

and 55 comrades, requesting enactment of House bill 3493; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8564. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 87, Alexandria, Minn., with a membership of 135, unanimously urging that speedy action be taken to secure appropriate legislation for immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8565. By Mr. LEAVITT: Petition of residents and taxpayers of Pondera County, Mont., residing on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, for the authorization of a sufficient sum of money for the purpose of building and maintaining a public highway, beginning at a point on Birch Creek known as Robare, in Pondera County, Mont., and running thence northwest to Heart Butte, Mont.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8566. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of residents of the thirteenth congressional district of Massachusetts, urging the passage of the bill to exempt dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8567. By Mr. MANSFIELD: Petition of F. J. Hornburg and other members of the American Legion of Victoria, Tex., requesting legislation authorizing the immediate payment of the World War veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8568. By Mr. MILLIGAN: Petition and plan for the relief of unemployment indorsed by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie No. 260, Richmond, Mo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8569. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition of E. T. Hughes and 48 other citizens of Baird, Tex., for the payment in full to ex-service men of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8570. By Mr. STONE: Petition of Lone Wolf Post, No. 57, American Legion, Lone Wolf, Okla., urging payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8571. By Mr. WAINWRIGHT: Petition of certain citizens of Westchester County, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 7884 to prohibit experiments on living dogs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8572. By Mr. WATSON: Resolution adopted at meeting of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Newtown, Bucks County, Pa., favoring the Grant Hudson motion-picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8573. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of the Dannial Davison Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, of Clarksburg, W. Va., urging Congress to take favorable action on the Harris-Box bill and change same to favor either a restricted immigration bill with a smaller quota or prohibit immigration for a period of at least two years; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8574. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Amos A. J. Myers Post, No. 28, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jeannette, Pa., requesting favorable consideration of Wright Patman bill to provide for the immediate payment of the soldiers' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8575. Also, petition of Fort Ligonier Post, No. 734, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Ligonier, Pa., requesting favorable consideration of Wright Patman bill 3493 providing for payment of soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8576. Also, petition of A. R. Bollinger, commander Post No. 444, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Derry, Pa., requesting favorable consideration of Wright Patman bill 3493 providing for immediate payment of soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8577. Also, petition of American Federation of Labor, urging adoption of House Joint Resolution 334 providing for three cleared-channel broadcasting frequencies by the Federal Radio Commission to Departments of Agriculture, Labor,

and Interior; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

8578. Also, petition of G. B. Rowand, chairman State legislative board, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against House bill 14564, making provision for early completion of authorized and adopted river and harbor projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8579. Also, petition of the Association of Craft Employees of the Pittsburgh Division, The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., requesting regulation of busses and other forms of transportation, placing them on a basis of fair competition with the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1931)

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. In legislative session the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the special order, which is the bill (S. 4750) to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels. First the Chair lays before the Senate sundry telegrams, and so forth.

### DROUGHT RELIEF

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram from Harry D. Wilson, chairman, etc., of Memphis, Tenn., which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram]

MEMPHIS, TENN., January 12, 1931.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE:

Agricultural leaders, bankers, and farmers, representing 12 Southern States assembled in Memphis, Tenn., deplore and view with alarm the congressional deadlock over drought-relief measures, and inasmuch as all feed and food products are completely exhausted and all available resources tied up in failed banks in thousands of communities throughout the South, producing a state of abject poverty which necessitates quick and immediate alleviation, respectfully memorialize Congress to do everything humanly possible to expedite the passage of all relief measures now pending.

HARRY D. WILSON,  
Chairman, President Southern Association  
Agricultural Commissioners.  
E. C. McINNIS, Secretary.

CHIEF JUSTICE EUGENE S. BLEASE, SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following telegram, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

[Telegram]

COLUMBIA, S. C., January 14, 1931.

Vice President CHARLES CURTIS,  
Senate Office Building:

My brother, Eugene S. Blease, elected chief justice of Supreme Court of South Carolina by legislature in joint session to-day by overwhelming majority.

COLE L. BLEASE.

### DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War reporting, pursuant to law, that there is on the files of the War Department an accumulation of documents and files of papers which are not needed nor useful in the transaction of the current business of the department, have no permanent value or historical interest, and recommending action looking toward their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. REED and Mr. FLETCHER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram from Herbert R. Limburg, chairman of the committee on



criminal courts and procedure of the New York County Lawyers' Association, New York, N. Y., indorsing the nomination of George Z. Medalle for the office of United States attorney for the southern district of New York, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a petition signed by 7,586 citizens of the 48 States of the Union and the District of Columbia (including 161 bankers and business executives, 98 bishops, 208 university and college presidents, 602 clergy, 285 deans, professors, and teachers, and 100 judges and lawyers), praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COUZENS presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. VANDENBERG presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HEBERT presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Rhode Island, praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DENEEN presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts and of Bath, N. Y., praying for the passage of legislation for the immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BROOKHART presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boone, Iowa, praying for the immediate payment in cash of adjusted-compensation certificates of ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McNARY. I report back from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 15256) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1268) thereon, which I ask to have printed and the bill placed on the calendar. I desire to state that at the very earliest opportunity I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar and the report will be printed under the rule.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. TRAMMELL, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4821) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy in his discretion, upon request from the Governor of the State of Florida, to deliver to such governor as custodian for such State the silver service presented to the United States for the U. S. S. *Florida*, now out of commission, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1269) thereon.

Mr. BROOKHART, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3831) for the relief of Georgia A. Muirhead, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1270) thereon.

Mr. BLACK, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2296) for the relief of Nellie McMullen, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1271) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4489) for the relief of the heirs of Harris Smith, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1272) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4105) for the relief of the estate of White B. Miller, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1273) thereon.

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

S. 1244. An act for the relief of Capt. Christian Damson (Rept. No. 1275); and

S. 3144. An act for the relief of J. D. Stewart (Rept. No. 1276).

Mr. HOWELL also, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4120) for the relief of McIlwraith McEacharn's Line, Proprietary (Ltd.), reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1277) thereon.

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

S. 2008. An act for the relief of National Ben Franklin Fire Insurance Co. (Rept. No. 1278);

S. 4509. An act for the relief of Thomas G. Hayes (Rept. No. 1279);

S. 4510. An act for the relief of H. E. Hurley (Rept. No. 1280);

S. 4675. An act for the relief of the Seward City Mills (Inc.) (Rept. No. 1281);

S. 4676. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Bird, deceased (Rept. No. 1282);

S. 4677. An act for the relief of Dr. B. T. Williamson, of Greenwood, Miss. (Rept. No. 1283);

S. 5193. An act for the relief of Mildred N. O'Lone (Rept. No. 1284);

S. 5194. An act for the relief of the Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. (Rept. No. 1285);

S. 5195. An act for the relief of Howard Dimick (Rept. No. 1286);

S. 5196. An act for the relief of the B. & O. Manufacturing Co. (Rept. No. 1287);

S. 5197. An act for the relief of the David Gordon Building & Construction Co. (Rept. No. 1288);

S. 5198. An act for the relief of T. Morris White (Rept. No. 1289);

S. 5199. An act for the relief of Leslie W. Morse (Rept. No. 1290);

S. 5200. An act for the relief of the National Dry Dock & Repair Co. (Inc.) (Rept. No. 1291); and

S. 5201. An act for the relief of C. O. Smith (Rept. No. 1292).

Mr. BINGHAM, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to which were referred the following bills and joint resolution, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2832. An act to amend section 319 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (Rept. No. 1274);

S. 3463. An act to extend the admiralty laws of the United States of America to the Virgin Islands (Rept. No. 1293);

S. 5138. An act to amend the organic act of Porto Rico, approved March 2, 1917 (Rept. No. 1294);

S. 5139. An act to extend the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational education and civilian rehabilitation to Porto Rico (Rept. No. 1295);

S. 5285. An act to amend the organic act of Porto Rico, approved March 2, 1917 (Rept. No. 1296);

S. 5416. An act to provide for the filling of certain vacancies in the Senate and House of Representatives of Porto Rico (Rept. No. 1297); and

S. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution extending the provisions of sections 1, 2, 6, and 7 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," to Porto Rico (Rept. No. 1298).

Mr. PHIPPS, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to which was referred the bill (S. 5245) for the



relief of the Uncompahgre reclamation project, Colorado, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1299) thereon.

#### REPORT OF POSTAL NOMINATIONS

As in executive session,

Mr. PHIPPS, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported sundry post-office nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 5688) granting the consent of Congress to the State of New Hampshire to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or dike across Little Bay at or near Fox Point (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NYE:

A bill (S. 5689) for the relief of Grina Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 5690) for the relief of Edmund Glover Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 5691) granting a pension to Mary H. Rodgers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 5692) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Cole (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5693) granting a pension to Alice Rollow (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

A bill (S. 5694) granting a pension to Willis S. George;

A bill (S. 5695) granting a pension to Lula Rogers;

A bill (S. 5696) granting a pension to Rilla M. Hatfield (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5697) granting a pension to John M. Myers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUTTING:

A bill (S. 5698) granting a pension to Frank E. Crane (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5699) granting a pension to Elmer Gilbert (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5700) granting a pension to Margarito Barela (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5701) granting a pension to Jefferson D. Keith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5702) granting a pension to Carrie Belle Luther (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5703) granting a pension to Thomas J. Wells (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5704) granting a pension to Archibald H. Dixon (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5705) granting a pension to Jose de la Luz Mirabal (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5706) granting a pension to Ysidro Garcia (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5707) granting a pension to Trinidad Ortiz de Tucker (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5708) granting a pension to Amanda J. Brooke (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5709) for the relief of John Stratis (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5710) granting compensation to Reuben R. Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5711) granting compensation to Mary Griffin (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5712) granting compensation to Farrel E. Plymate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 5713) granting a pension to Robert Page; and

A bill (S. 5714) granting an increase of pension to Mildred A. Clough; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 5715) to authorize the attendance of personnel and animals of the Regular Army as participants in the Tenth Olympic Games; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5716) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, consider, and render judgment on the claims of George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd against the United States in respect of certain ships taken during the World War by the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Idaho:

A bill (S. 5717) to authorize exchanges of land with owners of private-land holdings within the craters of the Moon National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SCHALL:

A bill (S. 5718) for the retirement of employees of the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Co., on the Isthmus of Panama, who are citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5719) to amend certain sections of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, as amended, relating to descent and distribution; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 5720) granting an increase of pension to Amy E. Edwards; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

A bill (S. 5721) for the relief of E. E. Carroll; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5722) granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission and the Board of Supervisors of Itawamba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across Tombigbee River at or near Fulton, Miss.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 5723) granting a pension to Christ O. Severeide (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 5724) authorizing the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to print and distribute additional sets of the writings of George Washington; to the Committee on the Library.

#### AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACTS

Mr. KEAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 5249) to amend the acts of Congress approved March 3, 1925, and July 3, 1926, known as the District of Columbia traffic acts, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for soil-erosion investigations from \$280,000 to \$380,000, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15256, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT TO WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—OLD FORT NIAGARA, N. Y.

Mr. COPELAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15593, the War Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 69, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"Old Fort Niagara, N. Y.: For the completion of repair, restoration, and rehabilitation of the French castle, the French powder magazine, the French storehouse, the early American hot-shot oven and battery emplacements and gun mounts, the casemates of 1861, and the outer French breastworks, and for the repair and building of roadways and the improvement of grounds at Old Fort Niagara, N. Y., \$70,000, to be expended by the Secretary of War."

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JONES obtained the floor.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	Keyes	Shipstead
Barkley	Frazier	King	Shortridge
Bingham	George	La Follette	Simmons
Black	Gillett	McGill	Smith
Blaine	Glass	McKellar	Smoot
Borah	Glenn	McMaster	Steiwer
Bratton	Goff	McNary	Stephens
Brock	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Swanson
Brookhart	Gould	Morrison	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Hale	Morrow	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkley	Harris	Moses	Townsend
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Trammell
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Tydings
Carey	Hatfield	Nye	Vandenberg
Connally	Hawes	Oddie	Wagner
Copeland	Hayden	Partridge	Walcott
Couzens	Hebert	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Heflin	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Pine	Waterman
Davis	Johnson	Reed	Watson
Deneen	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Dill	Kean	Robinson, Ind.	Williamson
Fess	Kendrick	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN BATTLESHIPS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I wish to submit a report of the committee of conference on House Joint Resolution 447. I find that under the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into for a special order I can not have the conference report considered except by unanimous consent. So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I would modify the pending unanimous-consent agreement by another unanimous-consent agreement. I ask that the consideration of the bill (S. 4750) to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels be temporarily laid aside until to-morrow without prejudice, because I understand no Senator wants to speak on it to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. NORRIS. The Chair has one unanimous-consent request pending, that of the Senator from Washington. I think that ought to be acted on first.

Mr. SWANSON. My proposal was that it be modified. The agreement under which we are now proceeding provides that the bill relating to the modernization of battleships can be laid aside only by unanimous consent. I propose to modify the request of the Senator from Washington by providing that the naval bill shall be temporarily laid aside to-day without prejudice.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me to be the duty of the Chair first to submit the request of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not understand that the Senator from Washington desires to displace or rescind the unanimous-consent agreement relating to the modernization of battleships.

Mr. JONES. No; I do not.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Then I suggest to him that he modify his request so as to make that clear.

Mr. JONES. I thought I did make it clear. I stated that I could not have the conference report considered except under the agreement under which we are now proceeding, and I asked unanimous consent that I might present the conference report for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would hold that if unanimous consent is given to the request of the Senator from Washington the naval bill is only temporarily laid aside and following a demand for the regular order upon request the naval bill would again be laid before the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. I propose to modify the unanimous-consent agreement by requesting that the naval bill, S. 4750, be temporarily laid aside for to-day.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator from Washington has pursued the proper course. I have no objection to his request. I think we ought to take up what he asks us to take up; and if it is taken up, to that extent the consideration of the conference report will, of course, modify the unanimous-

consent agreement. The unanimous-consent agreement itself provides for such a modification. It seems to me he is following the unanimous-consent agreement strictly. I am not in favor of agreeing to a unanimous consent that will lay aside the other unanimous-consent agreement until a particular time. That is a violation of the unanimous-consent agreement itself.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from Virginia stated that he was informed that no Senator desires to speak on the special order to-day, and, as I think the Senator from Nebraska is informed, it is necessary at a certain hour to-day for the Senator from Virginia to retire from the Chamber.

Mr. NORRIS. My suggestion will not interfere with it. Suppose we get through with the conference report in five minutes. If the unanimous-consent agreement asked by the Senator from Virginia is entered into, even if it were in order, which I doubt very much, because we have a specific agreement to vote at a particular hour on the pending proposition, it would require a roll call and other formalities to lay it aside.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The proposed procedure does not change the order for a vote. It does not affect it at all, if I may point that out to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Even if that be true, why not go on, if there is no objection—and I hope there will be none to the request of the Senator from Washington—and take up the conference report? That is provided for in the unanimous-consent agreement itself, and that will take care of the situation.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator from Washington will permit me, the agreement provides that the naval bill shall not be laid aside temporarily except by unanimous consent. All I have asked the Senator from Washington to do is to include in any unanimous-consent request to proceed with the conference report a provision that the previous order shall be temporarily laid aside. That is all I ask, and I do that in pursuance of the unanimous-consent agreement itself.

Mr. NORRIS. There is no such language in the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. SWANSON. Let the Senator read it.

Mr. NORRIS. I read it:

And that except by unanimous consent it shall continue before the Senate—

And so forth.

Now, the Senator from Washington asks to take up for consideration a conference report. If that is done, the conference report automatically comes before the Senate—

Mr. SWANSON. And possibly may displace the unanimous-consent agreement, unless it shall be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. NORRIS. No; it would not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would hold that it would not displace the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection, if it is distinctly understood by the Senate that the granting of the request of the Senator from Washington will not interfere with the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington that the Senate consider the conference report on the drought relief joint resolution? The Chair hears none.

#### RELIEF OF FARMERS' IN THE DROUGHT AND STORM AREAS

Mr. JONES. I submit a conference report and ask for its immediate consideration.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 447) making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought



and/or storm stricken areas of the United States," approved December 20, 1930, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

W. L. JONES,  
REED SMOOT,  
WM. J. HARRIS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

WILL R. WOOD,  
LEWIS C. CRAMTON,  
EDWARD H. WASON,  
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,  
J. P. BUCHANAN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the report is simply one of disagreement. I ask that it may be adopted, and then I shall have another motion to make.

Mr. NORRIS. So that we may understand it—

Mr. JONES. The report is one of complete disagreement.

Mr. NORRIS. If it shall be adopted, then there will be nothing before the Senate.

Mr. JONES. If the report shall be adopted, I expect to make a motion with reference to the amendments.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, before that is done I should like to speak on the question.

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

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not asking the Senator to yield. I want the floor in my own right. I am objecting to the adoption of the report. Senators have a right to be heard on that question. The Senator from Washington, as I understood, asked that the report be adopted, and I want to be recognized before that is done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to be heard on that question.

Mr. JONES. Let me say to the Senate that this conference report is one of complete disagreement. The House and the Senate conferees could not agree upon either of the two amendments which were pending before them. If the Senate shall adopt this conference report, then the question will come up as to what further action the Senate shall take, whether it shall ask for a further conference or whether it shall recede from the two amendments. Therefore I take it that any discussion the Senate may desire to engage in really would be in order on that proposition. The adoption of the conference report, of course, will not foreclose any Senator from discussing the merits of the amendments which are in disagreement. So I thought, under the circumstances, that the conference report might be adopted, and then the question will come before the Senate as to what shall be done.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask that the conference report may be read. I am somewhat in doubt as to whether or not the procedure suggested is proper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again read the report.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 447) making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States," approved December 20, 1930, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

W. L. JONES,  
REED SMOOT,  
WM. J. HARRIS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

WILL R. WOOD,  
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,  
EDWARD H. WASON,  
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,  
J. P. BUCHANAN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing on the conference report.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I shall take but a few moments. Two amendments were adopted by the Senate. One was offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] directing the Secretary of Agriculture and his agents not to exclude from the relief provisions of the bill those who live outside of certain designated areas which the department seemed inclined to set up. As I understand, the Secretary of Agriculture was proceeding to say that people living within certain counties might be permitted to avail themselves of the provisions of the drought relief act, but those living in an adjoining county, for instance, would be denied the right to participate in the benefits, if there should be any.

The second amendment, providing that \$15,000,000 may be loaned to farmers in the drought and storm stricken areas of the country is, however, the real bone of contention in connection with the bill. Certain influences held it up for quite a while in the other body until they could make sure that they could prevent its adoption. The House never permitted a vote directly upon the amendment. There seems to be a new rule in that body providing that measures shall be sent to conference either by unanimous consent or by a special rule, so that the individual Members of the House may escape responsibility for having voted either for or against a given proposition. With that, however, I am not now concerning myself.

When this bill came back from the House with a request for a conference, I asked the Senator from Washington, in charge of the conference committee on the part of the Senate [Mr. JONES], if he would permit me to have four or five minutes when the conferees met, as there was some information which I wanted to convey which I thought possibly, even as hostile as I knew the conferees to be to the proposition, might move them to afford some relief. The chairman of the conference committee refused to grant me that request.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

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

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I did not refuse the Senator's request. I stated to him, however, the attitude that especially the House conferees had taken heretofore. They have not favored having Senators or anyone else from the outside come before conference committees. Personally I should have been glad to have the Senator come before the conference committee, but I knew of that attitude, because it was evident at the last session of Congress on two or three different occasions when similar requests were made.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the Senator, please, tell me what conference committee ever refused the privilege to a member of one body or the other, who was interested in the matter in conference and was the author of the amendment in dispute, to make a statement before the conferees?

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. Which one was it?

Mr. JONES. I can not name the particular conference committee, but I know—

Mr. CARAWAY. Which member of the House conference committee took that position in this instance?

Mr. JONES. I would not mention the name of any particular Member of the House.

Mr. CARAWAY. Very well.

Mr. JONES. That was my attitude, however.

Mr. CARAWAY. I understood the Senator's attitude perfectly well.

Mr. JONES. Well, the Senator did not state it correctly in his remarks a moment ago.

Mr. CARAWAY. I repeated just exactly what the Senator said to me. I asked him if I might have four or five minutes, and he said the House Members objected to it. I asked him if he were not chairman of that conference committee, and he said yes. I said, "Then, have you not some right to accord me an opportunity to be heard?" He said, "That is



the situation." That is what occurred, and every living soul knows exactly what it meant. Certainly I do, and everybody else does. I have known professional lobbyists to be permitted to appear before conference committees. But, Mr. President, I am not fixing to quarrel with the Senator from Washington, nor am I fixing to retract any statement I have made about it. I merely want the facts to be known. The Senator from Washington is responsible for his conduct, and I shall be responsible for mine.

There has not been a piece of legislation before this Congress that has been the object of so much hostile propaganda, so many utterly unestablished assertions as that now pending. Three Members of the House, whose names I shall not mention because everybody knows them, declared that they saw a great "red" propaganda because hungry children wanted to eat. I know, Mr. President, that they knew that statement was not true, and everybody who heard it knew it was not true.

Mr. Payne, the head of the Red Cross, was before the Committee on Appropriations the other day and took particular pains to deny certain statements I had made. He asserted that the Red Cross was in position to take care of the situation and was doing so. Yet Mr. Payne said last night that the greatest emergency that ever faced this country in time of peace was confronting it now; that the greatest sum the Red Cross ever raised for peace-time relief was imperatively demanded now; that more than 400,000 people in 21 States had already applied for relief and that number was being augmented daily.

I said, Mr. President, when Mr. Payne made his statement before the committee that he did not have any information touching the matter about which he undertook to enlighten the committee. In less than a week he admits that he had no information about it, because, diametrically opposite to what he said before the committee, is what he said to the President of the United States and what last night he said to the American public. I am not going to take the time to quarrel with him; I have had for him a very high regard. I will, however, quote just a portion of his language:

The situation in 21 States forms the greatest peace-time emergency in history.

And he goes into detail. The statement has been published in all the newspapers, and I shall not take the time of the Senate to review it.

Mr. President, I presume every Member of the Senate has received, as I have received, letters from many people in many different States setting forth the situation. Such letters have come to me, as I am sure they have come to you, Mr. President. They have come from people who have no selfish interest to serve, who will not be benefited by the passage of this measure; they have come from bankers and lawyers and business men, officials of the various counties and States, and there is but one story they tell.

The Chicago Tribune is a great newspaper, but one that never has been friendly to the South and never will be, I presume. It discusses this situation. It talks about a bread line in some of these drought-afflicted areas, and the relief that the people are being granted. Heads of families have been given from \$1.50 to \$3 for two weeks. If a family has five members, they get \$3 for two weeks; and it says that in the public schools children in the lowest grades even now are forming in soup lines in order to get enough to eat, to live.

Again I want to say that I think the Chicago Tribune is one of the world's greatest newspapers. I shall not read the entire article. I know that it is not overpainting the picture. It thinks it is so necessary that the public should know the situation that it puts its story on the first page, in the first column, under big headlines, and calls attention to the facts. No one can believe, the present administration can have no occasion to believe, that that picture is overdrawn; and everyone realizes—you can vote as you please, but you know—that people can not live on a dollar a month or a dollar a week, and that a family of five can not live on a dollar and a half a week.

If we are going to let them starve, why, Mr. President, I think we would just as well withdraw all relief at once. There is not any use to torture humanity by giving them a bite to-day and a bite to-morrow so as to prolong their agony.

These people, despite whatever one or two who are utterly reckless in their statements may say, are not agitators. In my State, less than one-fourth of 1 per cent are foreign born. They are of native American stock. Most of them would be eligible to be Sons of the American Revolution or Daughters of the American Revolution. They have met every emergency so far as lay within their power when distress came to this country or when danger came to it.

I am not stopping to eulogize my State; but when there was a call by the same man who is now President of the United States that people should forego certain rights in order that soldiers might eat, the State that I represent gave up more than any other State in the Union according to its ability to serve this purpose. It has a distinguished-service certificate for having given up a greater proportion of its sugar and flour rations than any other State in the Union; and, strange to say, it furnished more soldiers, according to the number of people who lived in it and were eligible for military service, I think—and I am not saying this to depreciate other States—than any other State in the Union. They took, without complaining, the most difficult rôle for an enlisted man to serve in in this great war. They became replacement troops everywhere. Wherever the shock of battle had depleted the regiments in the Regular or in the emergency Army, they stood ready to step into the places of those who had fallen and offer their lives in defense of their country.

In my own county, when the American Army checked the German advance at Chateau-Thierry in June, 1918, and again stood in front of it and turned it back on the 18th day of July of that year, 27 boys—every blessed one of them the son of some farmer family in that county—laid down their lives. When General Pershing was making up his list of the 100 most distinguished enlisted men in the last war, the fourth on that list was a barefooted boy who lived on a farm that I owned in Arkansas. I am sure that he had never been farther away from his community than the capital of his State. As I have just said, they did not own the land upon which they earned a living. They were just straightforward, honest farmer people. He went to France, and the record of his achievements and his heroism is written in the records of the War Department; and particular attention was called to it by General Pershing in his report, as I said, when he selected the 100 most distinguished enlisted men. This boy got nothing for that. His health was broken. He made application for relief, and died a pauper in the hospital at Memphis; and then the department said he was entitled to adjusted compensation.

They brought him back home and buried him. His neighbors, no better off than he, raised a fund and sent to Italy and had a figure of him carved in marble, and it stands on the roadside, and a highway has been named for him; but it all came after he was dead, Mr. President. Sooner or later, I presume, some kind of recognition of these women and children who are starving now, some recognition of their worth as American citizens, will be accorded them; but it will be too late.

I have in my pocket a letter from the president, Dr. Thad Cothen, of the medical society of my home county; and I want to read one paragraph from it. I could read it all with advantage, but I will read one. He says:

A pathetic incident took place in my office this morning.

Let me pause here a minute to say that the man who wrote this letter had a substantial and a profitable practice when war came. He laid it aside, put on his country's uniform, went to France, and under shell fire stood ready to relieve the wounded and care for those who were stricken upon the battlefield, and was decorated for his courage and his unselfish service. He came back home and undertook to reestablish his practice, and I presume has done so; but he writes this letter:



A pathetic incident took place in my office this morning. An elderly man living near the city here came in the office with his 7-year-old son. The child was very sick, very pale, and anæmic. The father had an order from the Red Cross for \$2 worth of groceries, and he had worked on the city streets here two days for this order. This child's illness was one brought on by poor and indigestible food which they had been forced to eat. We gave the child such treatment as was indicated, and, of course, had to furnish the medicine. The father stated that he did not know when he could ever get employment or any means with which to pay me; but that did not keep the child from needing this attention which we gave him. We doctors in this part of the State are all busy, and incidents like this occur to us daily.

Mr. President, recently there was held here a great convention, and there is appearing in the *Cosmopolitan Magazine* a eulogistic story of the President of the United States. In the last issue there is a long line of his pictures across two pages of the magazine, every one of them professing to portray the President's features as he said something about caring for children, posing as the defender and the advocate of giving the coming generation a chance to grow up better than the present generation, and yet, Mr. President, refusing to allow the children in 21 States of this Union to have enough food to keep life in their bodies, much less to permit of a healthful, normal development of American childhood.

