475,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $551,250, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 90: Soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations: Appropriates $1,540,780, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,393,776, as proposed by the Senate, as follows:

1. For investigations under controlled plot and laboratory conditions, $645,140;
2. For investigations on entire experiment drainage units, $500,318;
3. For sedimentation investigations, $106,037;
4. For geographic and climatic investigations, $89,285;
5. For economics of erosion investigations, $100,000; and
6. For erosion-resisting plant investigations, $100,000.

Amendment no. 91: Soil and moisture conservation operations, demonstrations, and information: Appropriates $22,853,485, instead of $20,453,485, as proposed by the House, and $29,554,974, as proposed by the Senate, as follows:

1. For conservation surveys, $660,624;
2. For demonstration projects, $14,674,410, being $1,200,000 in excess of the amount proposed by the House;
3. For work on watersheds largely owned by the Government, $3,836,357, being $1,200,000 in excess of the amount proposed by the House;

4. For cooperation with conservancy districts, $581,084;
5. For operation of erosion nurseries, $1,383,738; and
6. For cooperation with other Federal agencies, and with State and local agencies, $1,717,272.

ELIMINATION OF DISEASED CATTLE

On amendment no. 95: Elimination of diseased cattle: Provides a reappropriation of $21,364,000, instead of $17,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $25,228,000, as proposed by the Senate, the entire amount of the increase above the House figure being for Bang's disease work, in addition to the sum of $11,350,000 allocated for that purpose under the amount originally appropriated by the House.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

On amendment no. 96: Forest roads and trails: Appropriates $8,000,000 instead of $7,082,600, as proposed by the House, and $10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

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

On amendment no. 2: Purchase of arms and ammunition: Authorizing the purchase of arms and ammunition in the open market when same cannot advantageously be supplied by the Secretary of War pursuant to the act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 412).

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

On amendment no. 16: Payment by dealers of travel and subsistence expenses incident to livestock inspections at places other than the official headquarters of the inspector: Authorizing the payment by the owners of or dealers in livestock and other animal products, of travel and subsistence expenses incident to inspection of such products at points other than the official headquarters of the inspectors.

On amendment no. 71: Public lands, highways: Cancels the authorization for an appropriation of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year 1937 and makes the same applicable to the fiscal year 1938.

On amendment no. 85: Sea-food inspectors: Appropriating $80,000 for sea-food inspectors.

On amendment no. 86: Adjusting the total for Food and Drug Administration, which is dependent upon final action to be taken as to amendment no. 85.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
W. R. THOM,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
LLOYD THURSTON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret to report that this bill is $1,000,000, in round numbers, in excess of the Budget recommendation. As the bill was reported by the committee and as it passed the House it was $11,000,000 under the Budget estimate. The Senate exceeded the Budget by $29,000,000, in round numbers; and we finally compromised on a bill, as presented in this conference report, in round numbers, $1,000,000 in excess of the Budget.

As large as the bill is, it is not large enough to provide for many additional appropriations asked by those who appeared before the committee urging provision for additional projects or larger appropriations for those already provided for; and I want to express appreciation of the kindness of those whose requests we were unable to approve, and especially our colleagues for their consideration and tolerance when we were unable to take care of all of them.

Every dollar perhaps requested by our colleagues was justified. I am certain the money, if appropriated, would have been well spent, but we had to cut the cost to the cloth, and even after making every effort to keep the bill within bounds it is one of the largest agricultural appropriation bills ever reported to the Congress.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Can the gentleman from Missouri, one of the ablest men who ever served in this Congress, tell us what the conference did with reference to that strange and fantastic project known as the shelterbelt?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No provision was made by the House for the shelterbelt project. The Senate added $1,000,000 for that purpose. The committee on conference finally agreed to compromise on $170,000, with the provision that it should be used to liquidate the entire project.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman believes, does he not, if this legislation prevails, the project will be absolutely liquidated and wound up, and there will be no reason for future appropriations by the Congress for this purpose?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This bill disposes finally and completely of the entire shelterbelt project.

Mr. LUDLOW. I appreciate all the gentleman has done to wind up this strange and fantastic venture, but may I ask him just why it is necessary to appropriate $170,000 for this purpose? Is there some moral or legal commitment there that requires this expenditure?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no commitment, but we have in the nurseries at the present time a little in excess of 60,000,000 trees. If no provision is made to dispose of them, the money which has been previously spent in their production will be wasted, and it was thought this amount would be justified in order to distribute to the farmers the remaining trees now in process of production.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. THURSTON. Amplifying what the gentleman has just said, if the executive branch of the Government will not make funds available to projects which have had the express disapproval of the Congress, then the project will be terminated?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This will effectively and finally conclude the entire project.

Mr. LUDLOW. As one Member of the Congress, I wish to extend my congratulations and my commendation to the able gentleman and his conferees for being instrumental in bringing about the abandonment of this very wasteful and impossible project. It was proposed to spend $258,000,000 in the creation of a forest belt across the United States, including regions where the Lord will hardly permit a cactus to grow. It is not given to men to so reverse the order of Creation. The whole project reeked with wastefulness. Even a pamphlet that was issued to advertise it was prepared in such an expensive way and with such artistic embellishment that it cost the taxpayers of this country $4,011.64.

I wonder how long it will take us to learn that the road to economy is the road to recovery, and that we will never again have happiness and prosperity in America unless we stop such wastefulness.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say there were many reasons which justify this project. Undoubtedly the completed shelterbelt would be of great service, especially in that particular section of the country. The liquidation of the project does not necessarily indicate lack of merit, but the committee thought that under present circumstances it was not advisable to spend this amount for the purpose.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BIERMANN. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that about 6,000,000 trees are now in the nurseries to be set out?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Something in excess of 60,000,000 trees.

Mr. BIERMANN. Can the gentleman tell us in what States these trees are to be set out?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not suppose there will be any necessity for prorating them. They will be distributed to all farmers who desire them and who will agree to plant them without expense to the Government. If there should be so many applications that the supply would not be adequate, doubtless they would apportion them to the various States in which the shelterbelt project is located.

Mr. BIERMANN. Does not the location of the trees depend in some measure on the kind of trees they are?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All of these trees are varieties which are adapted to the region in which they are to be planted.

Mr. BIERMANN. Does the gentleman have any information as to how the trees are getting along that were planted previously?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have received reports and photographs indicating a survival in some cases of almost

100 percent. In other cases, especially in regions visited by the drought, the mortality was high, but there is reason to believe that with the data now available trees can be supplied that will survive in practically all parts of this area.

Mr. BIERMANN. This money will not be entirely wasted. There will be much good result in the way of trees?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not think a dollar of this appropriation will be wasted. We should get several dollars' benefit out of every dollar expended.

Mr. BIERMANN. Does the gentleman have any figures as to how much money has been spent on this shelterbelt up to date?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We expended last year $2,700,000.

Mr. BIERMANN. That plus the $170,000 included in the present bill is the total?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That will be the total cost at the close of the next fiscal year.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Did the conferees consider any provision allowing the remaining trees to be sent to farmers to be planted in wood lots or something like that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No stipulation is made as to exactly where these trees shall be located. That is left with the individual farmer, but our understanding is that a large part of them will be planted in wood lots and around the homestead, where they will be cared for and produce the greatest benefits.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I may say that I have felt from the first this project was doomed to failure; and, although I am not rejoicing, I was convinced from the first, as I say, that the project would fall, because I have seen too much of these trees trying to grow under existing circumstances.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say in response to the gentleman that the results obtained from this project are not to be measured by the number of trees which have been planted and which now survive but rather of the impetus given to reforestation throughout the West. In the future, as these trees develop, the farmers, seeing the results, will plant trees at their own expense. The project is to that extent demonstrational and educational.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. On the other hand, I think the shelterbelt has brought ridicule on the idea of planting trees. If they had designed them from the first for wood lots, then much good would have come from it, but I cannot think this has done a great deal of good because it has been so fantastic.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I say to the gentleman that not all of them were planted in shelterbelt blocks but on practically every farmstead in this area the trees were used about the buildings and have added materially to the comfort and beauty of these farm homes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield to me in this connection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. In view of the statements made by the chairman and the possibility that there may be an effort made to secure an allocation to work of this character of further public-works funds, I feel it is proper that the RECORD should show that a majority of the conferees on the part of the House thought this project had not been successful and that it would be unwise to continue it, and that it was not simply a question of lack of funds which influenced your conferees to insist that the project should be liquidated.

I may say also in this connection that as one member of the conference I felt that the funds which have been allocated to this work and are now unused, which appeared to be at the time of the hearings before our subcommittee $750,000 in amount, should be properly used for the liquidation of the project and that no appropriation ought to be made by Congress for the purpose of liquidation at all, and I still hope that when the administrative authorities having this matter in charge find that Congress has disapproved the continuation of the project, instead of using the funds that are carried in this bill to liquidate it, they will use the funds which have been allocated them insofar as they are unexpended for the purpose of carrying out the liquidation proposed by Congress, and that it will not be necessary to spend the amount of $170,000 carried in the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say, Mr. Speaker, of course, there is room for wide divergence of opinion on this as on other items in the bill. There appeared before the committee witnesses and experts who testified to the great usefulness of this project and to the valuable results that would be derived from it, both at the present time and for many years to come, and the committee, after considering the matter exhaustively, thought it wise to provide sufficient funds to take care of the remaining trees and then liquidate the project.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. In justification for allowing $170,000, it was the thought of the subcommittee that this fund might be expended in assisting in the distribution of these trees among the farmers so that they could have them to erect windbreaks around their premises. So the winding up or the discontinuance of the belt idea still has the sympathetic consideration of the subcommittee in promoting stock to build windbreaks around the homes of farmers who want to obtain and plant these trees.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. May I inquire of the gentleman about the appropriation for the acquisition of additional forest lands?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman knows, the Budget made no provision for expenditures for that purpose. An amendment was offered on the floor of the House for $25,000,000 which, as the gentleman recalls, was defeated. The Senate then proposed an amendment of $10,000,000, and in conference we agreed on $2,500,000.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. LUCKEY. In reference to the reforestation program in the Great Plains section, I wish to say that I have lived there for many years. I felt that the so-called shelterbelt project was rather impractical, but there is a great possibility for reforestation in the Great Plains section if we know just exactly what should be done after a scientific study and investigation of the problem. For instance, years ago Chancellor Bessie, of the University of Nebraska, one of the leading botanists of this country, was instrumental in promoting a reforestation project in the northwestern part of Nebraska, which has now developed into a very fine forest. We also recall that Sterling Morton, who lived in Nebraska City, was a great advocate of tree planting and was the originator of Arbor Day in this country. Much good work has been accomplished. There are still great possibilities along these lines, and we should not lose sight of the fact that something should be done for the Great Plains section—the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and western Texas—along the line of scientific study of what is practical for these States; and, following such a careful study, carrying out a plan in accordance with our experience and based on such scientific study.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Does not the gentleman believe that some of this enterprise ought to be left to the local initiative of the counties and States, rather than devoting the money of all the taxpayers to such work?

Mr. LUCKEY. Yes; and the States are doing a great deal of work along this line; but what we need now is a coordination of all the forces under one head, so we can go forward with as little duplication of effort and waste of money as possible in bringing forward a sound program of reforestation. Instead of going at it in a visionary way, we should proceed in the most practical way possible.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman, and unquestionably the expenditure of this money has given a salutary impetus to the cultivation of trees and reforestation studies which will bear fruit in the future. It is similar to the demonstrational work of the soil-conservation program. There is not one of those 150 conservation projects which would be justified if the only advantage accruing was to the particular section of land on which located, but they are intended to be educational, and unquestionably the work of the Government in building these units of the shelterbelt is going to bring about increased interest and better methods of farming in those sections which will encourage private enterprise to take up the work where the Government is leaving off.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to Governor PIERCE.

Mr. PIERCE. Do I understand that there is only two and a half million dollars appropriated for the purchase of forest lands? That is a very small percentage.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is one-fourth of the amount suggested by the Senate.

Mr. PIERCE. What was the amount asked for by the commission?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There was no request to the committee in any amount. The Budget made no provision. This appropriation is in excess of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, if there are no further inquiries, I ask for a vote on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCREYNOLDS). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 2: Page 4, line 10, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for field work in the Department of Agriculture may be used for the purchase of arms and ammunition whenever the individual purchase does not exceed $50, and for individual purchases exceeding $50, when such arms and ammunition cannot advantageously be supplied by the Secretary of War pursuant to the act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 412): *Provided further*."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 16: On page 24, line 11, insert after the semicolon the following: "and the Secretary of Agriculture, upon application of any exporter, importer, packer, owner, agent of, or dealer in livestock, hides, skins, meat, or other animal products, may, in his discretion, make inspections and examinations at places other than the headquarters of inspectors for the convenience of said applicants and charge the applicants for the expenses of travel and subsistence incurred for such inspections and examinations, the funds derived from such charges to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation from which the expenses are paid."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 71: Page 75, insert, after line 6, the following:

"The authorization of $2,500,000 for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations other than the forest reservations, under the provisions of the act of June 24, 1930 (46 Stat., p. 805), provided for by section 6 of the Highway Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat., p. 994), for the fiscal year 1937, is hereby canceled for said fiscal year and made applicable to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 85: Page 90, after line 10, insert:

"Sea-food inspectors: For personal services of sea-food inspectors designated to examine and inspect sea food and the production, packaging, and labeling thereof upon the application of any packer of any sea food for shipment or sale within the jurisdiction of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to amend section 10A of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 871), $80,000: *Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1937, receipts from fees authorized to be collected by the operations of Public Act No. 346, entitled 'An act to amend section 10A of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of 'Miscellaneous receipts', and hereafter appropriations for the operations under said act are authorized to be made annually out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

"Sea-food inspectors: On and after July 1, 1936, receipts from fees authorized to be collected by the operations of Public Act No. 346, entitled 'An act to amend section 10A of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of Miscellaneous Receipts, except such fees paid after June 30, 1936, on account of services rendered prior to July 1, 1936, and required for payment of obligations incurred prior to such latter date. For expenses of inspection, including personal services of sea-food inspectors designated to examine and inspect sea food and the production, packaging, and labeling thereof upon the application of any packer of any sea food for shipment or sale within the jurisdiction of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to amend section 10A of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 871), there is appropriated an amount equal to the sum received during the fiscal year 1937 from the fees hereinbefore mentioned, to be warranted monthly: *Provided*, That the sum of $40,000 shall be advanced from the general fund of the Treasury on the first day of the fiscal year to the foregoing appropriation, to be returned to the surplus fund of the Treasury when the first $40,000 of revenue from the aforesaid fees has been received and warranted for the fiscal year 1937."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following substitute amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield for that purpose?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: In lieu of the amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri under the title "Food and Drug Administration", subtitle "Sea-Food Inspectors", insert:

"Enforcement of the Sea-Food Inspectors' Act: For personal services of sea-food inspectors designated to examine and inspect sea food and the production, packing, and labeling thereof, upon the application of any packer of any sea food for shipment or sale within the jurisdiction of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to amend section 10 (a) of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 871), $40,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I shall have to make the point of order that the proposed amendment is not germane to the pending amendment. The amendment proposes that the Government advance $40,000 which shall be repaid from fees; in other words, that it shall lend $40,000 for this purpose. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi is an outright appropriation—in other words, gratis service to the packers. The Speaker, I am certain, will recall the decision in the Sixty-fifth Congress, in which it was held that a proposition to buy could not be amended by a proposition to give. In

other words, that a proposal to give is not germane to a proposal to sell. The Speaker will also remember one of the early precedents cited by Mr. Hinds in which an amendment to pay a claim was held not to be germane to a proposition to refer a claim to the Court of Claims. The doctrine in both cases sustains the contention that a proposition to make an appropriation would not be germane to a proposition to make a loan.

I reserve my point of order in order that the gentleman from Mississippi may be heard.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard for a moment on the point of order, contrary to the position just taken by the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the original Senate amendment numbered 85 is an amendment adding to the House bill an appropriation, not a loan, in the amount of $80,000 for the payment for personal services of sea-food inspectors. The argument of my colleague Mr. CANNON would be sufficient to justify holding that the amendment submitted by the conferees in lieu of the Senate amendment, is out of order by reason of the fact that that amendment proposes a loan or advance instead of a direct appropriation, but the point of order has not been made against the amendment submitted by the conferees. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi as a substitute for the amendment offered by the conferees is exactly in line with the original Senate amendment numbered 85 in that it proposes a direct appropriation of $40,000, whereas the original Senate amendment proposes a direct appropriation of $80,000. It is inconceivable, merely by reason of the fact that the conferees have offered an amendment proposing a loan instead of an appropriation which might have been held out of order had the point of order been made, that a substitute for that amendment cannot be offered just exactly in the terms of the original Senate amendment, except as to the amount involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The contention of the gentleman from Georgia is that the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi is a substitute for that is carried in the original bill as an amendment of the Senate?

Mr. TARVER. As I understand it the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi is offered as a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is certainly germane to the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is an amendment to the pending amendment and it is well established that the admissibility of an amendment under such circumstances is judged by its relation to the amendment to which it is offered and not by its relation to any other provision in the bill. The proposed amendment is not germane to the amendment to which it is offered.

I reserve the point of order to give the gentleman from Mississippi an opportunity to discuss his amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this appropriation is intended for the purpose of furnishing funds whereby food packed in the sea-food industry may be inspected, similar to that inspection that is granted to the meat-packing industry of this country. This is a wholesome proposition. It is in the interest of the public welfare that this sea food be inspected.

At the last session of the Congress there was a law passed authorizing this appropriation. The Pure Food and Drug Department, acting upon the authority of that authorization, asked the Budget for $80,000.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. After the authority and the Food and Drug Department made their request of the Budget, did the Budget not approve and make its recommendation to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. COLMER. The Budget made its recommendation to the Appropriations Committee. I thank my colleague.

Then the Senate inserted this item of $80,000, just as we are asking in this amendment, for this purpose. We are merely asking that the recommendation of the Pure Food and Drug Department and of the Budget and of the authorization of this Congress be carried out by this appropriation, except that for the purpose of compromise, to be frank about it, instead of asking for $80,000, we have provided for just one-half that amount or $40,000.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that the gentleman is only asking for the same thing that is now granted for meats; that is, inspection by the Government?

Mr. COLMER. That is my understanding.

Mr. PATMAN. And the Budget recommended $80,000 for that purpose and you are only asking for $40,000 in this amendment?

Mr. COLMER. That is true.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. The real matter in controversy is whether we should furnish a revolving fund of $80,000, so that ultimately the fees would repay something to the Treasury, or your proposal to pay $40,000 out of the Treasury, no part of which would be returned to the Treasury?

Mr. COLMER. That is quite true. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the distinguished chairman of this committee, we are granted $40,000 as a kind of initial revolving fund. We are merely asking by this amendment that you give us $40,000 without any strings tied to it. That is a frank, candid statement of the whole situation.

Let me say that this does not alone involve my selfish interest or my congressional district. This matter goes to the welfare of the consuming public. As I stated once before upon this floor, there is an opinion prevalent among the consuming public that canned sea foods are injurious and poisonous. The sea-food industry is a big industry in this country. In my district alone there are some fifteen or twenty thousand men engaged in this industry. Unless we can receive an inspection service for this sea food, and this prevalent opinion continues to grow that this product is not good for human consumption, that industry would likely be destroyed and those men will go upon relief and add to the unemployment list.

I appeal to my colleagues, not for any selfish reason but upon the merit and upon the justice of my cause, that we not twiddle about this thing, but give us this $40,000 that we have asked for, just one-half the amount that the Budget recommended, and vote for my amendment.

I want to thank my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who has been so courteous to me throughout this matter and to the cause that I represent. Even though he has seen fit, under a sense of his duty to hold down this appropriation as much as possible, to oppose me in this, I appreciate the courtesy, and I hope the amendment will prevail and that we may get this $40,000. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCREYNOLDS). The Chair is ready to rule upon the point of order.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to the Senate amendment appearing on page 90, line 10, with reference to sea-food inspectors, provides for a loan. The amendment reads:

Provided, That the sum of $40,000 shall be advanced from the general fund of the Treasury on the first day of the fiscal year to the foregoing appropriation, to be returned to the surplus fund of the Treasury when the first $40,000 of revenue from the aforesaid fees has been received and warranted for the fiscal year 1937.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is an amendment to the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and provides for an outright appropriation of $40,000. The difference between the amendments is that one is a loan and the other is a straight appropriation without return.

It has been well settled that an amendment to change a condition of that character is not in order. So the only question is whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi must be germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri or to the Senate amendment. The Chair is of the opinion, from previous rulings, that it must be germane to the amendment to which it is offered. That is, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi must be germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, because it is offered as an amendment to that amendment.

In support of that statement the Chair reads the following syllabus from Cannon's Precedents, volume VIII, section 2924:

It is not sufficient that an amendment proposed to a pending amendment be germane to the bill, but it must also be germane to the amendment to which it is offered.

In view of that situation, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. In the event the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri should be voted down by the House, the gentleman from Mississippi would then be in order to offer his motion to recede and concur with his amendment to the Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is a correct statement.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 21, noes 28.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 130, nays 147, not voting 148, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—130

Allen	Darrow	Larrabee	Reed, N. Y.
Andresen	Dirksen	Lesinski	Rogers, Mass.
Bacon	Dockweiler	Lewis, Colo.	Romjue
Barry	Dondero	Lord	Russell
Biermann	Duffy, N. Y.	Ludlow	Ryan
Blanton	Duncan	McAndrews	Sandlin
Boland	Ekwall	McLaughlin	Schuetz
Bolton	Engel	McLeod	Shanley
Boylan	Fletcher	Main	Shannon
Brewster	Frey	Mapes	Smith, Conn.
Buckler, Minn.	Gifford	Marshall	Spence
Burnham	Gilchrist	Martin, Mass.	Stack
Cannon, Mo.	Goodwin	Meeks	Stewart
Carlson	Guyer	Merritt, Conn.	Sumners, Tex.
Carpenter	Hancock, N. Y.	Michener	Taber
Casey	Harlan	Millard	Tarver
Christianson	Healey	Mitchell, Tenn.	Taylor, S. C.
Church	Hess	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Citron	Higgins, Mass.	Nelson	Thom
Cochran	Hollister	O'Brien	Thurston
Coffee	Holmes	O'Connor	Tinkham
Colden	Imhoff	O'Day	Tobey
Cole, N. Y.	Jacobsen	O'Neal	Umstead
Collins	Jenkins, Ohio	Parsons	Wadsworth
Connery	Jones	Pettengill	Welch
Costello	Kinzer	Pierce	Williams
Crawford	Kloeb	Pittenger	Wilson, Pa.
Cross, Tex.	Kniffin	Plumley	Wolcott
Crosser, Ohio	Knutson	Polk	Wolverton
Crowther	Kramer	Rabaut	Woodruff
Culkin	Lambertson	Ransley	Young
Cullen	Lambeth	Reece	
Cummings	Lamneck	Reed, Ill.	

NAYS—147

Amlie	Brown, Ga.	Clark, Idaho	Cravens
Beam	Buck	Cole, Md.	Creal
Binderup	Cartwright	Colmer	Crosby
Bland	Castellow	Cooper, Tenn.	Curley
Boileau	Chandler	Cox	Daly
Deen	Halleck	Marcantonio	Schulte
Dempsey	Hildebrandt	Martin, Colo.	Scott
DeRouen	Hill, Ala.	Mason	Scrugham
Dies	Hill, Knute	Massingale	Secrest
Dingell	Hobbs	Maverick	Smith, Va.
Disney	Hook	May	Smith, Wash.
Dorsey	Houston	Mitchell, Ill.	Smith, W. Va.
Doughton	Hull	Monaghan	Snyder, Pa.
Doxey	Jenckes, Ind.	Montague	Somers, N. Y.
Driver	Johnson, Okla.	Owen	South
Dunn, Pa.	Johnson, Tex.	Palmisano	Starnes
Edmiston	Johnson, W. Va.	Patman	Steagall
Eicher	Keller	Patterson	Stefan
Ellenbogen	Kelley	Patton	Stubbs
Faddis	Kennedy, Md.	Pearson	Terry
Farley	Kenney	Peterson, Ga.	Thomason
Fiesinger	Kocialkowski	Peyser	Thompson
Fiannagan	Kopplemann	Quinn	Tolan
Focht	Lemke	Ramspeck	Turner
Ford, Miss.	Luckey	Rankin	Utterback
Fuller	Lundeen	Reilly	Vinson, Ga.
Gassaway	McClellan	Richardson	Vinson, Ky.
Gavagan	McCormack	Risk	Wallgren
Gildea	McFarlane	Robertson	Walter
Gillette	McGehee	Robinson, Utah	Warren
Goldsborough	McGrath	Rogers, Okla.	Wearin
Granfield	McKeough	Sabath	Whittington
Gray, Ind.	McReynolds	Sadowski	Wilson, La.
Greenway	McSwain	Sanders, La.	Withrow
Greenwood	Mahon	Sanders, Tex.	Woodrum
Gregory	Maloney	Sauthoff	Zimmerman
Griswold	Mansfield	Schneider, Wis.	

NOT VOTING—148

Adair	Crowe	Hart	Oliver
Andrew, Mass.	Darden	Harter	O'Malley
Andrews, N. Y.	Dear	Hartley	Parks
Arends	Delaney	Hennings	Peterson, Fla.
Ashbrook	Dickstein	Higgins, Conn.	Pfeifer
Ayers	Dietrich	Hill, Samuel B.	Powers
Bacharach	Ditter	Hoeppel	Ramsay
Bankhead	Dobbins	Hoffman	Randolph
Barden	Doutrich	Hope	Rayburn
Beiter	Drewry	Huddleston	Rich
Bell	Driscoll	Kahn	Richards
Berlin	Duffey, Ohio	Kee	Robsion, Ky.
Blackney	Dunn, Miss.	Kennedy, N. Y.	Rogers, N. H.
Bloom	Eagle	Kerr	Schaefer
Boehne	Eaton	Kleberg	Sears
Boykin	Eckert	Kvale	Seger
Brennan	Englebright	Lanham	Short
Brooks	Evans	Lea, Calif.	Sirovich
Brown, Mich.	Fenerty	Lee, Okla.	Sisson
Buchanan	Ferguson	Lehlbach	Snell
Buckley, N. Y.	Fernandez	Lewis, Md.	Sullivan
Bulwinkle	Fish	Lucas	Sutphin
Burch	Fitzpatrick	McGroarty	Sweeney
Burdick	Ford, Calif.	McLean	Taylor, Colo.
Caldwell	Fulmer	McMillan	Tonry
Cannon, Wis.	Gambrill	Maas	Treadway
Carmichael	Gasque	Mead	Turpin
Carter	Gearhart	Merritt, N. Y.	Weaver
Cary	Gehrmann	Miller	Werner
Cavicchia	Gingery	Montet	West
Celler	Gray, Pa.	Moran	Whelchel
Chapman	Green	Moritz	White
Claiborne	Greever	Murdock	Wigglesworth
Clark, N. C.	Gwynne	Nichols	Wilcox
Cooley	Haines	Norton	Wolfenden
Cooper, Ohio	Hamlin	O'Connell	Wood
Corning	Hancock, N. C.	O'Leary	Zioncheck

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Corning with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Sears with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Bacharach.
Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Wolfenden.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Fish.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Wilcox with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Mead with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Haines with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Turpin.
Mr. McFarland with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
Mr. Eagle with Mr. Gwynne.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Short.
Mr. Bloom with Mrs. Kahn.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Cavicchia.

Mr. Cary with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Darden with Mr. Gehrmann.
Mr. Green with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Kvale.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Beiter with Mr. O'Leary.
Mr. Carmichael with Mr. Ramsay.
Mr. Dear with Mr. Lewis of Maryland.
Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Driscoll.
Mr. Werner with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Parks with Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Sirovich.
Mr. Dobbins with Mr. Montet.
Mr. White with Mr. Claiborne.
Mr. Greever with Mr. Ayers.
Mr. Gasque with Mr. Hamlin.
Mr. O'Malley with Mr. Caldwell.
Mr. Dunn of Mississippi with Mr. Wood.
Mr. Merritt of New York with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Brown of Michigan with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Moran.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Hennings with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Schaefer.
Mr. Sisson with Mr. Eckert.
Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. Tonry with Mr. Murdock.
Mr. Evans with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Ford of California with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Adair with Mr. Hancock of North Carolina.
Mr. Harter with Mr. Brennan.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire with Mr. Duffey of Ohio.
Mr. Zioncheck with Mr. Moritz.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Sam B. Hill.
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. McGroarty.

Mr. DINGELL, Mr. REILLY, Mr. BARRY, Mr. KOPPLEMANN, Mr. MARTIN of Colorado, Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, Mr. STARNES, and Mr. MASSINGALE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HAINES, is unavoidably absent. If he was present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the following motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLMER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter in the Senate amendment insert:

"Enforcement of the Sea Food Inspectors Act: For personal services of sea-food inspectors designated to examine and inspect sea food and the production, packing, and labeling thereof upon the application of any packer of any sea food for shipment or sale within the jurisdiction of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to amend section 10 (a) of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 871), $40,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the proposed amendment to the Senate amendment embraces provisions that are not in conference; that the gentleman can propose only such things as are embraced within the jurisdiction of the conference; and the amendment exceeds that matter by releasing restrictions that have already been agreed to by the conferees.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair reads the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, it contains exactly the same language as the first portion of the Senate amendment except the amount is $40,000 instead of $80,000.

Mr. BLANTON. But, Mr. Speaker, it releases restrictions that have been agreed upon.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment is germane.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, only those matters that were embraced within the jurisdiction of the conferees may be offered as amendments.

The SPEAKER. This Senate amendment was reported back to the House still in disagreement, as a matter of fact, and is now before the House for such action as the House may see fit to take. The gentleman from Mississippi has offered a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. The Chair has held that the amendment is germane and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi on this splendid tribute to his popularity in the House, and I desire to join those who voted for him in this well-merited complaint. The vote was a vote in favor of the gentleman and is a testimonial to our deep affection for him and the esteem in which he is held. It was a vote on the gentleman from Mississippi and not a vote on the merits of the amendment before us.

Mr. Speaker, I would not oppose this amendment if it involved merely the item before us today, but it is the entering wedge, and when we admit it we open the door to millions of dollars of expense in supplying similar service to other industries in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield such time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] as he may desire.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the very impassioned plea made by my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I appreciate the very kind references he made to me in the beginning of his speech, but as he went along, I was reminded of the old adage, "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts", because he bore down on me pretty hard before he concluded.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter of personal popularity. It is true I did ask some of my colleagues to support me in this piece of legislation. It is even true I went to the door and saw a few of the Members when they came in.

You know, I was rather impressed when I first came to Congress a few years ago with the fact that every time I came in that door to answer a roll call there was a man standing there telling me to vote with the committee, or telling me how to vote. I used to resent that. He always stands there and says "The vote of the committee is yes" or "The vote of the committee is no." So today, I just took the precaution of going out there to the door in order to offset any committee action. If I did wrong, and if I was in error, I apologize. The man at the door, who usually says "Vote with the committee" retreated after I got there.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BOILEAU. I wish to voice my protest against a custom that has developed here of employees of the House standing at the various doors telling Members how to vote. All they say is "Vote 'yes'" or "Vote 'no.'" I wonder under what rule anyone is authorized to instruct employees of the House to stand out there and tell Members how to vote?

Mr. COLMER. I am sure it was not the distinguised chairman of this committee.

Mr. BOILEAU. Oh, I do not say that. I did not make any such inference.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. I take issue with my distinguished friend and colleague. It is on a parallel with the meat-inspection provisions of the Pure Food Act. If this inspection service is granted it can have but one purpose, and that is to protect the consuming public who consume sea-food products. If there is any food products that need inspection, I submit it is sea-food products.

The House has voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, which is tantamount to an endorsement of the proposal which I have made. I am not going to take the time of the House unnecessarily, because there is not a great deal involved; just $40,000. I am asking you to take the strings off of this amount and let the people of our country have this service to the extent of $40,000.

I hope the House will confirm what it has already done and support this motion. [Applause.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, before my colleague concludes, will he yield for a question?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. Is it not a fact that the Director of the Budget has approved an appropriation for this purpose in the amount of $80,000, while all the gentleman is asking in his motion is $40,000?

Mr. COLMER. That is quite so, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is the situation with reference to the pending motion. The Senate tacked on amendment no. 85, which provided for sea-food inspection to come out of the Treasury of the United States, $80,000, and it was provided that on and after the 1st of July 1937 receipts from fees authorized to be collected for sea-food inspection should revert to the Treasury. In conference it was worked out so that $40,000 should be set up and then the fees should go into a revolving fund.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] offered an amendment providing for what the conferees had agreed to and the House voted it down. An attempt is now made to come back here and take $40,000 out of the Treasury and not provide that the fee shall come back, which makes it a little worse than the Senate amendment and carries it way beyond the provisions of the Senate amendment so far as a raid on the Treasury is concerned.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Is it not a fact that the authorization passed by the Congress last year, which I do not have before me now, provided for just such an appropriation?

Mr. TABER. Not in just this way, no; because there was an authorization which required, as I recall the situation, the tax to be levied and collected from those who offered the shrimp for inspection.

Mr. COLMER. I may say to the gentleman that if he will investigate the matter further he will find he is in error.

Mr. TABER. We looked it up and we found that the Budget language that was submitted and the language submitted by the Senate did not comply with the statute.

Mr. COLMER. I may say further to the gentleman that the amendment offered now is in language prepared by the Budget.

Mr. TABER. Whether it is the language of the Budget or not, it is not language which will protect the Treasury of the United States.

I do not know who will be out in the hall asking folks to vote, but right now I am asking the membership of this House to vote to protect the Treasury and not permit this thing to go through without providing how these taxes shall be collected and how the money shall revert to the Treasury.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this squabble over $40,000, to my mind, is entirely unjustifiable. I am a member of the committee of conference which submitted the report which, so far as this amendment is concerned, the House a few moments ago, by a yea-and-nay vote, turned down. I voted with my fellow conferees in favor of the conferees' report, but our attitude was disapproved by the House. It therefore is not now a question of supporting the conferees or supporting the committee. The conference committee's attitude has already been rejected, and the question now before the House is what we ought to do to endeavor to solve this question of difference between the House and the Senate.

The Senate wants $80,000 for this purpose, and the gentleman from Mississippi, in an effort to reach a compromise, has proposed to appropriate $40,000. I think we ought to meet him halfway. I think we ought to agree to the amendment.

This is not any effort to raid the Treasury. If you wanted to protect the Treasury, I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] he ought to have objected last year when they passed through this House a Senate bill by unanimous consent authorizing the appropriation of money from the Federal Treasury to carry on this work.

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

Mr. TARVER. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I was not able to be here when that bill was up. I was engaged on hearings in committee. I try to protect the Treasury, but I cannot always be here and look after all these matters. I have to rely on some of the others some of the time.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, all the Members of Congress are not individually responsible for a legislative authorization which may be passed by Congress and enacted into law, but, after it is passed and signed and approved by the President, it constitutes a legislative expression of the purposes of the Congress and authorizes the appropriation of money in accordance with the collective will of Congress; and in this case legislation, subsequent to the time when the promises were made to the committee which originally considered the matter by the shrimp people, has been enacted by Congress under the unanimous-consent rule, providing that the expense of this investigation and inspection shall be paid from the Federal Treasury instead of being paid altogether by the people who are interested in the industry.

Unless we want to disapprove or repudiate the legislation we unanimously passed last year, we ought at least to make provision for a reasonable part of this expense. Forty thousand dollars will not be enough. This is unquestioned. The Budget estimated it would require $80,000. If we agree to $40,000, as proposed in the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi, the effect will be that the fees paid by the shrimp people themselves must pay one-half of the cost of inspection, and the Federal Government, instead of doing what it impliedly promised last year and paying it all, is going to pay one-half of it. This seems to me to be a happy and a reasonable compromise, and it certainly is my hope that the membership of the House will accede to the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi and remove this cause of controversy between the House and Senate. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, like my chairman, I have no quarrel with my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. I merely want to say a few words in defense of the action of the Democratic employee of the House who, upon roll-call votes, stands at the door and tells incoming Members what issue is being voted upon, and who for 25 years has served the House faithfully and well, and that is Johnnie Snyder. [Applause.]

Frequently a matter comes up on the floor under debate where the committee conducts general debate for an hour or more and Members have to go in and out of the Chamber on important business. They have to meet constituents, they have to sign important documents, they go out to committee meetings, expecting to get back in time to vote by the time the question comes to a vote.