This is the situation, Mr. President. It does not rest upon my testimony. It comes now from the President of the United States. It comes from John Barton Payne, the chairman of the Red Cross. It comes from respectable and highly respected and thoroughly credible papers like the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, like the *Sun of Baltimore*, and innumerable papers throughout the United States. I am not asking you to take the testimony of a single man or woman who would be relieved by what is proposed.

Now, candidly, I want to ask this question: I shall have lost some faith in humanity and some faith in the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States if this is true: Knowing the situation that has developed, the greatest calamity in peace time in the history of this country; knowing that thousands and thousands of American men and women and children are suffering, that they are becoming the prey of disease, that their lives must be paid as a forfeit for our neglect, that if they escape they shall do so with children deprived of the nourishment that would make them strong and healthy mentally and physically, but on the other hand will make them mental and physical weaklings, are we willing that these things shall happen because we are unwilling to extend to them \$15,000,000?

We can clip that amount off an appropriation bill anywhere. Here is a bill—and I am not fighting it—appropriating \$30,000,000, to be made available at once, to recondition three battleships; and every man who sits in the Senate Chamber knows that they will never fire a hostile shot during the time they float on the sea. Here is \$100,000,000 being appropriated to build magnificent public buildings in the District of Columbia. Here is eighty-odd million dollars being asked to increase the salaries of people who now, I will not say are adequately paid, but at least are comfortable. Here was \$126,000,000 turned back to rich corporations for overpayment of taxes alleged to have taken place 10 or 12 years ago. Day before yesterday, Mr. President, and recorded yesterday, there was turned back to the estate of one man more money than this measure asks.

Let us concede that all those things are right and proper; but if we have the money to do all these things, we have the money to keep American citizens from starving. Why, God bless your souls, they are not beggars. They are just as good people as any man who sits in the Senate of the United States. They are just as worthy of protection as the man who sits at the other end of the Avenue and for a little time is the President of the United States. Why, God bless you, the children that are forming a ragged bread line in the public schools, to try to get enough to eat to keep from starving, are just as much human beings, just as good American citizens, as are the grandchildren of the President of the United States who had eight Christmas trees on Christmas Day. These children did not have one,

and they are not complaining about that. They are not asking for a luxury like that. God bless their little hearts!

If they can just eat, if they can just have enough clothes to keep them from freezing, they are not complaining. But, in the name of God and in the name of humanity, I want to ask, is it possible, is it possible; have we become such a hardened race of people that we, to save a few dollars of taxes, are willing not only to doom a million American people to suffering, to a winter of hunger and cold and rags and scant rations, but to send many of them to their graves and leave others hopeless cripples to struggle with the years to come? Are we willing to do it? I shall believe that we are not. I shall hope that we are not.

I want to say again, we relieved suffering in Europe, and we thought that we deserved well of Europe because we did so. I stood here and defended an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to go to Russia, though I was never in Russia and never expect to be. We were not thinking of any in that country that might owe allegiance to the flag of the United States; but the people were starving, they were human beings, and it was thought that we would be inhuman if out of the fullness of our plenty we did not supply those people with something to eat.

Going back to 1848, we all know that a famine fell upon that little island just off the coast of England called Ireland, when the potato crop failed. People in the United States raised sufficient funds to keep the people there from starving, and from that day to this, for nearly a century, Ireland has blessed the United States for her generosity. Such actions do not die. When people come to the relief of others in time of great want, the feeling of gratitude lives on; it survives the ages. Likewise I take it for granted that if a government will deny to its own people the right to live, the right to keep from suffering, the right to preserve the lives of their children, the people are not going to feel wholly grateful for that neglect.

I do not know what animus is back of this failure to take action. I can not understand it. Feeding the hungry by the Federal Government is not a new proposition. Take the great imperial Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I am proud of it. It is a Commonwealth which has added much to the resources and to the learning and the culture of this country of ours. I take pride in its achievements and in the reputation of its citizens. When I first became a Member of the House of Representatives, Salem, Mass., was swept by a disastrous fire. I remember that Mr. Gardner, who is dead now, a patriotic Representative from that State, offered a resolution for the appropriation of \$200,000 out of the Treasury of the United States to take care of that emergency. That resolution passed both Houses without an objection. Not a single man raised his voice in opposition to it. The Democratic Party was in control of the Government at that time, and one of the greatest men who ever was President of these United States sat at the other end of the Avenue, Woodrow Wilson. He signed the resolution. Every Democrat and every Republican in both Houses voted for it, and we were glad to do it. I am glad that no American in either House raised his voice against supplying the necessities of life to suffering humanity on that occasion.

When San Francisco was rocked by an earthquake we appropriated money to take care of the emergency. Senators are familiar with the history of that catastrophe. This is no new experience.

In the name of common sense, when did the life of a mule become sacred and that of a child of no account? Nobody is objecting to giving \$45,000,000 to take care of livestock. The objection comes when we want to feed human beings. I am curious to know when it became the policy of this Government to say that its citizenship is of no account but that its livestock must be cared for.

I presume this provision for the \$15,000,000 will go out of the measure. We who believe that this Government is a humane government, we who believe that the resources of this country are dedicated to the comfort and the protection of the American people, and to sustaining their lives, purpose offering the amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill. The amendment has passed the Senate at this session of



Congress and, therefore, would not be subject to a point of order.

As I said before, if there is a man who takes pride in saying, "I object to human beings being fed, I gloat over the suffering of men and women, I take pleasure in knowing that to-night barefooted, hungry children will cry for bread and not get it"—if there is such a man in the Senate, I wish he would stand up. If anyone feels that way about it, I wish he would stand up and record himself on the side of those who think that it is a credit to a great government like ours to make its citizens suffer and to make children sleepless, and hungry, and ragged, and cold. If anyone gets any pride or pleasure in such a feeling, I should like to have him record himself on that side of this question.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, there are two amendments on this bill which are subjects of controversy, and one of them has not been explained to the Senate. I do not believe there is a Senator on either side of the Chamber who would justify to the slightest extent turning down the other amendment, which has not been discussed. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas provided \$15,000,000 for loans for food. The amendment which I offered is of a different nature. The amendment I offered would require the Secretary of Agriculture to extend the relief to any person in any drought-stricken area who has been injured by the drought.

As it is now written, and as it is now construed, the Secretary of Agriculture takes the position that he can award the benefits of this bill to a drought-stricken farmer in one county, but will decline to award the benefits of the bill to a drought-stricken farmer in an adjoining county. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture takes the position and says that in some of the States he will award relief under the administration of this measure, to the farmers in part of the counties who are suffering from the drought, but will decline to award the relief to farmers in other counties who are suffering from the drought.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BRATTON. I am interested in the statement now being made by the Senator from Alabama, because it conflicts with my understanding of a statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture when he appeared recently before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, it being my distinct memory that I asked the Secretary at that time whether relief under this bill would be confined to any particular area, to which he replied by saying no, that although the department had made a rather thorough survey of the drought-stricken areas and had rather definitely in mind the areas of the country to be served under the bill, the department would not confine relief to those areas but would consider applications coming from any section of the country.

Mr. BLACK. I will read to the Senator, in answer to his question, the information which I have in my hand, which has been issued by the Department of Agriculture touching the loans.

Mr. BRATTON. I wish the Senator would do that, because I asked the Secretary the direct question, having the particular thought in mind, and I thought I understood him on the subject.

Mr. BLACK. I will state to the Senator that I raised this exact question before the Committee on Agriculture and suggested that the bill might be so amended as to prevent exactly the situation which I have outlined. The committee unanimously took the position that the Secretary of Agriculture under the bill would have no authority to deny relief to a drought sufferer in any county if he had suffered from the drought. Doctor Warburton, who appeared, indicated that such was his view.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. When the resolution was reported to the Senate I asked the chairman of the Committee on Agri-

culture the specific question whether or not the legislation was to take care of any case, and he said that was the understanding.

Mr. BLACK. I might state to the Senator that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, who I am sorry to note is out of the Chamber at the moment, stated to me that that was his understanding, and he was for the amendment which I offered. He stated so on the floor.

Now I would like to read the regulations which have been issued by the Department of Agriculture to govern the loans.

Loans will be made in practically all counties in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Arkansas, which States were wholly within the drought area of 1930, and in those counties in other States in which drought damage was most severe.

In other words, in the counties where the drought damage was most severe the loans will be made. The position I took before the committee, and the position which the committee unanimously took, was that it was not a question of the severity of the drought in any particular county, but it was the intention to direct and authorize the relief to be awarded in all counties where there was suffering from the drought. I read further:

These States—

Where it is not to go to all the counties—

include Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Montana, and Washington, together with smaller areas in the States of North Carolina, Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Kansas. Definite announcement as to the counties from which applications for loans will be accepted will be made at an early date.

I might state that I have taken this up with the department and they take the viewpoint that they have the right to determine the counties in which the drought was sufficiently severe to authorize the making of loans. They do not take the position that they will designate these areas so as to exclude only those counties where none suffered from the drought, but that if there are those suffering from the drought in certain counties in a State they have the right to say that by reason of the fact that it was not so severe in those counties as it was in other counties they will exclude from the benefits all who live in such counties, irrespective of whether they were injured by the drought or not.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. What document is that from which the Senator is reading, and when was it promulgated? Was it promulgated after the resolution passed the Senate or before?

Mr. BLACK. It is dated Washington, December 22, 1930. The heading of it is:

United States Department of Agriculture. Loans for seed, fertilizer, and feed. Administrative procedure for loans to farmers in drought and storm stricken areas.

Loans to farmers under the authorization of Congress contained in Senate Joint Resolution 211, approved December 20, 1930.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator think that the Department of Agriculture can select certain States, under that joint resolution, and exclude other States? I observe that Florida is not mentioned at all.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. There are certain portions of Florida which did suffer from the drought; not all the State suffered, but some counties did, and I do not see why they should be excluded. I asked the chairman of the committee, when the joint resolution was here, whether it was the intention to exclude any of the States, and he said, not at all. I do not see how the Department of Agriculture has the authority to eliminate States and say that, notwithstanding there must be suffering in those States, they can not come under this provision. I am for the Senator's amendment.

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



Mr. BLACK. I may state in reply—and then I will yield—that I took exactly the same position before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and that committee agreed with my viewpoint. We understood, from what Doctor Warburton stated before the committee, that he agreed with us.

But now the position is that certain counties as well as certain States, or certain counties in various States, will be denied the relief, not because they did not suffer from the drought and hail, but because the department takes unto itself the authority under the bill to determine whether it was of sufficient severity to warrant relief. The situation will be that in one county there will be a number of men who suffered from the drought, while others will be immediately over the county line. Relief will be denied to the latter unless the department voluntarily changes the position which it has assumed or unless the amendment which I offered to the bill or one of the same type shall remain in it and become a part of the law.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BRATTON. I want to observe in connection with what the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has just said that I recall distinctly hearing him propound his question to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] having charge of the original measure. I paid particular attention to it because some farmers in my State had advised me that they desired to seek relief under the measure. Hearing the answer of the Senator from Oregon, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, substantially as the Senator from Florida has outlined, I did not press the matter. But later when the Secretary of Agriculture was before the Senate Committee on Appropriations while the measure making the actual appropriation was under consideration, I asked him the direct question whether other areas than those regarded by the department as being in the drought-stricken region would be considered. My recollection is quite distinct to the effect that his answer was that applications from any part of the country would be considered by the department. I do not think I could be mistaken about that.

Mr. BLACK. May I say to the Senator that he has accurately outlined the viewpoint of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry? He so stated in the hearings; he so stated when I took my amendment to him; and he joined me in asking that the amendment be included so as to prevent the exact thing which I desire to prevent. I believe the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. JONES] will bear me out.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator here for the purpose which I have in mind, because I thought I would refer to it at a later time, but it seems to me it will be appropriate now as well as any time. I have here a copy of a letter written by Mr. Warburton to Congressman Wood in answer to his request for comment or statement with reference to this particular amendment. If the Senator has no objection, I would like to read that letter at this point.

Mr. BLACK. I shall be delighted. If the department officials have changed their position, I shall be glad to know it, because that is what I want.

Mr. JONES. The letter is addressed to Congressman Wood, and reads as follows:

Replying to your request for statement as to the effect of the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 447, added by the Senate on Monday as section 3, this amendment would prevent the Department of Agriculture, in the administration of the fund provided for seed loans under Public Resolution 112, in limiting the area in which loans would be made. In previous years it has been our practice to confine our distribution of application blanks and other forms and the making of loans to the States and counties in which there was need for assistance on the part of farmers to an extent which was beyond the ability of local agencies to give. We have not considered applications for loans from individuals in counties where conditions generally were favorable and where

only a few, perhaps a dozen or less, individuals were in need of financial help, feeling that aid could be extended to them from local sources. We do not feel that our exclusion of counties from consideration in previous years has resulted in serious hardship to anyone.

If Senator BLACK's amendment is retained, the net result will be to make the loans available to any farmer anywhere who can show that his crops were damaged by drought or storms in 1930, even though he may be the only individual in the county who is in need of financial assistance from this cause. It would materially increase the work of our field offices in handling loans by widening the area of operations without increasing to any large extent the number of loans which would be made. It would probably result in the receipt of a considerable number of applications from persons to whom we would not be justified in giving assistance, either because their crop injury was not sufficient to justify us in making loans to them or because they could obtain funds from local sources.

Very truly yours,

C. W. WARBURTON,  
Secretary Federal Drought-Relief Committee.

I infer from the statements in this letter that they would not refuse assistance to individuals in a county where a considerable number were suffering. He says that they have not granted relief in counties where a dozen or less were involved. I tried to get Mr. Warburton over the telephone this morning to ask him more definitely in regard to the matter, but I was unable to do so because he was in conference with the Secretary; but I have just read the letter he wrote to Congressman Wood.

Mr. BLACK. May I say to the Senator that the letter shows exactly the situation which I have stated to the Senate. If we knew that that principle would be carried out so that only those counties would be excluded where, for instance, one man had applied, the prospective injury would not be so serious. But the committee stated to Doctor Warburton, and the statement appeared in the hearings before the committee, that it was the object to relieve the drought sufferers wherever they were.

May I also invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that a short time ago the department did designate the drought areas in my own State, and I am, of course, more familiar with that than any other State. Thirty-nine counties were designated as the drought-stricken area and the remaining 28 were designated as not within the area. When that was done a survey was taken by the board appointed by the President. It has been found that the suffering in those 28 counties is 50 per cent of the suffering in the other 39. I have in my hand a letter from one of the counties which was designated as not being within the area in which this statement appears, the letter being dated Valley Head, December 29, 1930:

We have from 150 to 300 families in dry section near Valley Head, including about 175 square miles, that are destitute and many of them are suffering for want of food and clothes and who need help from some source. Of course, we can get a little aid in the county, but it will be insufficient to meet the needs of conditions. Conditions in this section are terrible.

A mass meeting was held for the purpose of endeavoring to get relief. This is one of the counties which has already been designated in a previous allotment as not being within the drought area.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. With respect to the statement made a while ago by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], it may interest the Senator to know that Doctor Warburton actually assumes authority to say what class of farmers may be relieved as well as what counties may be regarded as suffering. In other words, as members of the Appropriations Committee will recall, when we had the La Follette resolution under consideration Doctor Warburton stated that no relief would be afforded to orchardists upon the extraordinary assumption that any man who is able to own an orchard has sufficient credit to take care of himself and does not need any aid from this source.

I make that statement in order that the Senator from Florida, who comes from a great fruit-growing State, may understand that no matter how much his fruit growers may



suffer they will not get any aid under this measure, although there are words in the bill put there expressly for the benefit of the fruit growers, to furnish aid to that class of farmers.

Mr. BLACK. May I also call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to one or two other letters coming from reliable sources with reference to counties which have already been designated in the previous action by the Secretary of Agriculture as not within the drought area? Here is one from Escambia County:

There are 400 or more families in Escambia County who suffered total or partial crop failures in 1930 on account of drought and hail.

If the Secretary of Agriculture follows the designation which he has previously set forth, that county will be excluded. Here is another one from Henry County:

The undersigned banks and county officials of this (Henry) county, Alabama, make this earnest appeal to you for your best efforts to secure as liberal aid as possible from the \$45,000,000 appropriation recently made by Congress for relief to drought-stricken areas. There are approximately 600 farmer families of this county whose 1930 crops were practically failures, caused from weather conditions, namely, droughts and hailstorms.

I call the attention of the Senate to this matter for the reason that if we are compelled to recede from the amendment in order to obtain the relief as indicated, I am hopeful that Senators will express themselves as being favorable to awarding the relief to those who suffer from the drought and hail wherever they have suffered. It is not right, and it is contrary to the plain purposes of the bill, for the Secretary of Agriculture to arrogate unto himself the right to designate county lines because, forsooth, he says there may have been a little more severity in one county of a given State than in another.

Here is exactly what it will lead the public to believe. The administration has not desired to have \$45,000,000 appropriated. They have shown that idea from the beginning. The desire is to so whittle the appropriation down that in the end it will be shown that \$45,000,000 was not needed, and that another great victory has been won by the administration by showing that a greater sum was appropriated than was needed for the purpose, and yet here are 25 States designated as suffering from the drought where the Secretary of Agriculture will take the position that he can cut off the benefits from some sufferers in some counties merely because it is not so severe there as in his judgment to justify an award.

I hope that Senators will not permit this to go by without expressing themselves against it. I desire to ask this question at a time when the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is listening, and I desire to invite particularly the attention of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, as well as that of every other Senator. If there is any Senator here who conceives it is the purpose or policy of this measure for the Secretary of Agriculture to deny relief to drought sufferers in some counties and to award relief to drought sufferers in counties immediately adjoining, I would like for that Senator to so state. If not, then I assume it is the opinion of those here, including the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as I know it to be the opinion of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that the Secretary of Agriculture should award relief to those who need it and that he should not arbitrarily deny it simply because he may arbitrarily designate a county or State line as the dividing line.

Mr. President, I have a number of letters from other counties stating the deplorable conditions in those counties. It is my opinion that the \$10,000,000 asked for by the Red Cross will be but a beginning. It is not surprising to find that the chairman of the Red Cross, within a very few days after he made his statement before the Appropriations Committee, has been compelled by the inevitable facts which stared him in the face to call for more liberal contributions from the public.

I can state of my own personal knowledge that there is in Birmingham, Ala., one family in particular that I know of, six members of which are absolutely dependent upon the

Red Cross. The father has not had a job for six months; he can not obtain a job; it is impossible. His wife has tuberculosis; there are four little children in that home. They are receiving the sum of \$4 per week from the Red Cross for their sustenance and support. I do not make any complaint about this being all the Red Cross contributes, for on investigation by me I found that was all they were contributing because that was all they could contribute with the money they had on hand; that it was absolutely impossible for them to contribute more.

I have personal knowledge of another family, a man who served in France for 10 months. He has two little children. A volunteer Red Cross worker went into his home three or four days ago. She found him at home in bed, sick and helpless; she found his wife ill; she found two little children there hungry; she found the fact to be that the light had been cut off, the gas had been cut off, the water had been cut off. The Red Cross is contributing \$4 per week, which, I repeat, is all they can contribute with the funds they now have on hand.

Mr. President, I desire to say that I have written a letter to the chairman of the Red Cross in which the question is asked whether or not if he secures the \$10,000,000 which he is seeking to raise from public contributions it will permit the Red Cross to make an allotment greater than \$4 per week to a family with four or six dependents. If the \$10,000,000, which the Red Cross proposes to raise from the public, is not sufficient to increase the family allotment, I deny that the Red Cross can make adequate provision for those who are suffering and destitute and hungry in this country. It is, however, not only a question of those who are suffering from the drought but it is a question of those who are suffering from the terrible unemployment situation which exists in the cities. If the chairman of the Red Cross informs me that with the \$10,000,000 contribution he will still be unable to increase the \$4 a week allotment to families with four to six dependents, I expect at that time to introduce a bill which will provide a contribution from this Government to be taken fairly and equitably from the taxpayers who are able to bear it in sufficient amount to make certain that American citizens are not longer left starving, helpless, and destitute.

That is simple. The lines are clearly drawn. No one who appreciates the situation can fail to see it. We all know that contributions which are raised from the public voluntarily can not be collected on an equitable basis. The person who asserts that they are is not familiar with the way they are raised. I deny, for instance, that those whose income-tax refunds of \$146,000,000 were returned to them on yesterday will make a proportionate contribution to the \$10,000,000 which is proposed to be raised by the Red Cross. The contribution will be made, in the main, by those of moderate incomes.

The very moment it is suggested that relief for the poor, the suffering, and the destitute should be secured by taxation, a contest ensues with the great forces that have ruled the dominant party of this Nation for a long number of years, for they know that when the money is raised by taxation, taxes being imposed in proportion to wealth and the ability to pay, they will be compelled to contribute their proportionate part to relieve the suffering and the destitute of this land. That is the line of demarcation, and that is the reason why there is a great concerted effort on the part of the administration leaders to prevent any idea permeating throughout the country that it would be permissible, under any circumstances, to feed the starving and hungry people of the Nation through the medium of public funds raised by taxation.

I assert, Mr. President, that if the Red Cross does not intend to increase the allotment to more than \$4 per week to suffering and destitute families and those families are compelled to live upon \$4 per week, the time will have arrived when we must assert the right of Congress to obtain the money from the source from which it should come, and that is from the incomes that are out of all proportion to the labor which produces them, the incomes which are re-



ceived by those who have been the chief beneficiaries from tax refunds both from the Treasury Department and under the law which was passed last year.

I now give notice that if from the reply to my letter to the Red Cross the information reaches me that with the \$10,000,000 the Red Cross does not intend to increase the allotment to dependent families, I shall introduce a bill to appropriate from the United States Treasury money to be expended either through the Red Cross or some other organization to take care of the starving and the hungry of this Nation, and to take care of them in the way they should be taken care of, fairly, equitably, and justly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas obtained the floor.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may note the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I prefer not to yield for that purpose at this time.

Mr. BRATTON. Very well.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, this bill, admittedly an emergency measure, passed the Senate with two Senate amendments on the 5th day of January. It went to the body at the other end of the Capitol, where no action whatever was taken with respect to it until yesterday. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and others gave out the information that unless those who were interested in making some provision for food loans receded from their position and permitted the bill to go to conference by unanimous consent, the measure might be held in abeyance for a considerable time. Then, when action was finally taken, an extraordinary procedure, one which does not apply here, but which is frequently invoked in the body at the other end of the Capitol, was employed. A special rule was adopted which had the effect of shutting off all opportunity for amendment, even of an amendment to an amendment. That rule was agreed to by an overwhelming, almost a unanimous, vote, for the simple reason that if it had not been adopted the proposed legislation would have been further delayed and might have failed. Subsequently, a motion was made to instruct the conferees to agree to the amendment incorporated by the unanimous vote of the Senate, appropriating \$15,000,000 for loans for food, and a vote was taken on that motion resulting in 134 yeas and 216 nays. That represents the disposition of the amendment on the part of the House, and I apprehend that the purpose of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in charge of the conference report is, if the conference report be agreed to, to move that the Senate recede.

Twice the Senate has marched up the hill in solid phalanx; once we retreated down the hill, and now we are about to do the same thing again. Frankly, it is in the power of the administration leaders in the House of Representatives to delay or defeat the feed, seed, and fertilizer loans indefinitely, and my information is they propose to do so. If time permitted, I should like to have something to say about the body at the other end of the Capitol habitually taking the whip hand, habitually refusing to consider Senate bills, habitually declining to consider Senate amendments, and declaring with a defiant spirit, "Take it as you find it or leave it."

Let me say now that, in my judgment, the most important legislation before the Congress or to be considered by the Congress is fair, adequate relief legislation to meet an emergency which everyone with common intelligence has at last realized is upon the country; and before this session closes such legislation will be enacted by both Houses of the Congress of the United States or much relatively unimportant legislation will be relegated to the scrap heap. The friends of this proposal are in a situation that if they reject the conference report and adhere to the Senate amendments the House under its present leadership, under the direction, as I believe, of a higher authority, will let the bill lie unacted upon, and then from limit to limit of the drought-stricken regions propaganda will be inspired, as it

has already been inspired, directed against those who are trying to meet the situation frankly and fully, to compel them to yield in order that the meager relief carried by the seed loans may be obtained.

The agricultural appropriation bill is coming on, the deficiency appropriation bill is coming along, and if it is possible to write a fair and adequate provision into either one or both of those bills they will lie in the tomb of just legislation at the other end of the Capitol for a long period. The attitude of stifling debate, of cutting off amendments, of refusing to consider fair legislation, can not be justified in a government like ours.

The friends of this bill do not wish to defeat the measure. They realize the situation; but somebody who has the power to get action had better get busy.

On the 6th of January it was said before the Appropriations Committee, to discredit efforts to secure loans for food purposes, that the Red Cross, having a fund of four or four and a half million dollars, would be able to get through the winter without an additional fund; and within one week an appeal is sent to the country for \$10,000,000 in order to meet emergency requirements! I hope that appeal will be responded to in the spirit of generosity and sympathy which has marked the manhood and womanhood of America throughout the history of our country, but when it has been responded to the provision will still be inadequate; and it is a queer and inexplicable policy to disappoint the hopes of thousands of deserving citizens by denying measures of relief which are prompted by the sympathies which animate people everywhere.

To discredit the efforts of those who are trying to get relief, without the slightest foundation in fact or circumstances, statements have been made that the incident that occurred at England, Ark., a few days ago was instigated by communists, and was the result of communistic propaganda.

Mr. President, I have investigated that statement, not because I believed at the time it was made that an investigation was required, but because of the high source from which it emanated—the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and the chairman of a special committee in the same body. There is not one word of truth in the declaration. There was not one circumstance upon which the most vivid imagination could conceive of the existence of communistic influences in bringing about that incident. Similar incidents have occurred at other places in Arkansas and in adjoining States, and they will occur again inevitably unless the Congress takes some action to meet the requirements of the conditions.

Crop production in a vast area in the section most vitally affected is carried on by a credit system. Merchants, bankers, and agricultural credit corporations advance, upon such security as is available, including the crops, sums to be used in supplying food, feed, seed, and fertilizer. That is a general system that prevails over a very large area. The proposal here is to advance upon first mortgages, including all the security available, sufficient funds for seed, feed, and fertilizer, denying any loans whatever for the more important necessity—food. I want to ask all Senators present if one executes a first mortgage on his crop and other personal property to secure a loan for feed, seed, and fertilizer, how is he expected, how can he hope to obtain credit for the other necessities, just as requisite and even more so, in the production of crops? The inevitable result will be that the value of the \$45,000,000 seed loan bill will be very small in the areas where the distress is greatest; and let me point out now an inconsistency that makes absurd and that invites condemnation upon all those who insist that there should be no loans for food purposes. What it is proposed to do is to give to a farmer an honorable loan for the benefit of his mule or his cow but compel him to stand in a bread line to secure food for his wife and his children.



Why, of course, they will accept charity if they can not make their customary arrangements for credit; and these can not be made for reasons that I have already explained in other addresses to the Senate. The banks are closed. The merchants are in bankruptcy. They can not secure the capital with which to establish agricultural credit corporations. In many cases that capital had been arranged for. The banks in which the capital was deposited failed, so that the real difficulty in that situation is one of credit; and it can not be met by simply supplying charity.

If the Red Cross is to supply the demand for food, the absolute necessities for food throughout the country during this great economic crisis, it will require a much larger sum than is contemplated by the appeal that is now being made. Before the end of this session of Congress the situation is going to be realized fully; but in the meantime great suffering and distress will have occurred. Who should take responsibility for that suffering and distress?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do.