When the bell rings they come in, and then Mr. Snyder, who has served here for 25 years, served faithfully the Democratic administration of the House, stands at the door and says, "This is bill, or resolution, or amendment, or conference report so and so. The committee vote is 'aye' or the committee vote is 'no.'" He does not tell the Member how to vote. He would be the last man in the world who would tell a Member how to vote; he is one of the most modest men you ever saw, and one of the most faithful men. He is industrious and on the job every minute that the House is in session.

I frequently have to go to the Appropriations Committee's room on important business, and when I come back I say to Johnnie, "Is this vote on the committee?" I find out about the situation and then exercise my own judgment as to how to vote.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I want to say to the gentleman that I had no intention of reflecting on any of these valuable employees

of the House. I hope that there is no such inference from my remarks.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BOILEAU. Let me say that I had no intention of reflecting on any employees working at the door. My criticism was against the system and not against any employee.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say that when the Republican Party was in power they had a faithful employee who occupied the same position that Mr. Snyder does. He stood there at the door and gave Members the facts as to the situation.

Mr. BOILEAU. And it will not be long before the Progressives will have a man standing at the door. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman's grandchildren will be gray-headed before that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were 60 ayes and 65 noes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 129, not voting 147, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—149

Amlie	Fiesinger	McFarlane	Sanders, Tex.
Barry	Flannagan	McGehee	Sauthoff
Beam	Ford, Miss.	McGrath	Schneider, Wis.
Bell	Frey	McReynolds	Schulte
Bland	Fuller	McSwain	Scott
Bloom	Gasque	Mahon	Scrugham
Boileau	Gassaway	Maloney	Smith, Va.
Brown, Ga.	Gehrmann	Mansfield	Smith, Wash.
Buck	Gildea	Marcantonio	Smith, W. Va.
Cartwright	Goldsborough	Martin, Colo.	Snyder, Pa.
Casey	Greenway	Mason	South
Castellow	Greenwood	Massingale	Stack
Chandler	Greever	Maverick	Starnes
Chapman	Gregory	May	Steagall
Clark, Idaho	Haines	Miller	Stubbs
Colden	Hamlin	Mitchell, Ill.	Tarver
Cole, Md.	Hildebrandt	Monaghan	Taylor, Tenn.
Colmer	Hill, Ala.	Montague	Terry
Connery	Hill, Knute	Moran	Thomason
Cooley	Hobbs	Murdock	Thompson
Cooper, Tenn.	Houston	O'Connell	Tolan
Costello	Hull	O'Connor	Turner
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	O'Day	Umstead
Cravens	Johnson, W. Va.	Owen	Vinson, Ga.
Crosby	Jones	Parsons	Vinson, Ky.
Cross, Tex.	Keller	Patman	Walter
Curley	Kennedy, Md.	Patterson	Warren
Deen	Knutson	Patton	Wearin
Dempsey	Kocialkowski	Pearson	Weaver
DeRouen	Kramer	Peterson, Ga.	Welch
Dies	Kvale	Ramspeck	Whittington
Dingell	Lambeth	Rankin	Wilson, La.
Disney	Lamneck	Risk	Withrow
Doughton	Lea, Calif.	Robertson	Woodruff
Doxey	Lemke	Robinson, Utah	Woodrum
Driver	Lundeen	Rogers, Okla.	
Dunn, Pa.	McClellan	Sabath	
Ellenbogen	McCormack	Sadowski	

NAYS—129

Allen	Cole, N. Y.	Focht	Kahn
Andresen	Collins.	Gavagan	Kelly
Ashbrook	Crawford	Gearhart	Kenney
Bacon	Crosser, Ohio	Gifford	Kinzer
Biermann	Crowe	Gilchrist	Kloeb
Blanton	Crowther	Goodwin	Kniffin
Boland	Culkin	Granfield	Lambertson
Bolton	Cullen	Gray, Ind.	Larrabee
Boylan	Daly	Griswold	Lesinski
Brewster	Darrow	Guyer	Lewis, Colo.
Buckler, Minn.	Dirksen	Hancock, N. Y.	Lord
Burnham	Dockweiler	Harlan	Luckey
Cannon, Mo.	Dondero	Healey	Ludlow
Cannon, Wis.	Dorsey	Hess	McAndrews
Carlson	Duffy, N. Y.	Higgins, Mass.	McKeough
Carpenter	Duncan	Hollister	McLaughlin
Christianson	Edmiston	Holmes	McLeod
Church	Eicher	Imhoff	Main
Citron	Ekwall	Jacobsen	Mapes
Cochran	Engel	Jenckes, Ind.	Marshall
Coffee	Fletcher	Jenkins, Ohio	Martin, Mass.
Meeks	Pittenger	Ryan	Thurston
Merritt, Conn.	Plumley	Sandlin	Tinkham
Michener	Polk	Schuetz	Wadsworth
Millard	Rabaut	Shanley	Williams
Mitchell, Tenn.	Reece	Shannon	Wilson, Pa.
Mott	Reed, Ill.	Smith, Conn.	Wolcott
Nelson	Reed, N. Y.	Spence	Wolverton
O'Brien	Richardson	Stefan	Young
O'Neal	Robsion, Ky.	Stewart	Zimmerman
Palmisano	Rogers, Mass.	Taber	
Pettengill	Romjue	Taylor, S. C.	
Pierce	Russell	Thom	

NOT VOTING—147

Adair	Dickstein	Hoeppel	Ransley
Andrew, Mass.	Dietrich	Hoffman	Rayburn
Andrews, N. Y.	Ditter	Hook	Reilly
Arends	Dobbins	Hope	Rich
Ayers	Doutrich	Huddleston	Richards
Bacharach	Drewry	Johnson, Tex.	Rogers, N. H.
Bankhead	Driscoll	Kee	Sanders, La.
Barden	Duffey, Ohio	Kennedy, N. Y.	Schaefer
Beiter	Dunn, Miss.	Kerr	Sears
Berlin	Eagle	Kleberg	Secrest
Binderup	Eaton	Kopplemann	Seger
Blackney	Eckert	Lanham	Short
Boehne	Englebright	Lee, Okla.	Sirovich
Boykin	Evans	Lehlbach	Sisson
Brennan	Faddis	Lewis, Md.	Snell
Brooks	Farley	Lucas	Somers, N. Y.
Brown, Mich.	Fenerty	McGroarty	Sullivan
Buchanan	Ferguson	McLean	Sumners, Tex.
Buckley, N. Y.	Fernandez	McMillan	Sutphin
Bulwinkle	Fish	Maas	Sweeney
Burch	Fitzpatrick	Mead	Taylor, Colo.
Burdick	Ford, Calif.	Merritt, N. Y.	Tobey
Caldwell	Fulmer	Montet	Tonry
Carmichael	Gambrill	Moritz	Treadway
Carter	Gillette	Nichols	Turpin
Cary	Gingery	Norton	Utterback
Cavicchia	Gray, Pa.	O'Leary	Wallgren
Celler	Green	Oliver	Werner
Claiborne	Gwynne	O'Malley	West
Clark, N. C.	Halleck	Parks	Whelchel
Cooper, Ohio	Hancock, N. C.	Peterson, Fla.	White
Corning	Hart	Peyser	Wigglesworth
Creal	Harter	Pfeifer	Wilcox
Cummings	Hartley	Powers	Wolfenden
Darden	Hennings	Quinn	Wood
Dear	Higgins, Conn.	Ramsay	Zioncheck
Delaney	Hill, Samuel B.	Randolph	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Corning with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Tobey.
Mr. Reilly with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Darden with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Johnson of Texas with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Ransley.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Gingery with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Wallgren with Mr. Berlin.
Mr. Faddis with Mr. West.
Mr. Tonry with Mr. Ayers.
Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Secrest.
Mr. Utterback with Mr. Quinn.
Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Hook.
Mr. Binderup with Mr. Parks.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Dietrich.
Mr. Lee of Oklahoma with Mr. Cummings.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Farley.
Mr. Peyser with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee and Mr. WELCH changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 86: Page 91, strike out "$1,975,217" and insert "$2,579,837."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,077,758."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Motions to reconsider the various votes by which the several motions were agreed to were laid on the table.

LEAVE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until tomorrow night at 12 o'clock to file committee report upon H. R. 12869, and that the minority may have the same right to file minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ODESSA MASON

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1252) for the relief of Odessa Mason, with a committee amendment thereto, and agree to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and insert "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was agreed to was laid on the table.

LOOKING TO THE CAMPAIGN

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein an address delivered by my colleague from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] on May 27 over a national hook-up of the National Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS, of New York, on May 26, 1936:

Members of the national radio audience, as a radio fan myself I am mindful of the fact that in these days you are invited to listen to a lot of so-called political orators, and as a speaker this evening I wish to avoid, if possible, being put into that class. My time on the air with you is brief, so I shall confine myself to some observations which I believe are pertinent, Looking to the Campaign. These for your information are based upon 5 years' service in the House of Representatives, a reasonable business experience, and contacts largely with my fellow citizens in New York State. In talking with you I may also state that I am one of those who believe that, given the facts and a fair understanding in any situation, the average citizen is better qualified today to exercise his or her political judgment than at any time in our history. Largely due to the development of the press in its news from Washington, and in particular the radio, a vast majority of our citizens are much better informed than ever before.

We have now witnessed over 3 years of the so-called New Deal, and what are to be our considerations looking to the campaign and the election? At the start, to be sure, some of the early expressions of Mr. Roosevelt and some of the measures sponsored by his leadership gave us hope for the solution of our pressing problems, but this did not last for long.

Mr. Roosevelt's personal charm lasted about 2 years, and even before that the failure of his policies became evident. At the outset, having no real or sound convictions of his own, Mr. Roosevelt surrounded himself with a group of impractical theorists. It is this group, to a large extent, who have supplied the ideas of the New Deal. It is interesting to note that among the entire group of departmental bureaucratic advisers of the President it would be most difficult to find one self-made man or anyone who from experience knows what it is to meet a Saturday night's pay roll or manage a farm. Looking to the Democratic National Convention and Mr. Roosevelt's renomination, how can his 1936 platform be anything but meaningless. Here is a man who promised to reduce Federal expenditures. He has increased them enormously. He has cynically violated most of the other major planks of his 1932 platform.

Figures taken from the books of the Treasury Department itself show that up to May 18 last the Federal Government, under the present administration, has expended the colossal sum of twenty-two and one-half billion dollars. Putting this long figure another way, twenty-two thousand million dollars. The magnitude of this spending becomes more alarming when you realize that during this period the Government has been putting out more than $2 for each dollar of revenue it has taken in. The administration right now is in a hot spot. It is unwilling if not afraid to cut expenditures at the moment. It is equally unwilling and probably afraid to impose the added taxes which would be required to bring the revenues somewhere near its expenditures.

It was the President himself who once said, "Taxes are paid by the sweat of every man who labors." The people must be assured that Government borrowing will stop as soon as possible, thus releasing funds for private enterprise. Honest relief must be provided for those who require it, but the Republican Party cannot attempt to follow the present administration's wasteful policy. The New Deal administration is about to go into a national election. What is it going to do after election if it be successful in retaining control of the Government? If its future is to be judged by its past performances, the spending will continue, along with its experiments.

The second count against Mr. Roosevelt is his disregard of American tradition. Attempts to intimidate a free people through the N. R. A., the A. A. A., the Potato Act, and other similar devices have failed. Mr. Farley's attempt to buy the election of 1936 through the political domination of W. P. A. workers, corruption of the civil service, and wholesale patronage disposal to hundreds of thousands of additions to the Federal pay roll will not prevail against the rising tide of sane thinking among the voters. Everywhere allegiance to Roosevelt and Farley is a requisite for getting a W. P. A. job. Hunger and anxiety to work are not enough. Desperate tactics are being employed by Roosevelt, Farley & Co., for they are not so sure of winning as they would have you believe. But these tactics will not succeed as in 1932 and 1934. The people have awakened. The majority of them will not endorse a national Tammany Hall bossed by a stamp seller, chairman of the New York Democratic Committee, chairman of the National Democratic Committee, and ex-officio Postmaster General. If Mr. Roosevelt is sincere in some of his early expressed ideals for the Federal Government, why doesn't he listen to the pleadings of his friend Senator NORRIS, who asks that Mr. Farley resign one of his jobs? When have we ever heard of such brazen thirst for political power in one man on this side of the Atlantic? Mr. Farley is a smart man, but he made a bad mistake the other day during his private-car trip through the country, while in Michigan. He included in his talk a reference to one of the Republican candidates as "merely the Governor of a typical prairie State." This shows what the Tammany national chairman thinks of the Middle West. No matter who the Republican candidate may be, Farley's crack should be plastered on every fence post in the Mississippi Valley.

The third count against the President is from a practical standpoint probably the most damaging of all. He has failed to reduce unemployment appreciably, in spite of all his spending, with an increase in the national debt from twenty-one to thirty-four billions of dollars. American Federation of Labor statistics place present unemployment at about the same as in September of 1933. Roosevelt's petulant attacks on American businessmen merely expose his own incompetence. It is his vacillating and undependable policies which prevent the average man in business from making any long-range plans. The result is a vast amount of idle capital. Our successful Presidents have in the main cooperated with businessmen and with all other classes, instead of denouncing them. Our heritage has been that the Government has been the servant of the people and not their master.

The fourth count against Mr. Roosevelt is his deliberate creation of class hatred, his attempt to buy the votes of the farmers and those who want honest work. In order to fight depression the wisest, as well as the most honest, course to adopt is the encouragement of unity among Americans. It is the duty of a President to set an example of faith, hope, and charity. This last quality is conspicuously absent in the President. His self-complacency attributes to all opponents an unworthy motive. He has done a good deal to discredit the word "liberal" as applied to the political world. Matthew Arnold, a genuine social reformer, who once described himself as a liberal of the future, asserted that a liberal must keep himself free from petty hatreds and prejudice. There are none like him in the New Deal gang. They resent criticism no matter from whom it comes.

The best that can be said about Mr. Roosevelt is that he is a pleasant man, but shallow on fundamentals and pleasant only when he is not opposed.

His record furnishes us with no reason for entrusting him with the conduct of national affairs for another 4 years. Under his confused and spendthrift rule the Nation has been hurried toward eventual bankruptcy. Leading Democrats have protested these policies in vain. Many good Democrats, who voted for him in 1932, are now joining in this chorus. The country is not going to revolt in November. It has already revolted. The determination to turn to sound principle has already been made by the people. This is apparent everywhere. The only question to be immediately decided is into whose hands to place the new leadership. This question is to be decided at Cleveland next month, which brings me before closing to a few words to the Republican voters and delegates to the national convention.

Herein rests our great responsibility. I believe it paramount that every Republican urge his or her delegate to use their influence to elect the strongest possible candidate with the adoption of a platform devoid of bunk and capable of performance. It should be straightforward, concise, and clearly stating the honest and actual intentions of the Republican leadership.

For the last 3 years we have been at the mercy of the Roosevelt-Farley gang, who have posed as the Democratic Party while violating almost every fundamental principle upon which that party has

formerly stood. The Republican Party must appeal to persons of moderate circumstances and moderate frame of mind and to the young people of our country looking to the future. Those in moderate circumstances are the backbone of America. The everyday man and woman of America, the heads of families, have a great stake in the Republican Party. Only through it can their families, their homes, their savings, and their ideals find protection against rising socialism and its great bureaucracy.

If the Republican Party should nominate a man who is merely the heir of old and broken-down machine politics, a man who has not rubbed elbows with his fellow men, we had better close up shop today. But we will not nominate such a man.

With this the Republican Party will represent common sense over socialism, common honesty over crazy bureaucracy, common decency over a lower code. If we will give this great majority in this country of common men and women the chance to make the choice, there can be no question of a victory in November. It will be a victory for American traditions and principles.

THE DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD dated tomorrow a copy of a letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate conferees on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, answering a letter I have just received from him, and outlining a matter coming into conference on Monday morning next between the House and the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent extend in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated tomorrow the chairman of the Senate conferees on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 30, 1936.

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Conferees, District Appropriation Bill,
Senate Office Building.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Your letter of May 29 (embracing 5 pages, typewritten, single-spaced) addressed to me as chairman of the House conferees, copies of which at the time of sending you gave yesterday to the five Washington newspapers for publication, is before me for reply.

Your procedure, Senator, is most unusual and unprecedented. We five House managers invited you and the other Senate managers to meet us in conference next Monday, hoping that it might be possible then to reach an agreement on the 87 Senate amendments you placed on the House appropriation bill. You could have telephoned your acceptance. It required no five-page letter. Yet on Friday, when agreeing to meet us in conference next Monday, you made an attempt to prejudge and predetermine all of the issues of the conference, by making an extended argument in your five-page letter, given front-page notoriety last night and this morning by your personally interested ardent backers—the local newspapers.

I won't complain, however, Senator, but accept the situation with much gratification, because your unprecedented action inviting from me a reply, affords me a most apropos opportunity, thus by you made both parliamentary and proper, frankly and fully to place before you and the public the exact position of the House conferees, which you and your forum, the interested Washington newspapers, continue to ignore and misrepresent, and with erroneous statements and counterfeit logic seek to avoid.

We are not going to let you side-step the issues or misrepresent the facts or shift the responsibility. You placed 87 Senate amendments on the House bill, which, without question or consideration, passed the Senate in 15 minutes, as so reported by all local newspapers. Your 87 Senate amendments involved millions of dollars, 6 being legislative matters that should have been reported only by a legislative committee. One is to establish pay parking meters in Washington, so that every person who parks an automobile in their Nation's Capital would be forced to pay tribute to one monopoly. You did not expect the House to agree to your 87 amendments, because you asked for a conference and had Senate conferees appointed immediately, before any House Member had seen any of your 87 amendments, and the local papers immediately quoted you as saying that the House would be compelled to agree to the Senate action or there would be no bill, and you would pass a continuing resolution.

In your first amendment you demanded that the taxpayers of the United States should contribute, out of their Federal Treasury, the huge sum of $5,700,000 on the local civic expenses of the Washington people. You at the time had access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which showed that when such proposal was made in the House only 11 Members voted for it, and that upon a record roll-call vote in the House the bill passed allowing a contribution of only $2,700,000, with only 26 Members voting against it.

Then, again, you knew that the House subcommittee had held exhaustive hearings on the request of Superintendent Ballou to give him $78,660 to be spent on his so-called character education, and that the House committeemen, by a unanimous vote, had decided that the $87,540 you allowed Ballou last year, and the $63,385 you allowed him the year before, had been wasted, misspent, and perverted; that he was using it on only 10 of his 175 schools, and was doing no good, but lots of harm; and they unanimously refused to allow any part of the $78,660, and the House approved their action by passing the bill, with only 26 Members voting against it on record roll-call vote. Yet, by amendment, you had the Senate to place this $78,660 in the bill for Dr. Ballou to waste and misspend.

Then, again, you knew that through hearings the House subcommittee had ascertained that judges drawing salaries of from $8,000 to $12,500, and prosecuting attorneys drawing large salaries up to $8,000, and doctors drawing salaries up to $7,500, and other employees drawing high salaries were selling part of their time to outside employers, and the House provided in its bill that no such official or employee drawing as much as $2,400 per year should accept outside employment, and you placed a Senate amendment on our bill, striking out this House limitation, which was included in the House bill which passed with only 26 votes against it on roll-call record vote.

I firmly believe that 95 percent of the people of Texas would strongly support the House on the above three issues. I firmly believe that in spite of your tremendous popularity in your own State, and the honor and eulogies your five Washington newspapers daily bestow upon you for fighting their battles, that 90 percent of the people of Oklahoma would strongly support the House on all three of the above issues.

Yet, Senator, you have held this bill in deadlock since April 24 1936, notwithstanding the fact that in a final effort to get a bill so that the District of Columbia would not be deprived of some urgent, badly needed, new construction and equipment the House conferees proposed that if the Senate would yield on the three propositions above mentioned that the House conferees most generously would yield on the other 84 Senate amendments. You refused. You claimed that an expert named Parker, and Mr. Richards, had given convincing proof that Washington people were overtaxed and we asked to be allowed to question them, and you arranged for the Senate and House conferees to meet in joint hearing on May 7, 1936, to hear Parker and Richards.

We met together on May 7, 1936, to hear Parker and Richards and, to our surprise, you had no stenographer there to take down the evidence. We asked that you call one of the official stenographers, as we wanted the evidence taken down and printed, so that it would be of some value. To our great surprise, you obstinately refused to have a stenographer or to have it taken down, so all five of our House managers refused to sit with you in the hearing, as your arbitrary action caused all of us to have suspicions regarding the entire proceeding. We all withdrew and learned afterward that you then sent for a stenographer, and, with our House conferees absent and with no opportunity for any of us to ask the witnesses questions, you proceeded to allow them to introduce a lot of irrelevant, erroneous documents and statements which, had we been present, we could have made them admit, through pertinent questioning, were of no value and had no probative force and effect whatsoever; yet you had same printed into a worthless document of 53 printed pages.

We House conferees finally succeeded in getting this Mr. L. H. Parker before us on May 13, 1936, and we elicited from him facts that you made no attempt to develop. We made him admit that he is drawing an annual salary of $9,600 from the Government, yet last October accepted employment from the Washington Board of Trade, and that they paid him $5,500 in cash for his absurd, ridiculous statement that "Washington is the third highest taxed city in the United States." Every posted person in Congress knows there is no truth whatever in such statement. His 26 pages of testimony in our printed hearings show that Parker does not know anything whatever about Washington taxes.

Parker was in error about the date he bought his own home, and as to what he paid for it, and as to its assessed value. He testified that he bought it new in 1929, when he bought it in 1931; he testified he paid $17,250 for it, when he paid $17,950 for it; he testified that during the 3 years he owned it it was assessed at $14,000, when during said time it was assessed at $11,010 and it is now assessed at only $10,110; he testified he paid an automobile tax of $18, when the tax official, Mr. Allen, certifies that he paid only $2, of which $1 was a property tax on his auto and the other $1 was for registration and annual license tags.

I will guarantee that neither the people of Texas nor Oklahoma would give any credence to the evidence of a man who had been paid $5,500 in cash for giving it.

As to Mr. Richards, since he has lately gotten on the board of trade pay roll, he has suddenly changed front from the evidence he has been giving us for the past 20 years. He won't deny that in 1927 the tax rate here was $1.80 per $100; that in 1928 the Commissioners lowered the tax rate to $1.70 per $100, and he was present, assenting to Commissioner Hazen's testimony in 1934 that "for 1934 they had lowered the tax rate from $1.70 to $1.50 per $100, which meant a saving that year to Washington taxpayers of $2,445,000; also that they had reduced the assessed valuation of real estate by $80,000,000, which meant another saving of $1,200,000, and for 1935 they were making an additional reduction in assessed valuation of real estate of $50,000,000; that they had given a 25-percent reduction in water charges, which meant another saving of $600,000, as they had increased the metered allowance from 7,500 to 10,000 cubic feet; and they were allowing 10 percent discount on bills, which meant another saving of $100,000 to local taxpayers.

Mr. Richards assenting thereto then heard Commissioner Hazen admit the many privileges Washington people enjoy, and the many exemptions from ordinary taxes they have which people in

other cities have to pay, and heard Commissioner Hazen testify that Washington people are the best cared for, are the least taxed, and enjoy more privileges than any other people in the United States.

You, Senator, and your conferees, made no attempt to elicit from Mr. Richards the reason for his change of front. We have a certificate from Maj. Daniel J. Donovan, auditor of the District, showing that instead of retiring on March 14, 1936, with retired pay for life of $1,265 per annum, payable in 12 equal monthly installments every year, Mr. Richards resigned on March 12, 1936, and will now draw no retired pay. He did this so he could go on the pay roll of the Washington Board of Trade. Many times he has testified that property here wanted by the Government has cost us as high as 10 times its assessed value, based on the evidence of Washington experts. Hence we do not pay any attention to his change-of-front testimony now, since he has gone on the pay roll of the Washington Board of Trade. When it has paid Parker $5,500 for giving them a worthless statement, it must be paying Mr. Richards pretty high compensation to induce him to waive his retired pay for life.

You contend, Senator, that taxes are not extremely low here. How about your own. You own your own apartment in the large apartment house at No. 1661 Crescent Place NW. There are 49 other apartments in this building owned by individuals like yourself, all taxed together as one piece of property. In 1933 this property embracing the 50 apartments was rendered at an assessed valuation of $687,450, upon which at the then tax rate of $1.70 on the $100, there was paid a tax of $11,686.66, your one-fiftieth of same being $233.73. This year said property embracing said 50 apartments is rendered at an assessed valuation of only $597,705, which is a reduction in assessed value of $89,745 since 1933, and the tax paid this year at the reduced tax rate of only $1.50 per the $100, is $8,965.58, your one-fiftieth part of same being only $179.31, if yours is an average of said 50 apartments. The above facts were certified to us by the tax assessor of the District of Columbia, who further shows that above your $1,000 household-furniture exemption allowed you here by law, you render $500 of household furniture upon which you pay an annual tax of only $7.50, and that your 1935-model family sedan is rendered at an assessed value of $785, upon which you pay a property tax of only $11.77, and that you pay $1 per year for your registration license tags. Don't you know, Senator, that the property you own here would cost you at least three times as much taxes per annum in Oklahoma or Texas as the amount you pay here in Washington?

In our House hearings we showed the actual renditions of all the newspapers in Washington and of about a hundred citizens drawing salaries of from $20,000 to $75,000 per year, and none of them would think of selling their property for double its assessed value, and some of them were paying $2 and $3 per annum on their family Cadillacs and Packards.

Your first bluff was that you would make the House give a Federal contribution of $5,700,000 by passing a continuing resolution, but we called that by assuring you the House would amend it, and refuse to allow it.

Then you bluffed again by stating you would force the President to pay the District expenses out of Federal relief funds so as to make all of the expense be borne by the United States, and the President called that bluff by stating he would use no relief funds for such purpose.

Now in your letter you bluff again by threatening to pass your ridiculous resolution to let the President appoint three men of the qualifications you specify, to decide what amount of Federal contribution Congress shall give to Washington people, and that we appropriate $50,000 to pay these men. And in your letter you say "the Government of the District of Columbia is the direct and unavoidable responsibility of the President." I thought you were acquainted with the Constitution. The President does not have any control whatsoever over the District of Columbia. It is not his concern. The Constitution provides that "the Congress shall exercise exclusive control." Watson on the Constitution, page 698, says: "The Constitution confers upon Congress absolute control and authority over the District of Columbia." In *Gibbons* v. *The District of Columbia*, and numerous other cases, the Supreme Court of the United States held that under clause 17, of section 8, of article I of the Constitution "Congress is given exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia for every purpose of government, national or local, in all cases whatsoever, including taxation." So the President has nothing to do with it. It is solely a responsibility of the Congress. And we are not going to allow you to shift it to the shoulders of the President. He appoints the Commissioners solely because Congress delegated that authority to him by statute.

Of course we know who would select the three men you have in mind. The Senate selects all judges, all prosecuting attorneys, all directors, all commissioners, all administrators, all heads of bureaus—all this and all that. You might, Senator, accidentally select some fellow like Parker, who, without your having found it out, had gotten on the pay roll of the Washington Board of Trade at $5,500 cash per high tax opinion, or you might accidentally select some fellow like Richards, who resigns without retirement pay so he can work for the Washington Board of Trade, when he could have retired and drawn retired pay for life of $1,265 per annum, which is a pretty fair pension.

What is the use of paying $50,000 to your three men when only last year President Roosevelt had his Treasury experts to make an investigation of taxes paid in 15 comparable cities, and he certified to us that the taxes paid in Washington are lower than those paid in any other cities of between 300,000 and 825,000 population in the United States.

Have you forgotten the long, expensive, exhaustive investigation made by the Mapes committee, which found taxes here so low they immediately had the House pass the four Mapes bills, increasing the gasoline tax, the tax on automobiles and trucks, providing an income tax, and other taxes that people in all other cities pay, and all of said bills died in the Senate. We are not going to waste another $50,000 on any worthless commission.

Before I conclude, Senator, I must remind you of a few of the things the United States has done for the District. It has made out of a swampy, unhealthy, mosquito-ridden, small town, one of the finest, most beautiful cities in the world, where lots that formerly you could hardly give away, are now worth a fortune. It owns the original water conduit here, and has spent over $20,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury in perfecting the water system. It has built the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial and reflecting pools used for skating in winter, the $14,750,000 Memorial Bridge, the wonderful new boulevard highway to Mount Vernon, the $10,000,000 Supreme Court Building, the magnificent Congressional Library, and scores of other remarkable places of interest, all with United States money, that attract hundreds of thousands of tourists here constantly. The Washington Star for April 26, 1936, quoted the board of trade as stating that during the last 5 years visitors to Washington had spent the enormous sum of $221,547,992 in cash, which greatly benefited every businessman in Washington.

Moreover, under the old regime, the Government paid all of the debts incurred by the District, and has kept it out of debt with large annual contributions from the Federal Treasury, so people here pay no interest.

And under the old unjust 50–50 arrangements, the United States furnished half of the money to install the sewer system here, to pave the streets, to build the many fine bridges, including the million-dollar bridge on Connecticut Avenue, to build most of the 175 school buildings of Washington, to procure and develop the numerous fine playgrounds, the 1,200 parks, big and little, the jail, penitentiary, the courts, the municipal building, the markets, some hospitals, branch libraries, and many other permanent improvements which people of all other cities must buy and pay for themselves without help.

People in other cities have to pay State taxes, county taxes, school taxes, water taxes, and many other special taxes. Here in Washington people pay one tax of $1.50 on the $100 on both tangible personal property and on real estate. They pay only one-half of 1 percent on intangibles. They get their water furnished for only $6.60 per year for an average family, with a 10-percent discount on that when paid within 15 days after due. They pay only 2 cents gasoline tax, when it is 7 cents in Tennessee, 5 cents right over here in Virginia, and 4 cents right over here in Maryland, plus a sales tax. They pay only $1 per year for registration and license tags on automobiles and trucks, no matter whether they are a fourth-hand Ford or a $12,000 new Rolls Royce. They are allowed $1,000 of household furniture exempt from all taxes. They have the wearing apparel, whether worth $5 or $50,000, exempt from taxes. They have their private libraries, whether worth $5 or $50,000, exempt from all taxes. They have their ashes gathered free, their trash gathered free, and their garbage gathered free. They pay no monthly or yearly charge for sewer service. They do not have to pay for repairing or repaving of streets contiguous to their property. They do not have to pay for repairing or repaving sidewalks around their property. The shade and ornamental trees in front of their property are furnished free, have fences built around them free to protect the first few years of early growth, are pruned free, are sprayed free, are cared for free, and are replaced free when they die. Other than the Federal taxes that people in all cities pay, the Washington people pay no estate tax, no inheritance tax, no gift tax, no income tax, and no sales tax.

The Washington people enjoy the pansy beds, the rose gardens, the cherry blossoms, the flower-covered Hains Point Drive, the Capitol, the Congressional Library, the national functions, all without cost to them.

No wonder that Commissioner Hazen was forced to truthfully say that "Washington people were better treated, were least taxed, and enjoyed more privileges than any other people in the United States."

You speak about the "voiceless people of Washington." They are not voiceless. They have you and other Senators fighting all the time to give them everything they want. I am thinking of the "voiceless people of Texas", the "voiceless people of Oklahoma", who can't be heard here when you are taking $5,700,000 of their money out of the Treasury and giving it to Washington people. I am making my fight to protect the people of Texas, and the people of Oklahoma, and the people of the other States from having to make an unjust contribution on the annual taxes of Washington people.

I have discussed the matter with many of my House colleagues, and they assure me that this is one time they are not going to knuckle down to these unreasonable demands. The newspapers have misrepresented and misquoted the Speaker on this subject. They have misrepresented and misquoted the President about it. The President knows just how pampered Washington people are, and he is not going to be unjust to the other 120,000,000 people of the United States just to give this handsome $5,700,000 birthday present to Washington people every year.

You speak of the President's Budget. Congress goes under and over it all the time. It merely fixes a maximum. The President expects Congress to keep under it, otherwise there would be no need of Congress. We could all stay at home and let the Budget estimates be spent. You, however, have already realized to what

an impossible extreme your contention about the Budget has carried you, for the Budget does not authorize the Eastern High School, or the Police Court Building, or the Chain Bridge, or the needed fire trucks and apparatus.

As none of the Washington papers would dare to publish this letter, my only means of getting the facts of this situation before the American public, is to publish it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, fortunately, the House granted me consent to do so last evening before we adjourned. We House conferees are willing to meet you Monday on the 87 Senate amendments, and see whether we can reach an agreement, which I believe is preferable to any continuing resolution.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Chairman, House Conferees.

DEMOCRATIC ACHIEVEMENTS

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address of Postmaster General James A. Farley, Democratic National and State chairman, at a testimonial dinner given in his honor at the Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse, N. Y., Thursday night, May 21, 1936, 7 p. m., by the Onondaga County Democratic committee, and broadcast over radio stations WFBL and WFYR, both of Syracuse:

It is a great pleasure for me to join with my friends of central New York in this fine gathering that has assembled for the purpose of lending further impetus to the sweeping wave of Democracy. We are nearing the time of the national convention and national campaign with increasing enthusiasm everywhere, which is indicative of the even greater confidence that a confident people have in the leadership of our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

His leadership has been on behalf of the great mass of our people. He has realized, more than anyone else before him, that our national prosperity depends upon the prosperity of all our people, and it would be well for those more abundant in wealth to delve deeply into the facts beyond this simple truth, for if they did they would find that even they would profit more if those less favored prospered more.

Their nearsightedness in this regard is unexplainable. No one has reason to know this more than the people of New York State, who have lately witnessed the sorry spectacle of the so-called young stalwarts in the Republican assembly blocking by obstructionist methods the benefits accruing from the National Social Security Act. Because of the stupid tactics of a stupid opposition a grave injustice is being done the sick, the infirm, the crippled, and the aged of this State for no logical reason whatever.

The battle waged on behalf of the State Social Security Act by our Democratic legislators, and by those Republican legislators whose intelligence surpassed their partisanship, is fresh in your memory. We have reason to be thankful that this whole question was kept before the people right up to the closing days of the legislature by the battle waged by our militant Governor. I say with all sincerity that the unceasing struggle in this fight made by him insures by a greater plurality than ever the reelection this fall of a Democratic Governor and our entire Democratic State ticket.

I predict that the Democrats will not only retain their strength in the State senate but I also prophesy that the anger of our people against those who refused to do the right thing by the crippled, the sick, the aged, and infirm will result in the defeat of a great number of Tory assemblymen and may again give our party the control of the lower house, as was the case in 1935, when a complete Democratic administration gave the people of the State the finest program of legislation ever enacted.

In the field of national affairs I know of no way to more clearly bring out the barrenness of the opposition than to ask a few simple and plainly understandable questions:

Have you noticed that none of the enemies of President Roosevelt invite a comparison between what he has done and what was done under the Republicans?

Have you noticed that none of his critics invite a comparison between the condition of the farmers under Roosevelt and under Hoover?

Have you noticed that not one of these pompous "saviors of America" invite a comparison between the more than 6,000 bank failures under Republican rule and the less than 400 under Roosevelt, and under Roosevelt the depositors of the closed banks were saved millions of dollars under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?

Have you noticed that even Hoover does not ask you to compare the production of the great basic industries under his administration with the production under Roosevelt?

Have you noticed that the spokesmen of predatory interests do not ask a comparison between the trade of retail stores throughout the country during the Hoover and Roosevelt administrations?

Have you noticed that these champions of the old deal do not dare talk about conditions in the last 4 years of the old deal?

Have you noticed that all their speeches are appeals to the big-money interests and find no time for a discussion of the rights and conditions of the masses of the people?

Have you noticed that Chairman Fletcher, who manages the old-deal campaign, instead of boasting of principles and enunciating policies, confines his boasting to the amount of money his people are able to raise to put an end to government by the people?

Have you noticed that the old deal has not yet submitted substitute plans for the Roosevelt policies, and that its spokesmen are as barren of constructive suggestions on raising the depression now as they were during the last 4 Republican years when our condition grew more desperate with each succeeding month?

Have you noticed how all those called by Theodore Roosevelt "the malefactors of great wealth" are united against Franklin D. Roosevelt?

If you have not noticed, notice now, and meditate on the meaning.

There is a meaning that requires no great brain to figure out.