Mr. HARRIS. As I recall, before the Appropriations Committee Judge Payne stated distinctly that anything the Red Cross did would not be to enable farmers to make crops.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is exactly right. The Senator makes a distinction which is perfectly clear in my own mind, though perhaps, because of the fact that I am speaking hastily, I have not made it clear to the Senate. The Red Cross does not do rehabilitation work. It does not promote industrial or agricultural activities. It merely supplies the imminent need of starving people for food and similar necessities. My proposal is that a fair policy would have the effect of rehabilitating a prostrate section; that it would enable the people of those sections to resume their normal activities, and that it is an unsound policy to deny measures fairly calculated to produce that result.

If the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with a bill that is now pending before the Senate, will loan, in cases where the capital stock can not be otherwise secured, the necessary sums for the capital of agricultural credit corporations, the situation will be very greatly relieved. There will be less work for the Red Cross, and there will be less work for the seed committee. But now, as a practical question, I wish to ask how it is proposed that these farmers who are required to mortgage everything that they have in order to secure seed and feed are to finance their necessities for food during the crop-making season? When one answers that question satisfactorily, perhaps he will make a sane reply to the arguments that are made for loans for food, as well as for seed and fertilizer.

I wish to put into the Record a number of statements which reflect upon the situation, and the necessity for the passage of the bill to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

GILLHAM, ARK., January 8, 1931.

Senator JOSEPH T. ROBINSON:

Sevier County farmers need relief, and need your influence in Government aid, needing food, feed, seed, and fertilizer. Conditions are critical and need action at once. We are trying to prevent conditions that have happened elsewhere.

E. A. HIATT & SONS.

CONWAY, ARK., January 8, 1931.

Hon. JOE T. ROBINSON:

A survey just completed by trustworthy representatives in Faulkner County reveals that at least 300 families are without feed or means of providing feed for approximately 1,500 mules, horses, and cows. These animals are rapidly nearing starvation and some have already died. If they are lost their owners will be unable to make a crop and will continue as objects of charity. Immediate aid is imperative, as it will be at least 30 days before Government feed-loan fund can be realized upon. Eight thousand

dollars will keep these animals alive another month. We earnestly urge that you wire as liberal allotment as possible for this purpose.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
J. O. FRAUENTHAL,  
President.

C. B. RALEIGH,  
Chairman Faulkner County Red Cross.  
FARMERS STATE BANK,  
FRANK FARRIS,  
Vice President.  
BANK OF CONWAY,  
GEO. SHAW,  
Vice President.

BLITHEVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Blitheville, Ark., January 10, 1931.

Senator JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBINSON: With further reference to our letter of the 5th instant and our telegram of this date:

Without any intention of trying to arouse any undue sympathy or creating any sentiment through the picturing of a distressing situation, we want to say that we feel that your plan of bringing succor to these drought-affected areas through your bill 5441 is the only one that holds out any promise of aid that will be of any benefit to farmers in this section.

At this time more than 1,000 families in the Chickasawba district of this county are being fed by the Red Cross. A large percentage of this number are farmers, who have been placed in this situation through the drought which practically destroyed the food and feed crops in this county last year. Hundreds of these farmers had their feed requirements planted, the drought ruined them, and to-day they have nothing.

After six years of consistent effort, this county was gradually getting into a self-sustaining farm program, which included cows, hogs, chickens, food, and feed crops. Gratifying progress was being made on this program, and the largest feed acreage ever planted in this county was planted in 1930. Under normal conditions the county would have produced at least 90 per cent of its feed requirements, whereas not more than 5 per cent of them can take care of themselves.

Farmers generally in this section are now sacrificing their cows, hogs, and chickens in order to be able to buy food.

Under the present plan of loaning money for seed and feed only there are very few farmers in this county who would receive much benefit. Feed and seed would be of little value unless there was food for the workers and their families.

We believe that if your plan can be put into effect that we can organize several of these credit corporations in this county that will be able to render effective service. This plan will be really worth while. We want to assure you of our wholehearted support of the plan.

Without some such plan, we believe we are safe in saying that there are hundreds of farmers in this county who will not be able to secure the necessary finances from existing sources to enable them to farm during 1931.

We are writing Senator CARAWAY and Mr. DRIVER along this line, requesting that they lend you their entire support in this effort.

We will appreciate it if you will advise us of any service in this connection that we might render.

Sincerely yours,

J. MELL BROOKS, Secretary.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What I have said is true without regard to what may happen to the pending amendment. The pending amendment would be supplemental to the plan which is incorporated in the bill to which I have referred; and I wish to say that there is a prospect that the bill mentioned may receive consideration and be enacted.

The chairman of the Federal Farm Board thinks enough of it to say that it ought to be incorporated by amendment in this bill. Of course, he did not understand that the seed bill had passed the status which permits of an amendment; but he writes cordially approving the principle of the bill, and suggesting that it be acted upon, and acted upon at once. The Secretary of Agriculture has been busy, no doubt, and has not made a response to the committee having charge of the legislation.

Before I take my seat I wish to say, on my responsibility as a Senator and in this public place, that I think the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, Mr. WOOD, and the chairman of the special committee of the House, Mr. FISH, who are reputed to have said there a few days ago that the incident which occurred at England, Ark., was inspired by communists according to information that they had received, should either publish the information upon which they claim to base their state-



ment, or make an apology to this Congress and to the people whom they have slandered in a cowardly manner.

I thank the Senate.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, no Senator regrets more than I do the action of the House in striking dead the amendment which was passed by the Senate by such an overwhelming vote providing \$15,000,000 for starving men, women, and children. The responsibility belongs to the House.

The measure which the Senate passed before Christmas appropriating \$45,000,000 has been held up all this time. Farmers out in the States in great distress have suffered and are still suffering, their suffering growing more acute day by day. I am not going to delay the passage of this measure appropriating \$45,000,000. I greatly regret the course this legislation has taken. I repeat what I said yesterday, it is inexcusable and indefensible.

We read in the papers that in the drought-stricken areas farm animals are dying. Certainly this appropriation will do good to those still living. Just what sort of philosophy the Members of the House could have who would appropriate money to be loaned to farmers to buy feed for their stock when they would not appropriate a dollar to be loaned to the farmers to buy food for themselves and their children I can not understand. They can perhaps explain that to their constituents. Farm homes are being broken up, farmers are going away seeking employment somewhere, seeking something to eat in the first place.

Mr. President, complaint has been made that Mr. Warburton is not going to use the fund appropriated for farmers who are in distress because of the drought. I know it was my intention, and I believe it was the intention of every Senator in this body, that this fund should be used for the relief of farmers wherever found who were in destitute condition and suffering, and suffering acutely, because of the drought. I submit to the Senate and to Doctor Warburton and to the Secretary of Agriculture that where a county contains 1,500 farm families suffering because of the drought, and another county adjoining it contains 250 families suffering just as much and as acutely as the 1,500 in the first county, it would be simply outrageous for the Government to go in and minister to the wants of those in distress where there were 1,500 families, and withhold aid and comfort and relief from the 250 families because they could not muster up 1,500 families in distress.

What does a fire company do when a fire alarm is given? Does it announce that it will not put out the fire unless there are a dozen buildings or more in flames? It goes to the humblest cabin and extinguishes the flame. The business of the Secretary of Agriculture is to take this fund provided by Congress and go to the rescue of farmers who are in distress.

As I said, I am not going to delay a vote on this measure. I want the \$45,000,000 to get on the way. When it is out of the way I am going to ask for the consideration of a Senate resolution providing as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby notified that when the Senate voted for the drought-relief measure it did so with the desire and understanding that the funds so provided would be used to afford relief to all families suffering from the drought, to destitute families suffering because of the drought, whether they live in counties where suffering is general and where there is great distress and destitution or in counties where the distress caused by the drought is not general. The Senate feels that the relief here provided should be granted wherever the conditions and facts justify it, and requests the Secretary of Agriculture to see that that is done.

I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding me this brief time.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—COPYRIGHT BILL

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12549) to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright and to permit the United States to enter the Convention of Berne for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, there was just sent to the Senate by the House of Representatives the copyright bill. At the proper time I should like to make a motion to refer that bill to a committee; but this matter is now before the Senate, and I wonder if I may make the request that the bill lie on the table and no action be taken on it until to-morrow, and not be referred to any committee until it can be discussed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). That request is in order.

Mr. DILL. I make such a request—that the bill be held on the table until I can be recognized for the purpose of making a motion to send it to a particular committee. I do that because of certain action that was taken this morning by the committee that I want to discuss.

Mr. JONES. I suggest to my colleague that the ordinary course would be to send it to a committee.

Mr. DILL. That is just what I do not want to have happen until I have a chance to discuss it; and that is why I ask to have it lie over until to-morrow.

Mr. JONES. Very well.

#### PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT TO THE PRESS ON POWER COMMISSIONERS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I desire at this time to call attention to some of the inaccuracies, to say the least, in the statement given to the press by the President the other day with reference to the Senate's action in requesting that the President return to the Senate for further consideration the papers in connection with the nominations to the Power Commission.

First of all I want to call the Senate's attention to the statement of the President of the United States, wherein he said:

The resolutions of the Senate may have the attractive political merit of giving rise to a legend that those who voted for it are "enemies of the power interests" and, inferentially, those who voted against it are "friends of the power interests," and it may contain a hope of symbolizing me as the defender of power interests if I refuse to sacrifice three outstanding public servants or to allow the Senate to dictate to an administrative board the appointment of its subordinates and if I refuse to allow fundamental encroachment by the Senate upon the constitutional independence of the Executive. Upon these things the people will pass unerring judgment.

Mr. President, that seems to me a strange statement for the President of the United States to issue, impugning the good intentions of Members of the Senate of the United States. It would seem as though the President of the United States was imbued with the idea expressed in the editorials of the Washington Post by the publisher of that paper, Ned McLean, wherein Mr. McLean, through the editorial columns of his paper, says, in commenting upon the action of the Senate:

Here is the successor of Washington, Lincoln, and Cleveland. No President has more resolutely fulfilled his oath to support and defend the Constitution.

And again the publisher, Mr. Ned McLean, states:

The immoral majority that committed the Senate to this disastrous collision with the Executive makes itself ridiculous by restoring the names of the power commissioners to the calendar of nominations.

Can anyone imagine the publisher of the Washington Post calling anybody immoral—this man who was willing to swear to a lie in order to help his friend, Albert B. Fall? This is the man who is the chief defender of the President's actions in this Power Commission fight. He is the man who has constantly tried to belittle the Senate of the United States. He is the man and the only man I know of who has said that "Here is the successor of Washington, Lincoln, and Cleveland."

I am of the opinion that the President of the United States has not only read these eloquent editorials by Mr. McLean but, in addition, he has been reading what some of his satellites have been saying to him, among them Mr. Lucas, of the Republican National Committee, who last night published a statement with reference to the President of the United States, in which he said:

The past year, however, has disclosed a well-laid plan by the Democrats to embarrass the Republican administration and to dis-



credit the President of the United States, and there has been no let-up in Raskob's "smear Hoover" campaign. To win in 1932 the Democrats must destroy the Republican leader. By subtle innuendo and insidious propaganda, which is being carried on by Raskob's organization in every community in the United States, they hope to break down the people's confidence in Herbert Hoover and thereby elect a Democrat in 1932.

Not only has he read these editorials and statements but I am afraid that he believes them himself.

Is there any question in the mind of any Member of the Senate but that before Mr. Lucas sent out that statement he exhibited it to his chief, and that Mr. Lucas was expressing the views of his chief, when it is taken in connection with the statement which the President himself issued, that everybody who voted to recall the nominations of the members of the Power Commission was doing it with the deliberate purpose of smearing the President of the United States, or, as he says, to symbolize him as the defender of the Power Trust? We can come to only one conclusion—that he believes the statements given out by his own coterie of politicians.

Some day, let me say to the Senate, there will rise in this body some one who will analyze the record made by George Washington, the record made by Abraham Lincoln, and the record made by Grover Cleveland, and then he will analyze the record that has been made by our millionaire President, Mr. Hoover. That will be done for the edification of the people of the United States, and particularly, I imagine, for the edification of Mr. Ned McLean and the Washington Post. When the curtain is drawn aside, I am sure the contrast will not be a happy one for the present President of the United States of America.

Again, in his statement the President said:

Much of the debate indicates plainly that those who favored this resolution are intent upon removing Messrs. Smith, Draper, and Garsaud, not because they are unqualified, but to insist upon the Senate's own selection of certain subordinates.

Is there any truth in that statement at all? Is there anybody in the Senate but who knows that the President, when he makes that statement, is uninformed as to what the real intention of the Senate or of those who voted for the resolution was? I for one stood upon the floor of the Senate and said that I believed that if the facts had been known to the President of the United States he himself would have removed Mr. Smith, and that I did not believe any President of the United States would stand by a man who was seeking to sacrifice two efficient, honest, capable public servants who had been working in the public interest, and defending the public's rights against great corporate wealth and combinations of the power interests of the United States.

That is the issue as it seems to me. Many of the leading newspapers of the country have entirely overlooked the real issue in the case. It was not an issue as to whether or not the Senate could recall its confirmation of these nominations. The real issue was as to where the President was going to stand when it came to the question of two public servants who had been fighting on the side of the public and another public servant who had been fighting on the side of the power interests. The President himself has chosen to stand by the man who was fighting for the power interests and to stand against Russell and King, who stood there as faithful servants fighting for the interests of the rank and file of the people of the country.

An editorial recently appeared in the Pittsburgh Press entitled "The Issue," which, in my judgment, expresses the situation better than I could express it myself. It reads:

President Hoover's denial that he is a defender of the power interests could be accepted more readily if it had not been made a few minutes before his Secretary of the Interior restored Frank E. Bonner to the Government pay roll.

It will be recalled that Mr. Bonner was the man as to whom practically every member of the Interstate Commerce Commission who had been investigating the matter, and who had heard his testimony, was of the opinion that he was entirely too friendly to the power interests and that he was not looking after the interests of the public. He has been placed back on the pay roll of the Government at the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Wilbur.

The editorial continues:

This sounds like a minor item compared with the major conflict now under way between the Senate and the President over the three Federal power commissioners. Hoover, no doubt, would like it to be ignored in the excitement of his wrathful attack upon the Senate.

Let me invite the attention of Senators on both sides of the aisle to the fact that the Pittsburgh Press is one of the numerous papers which supported Mr. Hoover vigorously in the last campaign. It is not a Democratic paper. Its editorial continues:

But it goes through all the smoke and thunder to the very heart of the matter.

There has never been the slightest doubt about Frank E. Bonner.

Bonner, whose appointment as executive secretary of the outgoing Power Commission was made on recommendation of a power company official; Bonner, who recommended that the commission drop regulation of power company securities; Bonner, who tried to break up the commission's accounting work; Bonner, who tried unsuccessfully to suppress opinions of Solicitor Russell squeezing the water out of power-company accounts, and then tried to have the position of solicitor abolished; Bonner, who, failing again, sent an investigator to Montana to try to smear Solicitor Russell's reputation; Bonner, who told the Senate the power companies "are being persecuted"; Bonner, who, as he saw his tenure of office drawing to an end, tried to get the commission to issue a "minor-part" license to the Appalachian Electric Power Co., freeing that company and possibly three-fourths of all power companies from all regulation by the Power Commission.

Bonner was dismissed by the new power commissioners. But so were King and Russell, the men who had tried to enforce the Federal water power act over Bonner's opposition.

And now Bonner is welcomed back with open arms into the Government service. King and Russell are left to land jobs where they may.

Hoover speaks the truth when he says the people will pass upon all this with unerring judgment. His phrases about the duty of the Executive to resist encroachments of the Senate upon his prerogatives will not blind an electorate which showed last November its understanding of the underlying conflict.

From the beginning there has never been a real issue in this quarrel except enforcement of the Federal water power act.

That was the issue when King and Russell refused to acquiesce in Bonner's attempts to nullify the act.

It was the issue when the President picked for his new Federal Power Commission four men who knew nothing whatever about the intricate power law or the difficulties of enforcing it, and—for chairman—a man who had shown himself a thoroughly tractable bureaucrat.

It was the issue when the Senate reluctantly confirmed these men, failing to find in their undistinguished pasts an affirmative reason for not doing so.

And yet in his statement to the press the President refers to these commissioners in the following terms:

Irrespective of the unique fitness of these power commissioners for their positions and before they have given a single decision in respect to any power company, they are to be removed unless they are willing to accept employees not of their own choosing.

I submit that they not only have no unique fitness for the positions, but the fact about the matter is that everybody who heard their testimony before the Interstate Commerce Committee recognizes that they are lacking in experience, lacking in fitness, and that there was not a man placed upon the commission who had any peculiar fitness or any qualifications for the position to which he was appointed, or who had any understanding or knowledge of the facts involved.

Had there been men appointed to those positions who had either fitness or knowledge of the real situation they would have at least consulted Mr. Russell and Mr. King to ascertain what the records in their own department showed, what the work was in that department; but disregarding that duty entirely, if you please, they discharge the men because of the fact that they said they could not get along with Mr. Bonner.

The editorial continues:

It was the issue when Smith, Garsaud, and Draper rushed to take the oath of office and to dismiss from the commission King and Russell, who had resisted the power companies.

It was the issue when the Senate, acting in the only way an honest legislative body could act, reconsidered its confirmation of these men.

It was the issue when Hoover elected to defend his three commissioners and defy the Senate in its right to refuse to approve them.



It was the issue when these self-discredited new "commissioners" secretly began consideration of the iniquitous "minor part license" case while the Senate was voting them not fit for office.

It was the issue when Hoover's Secretary Wilbur found a job for the repudiated Bonner.

And it will be the issue when the voters eventually "pass unerring judgment" on this power fight.

Let the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle remember that the people of the country are aroused. Senators may insert in the *RECORD* editorials from the New York Herald Tribune, a paper which more nearly represents the ideas of Wall Street probably than any other paper in the United States; they may insert in the *RECORD* editorials of Mr. Ned McLean, of the Washington Post, charging the majority of the Senate with being immoral; but nevertheless it will not have the slightest effect upon the masses of the people of the country who realize to-day what the issue is.

I am amazed that the chief executive of a nation, when the facts were brought to his attention as to what was the real issue, did not take a firm stand and insist that these two public servants who had been in the Government service, one for 20 years and the other for 8 years, should be put back in the positions where they belonged and insist that they should be permitted to carry out the work they were doing.

The other day I called attention to the fact that there are cases pending before the Power Commission at the present time, that there are legal questions involved about which few if any lawyers in the United States understand anything; that there are cases involving millions of dollars; that there are cases, if you please, of the highest importance to the people of these United States; and yet these newly appointed commissioners discharged Russell and King and left those cases to be tried by men unfamiliar with the facts and unfamiliar with the law.

Not only that, Mr. President, but I called attention to the fact that before the Power Commission there are cases involving millions upon millions of dollars, involving questionable items and in some instances plain frauds perpetrated by some of the power companies upon the Government of the United States, and because the men, Russell and King, uncovered those questionable items and frauds they are to be punished and kicked out of office. The President of the United States said nothing about these efficient public servants, but rushed to the rescue of George Otis Smith, of Garsaud, and of Draper, and said of them that they are uniquely fitted for the positions to which they were appointed and which they hold.

Either the President of the United States does not know what are the facts in the case, or we can not help coming to the conclusion that he is in sympathy with the views held by Bonner. It seems to me that it is incredible that the President should be in sympathy with the views held by Bonner, but what other conclusion can be reached in the face of the repeated statements made by Bonner, as I am informed, that he was acting under orders from the President of the United States, and in view of the fact that the minute he was discharged by the newly appointed commissioners he was put back to work in the Reclamation Service by order of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Wilbur.

Then Mr. Ned McLean refers to those who voted for the reconsideration of the confirmation of these commissioners as the "immoral majority." He likens the President of the United States to Washington and to Lincoln and to Cleveland for his refusal, if you please, to take any action. Yes; he likens him to Lincoln, but what does any Senator think Lincoln would have done under like circumstances? Would he have stood by men who lined up on the side of the power interests or would he have stood by the men who lined up with the common masses of the people?

As I said a moment ago, it is unfortunate, in my opinion, that the President of the United States thinks that every time a Senator upon the floor disagrees with him or votes contrary to his wishes he is moved by a desire to malign him and to discredit him before the people of the United States. The President has been so told by the Republican orators so many times and by Ned McLean and by Lucas

and by the little group of "yes" men around him, that he has come to the conclusion, I presume, that he really is what they have told him he is—another Lincoln or another Washington or another Cleveland.

Mr. President, when he is sympathizing with Draper, when he is sympathizing with Garsaud, when he is sympathizing with George Otis Smith, is it not queer that he does not extend just a little bit of sympathy to this employee, King, who has been working and plugging in the Government service for 20 years? King is not a politician; he has not any Republican Senators or Republican Representatives or representatives of power interests to come to his rescue. He is merely a clerk in the department who has been doing his duty, but no sympathy goes out to him. He has been uncovering the frauds which have been perpetrated by some of the power companies of the country.

Then the President goes on to say:

The qualifications of all five members were again searchingly investigated by the committee, the nominations were favorably reported to the Senate, and they were confirmed.

Then he concludes by saying:

I regret that the Government should be absorbed upon such questions as the action of the Power Commission in the employment or nonemployment of two subordinate officials at a time when the condition of the country requires every constructive energy.

"When the conditions of the country require every constructive energy." Yes, Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the Senate of the United States should be required to consume four or five days debating an action of the President and his appointees in dismissing two honest, faithful public servants when people on the farm are in a distressed condition and when there is and has been great unemployment throughout the country. But who is responsible for the Senate and the House of Representatives not having taken earlier action? Is the responsibility that of the Congress of the United States or of the President of the United States or his friends on the other side of the aisle? Who has been holding up the legislation and denying any relief to the farmers in the drought-stricken areas and to the unemployed in the country? Who is to blame? Let us analyze, if we will, what the facts are.

I state here, Mr. President, that the accusation contained in the last words of the statement of the President are not in accordance with the facts. That is proven by the pages of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* covering the past session of Congress as well as the present session. For over two years Members of this body have devoted time and energy in an effort to solve the problem of employment. When the drought came it was Members of this body who exposed the terrible conditions and sought to secure prompt and adequate relief from the Government.

Let me ask what happened to the unemployment bills which were introduced in the last session of Congress by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]? Where was the President of the United States then? Was he seeking to secure the enactment of unemployment legislation? What has he done at this session of Congress to help secure the passage of drought-relief measures through the other branch of Congress? Is there any man in this body who does not know that if the President of the United States should speak to-day and say to the Congress of the United States, "I want an appropriation for food to take care of the drought-stricken farmers of Arkansas and Oklahoma and the other States of the country," the Members of Congress at the other end of the Capitol would accede immediately to his request, and we would not be confronted with the refusal to furnish food to the suffering people in the drought-stricken areas of the country?

The President's accusation of the Senate is also a belated effort to escape blame that belongs squarely upon his shoulders. How has he been seeking to relieve these conditions? I want to enumerate his efforts:

First. By denying their very existence.

Is there anybody who will challenge that statement? The President of the United States has repeatedly denied that there was any unemployment in the country; he has re-



peatedly denied that there were any bad financial or industrial conditions in the country. Last spring he said in a statement he issued, as I recall, that prosperity was just around the corner, and his Secretary of Commerce and the Department of Commerce have constantly and repeatedly issued statements to the effect that we were just "on the verge of another era of prosperity."

Second. By using the power of his administration to obstruct employment measures proposed by the Senator from New York.

Third. By issuing prosperity statements in the midst of a great public calamity.

Fourth. By opposing congressional appropriations to relieve human distress.

Fifth. By grossly underestimating the amount of unemployment and the extent of suffering in drought-stricken areas.

Sixth. By proclaiming his ignorance of real conditions by a public announcement that the Red Cross was adequately caring for the victims of drought and did not need additional funds.

When I made a statement the other day with reference to the funds of the Red Cross it was the Senator from Utah, I think, who stated, as I understood him, that the Red Cross had only four or five million dollars. I think, if the Senator will check up on that statement, he will find that Judge Payne did not correctly report the amount of money the Red Cross had on hand or that the Senator got the wrong impression from his testimony.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator have reference to the statement made by me?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator says that I was mistaken, but that was the statement made by John Barton Payne.

Mr. WHEELER. I say if the Senator will check up that statement I think he will find that Mr. Payne was mistaken about it when he made the statement, and did not intend it in the way the Senator construed his statement.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not construe his statement in any way. I merely stated what John Barton Payne said the Red Cross had on hand.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not trying to say the Senator made a misstatement; I am simply calling his attention to the fact that if the Senator will press Mr. John Barton Payne I am quite sure he will find that he either misunderstood Mr. Payne's statement or that Mr. Payne was mistaken with reference to it.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] will agree with me that that was the statement made by Mr. Payne.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not doubt it being his statement; I am not challenging the fact that the Senator said that was the statement.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I confess that I can hardly understand the attitude of the Red Cross. The Senator from Utah will recall that in the hearing we had last week before the Appropriations Committee—and the Senator from Montana will bear with me, because what I am about to say is in line with his argument—

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I asked this question, which I quote from the record:

Judge, is there any hesitation on the part of the Red Cross to make an appeal at this time for funds because of the moral effect it might have—that is, the psychological effect—in emphasizing the situation?

That was my question. His answer was "No."

And I want the Senator from Montana to listen to this:

The reason we do not want to make it now is because we are not in need of it.

In view of the statement that I have made to you here this morning, if I would go outside and ask for money contributions you would laugh at me.

That was three days before he did go out and ask for \$10,000,000.

I quote further from my statement to him:

Well, Judge, if you will take it from me in good part, I say that you are in imminent danger of having some money thrust upon you by the Government, and my advice to you is, make your appeal to the public and replenish your funds. That is all in good part. Make it, and make it now.

Mr. President, I should like to say further that it was perfectly apparent to me at the time of the hearings last week that four and a half million dollars which the judge said the Red Cross had in its Treasury was not a fleabite—and that is exactly the language that I used, "not a fleabite"—to care for four and a half million unemployed people in this country. I am in harmony with the purposes of the Red Cross; I do not want to say a thing now to hurt it; I want its appeal to be a successful one; but we are so sheltered in this Capitol, we are so remote from unemployment and the effects of unemployment that we forget about the thousands and hundreds of thousands of men and women in the country who are to-day on the verge of starvation. We can not afford to disregard their appeal and its urgency. My only criticism of the Red Cross is that it did not wake up long ago and make an appeal for funds. If there shall be any failure on the part of the people to respond to that appeal, I say, Mr. President, in all solemnity, we must find the money.

I saw with my own eyes two weeks ago in New York City 9,000 men in line waiting to get soup and bread and coffee from a station provided by the philanthropic people of New York. If that is any index at all to conditions in America, it is time the American Congress turned aside from everything else and devoted itself to the one thing of relief of human suffering.

I apologize to the Senator from Montana for the long interruption. I came into the Chamber and heard him mention this matter about the Red Cross, and that is why I ventured to say what I have said. I assume that he is speaking in favor of doing something, some material thing, to relieve human suffering, and I want to indorse and to second his efforts in that direction.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I rose simply because I understood the Senator from Montana—

Mr. WHEELER. I was not criticizing the Senator from Utah in the slightest degree. If he so understood me, he is mistaken.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the way I did understand the Senator. Not only that, but I want to add my testimony to that which has already been given by the Senator from New York, because I do not think there was a member of the committee who felt that the \$4,500,000 that the Red Cross had on hand was sufficient to meet the emergency. When John Barton Payne, chairman of the Red Cross, was asked if he thought that was sufficient he answered, "Well, at least it is all that we anticipate; but," he said, "if the barrel gets close to the bottom we will squeal and we will ask the people to give more."