Whether it is abysmal ignorance or sheer dishonesty, the constant reference by themselves and by the press to the special pleaders of the predatory interests as Jeffersonians and Jacksonians is grotesque.

No Jacksonian or Jeffersonian at any time in history would have been permitted to contaminate the rarified atmosphere of that precious company. It represented more openly than ever before in the country's record the "ganging up" of the privileged against the people and a people's government.

But it was not the first time these privileged few have "ganged up." They "ganged up" against Jefferson, fought him tooth and nail, denounced him constantly, and everywhere ostracized his followers from the drawing rooms of the fashionable and the favored.

They "ganged up" with a vengeance against Jackson—referred to him as a Socialist, an ignoramus, a creature of the mob, unfit to associate with gentlemen, and ostracized his followers from their assemblages.

The purpose of the New Deal is—

To end privilege, which was the heart of the purpose of Jefferson and Jackson.

To protect the interests and proper opportunities of the average man, which was the soul of the programs of Jefferson and Jackson.

To make government the instrument of the people for the service of all the people, which was the fight made by Jefferson and Jackson.

To make impossible the dictatorship of money, which was the basis of the struggles of both Jefferson and Jackson.

To prevent by proper laws the rule of monopoly and autocracy, which was what called down on Jefferson and Jackson the hatred of the seekers of privilege.

Both Jefferson and Jackson stood for constitutional government precisely as Franklin D. Roosevelt stands for it.

And both were denounced by the Federalists and Whigs of their day as wreckers of the Constitution—as Roosevelt is today.

There was scarcely a single measure of Jefferson's administration that was not denounced as a violation of the Constitution. This is not hyperbole for the purpose of making a startling statement. The facts are:

That when Jefferson repealed the judiciary act passed in the last hours before his inauguration to pack the Federal courts with enemies of democracy, they said he was violating the Constitution.

When he demanded a constitutional amendment on the election of Presidents, he was ferociously attacked for "destroying the Constitution."

When he gave us the embargo law, he was hysterically denounced by certain business interests for violating the Constitution.

It would be hard to find a single Federalist speech made in Congress or a single editorial in a Federalist paper through the 8 years of his Presidency in which Jefferson was not held out as a violator of the Constitution and a wrecker of "American institutions."

And that which was true of Jefferson was just as true of Jackson. He was continuously abused as a wrecker of the Constitution during the 8 years of his Presidency.

It was a lie about Jefferson and Jackson—and just as much of a lie about Roosevelt.

But Jefferson did act beyond the Constitution once, and consciously. It was when he acquired the vast empire of Louisiana by purchase.

He knew what we all know now—that the acquisition of this territory, removing it from the clutches of Europe, was necessary to the future of the Nation. He knew that failure peaceably to secure it would probably mean war. Everyone agreed to that. And when he found he could buy it, he bought it.

But he could not thus acquire it without going beyond the Constitution. He might have asked for a constitutional amendment. He thought about it. But at the time Spain was protesting to France, and France was winning her battles in the war, and delay might easily have been fatal to the purchase. He was unwilling to sacrifice the vital interest of the Nation at such a time. And so he bought and kept Louisiana without an amendment. He did not believe that when the life of the Nation and the vital interest of the people were at stake that he could justify a gamble.

When we want an opinion of Jeffersonian or Jacksonian democracy we will not go to public men whose whole careers has been built on the Hamiltonian or anti-Jefferson theory of government.

We prefer to go to history and to the published works of Jefferson and Jackson.

Just as these men fought the battle of the common people, Roosevelt is fighting it today. Just as they were the pet aversions of the plutocrats of their day, Roosevelt is today. Just as they were denounced for violating the principle of constitutional government, Roosevelt is today. Just as they were pictured constantly as destroying American institutions, Roosevelt is today. Just as they were said to be arraying class against class, Roosevelt is today.

And just as Jefferson and Jackson prevailed over the plutocracy of their time, Roosevelt is today.

And his victory will come because truth will prevail over the distortion of facts being issued as opposition propaganda.

The old dealers are clearly not prepared in attacking the New Deal to invite comparisons with the old. The strategy agreed upon is to leave the old deal out of consideration at all. But since the old dealers want the old deal back, and if successful at the polls propose to bring it back, the comparison of the old deal and the new is inevitable. It is necessary.

Frightened at the thought of the comparison the reactionary politicians and the interests they represent have thought to divert attention from the old deal by raising the clamor for a square deal as against the New Deal.

True the average man—the farmer, the worker, the miner—has been getting the squarest deal he has had in generations under the New Deal, but the interests are not thinking of these.

They want a kind of square deal that will allow financial tricksters and gamblers to enrich themselves as before by gambling with the money of innocent investors resulting in the loss of hundreds of millions.

They want a square deal for the banks, which to some of them means the right to use depositors' money for gambling enterprises on the market while refusing loans to legitimate business enterprise.

It has been made dangerous under the New Deal for great banking institutions to flood the American market with foreign bonds the bankers knew or were warned would be repudiated, and these financial speculators want a "square deal" of a type that will allow a renewal of such nefarious practices.

The exploiters of the farmers, who have bought the products of their toil at ruinous prices and raised the price to the consumers for their own enrichment, want their kind of a square deal. The New Deal has brought the intervention of the people's Government for the protection of the farmers who feed the Nation.

Those who by questionable methods of manipulation flooded the market with securities that brought prices grotesquely out of proportion with the value of the stock, and are now compelled to play fair with the investing public, are clamoring for a square deal. All the New Deal has done has been to protect the honest investor in his savings; and that is not a square deal at all in their way of thinking.

The utility combines, whose methods are well illustrated in the revelations of the lobby investigation, and who have been milking the public with the smug acquiescence of Government, are threatened with regulations that will give a square deal to the consumers—but to the power magnates this is not a square deal for them.

Under the New Deal does the farmer get a square deal? Ask them. The answer is "yes."

Does the worker get a square deal? Ask them. Their spokesmen declare that under the New Deal they are getting the squarest deal they have ever had.

The men in industry, growing old after a lifetime of service for society in the factories, and haunted by the fear of being thrown out into the street to starve when too old to work, are now insured against that horror by the New Deal—and that is a square deal for them.

The average man depositing his hard-earned money in banks as a protection for his old age, for the education of his children, whose money was swept away under the old deal because of vicious banking methods, is now protected—and under the New Deal he has a square deal, too.

And the honest legitimate banker, whose bank was losing the confidence of the public because of the vicious methods of unscrupulous bankers, has been accorded a square deal by the New Deal reforms, which restores the confidence of his patrons.

Does the miner, reduced to desperation by the state of chaos to which selfishness has reduced the great mining industry, get a square deal under the New Deal? The head of the miners declares publicly they are coming nearer to getting a square deal than ever before.

And does the jobless, anxious to work, and left to private charity for bread for himself and children, want the old deal or the new? Under which does he get a square deal? Ask him! He will answer in the affirmative.

The reactionaries seeking a restoration of the old deal are the old dealers who never gave a square deal to the public in their lives and never will, without the intervention of the people's Government.

The issue is the New Deal with its square deal against the Old Deal, in whose vocabulary the words "square deal" never appeared until now.

Is the New Deal a square deal for you? The answer is yes; and it is my honest opinion that so many affirmative votes will be registered in November as to cause our critics to shudder in their selfishness and our supporters to contemplate with confidence the completion of the entire New Deal program under 4 more years of Roosevelt and recovery.

OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION A STRONG FACTOR

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of two things a nation must always do, pay small sums to educate and train its youth or pay large sums to regulate crime and build prison walls.

It almost dumbfounds us when our attention is called to the fact that in 1932 we spent only $2,968,010,400 to educate and train the youth of our Nation, while we spent $12,000,000,000 to look after crime and all of its ramifications. In other words, we spent practically four times as much money in 1932 for crime as we did to educate and train our youth. We spent more money in these United States in 1932 for crime and its ramifications than we did to build and support churches, plus homes for our people, plus educating and training our youth for future citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I am strong for the support of this vocational education bill now before this House. Speaking of national defense of our Nation, the only national defense we have for the future of the Nation lies in the training of the boys and the girls who are to take up the reins of Government when we lay them down.

Without a record vote, a few weeks ago this House passed the national defense war bill of $600,000,000 and the Navy bill of over $500,000,000 for the national defense of our Nation.

And now there is a disposition on the part of some to question the advisability of giving $12,000,000 a year to educate the hand, the heart, and the head of the boys and girls of this Nation to equip them to go out into life's school and earn an honest living.

Mr. Speaker, someone has well said, "We must educate, or we must perish." This axiom is ever true. To perpetuate our form of government we must educate our boys and girls in homemaking, in industrial arts, and in agricultural pursuits.

We must see to it that when our youth go out into the business world that they have a clear understanding of what is necessary in business procedure and government in order to perpetuate our institutions. We must put forth every effort to bring them to a full realization that the homes, the schools, and the churches of our Nation must be perpetuated if our democracy is to continue to function. We must adjust our educational institutions from time to time so as to dovetail into the social and economic conditions as each succeeding generation finds them.

Therefore, it is only natural that the youth of our Nation should expect this Congress to give them this $12,000,000 in order that they may be better trained in the vocational avenues they will have to travel when they get out in the workaday world.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 12870. An act to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936; and

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

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. 11687) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution empowering the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to have printed 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the subcommittee of said committee of the Senate during the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress pursuant to the resolution (S. Res. 185) authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to conduct an investigation of the expenditures by the Federal Government for the cotton cooperatives, etc.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment no. 2 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.

REFERENCE OF PRIVATE CLAIMS BILLS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. Res. 498 which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 498

Resolved, That Rule XXI, clause 3, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"3. No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent; to any other than the following-named committees, namely: To the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to the Committee on Pensions, to the Committee on Claims, to the Committee on War Claims, to the Committee on the Public Lands, and to the Committee on Accounts."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please explain the reason for this?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment of the rules with reference to the referring of private claims bills. For many years the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been handling private claims relating to the Consular Service. Some time ago a suggestion was made that a point of order might lie against such claims. There are some on the Consent Calendar, and to obviate the possibility of a point of order being made against a long-established custom, an amendment to this rule seems necessary, and the Committee on Rules reported it out and it was thought that this would be the most expeditious way of disposing of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand, the other committees are agreeable to this?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain whether or not this resolution changes the rule with respect to the committees that are authorized to report out bills appropriating money?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Not at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 38

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I shall not object, because we want to have a good celebration when Governor Landon is inaugurated next January; but will the gentleman please explain why we should make the arrangements now?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the "lame duck" amendment advanced the date of the inauguration from March 4 to January 20. When the inauguration was on March 4 the Congress, which met in December, could provide for this, but arrangements must be made sometime in the fall, or not later than November, as I am informed, for the celebration of the event to which the gentleman from Massachusetts so optimistically referred.

If the committee is going to handle it, it must be done now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

PARKS AND PARKWAYS FOR RECREATIONAL-AREA PURPOSES

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10104) to aid in providing the people of the United States with adequate facilities for park, parkway, and recreational-area purposes, and to provide for the transfer of certain lands chiefly valuable for such purposes to States and political subdivisions thereof, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman say something about these amendments?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This bill was passed by the House, and the Senate did away with about three-fourths of the bill, but permitted it to pass in one particular only.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What does the bill really provide, as it now stands?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It provides for the cooperation with States in making surveys of national parks and park areas.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has this been to a committee?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This bill was passed by the House. It went to the Senate, and the Senate amended it, and we are asking to accept the Senate amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman should withdraw it for the time being and let us look into it. The members of that committee on this side of the House are not present at this time.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I must object.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 522.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 522

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 12027, a bill to authorize the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Thomas Jefferson, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Library, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest expressed, I might say that the Rules Committee does not propose to call up any other resolutions after this one today.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. If the rule is passed now, does the gentleman expect to call up the bill this afternoon or on Monday?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We expect to call it up this afternoon. There is only 1 hour of general debate. I do not think we will take very much time on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take but a few minutes on the rule, because the Members are all familiar with it.

The subject matter is that of providing a memorial in the city of Washington to the memory of Thomas Jefferson. On April 13 last I delivered an address, in which I explained in detail what the commission proposed to do. That date was the one hundred and ninety-third anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

In the Seventy-third Congress I introduced a resolution calling for the appointment of a committee to take this matter under consideration. The committee consisted of three members appointed by the President of the Senate, three members appointed by the Speaker of the House, three members appointed by the President of the United States, and three members appointed by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation. That is the foundation that raised the funds to purchase the home and grounds of Thomas Jefferson at Monticello.

The Members of the House were the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, the gentleman from New York, Mr. CULKIN, and myself. Those appointed by the Senate were Senator MCNARY, Senator LONERGAN, and Senator THOMAS of Utah. The Presidential appointees were Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, Collins Randolph, both lineal descendants of Thomas Jefferson, and Joseph Tumulty. The representatives from the Thomas Jefferson Foundation were Stewart Giboney of New York, president of that foundation, Fiske Kimball of Philadelphia, director of the Metropolitan Museum of Philadelphia, and the third representative, Dr. George Ryan of New York, president of the board of education, who was instrumental in raising the funds for the purchase of Monticello.

We have worked on the project and secured the services of a distinguished architect, John Russell Pope, who was the architect of the Archives Building in Washington, the most beautiful of the group, from Pennsylvania to Constitution Avenue; he was also architect of the famous war memorials for the United States Government abroad, and the buildings of Yale University, and also architect of the Shriners' Temple in Washington on Sixteenth Street, the most beautiful specimen of Egyptian architecture in the United States. Everything we have done has been in harmony with the Fine Arts Commission and with the National Park and Planning Commission. We have reached a state now that we are asking for the authorization to go ahead with our plans. The understanding of all concerned is that no application is to be made this year for any funds. The application for funds will be made to the next Congress or some subsequent Congress. All we ask today is an authorization for funds, so that it can be honored at some future time, and we can proceed to the erection of this memorial.

You all know the particular reasons why we should honor Jefferson. If there would be no other reason, it would be the fact that he was the author of the Declaration of Independence. Just consider a young lawyer journeying to the city of Philadelphia from his home in Virginia, at that time in his early thirties, and sitting down in a small furnished room in a house in the city of Philadelphia and writing the Declaration of Independence. Those of us who have to make little speeches here on various subjects on the floor know how we sometimes have to sweat it out of ourselves. We have to get information from various sources, look up works of reference; yet here was a young lawyer who came into this small room in a house in Philadelphia, sat down, and wrote with his own hand, without any assistance whatever, the Declaration of Independence.

As I have explained, there is no partisanship at all in the appointment of this commission, as both parties are represented. We regard, and most Americans regard, Jefferson as next in the hearts of the people to George Washington. Other founding fathers throughout the years ought to be remembered, but at this time we seek to honor the memory of Thomas Jefferson.

Just imagine! The average visitor comes to the city of Washington and inquires where he can find the Jefferson memorial, only to be told there is no memorial to Jefferson in the Nation's Capital except one small statue outside the east entrance of the Hall of the House of Representatives, and that is on a raised pedestal, and unless someone attracts your attention to it you do not even see it.

Jefferson himself was a very modest and unassuming man; and I think at this late date it is little enough for us, in appreciation of the splendid services he rendered the Republic, to erect this monument to him in the Capital City. We do not ask that it be erected anywhere but in Washington, where the whole Nation will see it and where it will stand out as the offering of a grateful people to the young Virginian who did so much toward the founding of our country. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Have the plans gone so far that the type of a memorial has been determined upon?

Mr. BOYLAN. Not except that it is to be of classical design. Several suggestions have been made. It has been suggested that it be a large monument of Jefferson and to the rear or the sides of it a marble building to house Jeffersoniana.

Mr. GIFFORD. Would there be a profile of Jefferson himself?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes; I may add that the building would house not only Jeffersoniana, but matters that have been written about him.

Mr. GIFFORD. Would the gentleman mind a suggestion? I would suggest to the members of the commission that if there is to be a profile of Jefferson himself, it be made with tears streaming down the cheeks.

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not quite get the meaning the gentleman desires to convey.

Mr. GIFFORD. Our liberties have gone; and he would be feeling dreadfully about it were he alive. He should be so pictured, should he not?

Mr. BOYLAN. I may say to my friend from the illustrious shores of rugged Cape Cod that our greatest concern in this matter is honoring the memory of Jefferson.

Mr. GIFFORD. Only a memory.

Mr. BOYLAN. We are not going into the philosophy of the situation; we are simply asking a memorial to perpetuate the name of the man who wrote the Declaration of Independence, who was the author of the statute of religious liberty in Virginia, and who was the founder of the University of Virginia.

Mr. GIFFORD. And he is only a memory; not a living, vital force. I was hoping somebody would suggest that the freedom he advocated still lived and that his works of long ago still existed.

Mr. BOYLAN. I am sure any aid or assistance the gentleman could give to perpetuate the name, the fame, and the memory of Thomas Jefferson would be gratefully appreciated by the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, gladly.

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.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time that the party in power has made any move to honor the memory of an outstanding Republican. Not only was Thomas Jefferson an outstanding Republican, but he was one of the early exponents of an adequate tariff to promote and protect American industry. The time was when Thomas Jefferson's memory was honored by the Democrats. Yearly they gave Jefferson dinners in various parts of the country at $1 per plate, but as the need for Democratic campaign funds increased the New Dealers realized they could not very well boost the price to $50 per plate at a Jefferson dinner because he had been held up to us as the embodiment of simplicity and rugged Americanism. So the party in power placed Mr. Jefferson upon the shelf and brought Andrew Jackson down, dusted him off, and put on a $50 dinner, not only in Washington but in various parts of the country. They could, of course, think of no more appropriate date upon which to give a $50 dinner than on Jackson Day because Andrew Jackson believed in the spoils system.

Thomas Jefferson went into partial eclipse when it was found that the New Deal program ran contrary to the Constitution of the United States. No more do we hear him mentioned on your side of the aisle. He is not even a memory to most of you. I have often wondered, as I have sat in this Chamber the past 3 years, what Mr. Jefferson must be thinking as he looks down from his place in the azure blue and contemplates what those who belong to the party to which he belonged are doing in the name of democracy and to bring about a more abundant life.

The Republicans revere the name of Thomas Jefferson. We believe he was a great American. He does not need a memorial to perpetuate his name and fame any more than do Lincoln and Washington, but now that we have erected memorials to those two great Republicans it is only fitting and proper that we erect a memorial to that other great Republican, Thomas Jefferson. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, before leaving the Chamber my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], prepared an amendment which he asked me to offer in his absence. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read this amendment in my time.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not yield time for the purpose of amending the rule.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have 10 minutes, and I hope the gentleman will not consume my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I did not yield for the purpose of amending the rule.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am just having the amendment read so that the Members may give it consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNUTSON for information: Page 1, line 12, after "$3,000,000", insert: "*Provided*, That there shall be inscribed upon such monument or memorial the oath taken by Mr. Roosevelt to 'implicitly follow and observe the principles and teachings of government enunciated by Thomas Jefferson.'"

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. Who did the gentleman say proposed this amendment?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not surprised that he refrained from offering it himself and delegating that task to the gentleman from Minnesota. He was probably ashamed to do it in person.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will say to my good friend that the gentleman from Pensylvania [Mr. RICH], who could not be here, merely wishes to remind the majority of certain obligations that the Democratic Party took 3 years ago, which have been very conveniently forgotten. Of course, you all would prefer to forget certain things that were promised to the American people in 1932.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thought there was considerable interest in this matter, else I would not have requested the 5 minutes. I do want to suggest, however, that this is an inopportune time to erect a memorial to Thomas Jefferson. I think I may well be speaking for the real Jeffersonian Democrats, most of whom are now taking a walk. It would seem that at this time the matter of expense ought to appeal to you, but the matter of $3,000,000 is nothing for this administration after all. People may be going hungry and dependent on relief, yet you consider spending money for such a purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will not think I am lacking in full appreciation of this great man. I think we should perhaps do something to perpetuate his memory, even if his great works and doctrines have now been abandoned by his party. Certainly I recall that he made a great struggle for the liberties of the people. I read somewhere only yesterday that it would be harder to get back our liberties from the Government bureaucracy, which we are establishing at the present time, than if our liberties had been taken away by a dictator. These great bureaus will wish to perpetuate the stranglehold which they are steadily acquiring over us.

Do you Democrats really feel that you have been loyal enough to Jeffersonian principles during these recent days of experimentation to point out to the young people of this Nation who come to Washington a great memorial to Jefferson? They will say "Yes; he was indeed a great patriot, but he did not believe as his own party believes today." They must necessarily have been taught about him, and they must know that we have departed almost entirely from his teachings. I wish I could bring back to my mind more quickly at this moment the many tenets that he held sacred and which have been so violently repudiated by his own followers. I was not entirely facetious when I suggested to the gentleman from New York that Jefferson ought to be pictured with tears streaming down his face if his likeness be included in the memorial.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has it ever occurred to the gentleman that perhaps the Democrats are trying to salve their consciences?

Mr. GIFFORD. It occurred to me that perhaps they feel at this particular time they ought to try to keep up appearances to the public at large by pretending at least they still believe in and respect their great leader of long ago.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. A moment ago the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] stated that he would like to know what Jefferson was thinking of as he looked down upon the New Deal.

I wonder what Jefferson thought when he looked down on the Harding administration and the Hoover administration of do nothing.

Mr. GIFFORD. Tears would be shed by some Republicans at some of the things that happened during the Harding administration.

Mr. HOUSTON. I would think so.

Mr. GIFFORD. We do not pretend that in all individual cases all our leaders were perfect.

Mr. HOUSTON. Does the gentleman mean those who are in the penitentiary as the outgrowth of that administration?

Mr. GIFFORD. We bow our heads in shame at some of the things that happened then. But we are willing to acknowledge it. Some people are big enough to do that.

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman does not boast of it?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; I do not boast of it. I recently heard your own President compared to that person who said, "If

I ever had the opportunity to acknowledge a mistake, I would be very glad to do it." But, of course, he appears unwilling as yet to acknowledge that any errors have occurred in these many futile experiments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12027) to authorize the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Thomas Jefferson.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12027, with Mr. SHANNON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire on this occasion to enter into any political argument about this proposal, but I should like to speak in my own time of some of the outstanding achievements in the life of Jefferson, which this memorial would commemorate.

Recently I visited the Library of Congress and had the privilege of looking over the library of Jefferson. I noted the wide scope of the scholarship of this great American. There were books on architecture, scientific farming, education, government, and various international questions.

Thomas Jefferson was able to speak and read six languages, and they say at the time of his death he was learning a seventh language.

We know of his great contribution to American government and to the affairs of the world.

A few years ago I had the pleasure of visiting Monticello, his home, and I observed that magnificent residence, which one great architect said was the finest and most outstanding piece of Grecian architecture embodied in residential style in America. I went down to the hillside of the old homestead where Jefferson is buried, and there on his monument is an epitaph written by Jefferson himself, and it is in these words:

> Here is buried Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of American Independence and of the statutes of Virginia for religious freedom and father of the University of Virginia.

This great American had been Governor of the State of Virginia. He had been our Minister to France. He had been Secretary of State under George Washington and Vice President under John Adams and twice President of the United States, but all of these political honors were ignored in his epitaph and he set out these three outstanding achievements: Author of the American Declaration of Independence, which sounded to the world the principles of representative democracy; author of the statutes of Virginia, the principles of which were later incorporated in the Bill of Rights, which gave American independence of religious thought and belief; and father of the University of Virginia, a democracy of education upon which any representative democracy in government must be based.

These were three outstanding achievements, but perhaps the greatest of these was authorship of the Declaration of Independence. Previous to the Revolution the world knew very little about representative government, governed only by monarchies. The doctrine of the divine right of kings prevailed, whereby the monarch could do no evil. Because of his divine appointment, the monarch ruled and could commit no error; but the fathers of the American Revolution had expressed in this Declaration their thought that government is dependent upon the consent of the governed, and America has made 150 years of progress along this line. If Thomas Jefferson were to come back today, there would be no occasion for tears in his eyes because of the progress made or the standing of America in the family of nations. Representative government as proposed by Jefferson has endured. It was a new doctrine and a new creed that Thomas Jefferson laid down in this Declaration, that no longer could a monarch claim divinity and rule with arbitrary power, but that governments derived their just powers from the consent of the governed. This is America's greatest contribution to the civilization of the world, and Thomas Jefferson is the author of this thought that was written into the Declaration of Independence and later embodied in the Constitution of the United States. We have evangelized the world, and other democracies have followed the principles laid down by Jefferson.

Too long we have delayed paying proper honor to this great man whom we do not claim from a partisan standpoint, but because he was a great American. Like Lincoln and like Washington, he was a great American and belongs to the ages. He made his contribution to the progress and advancement of our Nation and the civilization of the world, and as one individual Member of the House I am pleased that we can pay tribute to him by properly commemorating his life and achievements in the Capital City of our country. This bill should pass without division of opinion. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the membership will recall that this bill has been on the Consent Calendar for some weeks. On each occasion when that calendar was called there has been a great deal of discussion, not on the life and character of Jefferson, not on the feasibility of erecting a suitable memorial to his memory, but on the more material aspects of this bill, and that is this:

Can we, as Members of this House of Representatives, with a clear conscience, every one of us believing, as I think we believe, that we should cut the expenses of this Government to the very bone, vote to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 at the present time for this or any other like purpose?

I do not think there is a Member of the House who reveres or respects the memory of Jefferson more than I always have. He was one of the great outstanding Americans. He was one of the great, if not the greatest, exponents of the rights of the common people.

Those of us who are now somewhat solicitous of the rights and prerogatives of the people look to Jefferson himself for guidance, and Thomas Jefferson would never consent under these conditions to spend $3,000,000 of the people's money to erect a memorial to him.

If you revere the teachings of Jefferson, if you are conscientious in wanting to respect that great humanitarian, you will never consent to add to the burden of the taxpayers of this Nation any more money than you have, especially for a purpose which can be delayed until we have at least approached the balancing of the Federal Budget.

I have listened for the last 5 years in this House to pleas in behalf of the unemployed men and women who have not enough bread, milk, and meat for themselves and their children. I have listened to more demagoguery in that respect than ever before came out of the mouths of legislators.

Today you plan to divert the equivalent of the aggregate income of 3,000 families averaging $1,000 each at a time when that income is badly needed to keep body and soul together. Gentlemen, the responsibility is yours. If you can, in the face of the conditions which confront this country today, with 12,400,000 people out of employment, with the States, counties, and municipalities burdened in addition to what the Federal Government is giving them for support of our needy—if you can, with a clear conscience, vote $3,000,000 for the erection of a memorial even to so great a man as Thomas Jefferson, it is your responsibility, and I have said all that I care to say on the subject. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, when the Jefferson Memorial Commission was appointed I was honored by membership on that body. The association has been most delightful and has more or less led me to read more liberally

than I had on the subject of Jefferson. Jefferson, to my mind, is, perhaps, the outstanding liberal of the ages. I heard Calvin Coolidge deliver an address at a commencement exercise and he referred to the Declaration of Independence and stressed the part that men of various types played in the Revolution. He said that Jefferson could not have fought the battles of the Revolution and that Washington could not have written the Declaration of Independence. Former President Coolidge's conclusion was that we could not have won the Revolutionary War without the participation of both these great Americans. I am not going to try out title here to Jefferson's partisanship. I think that is interesting, and, of course, in these days is becoming controversial. I simply call the attention of the House to the fact that this outstanding liberal, who by his pen laid the foundation of free institutions in America, is without a monument or marker to his memory in this great National Capital. Our Commission has been over this situation. We have considered the greatness of Jefferson's achievements, the question of cost, the question of construction, and all of those details, and this bill is the fruit of our nonpartisan discussion.

I have listened with interest, but not with alarm, to the discussion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. It is just as important in these days to the youth of America that their souls should be fed as well as their bodies. [Applause.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. In a moment. The only way that this will be accomplished is to encourage and inculcate in the youth of America a desire to study the history and the achievements and contributions to human liberty that were made by this man whom I again call the outstanding liberal of the ages. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have been taught always to believe that unless the body is fed the soul might depart from that body and would be fed on another shore. Does the gentleman not think it is more important to feed the body in order that the soul might enjoy the beautiful things we have on earth?

Mr. CULKIN. If the citizenship of America loses its soul—and it will if it is forgetful of the memories and sacrifices and leadership of the past—then we descend to the level of dumb beasts. This is one effective way to bring to all Americans what Jefferson stood for in government. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the erection of this memorial for three reasons. The first is that the memory of Thomas Jefferson does not need this memorial. The second is that as we build these extrinsic monuments we destroy in the heart of America the capacity for real inspiration to be derived from great men, and the third reason is that we probably could put this money to better use under an emergency. So far as the first reason is concerned, let me remind you, if you go to St. Paul's Cathedral in London and begin to clamber through those great recesses and up into the nave you will see an inscription which says, "If you would see the monument to the builder, look about you." That is true. If you want to see the monument to Sir Christopher Wren, the architect of St. Paul's, look about you and there you will see the great edifice, dedicated to the retreat of the human soul, where people can go and forget their tribulations and worries for a little while. It seems to me that if we want to find a memorial to Thomas Jefferson we must look about us in America. That is a far more verile and living memorial than a great mass of dispassionate stone and masonry to be erected in Washington. I am one of those unorthodox idealists who somehow feel that we have missed the mark, so far as Thomas Jefferson is concerned.

He stands out as an exemplar of the spirit of democracy, trying to bring human hearts together. As I survey the American scene today I sometimes wonder whether we have made a single bit of progress since the teachings of the Carpenter of Nazareth in bringing human hearts together. How light would be our burden, how easy of solution would be our problem if there was not forever that spirit of contest, that spirit of difference that translates itself into invectives and terms of vituperation. That is the thing that Thomas Jefferson taught—democracy. We have missed the goal. I do not believe that a $3,000,000 memorial is going to be very inspirational, either to this generation or to the generations that are to be.

It is a rather significant thing that on tomorrow, in all the cemeteries of the land, speakers will ascend the rostrum and speak about the sacrifices that we made for this wonderful country and for our permanent institutions. They will speak about catching the spirit and inspiration of those sacrifices, and yet the significant thing is that the fragrance of the flowers dies before the setting sun and all the beautiful rhetoric somehow passes away on the evening breeze, so seldom do we catch the spirit in the human heart, which is, after all, the only worth-while shrine.

In proportion as we catch the inspiration of Jefferson here and translate it into human hearts in America, we will have done something far greater than by spending $3,000,000 on a great building that is cold and lifeless and not given to any kind of inspiration.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. My time is too short.

The third reason is this: I believe we can put the money to better use. For instance, there are projects in my district where cities are trying to secure necessary sewer improvements, and the reason they cannot get them is because there is lack of bonding power and insufficient contribution on the part of the Federal Government, so that they cannot institute proceedings that are going to better conditions under which they must live. If we have $3,000,000 to spend, let us use the money properly and give it to some of those districts, some of those school districts that now have inadequate educational facilities, and that would like just a few dollars or a few thousand dollars with which to repair and improve the conditions under which the children in those areas must go to school.

Would it not be a far better thing, as a matter of fact? As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] said, I cannot reconcile my conscience to the expenditure of $3,000,000 when Thomas Jefferson's memory does not need it, when we create an incapacity in the hearts of the country for catching the real inspiration, and when the money can be used to a far better and more practical use. [Applause.]

It is regrettable that partisanship should creep into this discussion. It is far too reverential for that. Any discussion of memorials is necessarily an appeal to the religious nature of every man on this floor. I revere the memory of Jefferson as much as the most ardent Democrat in this Nation. But there is an essential fitness about things and this does not appear to be the time for such a memorial.

It would be far better to cater to the practical needs of the distressed people of this Nation in a time of emergency than to be expending $3,000,000 on a memorial that is unnecessary.

It has been said here today that man does not live by bread alone. Let the authors of that suggestion finish the language of that text. It continues: "But by every word * * *." Yes; by every word. The real memorial to Jefferson is the degree to which the human heart captures his inspiration and reveres his memory, and to rely upon a memorial such as is proposed is but to eloquently confess our incapacity for finding that inspiration without first gazing upon a great mass of masonry and stone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, at the last moment I have obtained consent of my own mind to give expression to my feelings upon this occasion.

I regret exceedingly that any man capable and able to occupy a seat in this great deliberative assembly would at this time raise any partisan question in connection with this effort to build a memorial to one of America's greatest men. From the foundation of the world there has been at work in this world two classes of people—two crews. There has been a construction crew and a wrecking crew. Thomas Jefferson belonged to the construction crew and was opposed to the wrecking crew. If Thomas Jefferson had never done anything more than write the Declaration of Independence, that enunciated the doctrines which took from the backs of the defenseless people the autocratic foot of autocracy, he would have immortalized himself. If he had never done anything more than help pen the Virginia statutes of religious liberty, which meant to the peasant, to the man in the ditch, the same that it meant to the President of the United States or the monarch on his throne, he would have immortalized himself. If Thomas Jefferson had not succeeded in making his name historic for all generations to come by those two acts, he would have completed the task when he founded and erected under his own supervision the great institution of learning, to send light and inspiration to the people, over at Charlottesville, Va., the third great achievement, of which he was proud to the end of his entire career.

Then today the question is raised whether it is prudent or wise for the Congress of the United States to appropriate an infinitely small sum of $3,000,000 to build a statue in the Capital City of the Nation to this great author of a great government theory and government philosopher. I am not willing for the school children traveling from the East, the West, the North, or the South to go upon the streets and highways of this country and find memorials to Thomas Jefferson here and there, and then come to the United States Capital and find a statue of Washington, a statue of Daniel Webster, of Lincoln, and a few others who compared with Thomas Jefferson, and go back home and say to the teacher, "I visited the great Capital City of Washington. I traveled the streets and avenues. I searched and looked in vain for a monument reared to Thomas Jefferson in the Nation's Capital."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The inference would be that the Congress, with the power to appropriate, had neglected to perform its duty in properly memorializing the name of the man who recognized in the Declaration of Independence that all men are born free and equal, and have certain inherent and inalienable rights, among which are to be reckoned the right to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness. These great doctrines—human life, human liberty, and human happiness—were the great principles that stimulated and inspired Thomas Jefferson to write the great books he did that the school children of the future may read as works of inspiration.

When they walk up and down Pennsylvania Avenue I want them to be able to look upon a statue built of marble and granite that will stand through the centuries, defying the corroding touch of time, as a tribute to the founder of the great principles of democratic government. But I say to you now that you do not disparage his great name by calling him Republican or Democrat. He was known as a Republican in his day. If Thomas Jefferson were living today, the people of America would place him side by side with the immortals of the ages. Let us build a monument to his memory that will stand there like a great beacon light to attract the eye and inspire the souls of our children and our children's children, and on down through the generations of the future. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. We have beautiful monuments in this city to Washington and Lincoln, but is it not a fact that the greatness and honor of these two men were born of the ideals and the spirit of Thomas Jefferson?

Mr. MAY. Both of them were students of Thomas Jefferson. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LUCKEY].

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, no one can have greater respect for this great statesman and publicist, this man who sponsored the rights of the common people, Thomas Jefferson, than I; but I feel that this is not the proper time to spend $3,000,000 on a monument to his memory. Today in this House we have agreed to the expenditure of practically $800,000,000. In the words of our good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], "Where are we going to get the money?"

The great humanitarian needs of this day are too great to merit this proposed expenditure, or that now under way at St. Louis, where millions are now being spent on another Thomas Jefferson Memorial. Let us apply some of the ideals of that great man whom we would thus memorialize and husband our resources so that they may be used in behalf of the citizens of this country to whom Jefferson dedicated his life.

I think it is about time we stopped this spending. I, too, would like to see a monument to Thomas Jefferson, but this is not the time to erect it. We have hundreds and hundreds of monuments here and the people hardly notice them. I see them walking through these Halls day after day hardly recognizing or paying attention to the monuments standing along the corridors.

A few days ago our attention was called to the deplorable conditions existing at the National Training School for Girls in this city. There is a place we ought to put our money. There is a place we can build character and where our money will count for something. Let us put our money where it can be used to develop living monuments that will be a credit to the ideals of Jefferson.

I shall, therefore, Mr. Chairman, oppose this measure at this time, much as I should like to see a wonderful monument erected to this great statesman; but this is not the time to make this expenditure. Let us vote this measure down. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I believe that if we are going to spend any money on Thomas Jefferson it would be a splendid idea, rather than erect a monument of marble and granite, to send out to the members of the Liberty League and the proponents of various alien and sedition legislation some of the teaching of Thomas Jefferson.