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say in reply to the Senator that I agree fully with what the Senator from New York has said; and I hope that the Red Cross will raise the money, and I hope they will distribute it to relieve the suffering. I have never criticized the Red Cross; but I was amazed when the statement was made that they had only four and one-half million dollars, because the information which I had, and which has been confirmed since that time by statements made to me by reputable men who have conferred with the Red Cross, is to the effect that they have many times more than \$4,500,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not any doubt but that the people will give the \$10,000,000 asked for, and give it very quickly.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator, so far as I am concerned, that I would go further; and I would say that the Government of the United States ought to take a



lot of this wheat that the Farm Board has stored and make some arrangement to have that wheat made into flour, and they ought to turn it over to the starving people, not only on the farms but in the cities like New York and other places throughout the country where millions of unemployed are going hungry to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was going to add that I have not any doubt that if the \$10,000,000 called for by the Red Cross is used up another call from the Red Cross will be responded to very quickly.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to see them use not only the \$10,000,000, but some of the other millions they have on hand.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. GILLET. I want to ask the Senator if he thinks the city of New York is so poor that it can not take care of its own suffering.

Mr. COPELAND rose.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not in a position to speak for the city of New York, but I do say it is not entirely a question for the city of New York any more than it is a question for the State of Arkansas or the State of Montana. This is a national calamity, and it has been brought about to a large extent by laws enacted by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I disagree with the Senator there. I do not think the laws of the United States had anything to do with the drought in the southwestern part of the country.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no; I am talking about unemployment. I am not talking about drought. Do not shift the issue from drought to unemployment. I am saying that the laws passed by Congress have had something to do with the unemployment situation in this country, and they have had something to do with the unequal distribution of the wealth of the country.

Mr. FRAZIER and Mr. COPELAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I do not think the action of Congress had anything to do with the drought, either; but I do think it is a mighty serious situation when the farmers who have worked for a lifetime in Arkansas or any other State, because of a drought in one season, are living under such poor conditions that they have not enough food to live on, or enough money to buy food and clothing for their children. It is not altogether farmers, either. The same thing applies to other workingmen, too, because if they are thrown out of employment for a few months they are on the rocks. It is an indictment against the method of doing business here in the United States Congress in not providing legislation for the benefit and protection of the common people of this Nation.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COPELAND. The question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts is typical of the attitude of persons who hold to the belief that we are not facing a great calamity. I am not criticizing the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET]. He has not been home. If he had walked up and down the highways and byways of the State of Massachusetts, unless that State is far different than it was the last time I visited it, he would find thousands of men and women out of employment.

Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that we do not ask one dollar for New York City—not one single penny. We do not need the money. We will provide for our own; but the fact that we are fortunate enough to do that is no reason or excuse for us to blind ourselves or to shut our hearts to the fact that there is widespread human suffering

in the United States, reaching from Maine to California and from Michigan to the Gulf; and we sit here so content that we are satisfied to have that condition go on!

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am not satisfied. I do not ask a dollar for my State—certainly not for my city—but I do not want to be here, a Member of this body, and know that there are men and women and little children in this country who have not food enough to maintain health and virility, and to give them just the creature comforts which they need, while we sit here indifferent; and every time the question is raised, the attitude of the Republican Party is, "Let us put on the soft pedal. Let us not let the country know that there is disaster. Let us not let the country know that there has been a breakdown of government." Any informed person, Mr. President, knows that there never was in this generation, certainly, any such state of affairs as we have to-day; and we can not excuse it by saying, "Oh, New York and Boston and Chicago may take care of their own." That is all right. That is the duty of the great cities; but in the rural sections, down in the drought sections, and I venture to say even in the rural sections of my State, there is suffering. Let us not close our hearts and our minds to this appeal.

It is our solemn obligation to find a way to bring relief; and if the great Red Cross, which has never failed in times of grave disaster, can not deal with the matter, let us not hesitate to appropriate funds and ask the Red Cross to administer them. We must not, of course, do anything that will hurt the future appeals of that great organization; but let no man here say that because New York City can take care of its poor and its hungry and those who are cold, we must not on that account be liberal in our contributions to take care of other communities less fortunate than the city of New York.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I was enumerating the different things that Mr. Hoover had failed to do. Among them, I said that by proclaiming his ignorance of the real conditions in a public announcement that the Red Cross was adequately caring for the victims of the drought, and did not need additional funds, he misled the people of this country. When the real situation was exposed by overwhelming evidence presented on the floor of the Senate, he issued, only two days ago, a proclamation calling for a public popular subscription of \$10,000,000 to supplement the Red Cross fund of \$5,000,000, which he and Judge Payne had claimed was sufficient.

Mr. President, when the President issues a statement to the press, and says to the press that he is sorry or regrets that it is necessary to take up so much time, and that we ought to be devoting our time to the problems that face the country, the distress that is facing the country, it seems to me that statement is beneath the dignity of the President of the United States, in view of the repeated statements he has made that there was not any unemployment in the country, and he would not recognize any unemployment in the country, and in view of the statement he made that the Red Cross was adequately taking care of the situation, and, in effect, that he did not want any appropriations by the Congress of the United States to feed the people.

But, Mr. President, just analyze the difference between his attitude with reference to drought relief and unemployment and what took place when the Wall Street crash came on. He came before the Congress of the United States at that time and immediately asked for tax relief and that a donation be handed out, not to the unemployed over in New York City—oh, no; not to the unemployed; they can take care of themselves—but he asked that it be given to the millionaires of New York City. They are the ones for whom he asked relief; and do you Republicans think that when the people of the United States meet they will not "pass unerring judgment" upon what is taking place in this body at this time?

Mr. President, Ned McLean may speak of the "immoral majority" in this body. When he does, the people of the United States will likewise pass unerring judgment as to who is immoral—Ned McLean or the majority of the Members of this body.



Mr. President, the President called these conferences, and after the conferences he announced that their object was "the demonstration of the confidence of the administration by undertaking tax reduction." That object was put through, and it was the only thing accomplished—\$160,000,000 gift by tax refund to the more prosperous, to the richest millionaires of the country. That is where it went; yet when it is proposed in the Senate that a much smaller amount than this be appropriated for the victims of unemployment and drought, the administration indignantly denounced it as a "dole" and "a raid upon the Treasury of the United States."

I want to cite but two of many significant statements which show that the people will pass unerring judgment on the situation in this country.

The first is from an article by Professor Slichter, of Harvard University, which appeared in the New Republic. I am going to ask that that article be inserted in the Record as a part of my remarks.

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

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the New Republic of December 31, 1930]

It is said that we have the dole in America, and this is true. But the real recipients of the dole are not the men who stand for hours before the Salvation Army soup stations. The real recipients are the great industries of America. They are extracting a percentage of the meager pay of tens of thousands of their employees, obtaining myriads of contributions from churches, charitable organizations, the Salvation Army, city employees, commission merchants, hotels, coal dealers, and thousands of business and professional men in order to pay their labor overhead. If anyone is being pauperized and demoralized by the dole, it is industry no less than the men in the soup lines. Industry pays dividends on idle capital. In order to do so the corporations of the country, according to the estimates of the National Bureau of Economic Research, save, on the average, approximately 40 per cent of their net profits. In 1921 corporations engaged in manufacture, according to the estimates of the bureau, paid dividends on their common stock of over a billion dollars. In order to meet the emergency caused by the depression they reduced their wage payments about 39 per cent below 1920. But they found it necessary to reduce dividends on common stock only 12 per cent. Why should not the policy of building up reserves to continue payments during periods of depression be applied to labor as well as to capital? Has not the time come for industry to cease holding out a tin cup to the American public and to pay its own labor overhead?

Mr. WHEELER. Then I want to call attention to statements in the New York Times, part of an editorial appearing on January 11, 1931, in which it says, in part:

Being an optimist does not necessarily mean that a man must blind his eyes to unpleasant facts. There has been something too much of this, for example, in the matter of unemployment. Governor Roosevelt dealt properly with this subject in his message to the New York Legislature. In a frank and manly way he said, when speaking of the efforts of this State to deal with the problem: "Our course has been founded on truthful and accurate statistics. Those charged with the duty of collecting these figures for the State have realized the futility and folly of attempting to gloss over or conceal the real situation. In the long run the truth hurts nobody."

Then the editorial goes on to say:

There was perhaps implicit in this a comparison between the figures of the New York Labor Bureau and those put out at Washington. The latter were doubtless not intended to be misleading, but they have been shown to be inaccurate. In his message to Congress early in December, President Hoover incautiously—

Even the conservative New York Times says that he "incautiously"—

committed himself to the statement that the number of the unemployed "was accurately determined by the census last April as about 2,500,000." He added that the subsequent manifold efforts to provide special employment "tend to reduce such published figures." Yet only a month later the head of his own commission on unemployment, Colonel Woods, informed Congress that the number of persons out of work is now somewhere between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000. He also believed that conditions might be a little worse, through obvious seasonal causes, during January and February. Such discrepancies in official information are, to say the least, unfortunate.

That is the end of the editorial.

#### FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. President, I conclude by saying it is not a pleasant task to stand on the floor of the Senate and call attention

to the misstatements of fact made by the President of the United States in his statement given to the press in connection with his refusal to send back to the Senate of the United States the names of Garsaud and Smith and Draper. It is not a pleasant thing to do. It is not a pleasant thing to do to call the attention of the country to the fact of the misstatements, and show the misinformation that was given out from the White House with reference to unemployment.

It is not a pleasing thing to stand on the floor of the Senate and call attention to the misinformation he has given to the country with reference to the drought relief. But these are the cold, undisputed facts. Misinformation has been given to the country, and it is the same kind of misinformation that was given to the country in this instance that he gave to the country the other day with reference to the contest that has been going on over Garsaud, Smith, and Draper. There was no attempt on the part of the Senate of the United States to dictate to the President of the United States with reference to his appointees. There was no attempt on the part of the Senate of the United States to tell the commission whom they should have, but there was resentment on the part of a majority of this body that two public servants who had been faithful in their duty, who had been fighting in the interest of the public for, lo, these many years, should be fired and kicked out and disgraced, and that another public servant who had been faithful to his duty should be received with open arms by the President's Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Wilbur, and kicked out.

Oh, yes, he can talk about the efficiency of the men he appointed on this Power Commission, but if you look into their records, you will fail to find it. He can talk about their fitness, but I challenge him to point to one single thing in the record of these men showing that they are qualified in the least degree, or that they know anything about the problems which confront the Power Commission of the United States.

Mr. President, this morning an editorial appeared on the front page of the Washington Herald, and likewise the same editorial appeared in the New York American, and I ask that it be inserted in the Record in toto as a part of my remarks. The editorial is entitled "Will the Senate Defend the Rights of the Public?" It calls upon the Senate to stop the appropriation for the salaries of Garsaud, Draper, and Smith when the appropriation bill carrying them comes before the Senate of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

#### WILL THE SENATE DEFEND THE RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC?

Now that the new Federal Power Commission has shown by its dismissal of Auditor King and Solicitor Russell that, instead of being the faithful and fearless servant of the people, it is only a subservient creature of the Power Trust, the duty of the Congress becomes plain and imperative.

Not another dollar of the people's money should be appropriated by the Congress for the continuance of this commission until its membership has been purged.

It can not be purged until Chairman Smith and Commissioners Garsaud and Draper have been eliminated.

These are the three commissioners who are responsible for the removal of King and Russell.

These are the three commissioners who penalized two brave and devoted Federal employees for exposing, condemning, and doing their best to prevent the Power Trust from stealing valuable properties all over the country that rightfully belong to the people.

If they did not know that they were doing exactly what the Power Trust wanted done when they dropped the chief accountant and the solicitor of the old commission, then Smith, Garsaud, and Draper are intellectually deficient and consequently unfit to serve on a regulatory body created by Congress to administer the water power act in the interest of the people.

On the other hand, if they did fully realize the sinister significance and the vicious effect throughout the whole Federal service which their summary discharge of King and Russell was bound to have, then Smith, Garsaud, and Draper are morally unfit for service as members of the new commission.

Congress created this commission to administer the Federal power act in the public interest by enforcing its every provision with a vigor that would protect the natural resources of this country against the raids of the Power Trust and every other tyrannical minority attempting to steal public property.



Congress did not set up this commission to provide another "fence" behind which the theft of public property could be concealed and the thieves permitted to get away with their swag.

Not until these three commissioners are driven from office and the vicious standard of official conduct which they set up when they dismissed King and Russell is repudiated can its official acts deserve the confidence of the people or command the support of public sentiment.

As long as Smith, Garsaud, and Draper remain in office, the commission will deserve the country-wide contempt in which it is now held as the proven creature of the Power Trust.

Instead of being a defender of the people's property a Power Commission contaminated by the membership of Smith, Garsaud, and Draper will only be a "nesting place" for the dummies or the dupes of one of the most tyrannical minorities that ever attempted to overthrow the visible government of the Constitution and subject the American people to an invisible government of, by, and for the evil forces of special privilege.

If President Hoover insists in his refusal to appoint a Federal Power Commission honest, brave, and competent enough to defy the dictates of the Power Trust and protect the property of the people, then the Senate should keep on rejecting his nominations until Mr. Hoover has a change of heart.

If the Senate finds itself prevented by legal technicalities from receding from its confirmation of the Smith, Garsaud, and Draper nominations, then the House of Representatives should join the Senate in refusing to appropriate any more money for the commission while these three dummies or dupes of the Power Trust continue to discredit its membership.

President Hoover has defied the action of the Senate and the opinion of the public and has determined to stand by the Power Trust and his and its appointees on the Federal Power Commission.

The only question now, therefore, is whether the Senate will have the backbone to stand up for the public rights and its own rights or whether it will "lie down" tamely and submissively, as it has done so often of late.

In fact, lying down before a dominant and impudent Executive has become so characteristic of the Senate that the Hearst papers venture to suggest that in the interest of senatorial comfort and convenience the chairs be removed from the Senate Chamber and overstuffed sofas, couches, and divans appropriately substituted in their places.

#### RELIEF OF FARMERS IN THE DROUGHT AND STORM AREAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 447) making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States," approved December 20, 1930.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me, not only from what has been said in the Senate to-day but from the general information the country has, and which has from time to time been offered in the Senate in the consideration of various aspects of the relief measures, that it must be apparent to every thinking man, to every person who has any sympathy in his heart or love for his fellow man, that the country is presented with a condition of distress which demands candid, fair, and merciful consideration at the hands of Congress. We are confronted with the fact that while the Senate has passed various measures of relief, we have never been able to have any of those provisions enacted into law because of the opposition of the President of the United States.

To be concrete, there arose early in the relief discussion a contest between those who wanted to extend relief in the form of loans for the purchase of human food as well as for the purchase of seed for crops and food for animals and those who opposed the appropriations for loans for the purchase of food. The Senate, to begin with, increased the amount to be used for the purchase of seed and feed for animals from thirty millions to sixty millions, and likewise amended the bill so that the money could be used in the purchase of human food. Those two amendments were bitterly opposed, and the influence of the President was sufficient, so that when we met in conference we were frankly told, "Take what we give you or get nothing."

We are confronted to-day with the same proposition. The amendment providing for an appropriation of \$15,000,000 to buy food to relieve human suffering is rejected, and we are frankly told that unless we accede to that rejection and withdraw from our position asking that this \$15,000,000 be appropriated for human food we will get nothing for seed for

crops and nothing for feed for animals. In other words, we are confronted in this conference report with the proposition that in spite of the judgment of the Senate that we ought to appropriate some of this money for the purpose of staying off starvation of human beings we must surrender on the proposition entirely or no money will be appropriated to buy seed, so that crops can be raised next year, or buy feed for animals which are to be used in the production of next year's crop.

I myself can not understand the viewpoint of those who say that human suffering in our own country must not be relieved by the appropriation of public funds. I know there are a great many times when we are asked to appropriate money under conditions like these when it is a debatable question as to whether it should be done or should not be done—debatable because there is perhaps some doubt as to the magnitude of the suffering. Everybody knows that if there is local suffering, local communities should and, as a general rule, do take care of it. But I think it must be conceded that we are confronted at this time with a condition of distress and human suffering that is almost nation-wide.

When such conditions have occurred in foreign countries we have not hesitated to appropriate money to give relief. I am not criticizing the Congress because they have taken such action in the past. I think they did the right thing. But it seems to me it would be much more reasonable for us to relieve human suffering at our very doorstep.

We are confronted with evidence—which, so far as I have been able to discover, is uncontradicted—that large sections of our country contain inhabitants the majority of whom do not have enough to eat and have no way of obtaining food to sustain human life. Men, women, and children are suffering over a territory that is much larger than the thirteen original States. Several things have happened to bring that about. It may be that in some cases those who suffer are in part and are sometimes wholly to blame. But, as I look at it, that should make no difference. When we find a man in the gutter, we do not ask how he got there, but we take him out and put him on his feet and make our investigation afterwards. When people, especially little children, are suffering for the necessities of life, the first thing to do is to bring relief, and it seems to me that that can be brought about most appropriately by appropriating money from the Federal Treasury. In fact, as I look at it, on account of the magnitude of the suffering, that is the only real way to meet the situation.

Some parts of the country have not suffered. I am fortunate in coming from a State where, while we did not have all over the State a big crop as compared with other sections of the country, we raised a very bountiful supply of food for human beings and for animals. There are coming into that State now from other sections of the country people who have no means of buying clothing or food. People are straggling and drifting by the thousands into the most prosperous portions of the country from the devastated regions, almost starving on the road to get there.

I received to-day here at my desk a telegram from a very highly respected citizen of Valentine, Nebr. That is away up in the extreme northern portion of the State, west of the center. This lady wires me a copy of a telegram she sent in answer to the representative of the Red Cross at St. Louis. She said:

Follows herewith copy of telegrams sent to William M. Baxter, Jr., manager American Red Cross, St. Louis, Mo.

This is the telegram she sent to the manager of the Red Cross at St. Louis:

Answering telegram requesting drive for relief funds, will advise we need every dollar at home. Our sand hills of Nebraska are prosperous compared with the rest of the country, but this county is filling up with refugees from less fortunate sections, demanding our time, money, and attention. Among these refugees are many pitiful cases necessitating instant and constant relief. We feel that since Congress wants to finance this relief, it should be permitted to do so. Sentiment of the entire community is that funds should be provided by Government and administered through the Red Cross without further delay. If President Hoover and Judge Payne would circulate among the common people for a few hours they might stop fiddling while the country starves.

SYLVIA A. K. QUIGLEY, Chairman.



Mr. President, I think the condition pictured is only a sample of what is happening in other sections of the country. Some of these people have not the means and have not the method by which they can go from the devastated parts of the country to other parts where there is more food and better opportunity to live through the winter. How anyone can close his mind and close his heart to the appeals coming from all over the country for relief from human suffering and say "We will give relief to animals but not to people" is more than I can understand or comprehend.

It is said it would establish a bad precedent. We were met with that statement in the conference committee in the consideration of the original measure. Suppose it does? Are we going to let people die of starvation because it may establish a precedent that will be difficult to overcome in the future? Are we afraid that some time in the years that are to come another catastrophe shall overtake large portions of the country and that we will not be able to say, "When we were asked for food in 1930-31 we gave you a stone and therefore we are justified in giving you another one now?" We ought to establish the precedent that we are not immune to appeals because of human suffering. We ought to establish the precedent that we are human beings and that the Government of the United States is human and is moved by the appeals of human suffering.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Far from any such appeal establishing a precedent, the RECORD shows that Congress has enacted more than 70 joint resolutions in the history of the United States, appropriating money for the purchase of food and clothing for the relief of the suffering, not only for people of our own country but for people of other countries as well.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I want to ask the Senator from Kentucky and those Senators from that region of the country which is most afflicted in regard to this proposition. It must be very apparent that we ought to have some aid very soon even if it is confined to loans for the purpose of purchasing fuel, feed, and so forth. The question is whether we ought to hold up the \$45,000,000 appropriation longer or whether we should appropriate that sum and make an effort to do with reference to the other matter whatever we may be able to do in the future. We are keeping the farmers from preparing for their crops, which is absolutely necessary. The question is whether we should insist upon the \$15,000,000 in this measure or seek to secure it in another bill. How does the Senator from Kentucky feel about it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course I personally would not be in favor of holding up the \$45,000,000 indefinitely in an effort to attach to this particular bill the \$15,000,000 for food. At the same time we have to realize that we would probably be confronted with the same opposition on any bill to which we might attach such an appropriation.

Mr. BORAH. But the \$45,000,000 will be available to enable them to prepare for their crops. That will have been appropriated and will be in their possession or be available to them. There are many bills which will come before us to which the \$15,000,000 could be attached without delaying that which is essential for the people to have in order to begin raising or preparing to raise their 1931 crops.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the difficulty will be that the pressure will be greater to prevent the appropriation of a dollar to buy food after the \$45,000,000 has been appropriated to buy feed. In other words, under the philosophy of the administration, if we provide feed for animals, the pressure will be even greater to prevent the purchase of any food for humans.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. DILL. I want to remind the Senator from Idaho that a similar argument was used regarding the debenture plan on the farm relief bill. We were told that it more appropriately could be applied to the tariff bill. When we put it on the tariff bill we yielded on it and we have no debenture now.

Mr. BORAH. I am aware of that fact, but what I would like to know from those who come immediately from States which are so severely afflicted is whether the time has come when it is absolutely necessary for them to have something to begin to raise their crops or else lose their crops for this year? Is the exigency sufficiently at hand? That is the question that confronts me. It seems to me we had better provide means for their crops and have it soon. In this way we neither provide for means to take care of their crops nor for food. We lose both.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from Nebraska will permit me further—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield further.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, except in the extreme southern portions of the drought area, there is very little that can be done at this moment toward the raising of crops. In the State of Kentucky, for instance, it will be at least two months normally before the farmers will begin breaking their land for the planting of the spring crops. Of course, it is necessary to buy feed for their animals in order that they may be able to pull a plow two months from now. But so far as the needs for the immediate particular moment is concerned in my State, the need for food for human beings is very much more urgent than is the need for feed for animals.

Mr. BORAH. I have not any doubt about that fact.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, are we not presented with this proposition? We can not get an appropriation for food for human beings because of the power and influence of the President of the United States. Put that down. It is an impossibility, no matter how anxious we may be to get it. We can get an appropriation for feed for animals and to buy seed if we will stop at that on this particular appropriation measure. If we insist on our amendment, we will not get even that much. Therefore we are presented with the situation as a practical legislative proposition, it seems to me, that we must either recede on the appropriation for human food or get nothing for human food or animal feed or for seed.

The thought has occurred to me that in connection with the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, which has been reported to-day and is now on the calendar, although it would probably require a suspension of the rules by a two-thirds vote, that in the Senate we could put this same or a similar amendment on that bill. Then the Senate would be in a position to stand on that amendment and either have the bill with that amendment attached to it or have no Agricultural Department appropriation bill at all.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I made that suggestion myself a few moments ago during the course of some remarks which I submitted on the subject now before the Senate. We can put the amendment on any general appropriation bill. We can put it on the Agricultural Department appropriation bill or the deficiency appropriation bill. Once it is in there the arbitrary practices which have prevailed thus far, preventing consideration of adequate measures of relief, will break down. I think that is true.

May I say while I have the floor by courtesy of the Senator from Nebraska that I think there is need for the immediate passage of the feed, seed, and fertilizer bill, although it is, as I have tried many times before to say, inadequate and puts the Congress in the anomalous position of saying to an honorable citizen that he may have a loan to feed his work stock but must stand in the bread line in order to secure food to feed his family. I have not language available properly to condemn a policy of the character just indi-



cated. The object of some of the people who have already delayed at the other end of the Capitol consideration and action on the seed, feed, and fertilizer bill is to put the friends of the measure in the attitude of being in part responsible for that delay.

I think the time has come when we should immediately yield, in view of the fact that the House conceded a vote on this amendment and that the vote was 134 in favor of the amendment and 216 against it. I think in view of that fact the correct strategy is to yield on the amendment here, put it in the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, and if it gets in there then see that it remains there or the Agricultural appropriation bill fails of passage. I am willing to take that position and whatever responsibility is attached to doing it.

I will say further that in anticipation of this question arising I took the liberty of calling together this morning the Democratic Senators who are regarded as most vitally concerned. A number of them had already left their offices to fill engagements at departments and committees and were unable to attend, but it was the unanimous opinion of those who did attend that the correct strategy, in view of the facts and circumstances now well known to the Senate, is to yield on the amendment and incorporate it or a similar appropriation provision in a general appropriation bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think that there will be any difficulty about the Senate putting such an appropriation on a general appropriation bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senate has twice voted for it by unanimous vote.

Mr. BORAH. There will be no difficulty about putting it on an appropriation bill. If we are able to accomplish it in that way we shall likely accomplish it as soon as we can in this way. In the meantime the farmers will be relieved of the great need that now confronts them and will have something to buy feed and put in their crops.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is true.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to say just a few more words—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator before he leaves this point?

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is a well-known parliamentarian and so is the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Robinson]. This amendment in the exact terms in which it has been offered having already passed the Senate, would it not be in order without suspending the rules and would not a majority only be required to pass it if it were put on a general appropriation bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Answering for myself in the time of the Senator from Nebraska and with his permission, I have assumed that is true. There may be some question. Some parliamentary issue might arise, but if it should arise I have not the slightest doubt that the Senate, having twice unanimously voted the proposal, would suspend the rule if the Chair should hold that that is required.

Mr. NORRIS. There might be some parliamentary question arise as to the form of the amendment. I have not talked with Senators about it. Quite a number have expressed to me their idea that the way to do it is to appropriate \$15,000,000 and turn it over to the Red Cross; that we ought not to loan it to these suffering people. A large number of them would be unable ever to pay it back. They have no security to give. It is a question of human food which the Red Cross is better equipped to take care of than our governmental agencies. I just want to drop that thought for the consideration of Senators.

We might have some difficulty if we relied upon the point raised by the Senator from Tennessee if we wanted to give it in such form as we have just outlined. But I think there will be no difficulty in getting a two-thirds vote on a motion to suspend the rules, which motion has to lie over one day, of course, but we can take care of it in that way.

It seems, although it may be, and I think is, humiliating on a great question of human suffering and human mercy, that we have to yield and abandon relief when hourly and daily the suffering all over the country is increasing at a rapid rate. But it seems we are helpless and that it is necessary for us to do something of that kind.

The President said some time ago:

The leaders of both parties are cooperating to prevent any such event.

He was speaking of large appropriations and increased taxation.

Some of these schemes—

He was referring then to the various schemes which had been proposed for relief—

Some of these schemes are ill-considered, some represent enthusiasm, some represent a desire of individuals to show that they are more generous than the administration—

That would not be very difficult to do. If one be in favor of feeding a single child who is starving, he would be more generous than the administration if he is in favor of feeding it out of public funds. The President further states:

More generous than the administration or that they are more generous than even the leaders of their own parties.

Where are the party leaders to whom the President refers, where is there one in the Senate—and there are many party leaders here—who wants to say that he is fundamentally opposed to the use of public funds to save women and children from starvation? If there are such, let them rise and say so. If there are such, then I should like to boast that I want to be more generous than they. The President goes on:

They are playing politics at the expense of human misery.

According to that, any man who is more generous in providing relief for starving people than are the leaders of the party or the administration is "playing politics." Mr. President, in the name of common honesty, I deny it. Is it playing politics to want to feed the hungry when the administration does not want to feed them? Is it playing politics to want to appropriate money to feed those who are starving when the leaders of one's party are opposed to doing so? If there is any party that has such leaders, it had better get rid of them and obtain leaders who have humane hearts and who will not close their eyes to the starvation and hunger apparent all around us. The President also says:

Prosperity can not be restored by raids upon the Public Treasury.

What about erecting public buildings as the administration advocates; what about building public roads, the funds for which all come out of the Public Treasury, on the ground of restoring prosperity? It seems to be admitted by the President that we do not have prosperity, for he is talking about its restoration.

Mr. President, I wonder if we have reached a time when a Member of Congress dare not say that he is in favor of this or that legislation without being charged with "playing politics," because it is alleged that the leaders of the parties do not want it? Are we going so far as to say that the rank and file of the membership, say, of the Senate, have no right to express their own opinions? Must they first go and seek out the leader and ask him whether or not they have a right to think? I am afraid that they would have some trouble to find the leaders even. Are we allowed to favor or oppose legislation without knowing first whether the administration wants it or does not want it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wish to say that, so far as our leader on this side is concerned, he is whole-heartedly and genuinely for this measure of relief and for any measure of relief that will alleviate human suffering and misery.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood that to be true; but I was afraid to assert it because I feared somebody would charge me with contradicting the President, for the President said that the leaders on both sides were with him in this matter;



and I did not want to get into that kind of a controversy, of course.

Mr. President, if we have reached the time when the United States Senate, right or wrong, can not express itself in favor of the appropriation of public funds to relieve human suffering, then we ought to abandon our form of government. What are we here for? What were our forefathers thinking about when they provided for a Congress—a House of Representatives and the Senate? If they wanted men on a checkerboard they would not have provided any salary for them, and there would have been no necessity of having so many. They would have established a Mussolini government.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Our system of government was established before we had parties, and provision was made when a man came to the Senate for him to take an oath to support the Constitution instead of to support a party.

Mr. NORRIS. That is an old form, and we have retained it; but it probably does not mean much any more. We now support parties and not the Constitution. We find out what our leaders want and we do what we are told; the leaders find out what the administration wants and they do what it wants them to do; and so everything goes right back to the administration. A Senator should have no voice in legislation; if he has a thought he should keep it to himself and not think it aloud, unless he agrees with his leaders or with the administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will detain the Senate for only a few moments.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] raised the question as to whether or not the Senate ought to hold up longer a vote on the item of \$15,000,000 for food and should let the \$45,000,000 item go through. I am very much disappointed at the action of the conferees on the part of the Senate in surrendering so quickly to the demands of the House conferees.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Senate conferees have surrendered nothing. The conference report now before the Senate is a complete disagreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I desire to compliment him instead of condemning him. If a Senate conferee stands out from 6 o'clock at night until 12 o'clock the next day I think he is entitled to reward, because, while my career here has been very short, I have not observed Senate conferees being able to endure very long. The public long conceived the Senate as being a body of senile characters, without any power of resistance, and that character is justified by my observation of what we have done since I have been here with reference to conference committees, for, as a usual thing, the Senate conferees recede and accept the dictates of the House.

I presume there is nothing else for us to do but to accept the \$45,000,000 now, and then tie \$15,000,000 and probably \$25,000,000—because if we wait much longer \$15,000,000 will not be sufficient—on to some deficiency bill or regular appropriation bill. Then we shall be in a position to say to the House—not to the House, I do not mean to the House; but I mean to the powers that control the House—that we shall not pass the appropriation bill unless, for once, the views of the Senate are respected.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator overlooks the fact that the longer this relief is put off the fewer people there will be who can eat, because a good many of them will have passed on to the beyond.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true; but at the same time their ranks will be recruited; the period of suffering is not over; and while many of them will pass on to the beyond, the longer relief is delayed the more hungry mouths there will be supplied to take their places.

There is some consolation in the fact that we may be able to get \$45,000,000. As I recall, during the French Revolution one of the ministers when he heard the people crying for food said, "Let them eat grass." We are going to buy hay for animals, and the attitude of the administration and the leaders undoubtedly is that if the people are really hungry, let them eat hay, because they will have hay when the \$45,000,000 appropriation shall finally be made.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska quoted a part of the record, but he did not quote it all. In 1921 I happened to be a Member of the House of Representatives. There was pending before a committee of that body at that time, of which I was a member, a resolution to appropriate \$20,000,000 not to buy feed for mules, cattle, and pigs, but to buy food for people. It is true those people were not living in America; they were not of our own flesh and blood; they were not our own kinsmen; they were not our own constituents; they were not citizens who had some right to look to this Government for generous treatment or even for its bounty; they were people living in Russia. At that time there appeared before the committee the Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Herbert Hoover. He appeared there in advocacy of an appropriation of \$20,000,000 to feed hungry Russians, hungry Bolsheviks, hungry men with long whiskers [laughter] and wild ideas. The appropriation was made. I am appealing to-day for funds to feed little children who have not reached the age of maturity, little children who can not earn their own livelihood.

Mr. McKELLAR. And American children.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, as the Senator wisely suggests, American children. In introducing his testimony, the then Secretary of Commerce made a review of the activities of the postwar administration for relief throughout Europe, and after making that review, and telling of the great work that had been accomplished in the war-stricken countries, largely through the generosity of this Government in appropriating, as I remember, \$100,000,000, he said:

Thus we were in position to make an effort in Russia and, with the full approval of our Government, the relief administration opened negotiations last August with the Soviet authorities, acting as an informal and voluntary body.

Now listen—and this is the then Secretary of Commerce speaking:

The problem that we are confronting is not a problem of general relief to Russia, for which there can be some criticism, but is a problem of relief to an area suffering from an acute drought.

The reason for according relief to Russia was not because we wanted to help Bolsheviks, but it was because a certain area of Russia had been stricken with drought. What is there about a drought in Russia that distinguishes it from a drought in the United States? Does the sun get any hotter in Russia? Does the ground become any more parched in Russia? Does the grass dry up any more quickly in Russia?

In other words, we are making a distinction here between the situation created by the hand of man, as distinguished from the situation that might be called an act of God. This Volga area, as has been stated, is practically altogether an agricultural region.

In 1921 it was sound and safe to vote money to give away—and here we are only asking that it be loaned—because of a drought in Russia. It was sound then to give it away because it had been caused, not by act of man, but by the act of God. Regardless of the claims of political parties, I will assume that we are going to agree that the drought really was caused here by an act of God and not



by the Senate minority—not by the coalition of Progressives and Democrats.

What else was said? The Secretary of Commerce then said:

Public charity is not to be an avenue through which this problem can be solved.

In 1921 public charity ought not to have been relied upon to raise \$20,000,000. It was not to be resorted to in this gigantic undertaking to feed a little area of the Russian people. It was going to require something more than private charity. Let us see if we are able to do it.

It does not look to be a very great strain on the population to take \$20,000,000 for a purpose of this kind.

That was good doctrine in 1921. What has happened—what has happened in the morals of nations, what has happened in the philosophical aspect of government—that between 1921 and 1931 we should have an absolute reversal of our attitude upon these questions?

If our own people suffer—

Listen—

If our own people suffer, we surely possess also the resources to care for them.

In 1921 the Government of the United States had the resources, so the Secretary of Commerce said, to care for the Russian people; and he predicated that upon the thought that—

If our own people should suffer, we—

We—who? Not Russia, but we—

we surely possess also the resources to care for them.

How has our financial position changed since 1921? If we had the resources then to care for Russia as well as for ourselves, why have we not the resources now to care for our own people, when Russia is making no demand upon our bounty of our charity?—

Secretary HOOVER. I have a feeling we are dealing to-day with a situation of a great deal of depression and have a proper right to inquire not only whether we are doing an act of great humanity but whether we are doing an act of economic soundness? To me, after assessing our ability to give, no other argument is needed beyond the sheer humanity.

In 1921 there were only two considerations. One was our ability to give; the other was the question of sheer humanity. Our ability is greater now. The dictates of sheer humanity ought to be greater now. These are our own people. These are the citizens of our own Republic. The Secretary of Commerce advocated this then not only as an act of humanity but as an economic measure. He said that food products were cheap; the farmers were depressed; we were in a period of great depression, and spending \$20,000,000 for food would help the farmers of the United States. How has that argument changed with the years? Mr. President, I submit that those arguments and those sentiments were good in 1921. They ought to be good now. They ought to be good because of the ripening effect of nine years upon that scene.

What has changed? Why should there be any modification of that sound position of the Secretary of Commerce? Ah, Mr. President, I appeal to those in authority, I appeal to the administration, to reflect. Reflection is good for all of us. Look back over that record, look back over the sentiments that were felt in 1921. I ask that the administration take on again some of the noble impulses, some of the pulsing, throbbing humanity that stirred the Secretary of Commerce in 1921.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to what has heretofore been done by our Government.

As early as May, 1812, we appropriated \$50,000 for the sufferers from earthquake in Venezuela.

In 1815 we appropriated for relief to the sufferers from an earthquake at New Madrid, Mo.

In 1836 we made an appropriation for the relief of sufferers from fire in New York City.

In 1836 we appropriated for rations to be given sufferers from Indian depredations in Florida.

It is said that there is no precedent for the provisions of this bill. I read again from the list of relief measures enacted by this Government:

February, 1803. Relief of sufferers from fire at Portsmouth, N. H.

1804: Relief of sufferers from fire at Norfolk, Va.

1827: Relief of sufferers from fire in Alexandria, Va.

1847: Authority to use U. S. S. *Macedonia* for transportation of supplies to the sufferers in Ireland.

1863: Relief of persons damaged in Indian depredations in Minnesota.

1864: Relief of sufferers from explosion in cartridge factory in the District of Columbia arsenal.

1866: Admission free of duty of articles for relief of sufferers from fire at Portland, Me.

1866: Relief of sufferers from explosion in the District of Columbia arsenal.

1866: Relief granted in payment of taxes of citizens who suffered from fire at Portland, Me.

1867: Authority to use public vessels in transportation of supplies to Southern States.

1867: Authority to charter vessel for the transportation and issuance of supplies to Southern States.

1867: The Secretary of War was authorized to issue supplies of food to sufferers in the South.

1871: Authority was given to use naval vessels for the transportation of supplies to the destitute and suffering people of France and Germany.

Oh, yes; the administration is perfectly willing to give food and supplies to foreign peoples; but when an unfortunate situation arises like the one we have now, the taxpayers must be protected, and these men and women and children who are suffering may look elsewhere than to their own Government!

1872: Relief of sufferers at Chicago, Ill. From history we all remember that terrible tragedy. The Government stepped in and aided the sufferers from that tragedy.

1872: Relief of the postmaster at Chicago on account of loss due to the fire. We actually relieved a postmaster.

1874: The President was authorized to issue supplies of food and clothing to the Mississippi River flood sufferers.

1875: Purchase of seed for sufferers from ravages of grasshoppers.

1879: Refrigerating ship for disinfection of vessels and cargoes on account of yellow fever.

1880: Articles for relief of colored immigrants to be admitted free.

1880: The Secretary of the Navy was authorized to use vessels to prevent suffering.

1882: Purchase of seed for Mississippi River flood sufferers.

1882: Rations for relief of the destitute sufferers of the Mississippi River flood.

Here it is. We did just what is proposed in this amendment, to provide both for furnishing seed and relieving human suffering, as well as in the way of providing food and rations.

In 1882 we again furnished rations to the Mississippi River flood sufferers.

In 1882 we again furnished food to flood sufferers of the Mississippi River—three separate bills, apparently.

In 1884 we authorized the purchase and distribution of subsistence, stores, and clothing for Ohio River flood sufferers.

In 1884 we provided for the relief of Ohio River flood sufferers.

In 1888 we made provision for the prevention of cholera and yellow fever.

In 1888 we took steps for the eradication of yellow fever.

In 1890 we authorized the purchase of tents for people driven from their homes on account of floods in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

In 1890 we appropriated for the relief of sufferers from Mississippi River floods.



Again, in 1890, certain unexpended balances of appropriation were made available for the relief of citizens of Oklahoma rendered destitute by drought.

In 1897 we appropriated for relief of the poor of India—relief of the poor of India!—and this Government furnished the money.

Again, in 1897, we appropriated for the relief of Mississippi River flood sufferers.

Again, in 1897, we appropriated for the relief of citizens suffering in Cuba. That was just before the Spanish-American War.

Again, we provided for payment to sufferers on account of the destruction of the *Maine*.

In 1905 we appropriated \$1,000,000 for the relief of sufferers from earthquake at San Francisco, Calif., and that was not enough. Later on the Congress appropriated another million and a half for those who suffered, those who had neither food nor clothes.

Can any Senator here say that it was not right? Why, of course those bills were right. They should have been passed, just as this bill should be passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator ought to emphasize the fact that in all these instances the relief afforded was an absolute and direct gift from the Treasury, not a loan. No single human being who was relieved under any of the measures to which the Senator has referred, and others which he will mention later, was ever required to pay back any of the money.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course not; and it should not have been required. From the year 1812 until the year 1931, whenever it appeared to the Congress of the United States that people were suffering from hunger, cold, or destitution, the Government has stepped in, wherever the people may have been, whether in far-off India, or in South America, or in Europe, or in the United States. Yet we are told that there is no precedent for what has been proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Let us follow this just another moment. In the year 1909 an appropriation of \$800,000 was made for the relief of citizens of Italy. They were suffering, they needed food and clothing, and the American Congress, with the approval of an American President with a heart in him, sent \$800,000 to far-off Italy to relieve human suffering, and it ought to have been sent.

In 1911 we made an appropriation for the relief of the sufferers from famine in China. We have made no distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, even. But when it comes to American children, American men, and American women who are suffering, the President of the United States uses every instrumentality in his power to prevent Congress from exercising its constitutional right to relieve suffering.

Let me see if there were any more such precedents. In 1908 we appropriated \$250,000 for the relief of suffering from cyclones in the States of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and Tennessee.

Again, in 1912—and we all remember this, because most of us were in the Congress at that time, in one branch or the other—for the relief of the sufferers from floods in the Mississippi Valley we appropriated \$1,239,000. In 1912, again, we made another appropriation of \$250,000 for the same purpose.

Throughout our entire history we have relieved want and suffering not only in our own land but in almost every land on the face of the earth, and I might say in every land on the face of earth where it was needed.

Mr. President, I know from actual observation that there are many people in my section of the country who are hungry this day. I know of men and women who have not the wherewithal to pay for their next meal. Why should not our Government take part in a situation like that? Heaven knows such a call does not come often. Heaven knows that the prosperity in this country of ours is such ordinarily that action like this on the part of Congress is not necessary.

But we have the money. There is no question about the money. There is no reason in the world why this should not be done except a fear on the part of somebody that his taxes may be raised a little. Why should not a man with a large income, who does not know what it is to want bread or meat, be compelled by the Government to give out of his great wealth a little more in taxes in order that those who are hungry, due to no fault of theirs, should be fed?

I think we should not hesitate. I greatly regret that the situation is such as it is. I am very sorry we can not keep this \$15,000,000 in this bill. I want to say for myself that I shall leave no stone unturned to put some such provision in every appropriation bill that comes up, if it is necessary in order to get it, and make a fight on every one.

In the first place, the President does not hold the purse strings of this country. Under the Constitution the purse strings are in the hands of the Congress, and the President ought to leave it to the Congress to say whether in its judgment these amounts should be granted.

There is not a Senator in this body, in my judgment, who is voting his honest, conscientious feeling who would not vote for this appropriation. If there is a man in this body—and I see quite a number here on both sides—who is unwilling to vote this appropriation, let him rise. I yield to him to make any explanation he may desire to make. [After a pause.] No one has arisen, and I know the Members of this body are not the kind of men who would hesitate to do what is honest and just and right toward these unfortunate people. It was not the fault of these people that there was a great panic in New York. It is not their fault that there is a great period of depression in this country. It is their misfortune, and this Government from time immemorial has provided for such a situation, and it is our duty to provide for this one now. It is the most solemn duty that now confronts the Congress, more important than any appropriation bill.

It is important not only for these people themselves, it is important for all of us. When men become hungry in any country, there is a dangerous situation, and I am pleading here now for established institutions in this country; I am pleading for the very men who are denying these people this relief, because I say to you that there are circumstances which come sometimes in the lives of nations when it does not make a great deal of difference whether a man is poor or rich.

Senators, it is our duty under the Constitution of the United States, it is our duty as Senators, it is our duty as human beings to grant this relief and to prevent any more human suffering in this country. We can do it. We can do it fairly and wisely and well. Let us do it.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska plumes himself on his generosity as compared with that of the occupant of the White House, and he cited as evidence the fact that he was ready to vote other people's money for this project, which he says the President is opposing.

I do not know the attitude of the President, but I think it is too late for the Senator from Nebraska, generous as he may be, to attempt to make the people of this country believe that the occupant of the White House lacks generosity. He was elected because the people believed not only that he had vast administrative ability but that he also was imbued with great sympathy for human suffering.

I want to decorate the columns of the *Record* with one of those literary gems found more often in the writings of Edmund Burke than of any other statesman, in which he was describing a philanthropist of his age, and which description I think our President has illustrated more conspicuously than any man who has lived since. Mr. Burke said:

\* \* \* He has visited all Europe, not to survey the sumptuousness of palaces or the stateliness of temples; not to make accurate measurements of the remains of ancient grandeur, nor to form a scale of the curiosity of modern art; not to collect medals or collate manuscripts, but to dive into the depths of dungeons, to plunge into the infection of hospitals, to survey the mansions of sorrow and pain, to take the gage and dimensions of misery, de-



pression, and contempt; to remember the forgotten, to attend to the neglected, to visit the forsaken, and to compare and collate the distresses of all men in all countries.

I do not believe there is any use in the opponents of the President trying to convince the people of the country that he is not full of sympathy with human suffering. Nor is it fair to argue that those who do not believe in this appropriation are blind and hardened against human suffering. Everybody wants to assist those who are in distress. If the method proposed were the only one of relieving them, everybody would vote for it. The question is not simply shall we relieve human suffering. The question is, what is the proper method of relieving this suffering which exists?

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

Mr. GILLET. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator taking the position that he does not think an appropriation out of the Public Treasury is the proper method of relieving the suffering?

Mr. GILLET. I am.

Mr. BARKLEY. I notice that on the 1st of August, 1914, Congress passed an appropriation of \$200,000 to relieve human suffering in Salem, Mass., which suffering was the result of a fire, and that the Senator from Massachusetts was at that time a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, and not only did not object to that appropriation, but supported it. Wherein lies the difference between a disaster in Salem, Mass., and one in other parts of the country?

Mr. GILLET. The Senator would better know his facts before he attempts to cite them. As a matter of fact, I was on the Committee on Appropriations of the House at that time. I did not favor that appropriation and I did not then think that that was a proper action.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was a Member of the House myself, and I do not recall that the Senator objected to it, or that he voted against it.

Mr. GILLET. I do not believe I did vote against it. I did not vote for it, I know.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator did not raise his voice against it on the floor of the House, as I recall.

Mr. GILLET. I am not certain about the matter, but my recollection is that in the Committee on Appropriations I stated that I did not believe it was a proper appropriation, that I did not believe there was such a national disaster that Congress ought to interfere. I see in the Chamber my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who was then the governor of the State, and who came to Washington to urge the appropriation. I differed from him, and in the Committee on Appropriations I expressed my opinion. But my most intimate friend and colleague represented that district, and he persuaded me not to vote against it. I am very sure, however, the Senator will find I did not vote for it.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was much easier, apparently, to persuade the Senator at that time than it is now. While he may have objected in the Committee on Appropriations, the sessions of which were behind closed doors, and not in the open, when the bill came on the floor of the House, my recollection is—and I think the record bears me out—the Senator had by that time hearkened to the importunities of Massachusetts, and did not raise his voice against the appropriation.

Mr. GILLET. I wish the Senator would look the record up. I am very certain he will find I did not even vote for it.

As I have said, I did not think that was a national disaster. Nine million dollars of property was swept away and people were left homeless, and there was a strong argument for the Government momentarily supplying them with tents and food. I did not think it was proper to make that appropriation, and I thought then, as I do now, that Massachusetts could relieve its own.

I recognize a difference however, in the present instance. I believe there are a number of places in the southern drought-stricken regions where the communities themselves can not take care of their own poor. If it were necessary for the United States Congress to interfere, if there were

no other remedy, I would approve it; but there is another remedy.

The Red Cross, which is constituted for exactly that service, states that it is equal to the contingency as it now exists. If it becomes so pressing that the Red Cross can not remedy it, if the local governments can not remedy it, if the States can not take care of it, then I am willing that Congress should appropriate, and I will favor it. But so long as that condition does not exist, and I do not believe it exists to-day, I do not think we ought to appropriate for it.

I hope that I have as much sympathy with distress and misery as any other man. There is misery always. There is not a day in the year when there is not suffering in the slums of our great cities. Piteous stories can be told any day, even in the most prosperous times, which will call for sympathy and might be used as the basis of an appeal for assistance. We do not grant it because we recognize that the local community ought to take care of it. There is unemployment every day in the year. There are vast armies of unemployed all the time, men who are too shiftless or too criminal or too lazy to be willing to take care of themselves. You remember the wealthy Englishman who came over here and complained to the clever American girl that we had no leisure class in this country. She said, "Oh, yes; we have a leisure class, but we call them tramps." We have in this country a class of permanent unemployed, and unquestionably they are now swelling the mass of unemployment which exists. They are counted now among the deserving unemployed. To the deserving unemployed everybody wants to give assistance. When the local organizations, the local communities, the States, and the Red Cross can not support them, then Congress ought to support them; but I do not believe that time has come yet.

The proper principle was, I think, well expressed by one of the clearest and deepest thinkers of the last generation, President Eliot, when he said:

\* \* \* With the continental nations of Europe it is an axiom that the government is to do everything and is responsible for everything. The French have no word for "public spirit," for the reason that the sentiment is unknown to them. This abject dependence on the government is an accursed inheritance from the days of the divine right of kings. Americans, on the contrary, maintain precisely the opposite theory, namely, that government is to do nothing not expressly assigned it to do; that it is to perform no function which any private agency can perform as well, and that it is not to do a public good even unless that good be otherwise unattainable. It is hardly too much to say that this doctrine is the foundation of our public liberty.

That is the doctrine which I think we ought to remember and observe to-day, the foundation of our public liberty, that as long as the people themselves can take care of themselves it is wrong for the Government to interfere, for it undermines that fundamental spirit of liberty to which President Eliot referred.

What the condition may be a week, a month, or two months from now no one can foretell, but I do not think that to-day the localities, the States, the Red Cross are not amply able to take care of the suffering which exists. I was amused to notice, in reading the proceedings of the House, an amendment which a Congressman from New York wished to offer. He asked that this money should not be spent simply in the drought regions, but that it should also be employed in the cities. He wants the city of New York to get something from this fund which we mean to give only to those regions which can not possibly take care of themselves and where, as I have no doubt, as in Arkansas and Kentucky, the whole community is in bankruptcy. But that shows the tendency, that shows that just as soon as we begin to have the Government contribute, then everybody wants to share. They all seem to look upon the National Treasury as if it were perpetually filled up from the outside and all one has to do is to draw from it without expense to anybody.

I am ready, if the exigency really exists, if the local communities and charitable organizations can not support and prevent this human misery, to vote for the appropriation,



but I do not believe the condition exists to-day, and therefore I do not think we ought to adopt the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. What is pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to adopt the conference report.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The motion, if agreed to, will place the bill back before the Senate in exactly the same shape in which it left here a few days ago. When that report is adopted a motion will be made, I take it, that the Senate recede from its amendments. From the speeches made here to-day I think I gather a rather distinct impression that the Senate will agree to that motion, whereupon the bill will be before the Senate for passage in its original form, carrying the sum of \$45,000,000 to be used as provided in the authorization bill passed by the Senate a few days ago.

At this time I desire to call attention to the authorization act. The authorization act passed and approved on December 20, 1930, provides that money may be appropriated in the sum of \$45,000,000 for the following purposes:

For the purchase of seed of suitable crops, fertilizer, feed for work stock, and/or fuel and oil for tractors, used for crop production, and when necessary to procure such seed, fertilizer, feed, and fuel and oil, and for such other purposes incident to crop production as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and sell the same to such farmers.

Mr. President, this is the last session of the Seventy-first Congress. Under the Constitution this Congress will end automatically at 12 o'clock noon on March 4, next. We have now been in session something like 25 days. We have less than 40 working days yet remaining of this Congress. When the pending bill shall have been disposed of this day, I prophesy that no other relief legislation will come before this Congress. If there is any plan now of the leaders of the Senate to present additional legislation in the nature of relief, I yield in order that that fact may be made known.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senator from Oklahoma will yield, I would like in his time to ask unanimous consent out of order to offer an amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill, which has been suggested to me by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] and other Senators, on both sides of the Chamber, in order to make sure that an opportunity will be afforded for the inclusion in the general appropriation bill of an adequate fund or what now appears to be adequate to supplement the funds which the Red Cross has and seeks for relief purposes. It is proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] and myself, and I ask that it may be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield for that purpose?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It is an amendment intended to be proposed to the Agricultural Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas and Mr. BLACK to the bill (H. R. 15256) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes. At the proper place in the bill to insert:

"There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000 (in addition to such sums as may be or may become available through voluntary contributions) to be expended by the Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food to persons otherwise unable to procure the same."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Earlier in the day I stated to the Senate that this course would be pursued. There is some confusion of thought as to what form the amendment should take. It is not my intention by proposing this amendment to preclude the provision that is in the special appropriation bill now under consideration, but to make certain that an opportunity will be afforded for supplementing the fund which the Red Cross has and seeks to secure by an appropriation. I have incorporated the sum of \$25,000,000. This would be expended to relieve suffering in all parts of the country. It is the result of some consideration by a number of Senators and if it should be incorporated in the Agricultural Department appropriation bill or the deficiency appropriation bill, an effort, as I have already stated, will be made to keep it there at the risk of defeating the bill if it is necessary to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he has given the necessary notice under the rule?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have given no notice yet. In the event the point of order is raised the proper notice will be given. This amendment would require a suspension of the rule. The amendment now under consideration to the bill before the Senate having already passed the Senate twice probably would not require a suspension of the rule. The difference between the amendment which I have just proposed to the agricultural appropriation bill and the one embraced in the conference report on the bill now before the Senate is that the latter provides for loans for the purchase of food in drought areas, whereas this amendment is proposed to meet a general condition and to respond to a demand which is nation-wide rather than limited to the drought areas.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a moment ago I paused and offered the opportunity for a statement from any leader suggesting any legislation that is now before the Senate, or that may be presented to the Senate for consideration, in the nature of relief. No suggestion came from the majority side. The leader upon the minority side, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has made a suggestion and has presented an amendment which he will offer at the proper time.

I take it, Mr. President, that when this bill is passed, no other recommendations shall come from the Executive. Believing this to be the fact, I desire briefly to review the legislation and the efforts made to secure relief legislation up to this hour.

On the second day of this session the President sent his message to the Congress. This message embraced something like 11 pages. Of those 11 pages, one-half were devoted to the conditions of distress existing throughout the United States. As proposals for taking care of such distress, the President made some suggestions.

The President requested that the Congress give him something like one hundred or one hundred and fifty million dollars with which to stimulate employment. His second request was:

I recommend that an appropriation should be made to the Department of Agriculture to be loaned for the purpose of seed and feed for animals.