For instance, I think if Thomas Jefferson were alive today there are certain gentlemen in this House, and distinguished gentlemen, too, who would ask for the indictment of Thomas Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson said in a letter written to W. S. Smith in 1787:

> God forbid we should ever be 20 years without such a rebellion.

He was referring to Shay's rebellion.

> The people cannot be all and always well informed. The part which is wrong will be discontented in proportion to the importance of the facts they misconceive. If they remain quiet under such misconceptions, it is lethargy, the forerunner of death to the public liberty.

Again, Thomas Jefferson said in a letter:

> I hold it that a little rebellion now and then is a good thing, and as necessary in the political world as storms are in the physical.

Imagine what some investigating committee would have done to Thomas Jefferson if he were alive today.

Also, in a letter to W. S. Smith, written in 1787, Thomas Jefferson said:

What country can preserve its liberties if its rulers are not warned from time to time that the people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts.

If Thomas Jefferson had attempted to make a statement like that over the radio today, I wonder how many gentlemen would rise on the floor of the House of Representatives and demand that the radio broadcasting company cancel Thomas Jefferson's broadcast.

A great deal is said nowadays about the right of the Supreme Court to declare laws passed by the representatives of the people unconstitutional. Thomas Jefferson was there in those days when the Constitution was written, and he knew what was meant when the Constitution was written. He had a pretty good idea as to what kind of government they were trying to set up at that time. Here is what Thomas Jefferson said with reference to the Supreme Court:

It has long been my opinion * * * that the germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in * * * the Federal judiciary—

Note what he said about the Federal judiciary—

an irresponsible body, working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step, like a thief over the field of jurisdiction.

Then, again, in a letter to Spencer Roane, in 1821, Jefferson said:

The great object of my fear is the Federal judiciary. That body, like gravity, ever acting, with noiseless foot and unalarming advance, gaining ground step by step, and holding what it gains, is engulfing insidiously the special governments into the jaws of that which feeds them.

The Supreme Court has certainly gained plenty of ground since Thomas Jefferson made that statement. A lot of territory has been taken from the days of the decision of Marberry against Madison to the Guffey coal decision.

Again, in a letter to William C. Jarvis, written in 1820, Thomas Jefferson said:

It is a very dangerous doctrine to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions. It is one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy * * *.

I think he had a right to talk about the powers of the Court under the Constitution, because he was around the country in those days when the Constitution was written.

Again he said:

The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal, knowing that to whatever hands confided, with the corruptions of time and party, its members would become despots. It has more wisely made all the departments coequal and cosovereign within themselves.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. From what document is the gentleman reading?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains excerpts from Jefferson included therein by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

Coming back to Thomas Jefferson and this proposed memorial, may I say that I am going to vote against the measure first of all because, as I stated in the debate today on the conference report on the naval appropriation bill, there are too many people being taken off the W. P. A. on the ground of economy. Three million dollars would put a lot of W. P. A. workers back to work, and I feel if Thomas Jefferson were alive today, and if he had the choice between erecting a monument to himself or to some other great patriot for that matter, or giving work to the unemployed, he would vote to furnish work to the unemployed.

More important than anything else is this. If you do erect a monument to Thomas Jefferson, then let it not be a monument of mortar or granite, but let us print and widely distribute these teachings of Thomas Jefferson so that they may permeate in the heart and mind of every American.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, I have just a few words to say. I am in favor of the Thomas Jefferson memorial. It should have been built years ago. Men do not live by bread alone. There is something spiritual in this world. There is a lesson we need to be taught by the inspiring memorial that is to be erected in this great American city. It will help to keep forever before us the American plan of government: That all men are equal; that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are inalienable rights; that the first duty of government is to safeguard those rights and guarantee them. Today violent attacks are being made against democratic government throughout the whole world. We in America should remember Thomas Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence.

Freedom—religious, political, economic—comes to us not as a matter of course. Freedom comes only after bitter strife and is preserved and fostered by struggle. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Thomas Jefferson was our foremost apostle of human liberty. He had infinite faith in the common people at a time when democracy was only a name. He was more than a liberal, a progressive, in his day. He was a radical. He was author of the most revolutionary document ever written. He is the great inspiration of forward-looking people today.

The spokesmen of reactionary forces sometimes attempt to shape the philosophy of Jefferson to fit their selfish ends. But in the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson speaks for himself. When the forces of reaction invoke his soul in oratorical tribute, we defend him from their praise.

I shall be pleased to vote for this great Thomas Jefferson memorial.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. As a matter of fact, in the construction of this memorial at a cost of $3,000,000, 80 percent of it will go for wages to the men who build it.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Certainly; and I am sure the American people will erect a great memorial commemorating the life and services of Thomas Jefferson. We who revere the memory of Lincoln should recall that Lincoln was a disciple of Thomas Jefferson. He was a student of Jefferson and continually quoted him.

The gentleman from Illinois spoke about the schools. I always want to aid our schools. I have fought a great deal on this floor for schools. In my speeches of May 16 and August 7, 1935, I pointed out the impoverished condition of the schools and demanded Federal aid for schools and students. The emergency education and recreation program, Federal project no. 1, should be continued and enlarged, and I urge Members to see that sufficient appropriations are made for this purpose. We want to carry on many activities that will help the country and someone has asked here: "Where are we going to get the money?" I may say that if you will tax the wealth of this country and the great fortunes of this country, you will have plenty of funds to carry on. We should at least apply the British rates. There are men like Eugene Grace, of the Bethlehem Steel, getting over $1,000,000 a year in salary and bonus, and one of our great publishers in 1935 getting over $500,000 a year as salary. Railroad executives are receiving amounts running higher than the salary of the President of the United States, and yet they are trying to demolish the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad in the State of Minnesota and destroy jobs and wages for our railroad men.

THE PUBLIC IS OPPOSED TO M. & ST. L. SPLIT-UP

A resolution introduced by our Farmer-Labor Senator, ELMER BENSON, asks that the Interstate Commerce Commission withhold approval of the proposed dismemberment of the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad until a committee

of Senators can investigate the social and economic effects of the proposed sale and the origin of the proposal. I hope this resolution will be favorably reported out by the committee and passed by the Senate. The people of Minneapolis and Minnesota and other States affected have a right to know just what the effects of this dismemberment will be and why it is being advocated when State and municipal officials, business, labor, and the Farmer-Labor Party of our State are definitely opposed. Why is this plan being advanced? Who is behind it? These facts must be brought out before the Interstate Commerce Commission is permitted to pass upon the proposal.

Of the eight railroads composing the Associated Railways Co., which was formed to bring about this purchase, one has already withdrawn. The Great Western Railway withdrew when its officials learned that the public is opposed to the plan, that more than a hundred communities would be deprived of services they now enjoy, and that more than 3,000 M. & St. L. employees will be imperiled.

The other companies composing the Associated Railways are the Great Northern, Burlington, Illinois Central, Soo Line, Rock Island, North Western, and Milwaukee roads.

MINNEAPOLIS BUSINESSMEN OPPOSE DISMEMBERMENT

The Minneapolis City Council retained a special attorney, Charles E. Elmquist, who is also attorney for the M. & St. L. executive defense committee. George K. Belden is chairman of the businessmen's committee assisting in opposing the dismemberment plan. Businessmen of Minneapolis realize that loss of jobs for more than 1,000 Minneapolis employees would be a serious economic blow to the city. The grocers, butchers, bakers, and creditors of these employees are concerned.

Minneapolis businessmen are interested in this matter to the extent that they conducted a tour over the Minneapolis & St. Louis line to check up on reports of the road's condition. They found in a 1,000-mile trip over the Minneapolis & St. Louis line to Peoria, Ill., and return, that stories about the broken-down condition of the road were greatly exaggerated. Their trip took them through Albert Lea, Mason City, Marshalltown, Oskaloosa, Des Moines, and Fort Dodge. They took a special train. Their party was composed of 35 businessmen. They found the railroad made average passenger running time. They made comments on the smooth-riding qualities of the trackage. This committee found throughout Iowa and southern Minnesota a growing support of the railroad. They passed through 90 miles of track scheduled for abandonment between Fort Dodge and Albert Lea. Immediately upon their return they began active solicitation of defense funds, they appointed captains of defense teams, and they are now calling on merchants and others directly affected.

WHAT IS BACK OF THIS MOVE?

When we compare the financial condition of the Minneapolis & St. Louis with the financial condition of the railroads wishing to purchase the Minneapolis & St. Louis, we wonder what is back of this move. It happens that the Minneapolis & St. Louis owes the R. F. C. nothing. The North Western is indebted to the R. F. C. for $46,589,000, according to the January statistical number of Railway Age. The Minneapolis Tribune reports that the Milwaukee has debts of $12,000,000; the Rock Island, $13,718,700; the Illinois Central, $17,863,000, with an application for $7,488,000 more; the Soo Line, $6,843,002. The Minneapolis & St. Louis management expects to make a net of $750,000 or more this year. This would be a 5-percent return, which most railroads have not been making in recent years.

The Minneapolis terminal of the railroad alone has been valued by the Interstate Commerce Commission at more than $4,000,000, and the entire system at more than $35,000,000. The Associated Railways are trying to get this property for $7,200,000, and the R. F. C. is apparently willing to loan $4,750,000 to the Associated Railways to finance the reorganization of the M. & St. L. It appears that the R. F. C. offer, made in 1934, preceded by a few months the efforts of these seven railroads to purchase the M. & St. L. The people of Minnesota and the Northwest have a right to know why the R. F. C. made this offer apparently before being requested to do so, and why the chief examiner of the railroad division of the R. F. C. continues to play an important part in the hearings being conducted at the present time in the various States affected. The people of these States are overwhelmingly opposed to the plan. Many of those who have attended the hearings held by the Commission in the districts affected have reached the conclusion that the matter would never have been seriously considered had it not been pressed by agents of the R. F. C. Witnesses have been unable or are unwilling to furnish evidence showing the origin of the plan. The present earnings seem to justify a capitalization of the railroad of $17,000,000, which is $10,000,000 more than the Associated Railways offer to pay.

M. & ST. L. EMPLOYEES MUST BE PROTECTED

Mr. Speaker, I have a mandate from the people of the Third Congressional District of Minnesota to oppose dismemberment of the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad. I am serving on a congressional committee created to prevent this dismemberment. From the first moment the attack began, from the very first mention of dismemberment, we answered the attack. We went into the front lines to repel those who for selfish reasons planned injury to Minneapolis, Minnesota, and the Northwest.

The split-up of this railroad would be a serious blow to Minneapolis, Excelsior, Hopkins, and over a hundred other communities in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, and Illinois. It is a blow to the entire Northwest. The M. & St. L. has the second largest pay roll in the city of Minneapolis. The wives and children of these 3,000 employees are directly affected. Labor is opposed to the plan and that is enough for me. A thousand railroad men are in danger of losing their jobs. They will enter the ranks of twelve and a half million already unemployed.

We demand a thorough investigation of the origin of the plan to dismember the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad. We want to know the motives back of it. The people have a right to know the economic and social results of such a plan. The Benson Senate Resolution 287 to investigate the M. & St. L. dismemberment would accomplish this purpose. When I endorse this resolution, I speak for the citizens of Minneapolis, St. Paul, Hennepin County, Excelsior, Hopkins, and other communities in Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include such data and information as may be applicable to the remarks I have made here.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. How can the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Kentucky say that 80 percent of the money for the construction of this monument is going to labor, when the Commission has not agreed upon any design, although they have given some consideration to it? We are expected to vote $3,000,000 for a monument, the design of which has not been considered to the point of giving us any information whatever as to what it is even going to look like.

Mr. LUNDEEN. So far as that is concerned, I will say to the gentleman I have every confidence in the Commission and in the architects and designers of the monument. I am no expert in this line and I am not concerned about that.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. The fact is that 90 percent of the $3,000,000 will be expended in material, workmanship, and labor. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I have received information to that effect, and I believe that is true.

Mr. CULKIN. And the bill that is offered here is offered as the joint offering of a group that has considered this matter for an entire year.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I must confess I have been somewhat surprised at some of the arguments that have been presented during the course of the discussion of this matter. I very deeply regret that in the consideration of a proposal to erect a memorial to one of the great, outstanding Americans, any possible tinge of partisanship or sectionalism should enter the controversy.

I happen to recall that in the year 1911 the Congress of the United States passed a resolution providing for the setting up of a commission for the construction of an adequate memorial to the life, character, and achievements of Abraham Lincoln, and although I am the son of a Confederate soldier who fought for 4 long years to destroy the Government that Abraham Lincoln was trying to preserve, it gave me pleasure, not only to see the passage of that resolution in 1911, but, subsequently, to know that my party, under Woodrow Wilson's administration, composed very largely of southerners, had carried forward and provided the funds for the construction of that great everlasting memorial down yonder on the Potomac River to the memory of one of the greatest men, in my opinion, this country has or ever will produce. [Applause.]

Why were sentiments of this character aroused in my bosom? Simply because I believe in the spiritual philosophy of One greater than any man who ever walked this earth, who said that "man shall not live by bread alone." When noble memories and reverence for the traditions of the past no longer appeal to our people, then there is danger that the Republic may perish. [Applause.]

The monarchies of Europe are not ungrateful or unmindful of their great and heroic figures. Those of you who have traveled abroad in the great capitals of foreign nations will see upon every street and avenue magnificent memorials and effigies erected to their great, outstanding leaders, while the charge has been made that republics are ungrateful. I trust this is not true of ours.

And here on this floor this afternoon I am surprised to hear some men, even Democrats, arise and say that the Government of the United States cannot afford this amount of money to erect an everlasting memorial to the greatest political philosopher and humanitarian of the age.

They ask if Jefferson were alive would he approve of this? Possibly no. If Abraham Lincoln, from your State of Illinois, you who just opposed this resolution, were alive and he had been asked if he wanted this great memorial constructed at a cost of $3,000,000, out of his innate modesty, he probably would have said no; you can turn it to a more useful purpose.

But that is not the issue here—what those men may have said. Happily the achievements of great men are not measured by themselves or their contemporaries but by a grateful posterity.

We ought to be ashamed to haggle over the small authorization, not expenditure, to construct an adequate memorial to that great man who was the author of the Declaration of Independence, of our statutes for religious freedom, the founder of the University of Virginia, the real constructive advocate of the Bill of Rights in our Federal Constitution—I say it seems to me it is rather a small position for any American, Democrat or Republican, to take the stand that we ought not to authorize this sum to perpetuate the memory of that man who, in my opinion, has impressed the minds of all men on the philosophy as well as the perpetuity of our institutions. I hope this bill will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to speak, but I shall use 2 or 3 minutes of the remaining time at my disposal. I call attention to the fact that stone as it lies in the ledge represents only 5 percent of the cost of the building into which it is to go, and that in monuments it represents much less; that in all buildings here the labor represents 95 percent, and in the monuments vastly more than that. So it does seem to me that since we are providing work at the present time there could be no other possible way in which you could be more justified in providing work that gives such tremendous percentage of the amount expended to labor.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman give us an outline or some information of the proposed memorial—what it is going to look like?

Mr. KELLER. That has not been worked out as yet.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Has it been worked out at all? Can the gentleman give us any idea about what it is going to look like? Can the gentleman give us any idea how much is going to be paid for labor and how much is to be paid for granite?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, so far as the building of monuments is concerned, I had occasion recently to go into that with reference to the Clarke Memorial, and the statement of the gentleman from Illinois is correct, so far as stone in the ledge is concerned or iron ore is concerned. More than 90 percent of the cost of the structure is represented in labor, transportation, and construction.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But one gentleman assured us that 8 percent would be for labor.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Oh, no; 80 percent.

Mr. WOLCOTT. How does anybody know how much is going to be paid for labor?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I went into a study of that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. How does the gentleman know it is going to be made of granite or bronze?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Whether it is in the form of granite or limestone or marble, the value of the stone is insignificant compared to the amount paid for labor, transportation, and construction. Statistics show that more than 90 percent of the value goes for labor.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And if it happens that this monument is not built of granite, the gentleman's remarks are of no avail.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Oh, not at all.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have nothing to show that it is even going to be made of granite. If it is to be made of bronze, how much will go into labor?

Mr. GREENWOOD. The same statistics apply, whether it is made of marble or granite or any other building material.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] whether some plans have been made.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], he has persistently made the misstatement that no plans have been made. This is about the fifth speech that he has made in opposition to this memorial.

Mr. WOLCOTT rose.

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not yield. The gentleman had his say, and plenty. The gentleman is interested only in a mere mess of pottage.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman, in all fairness after making that charge, should yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer the charge that he had made that I am interested only in a mess of pottage?

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BOYLAN. Repeatedly, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has been told that a distinguished architect has prepared plans. Not only did I tell him it again in my remarks today, but on four previous occasions I have told him. He has ears and he will not hear. I told him these plans were submitted, not only to the Commission, but to the Chief Executive of the United States. Yet all he has in his

mind is what is it going to cost, who is going to get the money. I cannot add a word to the beautiful sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], that outside of the mere question of food, which is talked about so much by the opposition, there is a spiritual value in this memorial that will revivify and rekindle the patriotism of our people. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think there are two statements here that should be answered.

Mr. KELLER rose.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not yield to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I supposed that all time had expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not yield to the gentleman for a parliamentary inquiry or for any other reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois exhausted all time on his side of the Chamber.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, there are two questions that should be answered. In the first place, having some solicitude for the welfare of the people of this Nation who are on relief and have not shelter over their heads, I am accused of having interest only in a mess of pottage. A mess of pottage, my friends, when there are 12,400,000 people out of employment today, and we have appropriated $10,000,000,000 here in the last few years to feed the hungry of this Nation. A mess of pottage!

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I think it is laudable that you gentlemen went along in 1911——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understood I had been yielded 3 minutes.

Mr. MAPES. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it was laudable that the Democratic side of this House, as well as the Republicans, went along together in the erection of the memorial to Abraham Lincoln in 1911. If conditions in this country now were as they were then, I think I would feel much differently about this. However, at that time the national bonded indebtedness was less than $1,000,000,000, and today it is over $32,000,000,000, and constantly growing. How can you reconcile your actions in voting $3,000,000 for this monument in face of that situation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission), heretofore created for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for designing and constructing a permanent memorial in the city of Washington, D. C., to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, shall determine upon a plan and design for, and proceed with the construction of, such memorial upon a site selected by the Commission, under a contract or contracts hereby authorized to be entered into in a total sum not exceeding $3,000,000.