In the next paragraph the President suggests that any further relief should come from the Red Cross.

Mr. President, the President, in a way, has called the attention of the Congress and the country to the condition of distress existing throughout the Nation. Congress in pursuance of and acting upon the recommendation of the President has proceeded to pass certain bills. The first bill



passed—and I desire at this time to call the attention of the Senate to that legislation—was Public, No. 550, approved on December 20, 1930. That bill was introduced and passed in compliance with the recommendations made by the President. It embraces some seven different items. The first is an appropriation of \$3,000,000 for the improvement of national forests, for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails and fire lines, and so forth.

No. 2. National forest highways. For the construction and improvement of highways within the boundaries of national forests, fiscal year 1931, \$3,000,000.

No. 3. For roads on unappropriated or unreserved public lands, \$3,000,000.

No. 4. For the Federal aid highway system, an appropriation is carried in this act in the sum of \$80,000,000.

No. 5. For roads and trails in national parks, \$1,500,000.

Item No. 6 comes under the War Department, and provides an appropriation of \$22,500,000 for rivers and harbors.

The seventh item is for the same department, for flood control on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, the sum appropriated being \$3,000,000.

This makes a total of \$116,000,000 carried in this act in obedience to the recommendation of the President.

The bill we now have before us comes under the second recommendation of the President, and provides an appropriation to help the farmers of the country to procure seed and feed for work stock.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Oklahoma will recall that on the night the bill authorizing the appropriation of \$45,000,000 was passed I offered an amendment appropriating the sum of \$45,000,000, so that the administration could go forward and accord the relief provided for in the bill. The Senator will also recall that the administration advocates on the floor of the Senate voted that amendment down.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I well remember, Mr. President, the record made on that historic night. At this time I submit for the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a copy, first, of House Joint Resolution 447 as passed by the House of Representatives. I ask that the body of the joint resolution may be placed in the RECORD at this point, and also that the amendments adopted by the Senate to that joint resolution may be inserted in the RECORD following the text of the joint resolution proper.

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

The joint resolution and amendments are as follows:

#### House Joint Resolution 447

Joint resolution making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States," approved December 20, 1930

*Resolved, etc.,* That to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States," approved December 20, 1930, including the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, printing, purchase of law books not to exceed \$1,000, rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans made thereunder, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$45,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1932, of which amount not to exceed \$80,000 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia.

#### IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, January 5, 1931.

*Resolved,* That the joint resolution from the House of Representatives (H. J. Res. 447) entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled 'Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States,' approved December 20, 1930," do pass with the following amendments:

(1) Page 2, after line 7, insert:

"Sec. 2. That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized for the crop of 1931 to make advances or loans to farmers in the drought and storm stricken areas where he shall find that an

emergency for such assistance exists, for the purchase of food under such terms as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such advances or loans shall be made on the same terms as the provision of said Joint Resolution No. 211 makes for the loans or advances for seed, feed, etc., subject to all the qualifications of said Senate Joint Resolution No. 211. For carrying out the purposes of this section, including all expenses and charges incurred in so doing, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000,000."

(2) Page 2, after line 7, insert:

"Sec. 3. In the administration of this fund the Secretary of Agriculture shall make loans in the drought and storm stricken areas, without regard to county lines, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall not have right or authority to prescribe rules and regulations excluding farmers from the benefits of this appropriation on the sole ground that they reside in any particularly designated area."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on yesterday the principal Senate amendment to this proposed act came up in another body. At that time Representative McCLINTIC of Oklahoma, so the RECORD states on page 2087, made this motion:

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House conferees be instructed to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment on which the vote was ordered is as follows, as stated by the Speaker:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized for the crop of 1931 to make advances of loans to farmers in the drought and storm stricken areas where he shall find that an emergency for such assistance exists, for the purchase of food under such terms as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Speaker made the following statement:

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] moves that the House conferees be instructed to concur in the Senate amendment. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma. The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Then the yeas and nays were called for and ordered and the vote was taken. There were 135 Members of the House who supported the motion and 215 Members of the House opposed the motion, so that it was lost.

At this point I submit for the RECORD a copy of the proceedings in the House of Representatives as they appear on page 2087 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and ask that it may be printed in connection with my remarks.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House conferees be instructed to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] moves that the House conferees be instructed to concur in the Senate amendment. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The Senate amendment on which the vote was ordered is as follows:

"That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized for the crop of 1931 to make advances of loans to farmers in the drought and storm stricken areas where he shall find that an emergency for such assistance exists, for the purchase of food under such terms as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture."

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 135, nays 215, answered "present" 1, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

Yeas—135: Abernethy, Allgood, Arnold, Aswell, Ayres, Blanton, Box, Boylan, Brand of Georgia, Briggs, Browning, Busby, Byrns, Campbell of Iowa, Cannon, Cartwright, Christgau, Clark of North Carolina, Cochran of Missouri, Collier, Collins, Condon, Cooper of Tennessee, Cooper of Wisconsin, Cox, Craddock, Crisp, Cross, Cresser, Davis, DeRouen, Dominick, Doughton, Doxey, Drane, Drewry, Driver, Edwards, Eslick, Evans of Montana, Finley, Fisher, Frear, Fuller, Fulmer, Gambrell, Garner, Gasque, Gavagan, Glover, Goldsborough, Granfield, Green, Greenwood, Gregory, Hall of Mississippi, Hancock of North Carolina, Hare, Hastings, Hill of Alabama, Hill of Washington, Howard, Huddleston, Hull of Tennessee, Hull of Wisconsin, Igoe, James of North Carolina, Jeffers, Johnson of Oklahoma, Johnson of Texas, Jones of Texas, Kennedy, Kerr, Kvale, Lambertson, Langley, Lanham, Lankford of Georgia, Lea, Lindsay, Linthicum, Lozier, McCLINTIC of Oklahoma, McCormack of Massachusetts, McDuffie, McKeown, McMillan, McReynolds,



McSwain, Mead, Milligan, Montague, Moore of Kentucky, Moore of Virginia, Nelson of Missouri, O'Connor of New York, Oldfield, Oliver of New York, Owen, Palmisano, Parks, Parsons, Patman, Patterson, Peavey, Prall, Quinn, Ragon, Rainey, Henry T., Ramspeck, Rankin, Rayburn, Romjue, Rutherford, Sabath, Sanders of Texas, Sandlin, Schafer of Wisconsin, Schneider, Sinclair, Somers of New York, Sparks, Spearing, Steagall, Stone, Sullivan of New York, Sumners of Texas, Tarver, Taylor of Colorado, Vinson of Georgia, Warren, Whittington, Woodrum, Wright, and Yon.

Nays, 215: Ackerman, Adkins, Allen, Andresen, Andrew, Arentz, Bachmann, Bacon, Baird, Barbour, Beck, Beedy, Beers, Black, Blackburn, Bohn, Bolton, Bowman, Brand of Ohio, Brigham, Britten, Brumm, Brunner, Buchanan, Burdick, Burtness, Campbell of Pennsylvania, Carter of California, Carter of Wyoming, Chalmers, Chase, Chindblom, Chipfield, Christopherson, Clague, Clancy, Clarke of New York, Cochran of Pennsylvania, Cole, Colton, Connerly, Connolly, Cooke, Cooper of Ohio, Coyle, Crail, Cramton, Dalinger, Darrow, Dempsey, Denison, De Priest, Dickinson, Dickstein, Doutrich, Dowell, Dunbar, Dyer, Eaton of Colorado, Eaton of New Jersey, Elliott, Erk, Estep, Esterly, Evans of California, Fenn, Fish, Fort, Foss, Freeman, French, Garber of Oklahoma, Garber of Virginia, Gibson, Gifford, Goodwin, Goss, Graham, Griffin, Hadley, Hall of Illinois, Hall of Indiana, Hall of North Dakota, Halsey, Hancock of New York, Hardy, Hartley, Haugen, Hess, Hickey, Hoch, Hogg of Indiana, Hogg of West Virginia, Holaday, Hooper, Hope, Hopkins, Houston of Delaware, Hudson, William E. Hull, Irwin, Jenkins, Johnson of Indiana, Johnson of Nebraska, Johnson of Washington, Jonas of North Carolina, Kading, Kahn, Kelly, Kendall of Kentucky, Kendall of Pennsylvania, Ketcham, Kinzer, Knutson, Kopp, Korell, LaGuardia, Lankford of Virginia, Leavitt, Leech, Lehibach, Letts, Looftbourrow, Luce, Ludlow, McClintock of Ohio, McLaughlin, Maas, Manlove, Mapes, Martin, Menges, Merritt, Michener, Miller, Mooney, Moore of Ohio, Morehead, Morgan, Mouser, Murphy, Nelson of Maine, Newhall, Niedringhaus, Nolan, O'Connor of Oklahoma, Palmer, Pittenger, Pou, Harcourt J. Pratt, Pritchard, Purnell, Frank M. Ramey, Ramseyer, Ransley, Reece, Reed of New York, Reilly, Rich, Robinson, Rogers, Sanders of New York, Selberling, Selvig, Shaffer of Virginia, Shott of West Virginia, Shreve, Simmons, Sloan, Smith of Idaho, Snell, Snow, Speaks, Sproul of Illinois, Stafford, Stalker, Strong of Kansas, Strong of Pennsylvania, Summers of Washington, Swanson, Swick, Swing, Taber, Taylor of Tennessee, Temple, Thatcher, Thurston, Tilson, Timberlake, Tinkham, Treadway, Tucker, Turpin, Underhill, Vestal, Vincent of Michigan, Walnwright, Wason, Watres, Watson, Welch of California, Welsh of Pennsylvania, White, Whitley, Wigglesworth, Williamson, Wolfenden, Wolverton of New Jersey, Wolverton of West Virginia, Wood, Woodruff, Wurzbach, Wyant, Yates, and Zihlman.

Answered "present"—1: Oliver of Alabama.

Not voting—80: Aldrich, Almon, Auf der Heide, Bacharach, Bankhead, Bell, Bland Bloom, Browne, Buckbee, Butler, Cable, Canfield, Carley, Celler, Clark of Maryland, Corning, Crowther, Cullin, Cullen, Davenport, Dorsey, Douglas of Arizona, Douglass of Massachusetts, Doyle, Ellis, Englebright, Fitzgerald, Fitzpatrick, Free, Garrett, Golder, Guyer, Hale, Hawley, Hoffman, Hudspeth, Morton D. Hull, James of Michigan, Johnson of Illinois, Johnson of South Dakota, Johnson of Missouri, Kearns, Kemp, Kiefner, Kunz, Kurtz, Larsen, McCormick of Illinois, McFadden, McLeod, Magrady, Mansfield, Michaelson, Montet, Nelson of Wisconsin, Norton, O'Connor of Louisiana, Parker, Perkins, Ruth Pratt, Reid of Illinois, Rowbottom, Sears, Seger, Short of Missouri, Simms, Sirovich, Smith of West Virginia, Sproul of Kansas, Stevenson, Stobbs, Sullivan of Pennsylvania, Thompson, Underwood, Walker, Whitehead, Williams, Wilson, and Wingo.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs: Additional general pairs:

Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin with Mr. Bland.  
Mr. James of Michigan with Mr. Almon.  
Mr. Morton D. Hull with Mr. Douglas of Arizona.  
Mr. Parker with Mr. Larsen.  
Mr. Cable with Mr. Doyle.  
Mr. Kiefner with Mr. Hudspeth.

On the vote:

Mr. Williams (for) with Mr. Aldrich (against).  
Mr. Cullen (for) with Mr. Hawley (against).  
Mr. Bankhead (for) with Mr. Free (against).  
Mr. Montet (for) with Mr. Bacharach (against).  
Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts (for) with Mr. Magrady (against).  
Mr. Browne (for) with Mr. Corning (against).  
Mr. Mansfield (for) with Mr. Short of Missouri (against).  
Mrs. Norton (for) with Mrs. Ruth Pratt (against).  
Mr. Underwood (for) with Mr. Englebright (against).  
Mr. Dorsey (for) with Mr. Golder (against).  
Mr. Carley (for) with Mr. Hale (against).  
Mr. Canfield (for) with Mr. Johnson of Illinois (against).  
Mr. Auf der Heide (for) with Mr. McFadden (against).  
Mr. Kemp (for) with Mr. Johnson of South Dakota (against).  
Mr. Garrett (for) with Mr. Reid of Illinois (against).  
Mr. Stevenson (for) with Mr. Kurtz (against).  
Mr. Sirovich (for) with Mr. McLeod (against).  
Mr. Smith of West Virginia (for) with Mr. Stobbs (against).

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think I am safe in saying that we know now what Congress expects to do by way of affording relief. We are appropriating in this bill \$45,000,000 to be loaned to the farmers of the country for the

purchase of seed of suitable crops, fertilizer, and feed for work stock. If this money shall be appropriated, and some farmer shall make application for money with which to buy seed or with which to buy fertilizer or with which to buy feed for work stock, and then, perchance, that farmer should use some of the money for buying human food, the bill provides a penalty of a thousand dollars fine or imprisonment for not exceeding six months, or both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. President, as has been stated many times on this floor, Congress is willing to appropriate money to buy feed for work stock, but not to buy food for human beings. Under this measure a farmer will not dare to feed the food which he may buy with money obtained under the law to anything but work stock. He can not feed the corn he may obtain or the wheat he may obtain to his cow; he can not feed the corn or wheat to his hog; he can not feed it to his poultry unless he can convert such animals and fowls into work stock; and I can not believe that it is the intention of those responsible for this legislation that the farmer himself and his family shall be converted into work stock, as is done in some countries in the world, in order to come under the provisions of this proposed law. In Russia I have seen horses and cows yoked together; in Russia I have seen men and dogs harnessed together; in Russia I have seen men and women working in the fields together.

In Russia I have seen women laboring on public works, pushing wheelbarrows, or carrying boxes full of dirt, brick, and mortar for the want of wheelbarrows. I have seen women working on the public streets of Leningrad and Moscow; I have seen women wielding the sledge and handling the crowbar on the railway tracks of Russia. I have not seen women in Russia hitched up with animals, but under the terms of this bill before a man can eat legally any of the food he may procure for his work stock he must convert himself into an item of work stock; before he can feed his wife he must convert his wife into a beast of burden, and the same thing is true of his children, or else he will violate this law and subject himself to a penalty of a thousand dollars' fine or six months in jail, or perhaps both such fine and imprisonment. Mr. President, I make the statement that this bill, if it shall be passed in its present form, Russianizes the farmers of America. Under this bill the farmer can not borrow money and use that money with which to buy food except for his work stock; that is, for his mules, his horses, or his oxen, unless perchance he converts the other animals on his farm into work stock. He can not legally use such funds to feed his hungry family, he can not provide food for his cows, his hogs, his poultry, or even for his faithful dog.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma, as I was also interested in the statement made a while ago by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], who said that he would be willing to vote for this measure later on if it should be found to be actually necessary. The suggested time at which he would vote for it was about two months later. Well, two months from now will be the 14th of March, and, of course, the Congress is not then expected to be in session, if the administration shall have its way. Therefore the Congress will not be able to vote for an appropriation to supply human food, even if it wanted to do so, because Mr. Hoover certainly will not have called it into extra session, and, by the way, the Senator from Massachusetts will at that time be out of public life. It is quite remarkable that it is the intention of the administration to have this \$45,000,000 appropriation provided for work stock and animals alone.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before Congress convened it was the evident intention of the administration to ask for an appropriation with which to stimulate employment on public buildings. That was item No. 1. It was likewise the intention to ask for an appropriation to be loaned to farmers to enable them to buy seed and feed



for work stock. Then, if conditions developed in such a way that a larger need was manifest, it was the intention that only the Red Cross and its allied agencies should be left between the people who are in distress and starvation. In the message of the President the last paragraph having to do with relief of human suffering proposes reliance upon the Red Cross.

Mr. President, before discussing the activities of the Red Cross—and I desire to discuss that somewhat at length—I desire to state that on the second day of the present Congress, the 2d of December, immediately following the reading of the President's message I introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a special committee of the Senate to have jurisdiction of relief legislation. I knew what the conditions were in the West; I did not know what conditions were in the East; but I have since learned the conditions in the East.

Only a few days ago I was in the city of New York. As I had some extra time, I went into that section of the city where the unemployed are the most numerous. I started at the Battery and went up the section along the East River, the Bowery district, and mingled there with thousands and tens of thousands of unemployed. I saw the soup lines and the bread lines on the Bowery. I actually went through some of the bread lines. They did not ask any questions of me. Perhaps my appearance was sufficient introduction. There was no one there to challenge my right to go into the Salvation Army and the Red Cross bread lines and soup houses. We went in single file. I reached the first wicket, and there a man kindly tendered me a chunk of bread, about two or three slices of a loaf of white bread.

At the next wicket a man tendered me a tin of a thick, yellow soup. I went on in among the crowd and saw the class of folks that were there patronizing this soup house. A constant stream was entering and a constant stream of humanity was leaving these houses. They were not kept open just an hour or two during the day. They open early and they stay open late; and, so far as New York City is concerned, I want here and now to compliment that great city on the manner in which it is taking care of the hungry and the unemployed.

Mr. President, when I introduced my resolution on the second day of the session I called attention briefly to the condition of the country. When it came up for a vote, but few votes were cast for my resolution, especially on the other side of the aisle. I wondered why that was. I could not understand it then, but I can understand it now. The leaders here did not intend to have any legislation considered by the Congress proposing to take care of these people who are hungry and unemployed. Of course they objected to my resolution; and when the time came for action on the resolution they spoke and voted against the resolution, and the resolution failed.

I can readily understand why it is that some Members of this body and some Members of another body do not desire to make a record here. This record stands for all time; and, Mr. President, supposing that this day ends our efforts for relief; what will the record be? Why, here is the record. The President of the United States devoted one-half of his annual message to the necessity for relief. Five pages of his message are given over to the conditions that obtain throughout the country. The Congress met and stayed in session until the 4th of March, and the Congress appropriated only \$116,000,000 with which to stimulate employment and appropriated only \$45,000,000 with which to make loans to the farmers of the country. Both such acts carried out the requests of the President.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Just a moment. When that record is made, after we shall have adjourned, we will have the record of the President devoting one-half his message to this situation, and the Congress, although acting as requested by the President, failed miserably to provide relief; and then those who support the administration can say: "Why, it is

not the President's fault. The fault is with the Congress. Congress failed to appropriate any money with which the hungry people of this Nation might be served; and so niggardly were the appropriations made by Congress that the President actually had to appeal to the Red Cross to feed the starving people of the country."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think the Senator should state the fact that in the recommendations made by the President concerning relief, he put very, very great limits; namely, that whatever money should be appropriated should not result in any increase in taxes, and that under no circumstances should there be any loans authorized by the Federal Government for relief. If that does not amount to doing nothing, I do not know what is doing nothing.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his suggestion.

Mr. President, at this point I desire to introduce for insertion in the RECORD a copy of Senate Resolution 338, the resolution introduced by myself on the second day of this session, and ask that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

The resolution is as follows:

#### Senate Resolution 338

*Resolved*, That a special select committee on emergency and relief legislation be, and is hereby, created, such committee to consist of 11 members to be appointed by the President of the Senate, as follows: Six members from the majority party and five members from the minority party.

Immediately upon appointment the members shall meet and organize such committee and, when organized, said committee shall have power coequal with regular Senate committees and shall have jurisdiction of emergency and special relief legislation, including proposals for the authorization of appropriations.

When organized such committee shall report to the Senate its plan of organization and location.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Goff in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I should like to have inserted in the RECORD, immediately after the conclusion of the resolution offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, my own conviction that the Senate made a grievous mistake when it failed to adopt that resolution.

If we had had the resolution enacted, and had had created the special committee that is provided for by it, there would have been one group in this body devoted to this one cause. We now have a dozen different measures scattered through the various committees of Congress, and nothing is being done with them. We have one which rests with the Finance Committee or the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, where it was proposed by those in authority that the red tape might be cut, that there might be a speedy engagement in the building program already authorized by the Congress, and for which appropriations have been made; but week after week passes, and nothing is done, and no report comes. No opportunity is given the Congress to wipe out this red tape in order that these building programs may go forward.

If we had had favorable action upon the resolution offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, I think that long before this a responsible body having nothing else to clutter up its pigeonholes would have brought to us something which would be constructive and would help in solving the problem.

I just want to say that much, and to say that the Senator from Oklahoma has stood out from the first as insistent upon effective action as regards this terrible situation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Just a minute. I thank the Senator from New York for his suggestions.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.



Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator from New York to the fact that the statement just made by him is rather unfair, for I think he knows that there are about 400 draftsmen now employed in the Supervising Architect's office. The building program is farther on the way to success than any other action, I think, taken by Congress. I am quite aware that we have cut some red tape in relation to it. We have allowed the local architects to make the plans of the buildings. We have taken off every restriction that has been imposed in the past in relation to the early building or the starting of the building of those post offices and public buildings.

I wish that every other department of our Government had done as well, and every other act of Congress had been put into effect as well as the public-building program of the United States is at this moment.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator bear with me a moment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I desire, if I can, to proceed; but I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have no fault to find with the Senator from Utah. I think there is no more kindly person in the Senate, nor one more deeply concerned over the existing situation; but I ask him this question:

Is it not true that both the Supervising Architect when he was before our committee, and Colonel Woods when he was before our committee, pointed to this measure to which I have referred as extremely necessary in order that we might go forward with this building enterprise?

It is proposed that in the matter of condemnations the money may be deposited with the court and that we may proceed at once with borings and with the preliminary work, and both the Supervising Architect, Mr. Wetmore, and Colonel Woods stated their views in positive language. I know that when I asked Colonel Woods if there was anything we could do, his language was significant. He said: "You bet there is!" That was his answer, and it was that this red tape might be cut.

This bill was presented four or five weeks ago and it has not been brought to us, and in consequence the building program is being delayed. I do not care how much the architects may have done or what local architects have been employed; the fact remains that these buildings can not be constructed because of the interference of these various red-tape measures which would be cut by this measure.

That is what I mean. I think it is time we talked plainly in the Senate and let the country know that the Senate is not doing its duty. I think there has been a shameful lack of appreciation on the part of the Republican administration regarding the situation of the country, and it is time we let the country know it. They find fault with us because we hold up appointments of the President or seek to recall them. That is only dust in the air. The fact is the Republican administration has minimized the situation and has not gone forward effectively to deal with it. That is my charge; and I think it is proven by the witnesses who were brought before the Appropriations Committee only a few days ago.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will yield for a question only.

Mr. SMOOT. That would not do me any good.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I did not think so.

Mr. President, when the time arrived in the Senate that legislation was out of the question, and some Members came to the conclusion that we must look to the Red Cross for relief if relief is to be forthcoming, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] proposed a resolution, and I desire at this time to call attention to a portion of such resolution.

Senate Resolution 376

Resolved further, That the Appropriations Committee is requested to call before it John Barton Payne, chairman of the American National Red Cross, to ascertain:

- (1) Conditions in the drought-stricken States.
- (2) Whether the American Red Cross can provide adequate relief to all needy persons in said States.
- (3) Conditions in the cities and towns of the country caused by the economic depression and resultant unemployment.

Mr. President, I can not speak for the administration. I can not speak for another branch of the Congress. What I am saying now is in defense of the Senate of the United States, because I expect to hear, in the next two years, speeches made to the effect that back in 1930 and 1931, in that bad winter, the Congress met, the President advised Congress of the conditions of the country, Congress did not respond to that appeal, and the President was forced to appeal to the Red Cross to raise \$10,000,000 with which to feed the starving people of the country.

I want to make a record, so far as I am concerned, to combat that kind of possible propaganda.

In pursuance of the resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Committee on Appropriations proceeded to hold hearings; and before I take up the hearings held by that committee I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the law under which the National Red Cross is operating.

This is Public, No. 4, Fifty-eighth Congress, third session. It was approved January 5, 1905, now more than 25 years ago.

This law authorizing the incorporation of the National Red Cross provides that the Red Cross shall have five major functions to perform. Two of those are important. The first one, section 3, is:

That the purposes of this corporation are and shall be, first, to furnish volunteer aid to the sick and wounded of armies in time of war.

We are not concerned with that here.

I skip over Nos. 2, 3, and 4, and come to No. 5.

As to No. 5, we find this language:

Fifth. And to continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in time of peace, and apply the same in mitigating the sufferings caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities, and to devise and carry on measures for preventing the same.

It is under that clause that the Red Cross each year has a roll call and collects money to defray the expenses of that great organization.

I do not want anything which I shall say to be construed as adverse to the Red Cross. The Red Cross has done a great work in the past. No organization in the world has rendered a greater service to suffering humanity than has the Red Cross. I shall not criticize the Red Cross as the same operates in the States. I shall not criticize the Red Cross in its organization here in Washington. But if the testimony given by the chairman of that organization, John Barton Payne, before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, is the expression of the board of directors of that organization, then I criticize the board. If he did not represent the board, then I do not criticize the board, and my criticism will be directed to the chairman himself.

Mr. President, in the hearings a few days ago before the Committee on Appropriations, John Barton Payne appeared and testified in pursuance of an invitation issued by the Senate. After he had testified the press of the country carried the information that Mr. Payne left the impression with the committee that his organization had the sum of approximately \$5,000,000 only that could be used with which to relieve the existing distress throughout the country. I got that impression here on the floor. If I did not mistake the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of one of the subcommittees, they left that impression. If I am wrong, I yield now to have that impression corrected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that that was the impression I got from the testimony.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. President, at this time makes the statement that he received the impression from Mr. Payne's testimony that the National Red Cross had but approximately \$5,000,000 which could be used to relieve



distress existing throughout the country at this time. May I have a similar statement from the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot]?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, John Barton Payne testified, as I remember it, that they had \$4,500,000 or \$4,600,000; it was not \$5,000,000. I want to say to the Senator that I think his statement is well within the facts as testified to. But of course, later John Barton Payne did make the statement that if they needed more, they would ask for it. I think he said that when the fund got near the bottom of the barrel, they would holler, or something like that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. "Yell" was the word he used.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I make the statement that the chairman of the subcommittee having charge of the Interior Department appropriation bill, and the chairman of the main Committee on Appropriations, received the impression from Mr. Payne's testimony that the American Red Cross had but approximately \$5,000,000 which could be used. Am I correct in that assertion?

Mr. SMOOT. He testified that that was what they had on hand.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The people of the country received that impression. I desire to call attention to an editorial appearing in one of the leading papers of my home State, The Daily Oklahoman. I will read only a portion of the editorial. It states:

The so-called drought relief measure with its promise of \$45,000,000 does not apply to the cities of the country, where more than one-half of our population resides. It does not apply to the rural population of those States which happily escaped the scourge of drought. It applies only to farmers who live in the drought-ravaged States.

Further on the editorial states:

But Government is leaving the work of direct human relief to the American Red Cross and similar agencies. And Government is positively refusing to lend financial aid to the Red Cross or any other relief agency. Those are the indisputable facts.

Here is a statement which corroborates the impression held by the two distinguished Senators, Senators who have been in the Senate more than 20 years.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to correct an impression the Senator may have received about the Government refusing to lend money to the Red Cross, if I understood the Senator correctly.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am not challenging that statement or that contention at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all right, then.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I now desire to read a paragraph from the mentioned editorial which corroborates my statement that the country believes as the two distinguished Senators believe. This paragraph is as follows:

It is indisputable also that the Red Cross lacks sufficient funds to meet the present emergency.

That is the impression this paper had, that is the impression the country has, that is the impression which the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations of this body now has, and it is likewise the impression the chairman of the great Finance Committee of this body has. I read further:

It has at present \$4,000,000 with which to meet the needs of a vast number of sufferers whose actual number can only be guessed at and not stated definitely.

Mr. President, what gave rise to that conclusion? From what source did that impression come? I want to call the Senate's attention to testimony given before the Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Payne appeared and testified. He prepared a statement, no doubt carefully prepared that statement, and I read first from his statement.

Should the balance of this fund—

He does not say what fund—

Should the balance of this fund prove insufficient, the Red Cross will ask the country for such contributions as may be necessary. This disaster reserve has been maintained—

He refers to the fund as "this disaster reserve"—

This disaster reserve has been maintained by the Red Cross for several years as a revolving fund to enable the organization to act immediately in time of large disaster, without waiting until relief contributions were received from the public. If exhausted during the present emergency, it will be necessary for the Red Cross to appeal to the generosity of the American people for such additional assistance as may be necessary.

Mr. President, in a carefully prepared statement the chairman of the Red Cross told one of the great committees of this body that he had a fund, and that when that fund was exhausted his organization would have to appeal to the generosity of the American people to raise additional funds with which to relieve human misery.

A little later on the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Phipps] interjected this question:

Colonel Payne, you say that approximately \$850,000 so far has been distributed. What have the contributions been up to January 1, and what balance does the Red Cross have available as of January 1?

Mr. PAYNE. We started out with a reserve fund of \$5,000,000. Up to January 1 we had expended \$849,965.49. Of this, \$446,000, roughly half a million dollars, came from the national funds, and \$403,000 came from local contributions and local-chapter funds, leaving roughly \$4,500,000 still available for relief.

Mr. President, the committee had a right to believe that that was all the money the Red Cross had which could be used at this time. Evidently that was the impression the chairman of the Red Cross intended to convey. That is all the information he gave. It is no wonder that the chairman and the members of the Committee on Appropriations got the impression that that was all the funds the Red Cross had.

I refer now to page 15 of this hearing. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Bratton] made a statement, and when Mr. Payne replied he used the following language:

Our feeling has been, and I so advised President Hoover perhaps six or eight weeks ago, that if we are permitted to proceed in our normal way—that means without excitement, it means without clamor—we might get through the winter with our present resources.

Senator BRATTON. That is, about \$4,500,000 now on hand?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Senator BRATTON. Is that your feeling now, Judge Payne?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

I call attention to one other statement appearing on page 17 of the record. Mr. Payne said:

I do not say that we can get through on four and one-half millions, but I say, if we get toward the bottom of the barrel, we will yell.

Mr. President, I submit that this testimony was intended to convey the impression to that committee that the Red Cross at that time had only four and a half million dollars available as resources to be used in taking care of the unemployed and those who are now in need, because the last statement I just quoted is that when the Red Cross gets down to the bottom of the barrel they will yell.

We have heard the yell, and when they got down close to the bottom of the barrel, when this four and a half million dollars was almost exhausted, Mr. Payne evidently went to the President and suggested to the President that a nationwide call be made for additional funds to replenish the resources, almost depleted, of the Red Cross.

I now offer for the RECORD a copy of the President's proclamation and ask that the same be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

#### PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION

To my fellow countrymen:

There must be a very material increase in the resources of the American Red Cross to enable it to bear the burden which it has undertaken in the drought area and smaller communities over 21 States during this winter. Within the last 10 days the Red Cross has had to increase the rate of expenditures to an amount greater than during the entire preceding four months.

The American Red Cross is the Nation's sole agency for relief in such a crisis; it is meeting the demand and must continue to do so during the remainder of the winter.

The disaster reserve of the Red Cross is not sufficient to meet the increased demand. It is imperative in the view of the expe-



rienced directors of the Red Cross that a minimum of at least \$10,000,000 be contributed to carry the relief program to completion.

The familiarity of this situation, due to much press reports of its progress, should not blind us to the fact that it is an acute emergency nor dull our active sympathies toward our fellow countrymen who are in actual want, and in many cases they lack the bare necessities of life unless they are provided for.

As President of the United States and as president of the American Red Cross I, therefore, appeal to our people to contribute promptly and most generously in order that the suffering of thousands of our fellow countrymen may be prevented. I am doing so with supreme confidence that in the face of this great humanitarian need your response will be immediate.

HERBERT HOOVER.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I will ask the Senator to be sure to put in the date. It was on the 6th of January when Judge Payne said that if they got near the bottom of the barrel they would yell. When did the yell come out?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have a statement issued on the 12th. I desire to call attention to one sentence of the President's proclamation, as follows:

As President of the United States and as president of the American Red Cross I therefore appeal to our people to contribute promptly and most generously in order that the suffering of thousands of our fellow countrymen may be prevented.

Mr. President, on the 12th of this month the press carried the story of the call being made by the National Red Cross. I desire at this time to call attention to a news story appearing in the New York Times under a Washington date line of January 12, as follows:

WASHINGTON, January 12.—The American Red Cross took steps to-night to raise \$10,000,000 for drought relief. Chairman John Barton Payne assigned campaign headquarters to 3,000 local chapters throughout the United States.

In a telegram to each chapter Judge Payne explained that President Hoover had announced a public appeal for this fund, and then made the following plea:

"Greatly increased demands during the last 10 days have made imperative an immediate campaign for a Red Cross relief fund to meet the emergency situation through parts of 21 States in the drought-stricken area. A minimum of \$10,000,000 is needed to prevent untold suffering and actual starvation of thousands of families.

Mr. President, when the President had given out his proclamation, and when Chairman Payne had released this story, there appeared in the Washington Daily News a signed story under the authorship of Max Stern. At this point I desire to have printed in the RECORD a copy of this news story.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, January 12, 1931]

RED CROSS ACCUSED OF SHIRKING JOB IN UNITED STATES—DIRECTOR OF PEOPLE'S LEGISLATIVE SERVICE ACCUSES RELIEF ORGANIZATION OF HOLDING BACK FUNDS

By Max Stern

Charging that the National Red Cross holds back \$38,000,000 now available for disaster relief while it disclaims responsibility for feeding America's 5,000,000 jobless and helps block direct congressional relief, Mercer G. Johnston, director of the People's Legislative Service, to-day assailed the organization and its chairman, John Barton Payne.

"Is the Red Cross hoarding relief funds in the face of human misery almost impossible to picture?" Johnston asks in his statement.

#### CITES DRAMATIC APPEAL

Out of \$44,000,000 held in reserves as of last July, \$38,000,000 is down as "available for expenditure." This, Johnston says, has been collected in "highly organized, dramatic appeal to the American heart." On his return from Europe, Judge Payne, according to Johnston, mentioned the drought and unemployment situation as one calling for attention of the Red Cross.

"The money is needed not for far-off people," another Red Cross spokesman is quoted as saying on the eve of the last roll call. "It is needed for our own."

Since then, Johnston says, the tragedy has become steadily worse. "Since last August, when Chairman Payne admitted 'that a very serious situation existed,' the human tragedy has grown steadily worse," the statement says. "To-day the cry of 'Bread! Bread!' is heard throughout the land. The situation is 'intolerable,' says the chairman of the President's emergency committee. Conditions are 'almost impossible to picture,' say Red Cross field workers. The Hoover-Payne policy of suppression merely serves to discredit confidence in its sponsors.

"Called to give an account of his stewardship, Chairman Payne, first washing his hands of all responsibility for the sufferings of the 5,000,000 jobless of the cities, reports that all is well in the rural districts.

#### RED CROSS WILLING

"Less than \$1,000,000 of its \$38,000,000 has been stretched out over six months, nearly half of it for seed. He throws the weight of his influence against congressional funds for food and clothing. The Red Cross is willing, if absolutely necessary, to spend a maximum of \$5,500,000 on the farmers. He regards that as quite enough for them. If not he will 'yell' for the public collection. Red Cross reserves are not to be tapped."

Johnston says that although these great reserves are for major disaster, none of the great disasters of the past decade has been relieved from these funds. A special appeal for funds is resorted to. Outside of special emergency funds, the Red Cross, he says, has spent in relief an average of less than \$750,000 a year for the past decade, and this was one-twelfth of the institution's total expenditures.

#### BLOCKS DIRECT RELIEF

"If ever," Johnston concludes, "the Red Cross intends to meet a great disaster out of its general or ordinary funds or large reserves, now is the time to do so. From its own house organ comes the unguarded confession that 'the magnitude and severity of the present situation are alone sufficient to justify a departure from normal policy.'"

"Its chairman has joined with its president in blocking direct Federal relief. Human misery is at the doors of its marble palaces. It has \$44,000,000 of mercy money within. If it keeps the money, it will risk the loss of public confidence to a degree that will greatly impair its usefulness."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I next desire to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial taken from the Baltimore Sun of January 12, without being read. No doubt everyone has read it.

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

[From an editorial in the Baltimore Sun of January 12, 1931]

Members of Congress from stricken States have insisted for weeks that conditions have passed beyond the control of their citizens and called imperatively for Federal aid to feed people, and not merely to provide them with seed and equipment loans. Mr. Hoover and his spokesmen in Congress have denied these statements. They have said that local agencies, supplemented by the resources and facilities of the Red Cross, were ample to meet the needs of impoverished people for food. But Mr. Hoover and the Red Cross now confess they were wrong.

That is the meaning, no less and no more, of the announcement yesterday that an appeal is to be made to the country to provide \$10,000,000 more for the Red Cross—the decision to make this appeal having been reached in conference between President Hoover and John Barton Payne, chairman of the Red Cross. It is one of the swiftest reversals and confessions of error on record. Only last Tuesday Mr. Payne told the Finance Committee of the Senate there was no need for the Government to appropriate money for food relief and no need for the Red Cross to appeal for more money, because he had \$4,000,000 left and that was enough. Yet within four days the head of this quasi-public agency and the President join in a decision to ask \$10,000,000 more—or to treble their original estimates.

Since at long last there is agreement that need exists vastly in excess of the estimates of the Administration and of its charity arm, the Red Cross, the only question is how it shall be provided; and it is distinctly better for the Federal Government to provide the money than for the Red Cross to conduct a popular campaign to raise \$10,000,000. In the first place, it is late in the campaign for the Red Cross to be waking up and asking for \$10,000,000. We are in midwinter and the people to be relieved are at this very moment in acute distress. In the second place, the communities in which the Red Cross would seek the money are the cities—mainly the big cities—and they have got enough charity problems and charity needs of their own at this time. Indeed, it is not at all impossible that some of them will echo Mr. LA GUARDIA'S plea that city people be included in Government relief.

In the past few weeks the administration's spokesmen in Congress, arguing there was no need for food that could not be met by local agencies plus the \$5,000,000 that the Red Cross started with, have gone on to make a great parade of the danger of giving "doles." They were willing to have the Government make character loans to farmers from the \$45,000,000 bill, so that they might buy seed, but they shuddered at the thought of making loans to farmers so they might buy food for their families. It was much better that they accept aid from the Red Cross. In the opinion of Mr. SNELL, Mr. TILSON, and Mr. WOOD, a Government food loan to a famished farmer robbed him of self-respect and self-dependence, while somehow a loan for seed plus a hand-out from the Red Cross for food left him an upstanding "American."

Such idiotic bilge ought to be swept out by every man of intellectual honesty. There is not the slightest reason to think Government food relief will any more really destroy self-respect now than famine relief, flood relief, and fire relief have done in the numerous instances in which they have been granted in the last 100 years.



Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I next want to call the attention of the Senate to the record of the condition of the finances of the Red Cross at this time. I make the statement that Mr. Payne did not tell the Committee on Appropriations of the resources under his control. I make the statement that Mr. Payne did not advise the Committee on Appropriations that he not only had four and a half million dollars, that he not only had ten million, that he not only had twenty million, but that he had as much as \$25,000,000 available for any purpose for which the Red Cross may be convinced needs exist.

Under the law the Red Cross must make a report to the Secretary of War. The Secretary of War must submit that report to the Speaker of the House. In this case the National Red Cross organization has reported to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of War has reported to the Speaker of the House, and I hold before you, Mr. President, a copy of that report, entitled "The National Red Cross Annual Report for the year ended June 30, 1930, published by the American National Red Cross, Washington, D. C." In this report we find that the President of the United States is the president of the National Red Cross. We find that Robert W. DeForest is a vice president, that Calvin Coolidge is a vice president, that Ogden L. Mills is the treasurer. I read the treasurer's name because it is from the treasurer's report that I expect to quote briefly in a moment. We find that Thomas D. Thacher is counselor of this organization, and that Mabel T. Boardman is secretary of the organization.

On page 177 of this report, and from there on through the balance of the book to page 213, I find the financial set-up of the organization. I now make the statement that on June 30, 1930, scarcely six months ago, the National Red Cross, as shown by the report submitted by its treasurer, had within its custody Liberty bonds to the total par value of \$7,791,150. That is the par value of the bonds. I think perchance the book value to-day would be slightly less, but the organization and its treasurer, Mr. Mills, had in their control Liberty bonds of the par value of \$7,791,150. The report of Mr. Mills shows that on that date he had commercial bonds—mostly gold bonds—and I compliment the treasurer for putting the money in gold bonds. He has a few trust bonds and a few bonds that are not gold bonds, but on that date Mr. Mills, as treasurer of the organization, had commercial bonds in the total sum par value of \$20,689,515.37. Adding those two sums together we have a total of \$28,480,665.37.

But that is not all of the resources the National Red Cross had. At that time, according to Mr. Mills's report, they had an endowment fund in the total par value sum of \$5,750,965.68. I will admit for the sake of argument that the endowment fund would not be subject to relief purposes. I understand that sum is made up of bequests made in wills and special gifts to the Red Cross to secure an income to make possible the perpetual existence of the National Red Cross, and if this fund is developed in that manner of course the principal would not be available for use for any purpose of relief.

Then the National Red Cross had other special trust funds amounting to \$807,223.19. Taking the Government bonds, the commercial bonds, the endowment fund, and the special trust funds, we get a total sum held by the National Red Cross on June 30, of \$34,731,962.86. Of course they have spent some of this money since that time, but in the meantime they have had a national roll call.

I have no record of how much that roll call brought forth and how much they have spent from this fund, but my statement is that at the time Mr. Payne was convincing the chairman of the great Appropriations Committee and the country that they had but \$4,500,000, at that same moment they had at least \$25,000,000 in good securities, readily negotiable, quickly cashable, that could have been used, and they have it now.

On yesterday I conversed with the financial secretary of the National Red Cross, Mr. McClintock. He told me he was preparing a statement giving the information I desired. I asked him to please send me a copy, and he

promised to do it. No doubt he will do so. The statement has not arrived, but I know how slowly things move in Washington.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to ask the Senator if the \$30,000,000 plus worth of commercial bonds had been donated to the Red Cross or has the Red Cross invested money donated to it in the purchase of those bonds?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. When the war closed in 1918 the Red Cross had many millions of dollars in its treasury. When the war closed suddenly this money was not used; so when the war was over the Red Cross had these many millions of dollars in their treasury. I was advised yesterday that in the few years subsequent to the war the Red Cross spent some \$38,000,000 less than they received. They had a surplus. Perhaps \$50,000,000 was raised during the time of the war that was not needed, and when the war period had expired the roll calls were made from year to year, and they collected \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 each year, perhaps \$10,000,000 each year, and having spent only about \$1,000,000 each year during recent years they have a reserve, a surplus, and they have been building up an estate.

I am not criticizing the Red Cross for taking care of that reserve and that surplus. I compliment them for it. I am glad the Red Cross has this gigantic fund. I am glad the Red Cross is proceeding along business lines to conserve this surplus, placing it in gold bonds where it can be used in time of major necessity. But the time has come when the major necessity is here. They have the money, but for some reason they did not advise the committee that they have the money.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of that portion of the treasurer's report to which I have just alluded, setting forth the amount of Liberty bonds and a statement of the various kinds of commercial bonds which the Red Cross had in its possession on the 30th day of June, 1930.

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

The statement is as follows:

*Securities owned and held by the National Red Cross*

United States Government:	Par value
First Liberty loan .....	\$249,400.00
Fourth Liberty loan .....	4,008,050.00
U. S. Treasury notes .....	2,500.00
Do .....	900,000.00
U. S. Treasury bonds .....	2,631,200.00
Total .....	7,791,150.00
Commercial:	
Chesapeake & Ohio R. R. bonds .....	200,000.00
Cleveland Short Line R. R. Co. bonds .....	75,000.00
Texas & Pacific Ry. bonds .....	200,000.00
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. bonds .....	200,000.00
Illinois Central R. R. Co. bonds .....	100,000.00
Cleveland Union Terminal Co. bonds .....	399,000.00
Lehigh Valley R. R. Co. bonds .....	100,000.00
Midwick Club Corporation bonds .....	1,000.00
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. bonds .....	100,000.00
New York Connecting R. R. bonds .....	200,000.00
Norfolk & Western R. R. Co. bonds .....	275,000.00
Pacific Electric R. R. Co. bonds .....	100,000.00
St. Louis, Peoria & Northwestern R. R. bonds .....	50,000.00
The Virginian Ry. Co. bonds .....	225,000.00
Illinois Central R. R. Co. bonds .....	200,000.00
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. bonds .....	200,000.00
Oregon-Washington R. R. & Navigation Co. bonds .....	457,000.00
New York Central & Hudson River R. R. bonds .....	200,000.00
General Petroleum Corporation bonds .....	200,000.00
Long Island R. R. Co. bonds .....	200,000.00
Western Union Telegraph Co. bonds .....	100,000.00
Standard Oil Co. of N. Y. bonds .....	200,000.00
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey bonds .....	100,000.00
Indiana Harbor Belt R. R. Co. bonds .....	150,000.00
City of Montreal bonds .....	200,000.00
Illinois Steel Co. debenture bonds .....	150,000.00
Boston Consolidated Gas Co. bonds .....	300,000.00
Canadian National Ry. bonds .....	200,000.00
Commonwealth Edison Co. bonds .....	200,000.00
Commonwealth Edison Co. bonds .....	200,000.00



## Commercial—Continued.

	Par value
Chicago Union Station Co. bonds.....	\$100,000.00
San Antonio & Aransas Pass Ry. bonds.....	250,000.00
Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis R. R. Co. bonds.....	100,000.00
Province of Quebec bonds.....	200,000.00
Westchester Lighting Co. bonds.....	100,000.00
Illinois Bell Telephone Co. bonds.....	200,000.00
New York Connecting Ry. Co. bonds.....	150,000.00
Toronto Harbor Commissioners bonds.....	200,000.00
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co. bonds.....	200,000.00
City of Toronto bonds.....	200,000.00
Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. bonds.....	200,000.00
United Electric Co. of New Jersey.....	200,000.00
Province of Ontario, Canada.....	200,000.00
Erie Lighting Co. bonds.....	100,000.00
Bell Telephone Co. of Canada bonds.....	200,000.00
Pennsylvania, Ohio & Detroit R. R. bonds.....	100,000.00
Duquesne Light Co. bonds.....	300,000.00
Denver & Rio Grande Western R. R. Equip- ment Trust.....	200,000.00
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Equipment Trust.....	100,000.00
Kansas City Southern Railway.....	200,000.00
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Southwest Division bonds.....	100,000.00
Elgin, Joliet & Eastern.....	100,000.00
Canadian National Railway equipment trust certificates.....	250,000.00
Illinois Central R. R.; Chicago, St. Louis & New Orleans R. R. Co. bonds.....	100,000.00
Illinois Central R. R.; Chicago, St. Louis & New Orleans.....	100,000.00
Carolina, Clinchfield & Ohio Ry. Co. bonds.....	100,000.00
Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co. bonds.....	100,000.00
Bell Telephone Co. of Canada bonds.....	100,000.00
American Radiator Co. bonds.....	200,000.00
Union Pacific R. R. Co. bonds.....	335,000.00
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co. bonds.....	456,000.00
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific R. R. equipment trust.....	214,000.00
Canadian National Railway bonds.....	300,000.00
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific R. R.....	200,000.00
Province of Ontario, Canada, bonds.....	100,000.00
Federal Land Bank bonds.....	445,000.00
Federal Land Bank bonds.....	75,000.00
Detroit Edison Co. bonds.....	100,000.00
American Telegraph & Telephone Co. bonds.....	500,000.00
Miscellaneous securities (donated).....	41,365.37
Total.....	12,898,365.37
Total, United States Government.....	7,791,150.00
Total, commercial.....	12,898,365.37
Grand total.....	20,689,515.37

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The call for \$10,000,000 has gone forth. To whom has the call gone? If the call has been extended to the farmers of the country there will not be much accretion to the Red Cross funds in the next few days, I fear. The farmers of the country are not able to respond to this request, and I doubt if the cities of the country are able to respond to it either. The great city of New York, having on deposit more money than it has ever had, having single banks with approximately \$3,000,000,000 of resources, has been called upon already to raise money to take care of the unemployed in that city. I understand that New York City has raised something like \$8,000,000 with which to feed the unemployed of that great city. This appeal of the National Red Cross must go to the cities, but to every city to which the appeal goes, an appeal already exists to raise funds to feed the unemployed in the city to which the call goes.

Mr. President, it is my contention that it is unfair now to ask the people even of the cities to contribute to a fund of \$10,000,000 with which to assist the starving farmers of the country when the Red Cross organization has in its treasury and under its control something like \$25,000,000 in Government bonds, in commercial gold bonds which it can cash. They could not get par for those bonds perhaps. They are not worth par to-day, and I regret that they are not. But the \$20,000,000 of gold bonds, the best bonds the country affords next to Government bonds, can be cashed at a slight discount, and even if the par value of those bonds to-day is higher than that quoted on the stock exchange, yet they would probably bring \$18,000,000 or \$19,000,000; and yet the head of the Red Cross has come before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and—I will not say concealed

the fact, but he has not advanced the intelligence that his organization has some \$25,000,000 in the best bonds in the world immediately available. Instead, the Red Cross went to the President and advised him to make a public appeal to the people of the country to raise money to feed the thousands of our starving population.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator reconcile, if he can, the appeal now being made to the country and the statement which he has made that there is now available \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 in the reserve fund of the Red Cross organization, in the light of the question and answer which I quote from the report of the hearings before the committee, at page 12:

Senator PHIPPS. About how far would you go down with your present surplus before you would make a national call to replenish the fund?

Mr. PAYNE. When we get down, I should say, between one and two millions, a million and a half, say.

Is not the plain meaning of that question and answer that there would not be a call made to the American people until the surplus—that is the word—had been reduced to \$1,500,000? How does the Senator justify his claim that there is \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 in the funds in view of the statement, which I have just read?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I can not reconcile the matter. I have one explanation I might offer and that is that the chairman of the National Red Cross has a desire not to make any further disclosure than is necessary in this period of our national distress. I do not know why the chairman of the National Red Cross is not willing to tell the Appropriations Committee of the Senate what vast resources his organization possesses. I do not think the President has knowledge that the Red Cross, of which he is the president, is possessed of this vast surplus.

Mr. President, if this record is to be believed—and I will submit it to anyone who desires to examine it—the managers of the National Red Cross have hoarded the money given to that organization in years past, and now not only have it hoarded but, in effect, they are trying to conceal it. It is not concealed, however, because this report is a public record; it is among the archives of the House of Representatives; it has been filed with the Speaker and can be obtained in the House of Representatives. I do not know why the chairman of that great organization refused to volunteer this information. At this time the people of America believe that the Red Cross is almost a bankrupt institution; that the Red Cross does not have to-day money with which to meet and serve the demands made upon it by the heads of local Red Cross organizations throughout the United States. I have letters and telegrams by the dozen to that effect.

Mr. President, the Congress has now about completed its relief legislation. We have passed a bill providing an appropriation of \$116,000,000 to stimulate employment; we are about to pass a bill appropriating \$45,000,000 to be loaned to farmers with which to buy feed for work stock and seed, and then we are through. No attention has been paid to the bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts; no attention has been paid in one branch of the Congress to the bills introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]; no attention has been paid to the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. It would do no good now to introduce other bills. Less than 40 days of the present session remain, and I think I am safe in advising the people of the country that they need look no further to Congress for relief in this period of depression, which will go down in history as the darkest in the life of the Republic.

Mr. President, what we get we must get from the Red Cross; what we get we must get from the Salvation Army; what we get we must get from the various community chests and other allied and similar organizations. If they



can not supply the needs of those in distress, the people are helpless.

Mr. President, in closing these few remarks, I desire to submit a plan of relief that already has worked satisfactorily in one portion of the United States. It is the plan suggested by a distinguished citizen of my State. I send it to the desk and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Will Rogers says:

"HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.—We got a powerful Government, brainy men, great organizations, many commissions, but it took a little band of 500 simple country people (who had no idea they were doing anything historical) to come to a country-town store and demand food for their wives and children. They hit the heart of the American people more than all your senatorial pleas and Government investigations. Paul Revere just woke up Concord. These birds woke up America. I don't want to discourage Mr. Mellon and his carefully balanced budget, but you let this country get hungry and they are going to eat, no matter what happens to budgets, income taxes, or Wall Street values. Washington mustn't forget who rules when it comes to a show-down."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the conference report which has been agreed to shows a disagreement on the two amendments which the Senate added to the bill. I gather from the expressions of Senators that, while they regret to do it, they feel that we should recede from the amendment proposing an appropriation of \$15,000,000 to be loaned for the purchase of food. There are two propositions that confront us: One is to provide relief for distress that is liable to come, and the other is to furnish food to meet an existing distressful condition. Apparently, on the pending bill at any rate, we can not secure both. We can, however, secure one.

I think it is quite urgent that the \$45,000,000 should be appropriated as soon as possible. I know of some sections where seed is needed right now. The \$45,000,000 is not to meet solely the seed situation, but it really deals with what may be conditions of starvation, for if crops can not be produced next year, then we will have a very serious situation of that kind. It is largely the purpose of this \$45,000,000 to avoid, if possible, such a situation. The reasons why the Senate should recede have been advanced by different Senators this afternoon. I am not going to take any more time of the Senate. I think the more quickly the \$45,000,000 can be appropriated the more quickly relief will start.

I might say that I have talked with officials of the Agricultural Department, and they inform me that certain things can not be done until this money shall have been appropriated. Some action must be taken by the Comptroller General, and he will not act until the money shall have been appropriated. So the longer we delay appropriating the money the longer will relief be postponed; and, as I have said, I know of some sections of the country where this relief is needed just as quickly as it possibly can be afforded. So, Mr. President, under those circumstances, I am going to move that the Senate recede from amendment numbered 1.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, amendment numbered 2 is that proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK]. I had hoped that we would be able to secure the adoption of that amendment, but I am inclined to think, in view of the letter from Mr. Warburton, that we can depend upon the department to take care of the situation about as well as it could be cared for. So I move that the Senate recede from amendment No. 2.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. The Senate, of course, voted unanimously for that amendment, which action was an expression of their belief that the amendment was a fair construction of the law according to their interpretation. Before we vote on the motion I should like to say that if there is any Senator here who thinks that the Secretary of Agriculture in construing the law and according relief would do it according to State lines or county lines, I think we ought to know it now, because I expect to take the question up with the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis that the Senate understands, and has decided by its vote, that it was intended that relief should be accorded to those who are suffering from drought or storm conditions, wherever they are suffering.