SEC. 2. In the execution of its functions the Commission—

(a) May designate as its executive agent any officer, agency, or establishment of the Federal Government qualified and equipped to act in that capacity, and any such officer, agency, or establishment so designated is authorized to act as such agent.

(b) May avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission of Fine Arts shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice.

(c) May make expenditures for personal services, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the purchase or preparation of plans, designs, and estimates, printing and binding, office equipment and supplies, contract stenographic reporting service, books and periodicals, traveling expenses of members and employees of the Commission (including such expenses and allowances for members of the Commission when required to be in Washington, D. C., in connection with the work of the Commission), and such other contingent and miscellaneous expenses as may be necessary: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Commission under authority of this subsection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHANNON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12027, and, pursuant to House Resolution 522, he reported the same back to the House.

HISTORY OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1908 Attorney General Charles J. Bonaparte ordered the creation of a staff of investigators to have jurisdiction over all investigative matters within the purview of the United States Department of Justice. A small group of about 35 agents was authorized to make the necessary investigations.

This was the humble beginning of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which has come within the past few years to be known as the foremost law-enforcement body in the world.

TWO PERIODS OF GROWTH

There have been two periods in the growth of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The first extended from its inception in 1908 to May 1924. During this time many new duties devolved upon the investigative staff of the Bureau. In 1912 the white-slave laws were passed. During the World War there was an increase in duty resulting from the activities of enemy aliens. Also demanding the investigative attention of the agents of the Bureau were the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act and the Bankruptcy Act.

ENLARGEMENT OF INVESTIGATIVE UNIT

The enlargement of this investigative unit until 1924 was the result of a natural growth. That is to say, each problem was handled as it arose. There was no looking into the future; there was no certain goal or standard toward which this unit was striving. There was only the business of investigating violations against the laws of the United States and gathering evidence in cases wherein the United States was an interested party.

GOOD LEADER SOUGHT

In 1924, when Harlan F. Stone, now a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, was appointed Attorney General of the United States, he regarded this routine manner of operation as wholly inadequate. In was clear to him that what the Bureau needed was an ideal and a leader who believed in it.

Back in 1908, when the Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice was first being created and organized, a young fellow 13 years of age was attending the public schools of the District of Columbia. Upon his graduation from high school, he entered the Library of Congress as a clerk and studied law at George Washington Law School in the evenings. In 1917 he was a clerk in the Department of Justice, and in 1919 he was appointed special assistant to the Attorney General. From 1921 to 1924, he served as Assistant Director of the Bureau of Investigation.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER APPOINTED

This was the man whom Attorney General Harlan Stone chose to carry out the ideal of honest and efficient law enforcement. His name was John Edgar Hoover.

STRIVING TOWARD A GOAL

Less than 30 years of age at the time of his appointment as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in May 1924, Hoover, even then, envisioned the day when the Bureau would be an efficient crime fighting organization, powerfully equipped with the necessary paraphernalia for exterminating the rats of the underworld and striving toward a goal of ridding this country of its blight of crime.

MR. HOOVER ANSWERS TO NO ONE BUT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Hoover knew what he wanted and he had the assurance of Attorney General Stone that as Director, Mr. Hoover would answer to no one but the Attorney General and that as far as he was concerned, the Bureau of Investigation was a separate Government agency, free from all outside interference. It was evident that Justice Stone knew what he wanted. He wanted this young man, Hoover, to give full vent to his enthusiasm.

Once in office, Hoover wasted no time. He completely reorganized the Bureau and effected many economies in its administration.

SELECTION OF PERSONNEL

His first thought, however, concerned the personnel under his supervision. For the task ahead, he wanted young and progressive men, well educated and forward-thinking. He immediately ordered that the age limits for new agents of the Bureau be set from 25 to 35 years and that preference in appointment be given to qualified attorneys. The seniority rule of promotion was discarded. All advancements in the service were to be based solely on merit. He weeded out undesirables. There rapidly developed a corps of men who brought to their work the same enthusiasm as their Director. Today there are a few more than 600 of these special agents. They have been carefully selected from thousands of applicants. They must be graduates of law schools of high standing, expert accountants, or have had constructive types of law-enforcement experience. In addition, each must have had at least 2 years' practical experience in the business world.

These are high educational requirements but to Mr. Hoover they are not sufficient to enable an agent to start the work of investigating. He must know more. Hoover, therefore, instituted a training school for agents. Here, over a period of 14 weeks, the newly appointed agent receives an intensive course in all phases of law-enforcement work. He studies the elements of each of the offenses against the United States; he becomes thoroughly versed in the methods of scientific crime detection; he becomes an expert in the science of fingerprinting and a qualified handler of all types of firearms.

FINGERPRINT COLLECTIONS

At the beginning of his term, Director Hoover was also concerned with another problem—the centralization of the fingerprint collections scattered throughout the country. After tireless efforts in that direction, he was successful in having transferred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation the records of the identification bureau of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the fingerprint collection of the Federal Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans. There were a little over 800,000 fingerprint cards with which to institute this national fingerprint exchange. It was pledged to give free service to any law-enforcement agency desiring to avail itself of these facilities. At every opportunity, Director Hoover has endeavored to preach the doctrine of coordination of all the forces of law and order in the fight against crime; without it his ideal of law enforcement cannot survive.

Phenomenally the collection has grown until today there are over 5,900,000 cards on file with an average of 4,500 arriving daily from approximately 10,000 contributing agencies. At the commencement of this work, the Identification Division received but 300 cards a day from less than 1,000 agencies. At that time only 14 percent of the incoming records were identified; today, previous criminal records are established in over 50 percent of the cases referred to the Bureau.

TRAINED STAFF OF TECHNICIANS

Intent on moving forward, Hoover early realized the need for a trained staff of technicians to attack a crime problem from the viewpoint of science. Acting to meet this need, he established a technical and research laboratory to assist in the current criminal investigations conducted by the Bureau's special agents. He has offered to the outside world of law enforcement the full facilities of this laboratory, evidencing again his supreme desire for cooperation among law-enforcement agencies. In addition, the laboratory, in the true spirit of the Bureau, is engaged in conducting research in the various police sciences. Improved methods of scientific crime detection will be placed in the possession of all peace officers who earnestly desire to raise the standards of their profession.

CRIME STATISTICS COMPILED

In 1930, Congress granted Hoover the authority to collect and compile crime statistics. It was the beginning of the important work of gathering national police statistics on a uniform scale so that those interested in crime trends and the remedies therefor would have tangible figures to point the direction toward which their efforts should be expended.

YOUNG CRIMINALS

With the aid of these statistics, Hoover is now able to call the attention of the country to the fact that 20 percent of the criminal element is composed of persons not yet of voting age. With these figures, he has hopes of making the people of this Nation crime conscious; of yanking their heads out of the sand and forcing them to face squarely the problem of law enforcement.

COOPERATION WITH LOCAL OFFICERS

The program of cooperation with local and State law-enforcement agencies, so evident in the projects of Director Hoover, was extended recently in the establishment in Washington, D. C., of training schools for municipal and State law-enforcement officials. The course of training lasts for a period of 12 weeks and covers the broad general field of law enforcement. Two classes have graduated. Since that time nearly all these men have advanced to better positions in their respective organizations. Many are engaged in the work of instructing their fellow officers in the modern criminal-detection methods learned during their training in Washington. These student-officers have returned to their homes convinced of Hoover's desire to cooperate with every honest and upright local authority.

During this entire march of progress, Hoover saw another great need. There was something radically wrong in the restrictions which beset his agents. Time after time, his men were called upon to cope with dangerous criminals who were armed in many cases with the latest and deadliest of weapons; yet Congress had not seen fit to empower agents to carry firearms. In fact, these special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation had no authority to make arrests but had to rely on local law enforcement officers to effect desired apprehensions.

ROVING BAND OF CRIMINALS

But something had been happening all this time. There arose in certain sections of this country a roving band of criminals, the backwash from the later prohibition era. These bandits boldly entered banks in broad daylight, gathered up their loot, and sped in high-powered automobiles across State lines. The local police, lacking funds, gave up the chase. The same thing happened in the commission of other crimes. Once these crimes were committed, their perpetrators fled to another State and in most cases were safe to continue their careers of depredation. Mr. Hoover sat in his office in Washington and saw all these things. He knew he was powerless to come to the aid of the local authorities. Even if he were, his agents were unarmed and without authority to make arrests. Something had to be done to remedy this grave fault in the Nation's fight against the lawless.

ATTORNEY GENERAL CUMMINGS CHAMPION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT, NEW LAWS PASSED

Appointed by one champion of honest law enforcement, Hoover found another in the present Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Homer S. Cummings; and in May and June of 1934, with the passage of new laws by Congress, another milestone of law enforcement was reached. This legislation included the Federal reward bill (of which I was the author), the National Stolen Property Act, the Extortion Act, and the Federal antiracketeering statute. Another act made it a Federal offense to rob national banks and member banks of the Federal Reserve System; still another

made it a Federal offense to flee from one State to another to avoid prosecution or giving testimony in certain cases. Heretofore, the killing or assaulting of a Federal officer was not an offense against the United States; prosecution had to be instituted in the State courts. An act was passed to remedy this strange situation.

AGENTS PERMITTED TO CARRY FIREARMS

With the passage of these bills and the delegation of the investigative duties thereunder to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, came the authorization for special agents to carry firearms and the power to make arrests. Congress had already in June 1932 passed the Federal kidnaping statute, commonly known as the Lindbergh law.

MOST ACTIVE PERIOD OF BUREAU

The period from June 1932 to May 1936 has been the most intensively active in the entire history of the Bureau. There is a saying that the more laws you have, the more crime will result. But these laws passed by Congress were not made to break; they were made to catch the criminal; to supply a stopgap to the free-flowing interstate commerce of lawlessness. Hoover realized this and also realized that the Bureau was about to stand a stern trial. He also knew that if he triumphed, his ideal of law enforcement would be well on its way to attainment.

BAD MEN OF COUNTRY APPREHENDED

Much that is sensational has been written within the last few years about the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, John Edgar Hoover. These years witnessed the imprisonment or death of criminals such as Dillinger; Homer Van Meter; Fred, Doc, and Ma Barker; "Pretty Boy" Floyd; "Baby Face" Nelson; Alvin Karpis; William Mahan; Thomas H. Robinson, Jr.; Harry Campbell; and countless others less notorious but no less a menace to society during their short reigns of terror.

SIXTY-THREE CASES INVOLVING KIDNAPING SOLVED LAST 4 YEARS

Since the passage of the Lindbergh law in June 1932, 63 cases of kidnaping and plots to kidnap have been investigated and solved. The sentences of the 149 persons thus far convicted total 2,095 years, 11 months and 2 days. This does not include the 31 life sentences, the 4 death sentences, nor those persons who committed suicide or who were killed resisting arrest or murdered by their compatriots.

NEW BANK ROBBERY ACT

The Federal Bank Robbery Act was passed on May 18, 1934. Since then 187 cases of robbery of national banks of the Federal Reserve System have been reported to the Bureau. Investigations in these cases have resulted in the conviction of 115 persons in the Federal courts and the imposition of 3 life, 1 indeterminate, and over 2,500 years in sentences. On August 23, 1935, Congress by amendment, included in the Federal Bank Robbery Act all insured banks of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and thereby added a great deal to the duties of the special agents of the Bureau.

CONVICTIONS IN 95 PERCENT OF CASES

Very few people know that since the beginning of the present fiscal year, July 1, 1935, until April 30, 1936, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has secured over 3,000 convictions with sentences of more than 8,000 years, together with one of death and three of life imprisonment. Still fewer people know that in the same period recoveries of property and savings to the Government amounted to 28½ million dollars. These are the figures that tell the true story of Director Hoover's administration of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But there is another final figure which demonstrates the efficiency of this law enforcement Bureau. Of the cases investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and brought to trial since July 1, 1935, 95 percent have resulted in convictions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BLACKNEY (at the request of Mr. MAPES), on account of important business.

To Mr. HIGGINS of Connecticut, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

To Mr. MERRITT of New York, for 3 days, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4618. An act 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.

S. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution empowering the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to have printed 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the subcommittee of said committee of the Senate during the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress pursuant to the resolution (S. Res. 185) authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to conduct an investigation of the expenditures by the Federal Government for the cotton cooperatives, etc.; to the Committee on Printing.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4148. An act for the relief of the Thomas Marine Railway Co., Inc.;

H. R. 9125. An act for the relief of Dr. F. U. Painter, Dr. H. A. White, Dr. C. P. Yeager, Dr. W. C. Barnard, Mrs. G. C. Oliphant, Amelia A. Daimwood, the Sun Pharmacy, Bruno's Pharmacy, Viola Doyle Maguire, Louise Harmon, Mrs. J. B. Wilkinson, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Grace Hinnant, Dr. E. O. Arnold, and Jennie Chapman;

H. R. 12120. An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories;

H. R. 12527. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; and

H. R 12870. An act to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4533. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wilkerson's Ferry, Miss.; and

S. J. Res. 262. 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.

BILLS 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, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4148. An act for the relief of the Thomas Marine Railway Co., Inc.;

H. R. 9125. An act for the relief of Dr. F. U. Painter, Dr. H. A. White, Dr. C. P. Yeager, Dr. W. C. Barnard, Mrs. G. C. Oliphant, Amelia A. Daimwood, the Sun Pharmacy, Bruno's Pharmacy, Viola Doyle Maguire, Louise Harmon, Mrs. J. B. Wilkinson, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Grace Hinnant, Dr. E. O. Arnold, and Jennie Chapman;

H. R. 12120. An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories;

H. R. 12527. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12870. An act to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were ayes 56 and noes 22.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to the order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, June 1, 1936, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3296. An act to authorize certain payments to the American War Mothers, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2888). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 12869. A bill to liberalize the provisions of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, to effect uniform provisions in laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, to extend the Employees' Compensation Act with limitations to certain World War veterans and other persons, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2899). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 3257. An act to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FADDIS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12902. A bill to provide a commissioned strength for the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for the efficient performance of military and other statutory duties assigned to that corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 2891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREGORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 12848. A bill to provide an additional place of holding terms of the United States District Court in the Eastern District of Kentucky, and to amend section 83 of the Judicial Code, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11614. A bill to amend the Judicial Code to divide the middle district of Georgia into seven divisions by adding a new division to the middle district, and providing for terms of said court to be held at Thomasville, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2893). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1687. An act to incorporate The National Yoeman F; without amendment (Rept. No. 2894). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2075. An act to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern and western districts of Missouri; without amendment (Rept. No. 2895). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHANDLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3179. An act to appoint one additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern, Middle, and Western Districts of Tennessee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2896). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SOMERS of New York: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 12756. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the memory of the late Dr. Charles P. Steinmetz; without amendment (Rept. No. 2897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SOMERS of New York: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 12677. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of York County, Maine; without amendment (Rept. No. 2898). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Pensions. H. R. 12908. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows, former widows, and helpless and dependent children of soldiers of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 2889). 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. COFFEE: A bill (H. R. 12909) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments or grants of aid under such act to agricultural producers occupying certain public lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RABAUT: A bill (H. R. 12910) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Michigan as one of the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mrs. O'DAY: A bill (H. R. 12911) making an appropriation for the purpose of completing a building to honor the detail which captured Major André, the British spy, at Tarrytown; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SHANLEY: A bill (H. R. 12912) setting up a joint public relief committee to assist Congress in the preparation of data for a permanent relief policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 12913) to protect for American actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers, solo dangers, solo instrumentalists, and orchestral conductors the artistic and earning opportunities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 12914) to regulate the conduct of elections in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 611) to create a Low Cost Research Housing Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GREENWAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 612) for the purpose of increasing and financing employment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 613) to modify and extend the act entitled "An act to include sugar beets and sugar cane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", approved May 9, 1934; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; 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. LESINSKI: A bill (H. R. 12908) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows, former widows, and helpless and dependent children of soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINDERUP: A bill (H. R. 12915) granting a pension to Nete Richardson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12916) for the relief of Alvin Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

11011. By Mr. COLDEN: Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Los Angeles on May 22, 1936, urging favorable action on the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill (S. 4424 and H. R. 12164); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11012. By Mr. DORSEY: Resolutions of Local Union, No. 98 (Philadelphia, Pa.), International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers endorsing the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill, and urging its immediate adoption by the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11013. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Mr. Val Horn, of Mexia, Tex., favoring the Robinson-Patman bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

11014. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Council of the City of Los Angeles, at its meeting on May 22, 1936, relative to the passage of the United States Housing Act of 1936, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11015. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Manhattan Avenue Merchants Association of Williamsburgh, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill (S. 4424); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11016. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of Monmouth County (N. J.) Women's Democratic Club, urging that the official name of the resettlement project near Hightstown, N. J., be changed to Monmouth County project no. 3; to the Committee on Labor.

11017. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New Jersey State Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11018. Also, petition of the city of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11019. Also, petition of the Lancaster Central Labor Union, Lancaster, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11020. Also, petition of Lawrence Central Labor Union, Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11021. Also, petition of the National Society of the Daughters of the Revolution; to the Committee on Appropriations.

11022. Also, petition of the Office Workers' Union, Local No. 19366; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11023. Also, petition of the city of Schenectady, N. Y.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11024. Also, petition of the city of Louisville; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1936

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 1936)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, May 29, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Chavez	Keyes	Pope
Austin	Clark	King	Reynolds
Bachman	Coolidge	La Follette	Robinson
Bailey	Copeland	Loftin	Russell
Barbour	Couzens	Lonergan	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Davis	Long	Sheppard
Benson	Duffy	McAdoo	Shipstead
Bilbo	Fletcher	McGill	Smith
Black	Frazier	McKellar	Steiwer
Borah	George	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gerry	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Glass	Murphy	Truman
Burke	Guffey	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hale	Neely	Wagner
Byrnes	Hastings	Norris	Walsh
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Caraway	Hayden	Overton	White
Carey	Johnson	Pittman	

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] are necessarily absent.

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

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion by Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent,

The junior Senator from Florida [Mr. LOFTIN] was assigned to service on the following committees: Claims, Education and Labor, Interoceanic Canals, Naval Affairs, Post Offices and Post Roads, and Public Buildings and Grounds.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 257)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, for administrative expenses of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, fiscal year 1937, in the sum of $35,000, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.