Mr. JONES. I will state to the Senator that I am frank to say that that is my construction and I will not hesitate to write to the Secretary of Agriculture and tell him that I believe that is the idea of the Senate. While, possibly, he might not be justified in going into a county to look after one individual, yet he should look after those in distress just as far as possible, regardless of county or State lines.

Mr. BLACK. And will the Senator further say that the fact the Senate does recede from its amendment is no indication that it recedes from its belief that that is the proper interpretation?

Mr. JONES. Certainly, I will.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JONES. I have moved that the Senate recede from the amendment numbered 2.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, we had some hearings on this subject before the Committee on Agriculture, and at those hearings Doctor Warburton appeared. I made it very plain to him that we wanted this fund used to relieve farmers who were in distress, whether they lived in counties where the suffering was general or where it was not so great. The other members of the committee felt the same way about it, and Doctor Warburton gave the committee to understand that he understood it in that way. However, since that time some Members of the House have talked with him about it, and they are not satisfied with his attitude on the subject. We are unable, it seems, to obtain legislation from the other end of the Capitol directly on this point. I gave notice to-day that I had prepared a resolution which would express to the Secretary of Agriculture, Doctor Warburton, and all others concerned, just how the Senate felt about it. I send that resolution to the clerk's desk, and ask that it may be read, and ask the Senator from Washington if he has any objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read, as requested.

The clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 401), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby notified that when the Senate voted for the drought relief measure, it was the intent and purpose that the funds so provided would be used to afford relief to all families suffering from the drought, whether they live in counties where suffering is general and where there is great distress and destitution, or in counties where the distress caused by the drought is not general.

*Resolved further*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the relief here provided should be granted wherever the conditions and facts justify it, and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested to see that that is done.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I hope the motion will be voted on before action is sought on the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, before the lengthy discussion as to the passage of this relief measure shall close I desire briefly to express my views upon the general question of Federal relief, after five weeks of observation of the administration's attitude.

First of all, it is quite apparent that all Senators are sympathetic with those persons who are in distress and need by reason of the drought of last year and the present economic collapse throughout the land. That feeling, I think, is unanimous. Secondly, every Senator is anxious and de-



sirous that all the citizens of the country shall contribute, through the Red Cross and other private relief agencies, as generously as possible to relief of those who are suffering.

We are, however, concerned with and are debating here the question what the Government ought to do in addition to what private relief agencies are doing. That State and municipal governments must come to the aid of those in want is also agreed. The contest here is what, if anything, the Federal Government should do.

We are dealing not with a local emergency or a State emergency but a national emergency. I take it there is no dispute about that. Then, in the final analysis, what is all this discussion about? Let the country know. It is about who will pay the bills for relief. When we talk about cities, counties, and States paying the bill we are saying that the cost of relief must be paid out of the pockets of the poor landowners of this country, for the people who will be called upon to pay taxes for the relief extended in the several States and communities are the average men and women who are the owners of homes and other real property that must meet the demands of local taxation.

What do those really advocate who say the Federal Government will not participate? They mean that the wealth of this country, the large income-tax payers, and the corporations which pay income taxes to the amount of \$2,000,000,000 a year and the importers of foreign goods who provide our customs revenue shall be exempt from increased taxes to meet the costs of this great emergency.

In this national emergency I want the country to know what we are fighting about. It is concerning who is to pay for years to come the tax burden placed upon the back of the American people on account of relief extended in a great national emergency of unemployment, drought, and business depression, caused as much as by any other cause by those of great wealth who have been gambling with the financial securities of the country. Here is what constitutes the real issue. The administration is for exempting the large income-tax payers and the corporations of this country from paying increased taxes toward this relief. That is what it amounts to say, the Federal Government will not increase taxes or make loans for relief expenditures.

No one wants taxes increased if it can be avoided, but it is necessary, and I favor all units of our Government, just as we do in war, sharing the burden. To exempt the Federal Government means you are going to place on the backs of the small property owners in every municipality and in every State the increased taxes for relief, not for this year, not for next year, but for several years. With their property depreciated, with themselves out of work, these people are to bear the entire burden! In a word, the poor must take care of the poor so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

The Federal Government acting through this administration has closed the Treasury doors and said, "The rich will not pay it. Go back to your localities and have it paid by those who pay taxes there," who are the farmers and the working class—the small property owners, the shop owners, and the industries who must face the increased tax on their plants that provide local taxes.

This is the record we are making here. I want the country to know it, and I am ready to go to the country on that issue. I am not being fooled and I am not being deceived. Not a single bill for adequate relief will pass this Congress, and the country might as well know it, because of the determination upon the part of the administration that those who pay large income taxes and the corporation-income taxpayers of the country must not be burdened with relief obligations.

The States and municipalities who have already incurred great expenditures for public works, who have increased tremendously their budgets for outdoor relief to the suffering, must place the tax burdens on their own unemployed and heavily burdened landowners.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am willing to have that vote taken now, and I want a vote on my resolution immediately thereafter. With that understanding, I am willing to have a vote on the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can not have an understanding of that kind. He will have to take chances on getting action on his resolution.

Mr. HEFLIN. I can discuss it, though, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly, the Senator can discuss it. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it. The ayes have it, and the Senate recesses.

#### NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I give the notice which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Arkansas offers the following notice of motion to suspend the rules:

Pursuant to the provisions of Rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to suspend paragraphs 1 and 3 of Rule XVI, for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 15256) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, the following amendment, viz:

At the proper place in the bill to insert the following:  
"There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000 (in addition to such sums as may be or may become available through voluntary contributions) to be expended by the Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food to persons otherwise unable to procure the same."

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McNARY, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. HEFLIN, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that H. R. 14675, the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. If that unanimous consent is granted, will it in any way interfere with a vote on the battleship modernization bill as agreed to for Friday next at 4 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will not.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, at this time I am going to object to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

#### SENATE'S CONSTRUCTION OF DROUGHT-RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. McNARY. I do.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want the Senator from Oregon to permit us to vote on this Senate resolution of mine. It expresses to the Secretary of Agriculture the feeling of the Senate upon the subject.

The Senate feels just as I have set out in the resolution. It will help the Secretary of Agriculture to know just how the Senate feels about this matter, and will enable him to tell people why he is following out these directions, because the Senate has gone on record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to a vote on the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, under the rule, and following the parliamentary procedure, the resolution would have to go over for the day. It is late in the afternoon. The attendance is not altogether complete. There probably may not be any objection to it; but I want to look into the resolution, because I am familiar with the statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture, and this may conform to his view. For the present, however, I shall have to object.

Mr. HEFLIN. Let it go over until to-morrow, then.



ADDRESS BY SENATOR NYE ON "THE INFLUENCE OF MONEY IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS"

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, last Saturday night the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] delivered over the radio an address on the subject of "The Influence of Money in Political Campaigns." I have in my hand a copy of that address and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Money is found to be freely spent in efforts to elect to public office the kind of men who will support the wishes of its givers. Political-party coffers are replenished because the givers have come to know that it is advantageous to be able to appear as a contributor to the election of officials who are to guide the affairs of government. Indeed, such an ability to show contributions made to the cause of elected officials has been proven so advantageous in many instances that men with great financial interests are known to have contributed to opposing candidates and opposing parties in the same campaign so that no matter who won, the records of campaign treasurers would show them to have helped win the victory. To such people it has not mattered which party won.

There are various influences at work these days which threaten our representative form of government, but upon me there has grown a most determined conviction that the most dangerous of these influences is that of money in the conduct of political campaigns. To my mind, such use as is being made of money and the hugeness of contributions and spendings to win election to high public office affords the greatest and most pressing issue threatening our Government and challenging our people to-day.

There are proper uses for money in political campaigns. Indeed, reasonable sums are quite essential when issues are to be carried to the people. It is the money which does not enter into a proper and necessary use against which I argue. The question as to what constitutes a proper and necessary use of money may invite a wide range of decisions. The custom in some States of distributing funds to workers and watchers at the polls, even though the total may reach a half million or more dollars, has to some minds dictated necessary a continuation of that practice. People in these States have come to feel that money paid in hand is the reward for interest in politics at campaign time. The result is that there are many people who became interested in politics and vote only after they have been paid for doing so and campaign expenditures become bribes. Whereas, if such practices were forbidden by law, if there were to be no paid workers or watchers, all candidates would be on a same footing and the only losers would be those who have fooled candidates and party leaders into believing that they were performing a real service that could not and would not be performed without money.

It is my belief that in States like Pennsylvania, where large campaign expenditures have been so long considered a great necessity, not more than a very small per cent of the total expenditure ever enters into educational or essential campaign work. Easy money for some individuals is thus afforded. This easy money builds political machines which insure returns for those interests which contribute to the machine coffers. It is not used to acquaint voters with issues and make them intelligent in the use of the ballot. Instead, it is more often used to deceive and intimidate the voter.

The worst influence of huge expenditures in political campaigns is that which the spending has upon the candidate who is without the backing of great wealth. Such a candidate can be quite easily smothered in a campaign. He can not make the same showing through advertising that his opponents may be making and people are quick to count him out of the race because he can not compete with his opponents more fortunate in the matter of financial backing. I have in mind a glaring example of this thought, an example growing out of the primary campaign for United States Senator in one State this past year.

In this particular campaign, there were three candidates of standing in the primary. During the early progress of the campaign all were considered real contenders, but as the campaign progressed one of the candidates found himself being hopelessly counted out. The public saw the advertising and energy being devoted by agents in behalf of the two candidates and immediately concluded, "Why, this third man hasn't a chance. He is not able to compete with these other two candidates; I don't want to vote for a losing candidate; it is for me to choose between the two." The facts were that this third candidate had resorted to only a matter of \$4,000 or \$5,000 to use in the conduct of his campaign while the other two candidates were spending much in excess of this, one having spent well in advance of \$300,000.

So, here we have the case then of a man defeated before a ballot was dropped in the box, defeated because in the public mind he couldn't hope to compete in the matter of expenditures of money; a very clear example of how near we are to that day when it must be concluded that a man without means is a plain waster to entertain even the ambition to represent the people of his State in the United States Senate. Does this not in itself clearly depict the vicious influence of money in our political life?

The Senate by resolution in 1922 voiced its positive displeasure with large campaign expenditures and put its foot down against them. When it was revealed that Newberry, of Michigan, had ex-

pended approximately \$195,000 in the conduct of his campaign to win election to the Senate there was indignation. On the strength of his expenditures his right to a seat in the Senate was challenged. His seat was saved to him only after the Senate had, in effect, given notice to candidates of the future that the Senate would deny seats to those making expenditures like that made by Newberry. In its resolution, to which I have referred, the Senate said that \$195,000 was "too large, much larger than ought to have been expended," and then went on to declare: "The expenditure of such excessive sums in behalf of a candidate, either with or without his knowledge and consent, being contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the honor and dignity of the Senate, and dangerous to the perpetuity of free government, such excessive expenditures are hereby severely condemned and disapproved."

"Dangerous to the perpetuity of free government," said the Senate in 1922 of expenditures of \$195,000. It is dangerous to the future of a free government to permit such sums of money to be used in electing men to places where they are expected to represent the interests of all of the people. The Senate has in the years since that action denied seats in the Senate to men who have expended excessive sums of money. Smith, of Illinois, was denied a seat in the Senate not alone because of the source of money expended in his behalf but because of the size of his expenditure.

The Senate denied a seat to Vare, of Pennsylvania, who in 1926 expended somewhere in the neighborhood of \$700,000 in the conduct of his campaign.

In furtherance of its desire to check huge expenditures in winning election to the Senate, the Senate itself last spring authorized the appointment of a committee to investigate into the conduct of senatorial campaigns and to ascertain the amounts expended by and for candidates. I doubt whether more unpleasant work has ever been delegated to a committee of Senators than was that delegated to this committee.

It has been made difficult work by reason of the fact that a large element of the press of the country has seen fit to direct its shafts of criticism against the committee rather than against the corruption which the committee sought to expose. The work has been distasteful to every member of it, but knowledge of the frightful influence which money played in election campaigns convinced all of the need for the work which was asked done. However, in the pursuance of its duty the committee has been afforded a rather liberal education on the influence which money does have. Following these investigations one outstanding conclusion of mine has been that corruption at the polls or in the conduct of campaigns was found generally only in States where huge expenditures were being made. In other words, before there is corruption in the conduct of an election it appears essential that there be large sums of money available.

Large sums are raised ostensibly for the purpose of paying workers and watchers in behalf of candidates on election day. Why do they need these watchers? I think there can be only one answer, namely, because there is fear that the availability of money would influence men serving upon election boards, and cause them to fail to conduct the election in keeping with law and decency. So they spend money because others are spending money; and so it goes on and on and on, and with its continuation grows conviction that large expenditures are necessary. In short, people have been educated to feel such expenditures necessary and proper.

While large expenditures often go for use in the actual conduct of a campaign, for the most part the money is expended to maintain partisan machines which seek to exercise a control over the affairs of government, and these machines are kept oiled through the availability of campaign money. The really hurtful influence of money used in campaigns is that of strengthening these selfish machines, which create bosses and corruption and strike at the heart of free and responsive government.

There have been observed in the study of the conduct of campaigns this year practices which many thought had long ago been relegated to the scrap heap; practices which ought to shame any believer in or defender of a free government.

Let me but recite the situation found in a few States dealing with Republican and Democratic campaigns alike. I have in mind one so-called primary election in which candidates went out and campaigned for the election of delegates to a State convention, with a result quite assuring to one candidate that he had won an easy majority of the delegates. Then, a few days later, the State convention was held, a secret ballot was cast, and the result of that balloting revealed the nomination of the man who was thought to have been defeated in the primary. Here, then, was an antiquated system which permitted delegates, instructed by those they were presumed to be representing, to go into a convention and cast a vote contrary to their instructions. It was afterwards revealed that there had been expended in behalf of the candidate ultimately nominated in that campaign something like \$3 for every vote known to have been cast in the primary. It was revealed also that the expenses of some delegates to the State convention had been paid by friends of this particular candidate. Why such a system should be honored by being called a primary election and how it can be expected that the voice of the people will be reflected and respected under such a system is simply too much for me to comprehend. The interests of our Government require changes and relief from such ancient and indefensible conduct in winning nomination and election to office.

In another State the conduct of primary elections is found to be so loose as to fail even to preserve the ballots cast for more than a few hours after the election.



In another State which comes readily to mind I recall how one man upon the witness stand declared himself to be the chairman of his county party committee, with the power to name officials to conduct the primary in the various precincts, and admitted that he instructed said election officials to waive certain requirements of the laws of the State in the election about to be held. In other words, party bosses feel at perfect ease in flagrantly violating such law as has been provided to insure clean elections. In this same State appeared another witness declaring himself to have been the head of the election board conducting the primary in his precinct. This man admitted that when it came time to close the polls he carried the ballot box and ballots to a point where party bosses were receiving the returns and the vote of this precinct was counted there, not at the place or by the authorized officials under the law.

Then again we have heard witnesses testify to truck loads of men being transported from precinct to precinct to repeat their vote, and when our committee sought the poll books to check such illegal action, found these records destroyed. One salvaged poll book showed, among other things, a man dead for nearly two years having voted (absent voter's ballot perhaps). Padded poll lists and padded registration lists are not an uncommon thing in States where large sums of money are available for the conduct of elections and the oiling of partisan machinery. Is it any wonder that decent people in communities where such practices prevail decline to bother about voting? Yet it is saddening to observe people resigning themselves to such a situation rather than fighting it and correcting it.

That men who resort to unfair tactics in politics are not proud of their activities is perhaps best revealed by the campaign waged in another State in our Union this year. In this State money was available to make it difficult for the voters of the State to honestly express themselves at the polls. This money was used to bring out candidates with like names against candidates whom the so-called bosses were endeavoring to eliminate. Power companies in the same campaign were initiating measures worded in such a manner as to make it difficult to distinguish them from other measures which had been introduced, all to the end that the voter could not freely and honestly express himself upon issues which were presented for election. Here you found men making contributions in the names of others rather than permit the records to show that they were parties to the efforts being made to destroy and defeat men who had not pleased them by their records; men high in public life contributing large sums but concealing themselves as the actual contributors. In this same campaign was found a man intrusted with the directorship of the affairs of a great national party entering propaganda into the campaign in such a manner as to conceal who was truly responsible for the vicious and unwarranted kind of literature distributed. All of these things—the deceit, the conniving, and the shameful work, done because money was available to defeat a candidate who hadn't pleased would-be bosses!

And when examining into these matters one could not help but be struck by the determination of witnesses to conceal rather than reveal facts which the inquisitors were after. I have observed men who stand high in their communities, who would not lie, men who would not deceive in the ordinary course of business or associations with mankind, do these very things in matters relating to politics. What does it mean? It means just this: That we have permitted our politics to be so conducted that men of standing feel that things which would be unfair in business life are quite the order in the conduct of political campaigns and in the concealment of what has been done in such campaigns. Just so long as we permit money to play the part in elections that it does play in some States to-day, that long are we going to find standards of conduct unbefitting to men. Large campaign expenditures invite corruption. Corruption can not exist without the money to expend.

I want to make more pointed my argument that campaign contributions and expenditures are expressly and directly related to the conduct of government. The records are filled with instances of favors accorded campaign contributors. Men with selfish interests to be served through legislation find it profitable to contribute to the campaign funds of a party, and at times to both parties. Investments in the form of such contributions have been found to be productive of certain and positive returns—returns of such proportions as make ordinary investments seem silly. Campaign contributions buy political favors. To establish that this is true, may I offer the very concrete evidence afforded through the record of campaign contributions in 1924 and legislative returns enjoyed by these same contributors in 1926? In 1924, with a presidential and congressional election on, John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Mellon, Payne Whitney, the Marshall Field estate, George F. Baker, sr., George F. Baker, jr., Vincent Astor, J. B. Duke, Julius Fleischmann, Cyrus Curtis, and Joseph E. Widener, to name only a few men, made contributions to party campaign funds ranging from \$5,000 to \$25,000. In 1926 the parties to which they contributed became sponsors of a tax reduction bill, which was whipped through Congress by party leaders and which saved to these men each and every year sums ranging from \$200,000 to nearly \$3,000,000.

Surely men would not make such excessive contributions as I have recited without some genuine return in mind, and so we are driven to know that campaign contributions are investments and the contributors expect rewards. That being so, isn't it high time we stood unitedly in opposition to excessive expenditures in the conduct of political campaigns? If the influence of money in campaigns is not fairly stated, then tell me why it is that from

\$300,000 to a million dollars or more will be expended to elect men to positions that pay salaries which never could return in a lifetime of service anything resembling the amount expended to win elections.

It has been repeatedly asserted that the primary system is making it impossible for any except the very rich man or the man who has the backing of organized wealth in one form or another to make a campaign for nomination in state-wide primaries. With such a contention I must take positive issue, for public offices contain example after example of the possibility of the poor man winning election contests without having made great expenditures. I think it is not disputed that there are more poor men or men of average means in both houses of Congress to-day than was true in the old convention days. People who are accustomed to making contributions to influence primary nominations probably would hold the convention system preferable on the ground that costs would be less. But the convention would cost less than the primary system only because it might be found cheaper to corrupt the limited number of men delegated to a convention than it would be to corrupt an entire electorate or a majority of an electorate.

It can not be doubted that politicians, party bosses, and those who seek to control elections with money and trickery much prefer the convention to the primary form of nominating. The primary grew out of the corruption prevalent in conventions. Certainly we don't want to go back to that convention plan simply to make it easier and cheaper for selfish interests to accomplish their purpose.

If the repeal of the primary laws is not the cure for the ills growing out of huge campaign expenditures, then what is the remedy? I think there are three positive things that can be done. First, there should be a tightening up of our law governing the conduct of elections, both general and primary. Second, there should be stricter limitation by law of expenditures, and, finally, there should be an awakening on the part of people to rebellion against money holding such sway as it does in some States in influencing the result of elections.

In conclusion, let me say that the best and finest results in opposition to the influence of money in campaigns would be gained if the people of America would stand out and uncompromisingly and jealously rebel against and guard against the corrupting of our election system, and fight it whether its sponsors were Republican or Democratic leaders. Clean elections afford a good guarantee of clean government. Children cry out against the daily washings to which mothers submit them. Yet these mothers uncompromisingly insist upon cleanliness of body. Why? Simply because they realize that the lack of cleanliness invites disease and corruption. These same mothers virtually work their knuckles bare to keep their homes free from filth because they know that filth invites disease and corruption. Why should we not all as Americans fight with equal diligence against those influences which would corrupt our election system and our Government and ultimately bring upon us a disease that would destroy the Republic and representative government?

We can have government responsive to the interests and to the needs of the people only so long as we keep government representative of the people. Government will remain representative only so long as our election system is permitted to function freely and record the will of the greatest possible number of our people.

Huge campaign expenditures do not have as their purpose a freely functioning election system. At least it would be difficult to cite a large campaign expenditure which had the effect of purifying an election.

#### RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolutions recently adopted by the national convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

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

Following are resolutions which were approved by voting delegates at the twelfth annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation at Boston, December 10, 1930.

The resolutions committee included E. A. O'Neal, president Alabama Farm Bureau and vice president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Charles E. Hearst, Iowa Farm Bureau president; George B. Putnam, New Hampshire Farm Bureau president; R. W. Blackburn, California Farm Bureau president; C. R. White, New York Farm Bureau president; Earl C. Smith, Illinois Agricultural Association president; and W. H. Settle, Indiana Farm Bureau president.

Chester H. Gray, director American Farm Bureau Federation legislative department, acted as secretary, while Mr. O'Neal was chairman.

#### REAFFIRMATION

The policies of the American Farm Bureau Federation heretofore expressed in annual meetings are reaffirmed, and unless repealed herein or inconsistent herewith, are declared to be in full force and effect.

#### AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ACT

We renew our previous pronouncement in support of and cooperation with the Federal Farm Board in its efforts to administer the agricultural marketing act. The Federal Farm Board has



wisely established a number of national commodity sales agencies and correctly refuses to create more than one such agency for any one commodity. It is equally important that competitive regional agencies be not established. As necessity arises it is expected that national sales agencies will be created for other commodities.

The stabilization activities of the Federal Farm Board in wheat and cotton have demonstrated the usefulness of this feature of the agricultural marketing act. However, these activities should be extended into more crops, not alone those which have great surpluses, but others which can be aided by the use of lesser portions of the revolving fund. A revolving fund of whatever amount necessary for stabilization and other activities should be made available by Congress.

The agricultural marketing act has not been operating long enough from an administrative standpoint to indicate exactly the nature of the amendments which might be proposed to improve it. Surely any amendments proposed now or in the future to harm that act, to make it ineffective, or to reduce the size of the revolving fund will meet with our sternest opposition. We expect the time will come when amendments to it will be necessary to make the tariff more effective and to dispose of surpluses more advantageously. When that time arrives all friends of agriculture should stand together, so that the amendments will strengthen, rather than weaken, the law. The act when amended should be amended by its friends; never by its enemies.

#### REGULATORY LEGISLATION

Congress in enacting the agricultural marketing act specified that the minimizing of speculation in farm crops is one task to be accomplished. To aid the Federal Farm Board in its efforts to minimize speculation, to secure what farmers long have desired in this matter, and to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture in a broader exercise of powers over grain and cotton exchanges, amendatory legislation is required. Members of exchanges should be licensed by the Secretary of Agriculture; limitations upon short selling should be invoked; rules and regulations of exchanges should be subject to approval by the Secretary as well as being initiated by him when necessary to protect the public welfare; and authority to close or suspend such exchanges should be vested wholly in the Secretary of Agriculture.

#### DROUGHT RELIEF AND UNEMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

Funds to be used as loans to farmers in the buying of feed for foundation animals, fertilizer, and seeds in the drought-stricken areas should be made immediately available.

We commend the intents, purposes, and policies contained in the recent message of the President to Congress wherein is outlined complete plans for drought and unemployment relief. We express our willingness to continue to cooperate with all other agencies to restore national prosperity.

#### WATERWAYS

We urge the present session of Congress to make such appropriations as will insure the immediate carrying out of the development of projects authorized in the river and harbor act of 1930 in accordance with the specific provisions of that act.

#### RURAL CREDITS

Agriculture should have credits as easily available to it and as adjustable to varying economic conditions as other groups have in the Federal reserve system. More than ever the farmers of the United States now feel the need of an operative and elastic rural credit system. Such a system can not be said to be efficient if it serves agriculture only when credits generally are easily available. The acid test of rural credit efficiency is given in times of stress when ordinary credits are tightened. Realizing that the Federal Reserve Board can be of great assistance in supplying agricultural credits we request that the representation of agriculture in the membership of that board, as provided for in the Federal reserve act, be brought to the attention of President Hoover now that vacancies exist in the board. The representation of agriculture on this board should be men who understand the need for rural credits; who are interested in keeping the circulating medium of the Nation distributed equably and in accordance with seasonal requirements; who will endeavor to use the discounting privileges resident within the powers of the board so that availability of credits will be equalized in the Nation, speculative use of money discouraged, concentration of wealth retarded, and stability in the purchasing power of the dollar more nearly effected.

We advocate the creation of an ample revolving fund in the Federal Treasury to be used exclusively to stabilize Federal land bank bonds. We believe the Federal farm loan system has failed to meet rural credit needs largely because of the manner of the administration of the law. Should amendment be necessary to remove certain of the present limitations of administration, we pledge our support in securing changes necessary to the end that the law may and will function as was intended by the framers of the act.

We recommend the immediate appointment of a committee to make a study of and report upon the possibility and feasibility of the further development of cooperative rural credit systems.

#### TARIFF

Any effort before the Tariff Commission or elsewhere to lower the rates recently secured on farm commodities will be resisted by us in every legitimate way. We realize that importers and American capital invested abroad will endeavor to break down the rates on farm commodities now that they have become in many instances effective in keeping the American market for the American

farmers. We urge our officers to put forth every effort to secure the greatest benefits possible under the flexible provision on every farm commodity which meets foreign competition in our markets. Efforts improperly to classify imported farm products in the raw state or in the manufactured form so as to secure the lesser of two possible rates will require constant watching. We will continue our efforts to secure adequate rates on commodities like vegetable oils, starches, sugar, dried-egg products, and hides. All of these are financed abroad partly or wholly by American capital and entry is granted into our markets free or at low rates of duty, thus denying the American farmer who produces commodities competitive to them, either directly or indirectly, the home market. We ask protection for American farmers in the American markets against Philippine products pending the granting of independence to the Philippine people.

#### TARIFF ON PULPWOOD

The sale of rough wood for pulp-making purposes by many farmers offers an opportunity of income in many parts of our Nation. The rates of duty on pulp and pulpwood are inadequate to permit the profitable sale of pulpwood under present conditions. Accordingly we recommend an increase in these rates.

#### PRESERVING THE NATURAL RESOURCES

The natural resources, such as navigable streams, water power, forests, the soil, coal, oil, and the air, together comprise a heritage for the people of our Nation and for their posterity. Again we state the position of our organization as being opposed to the control and exploitation by corporations or otherwise of these natural resources and insist that all grants for their use by authority of State or Federal Government should contain provisions so that the public welfare shall be thoroughly guarded. We have formerly asked that governmental inquiry be made into the growth and methods of capitalization of public-utility corporations supplying electrical energy in the form of power or light. This investigation has made much progress under the administration of the Federal Trade Commission. Our record is clearly one which opposes the acquisition of what is, perhaps, the greatest natural resource, water power, by monopolistic groups with privileges of lease and operation virtually perpetual in nature. We have insisted that the Federal water power act be so amended that the former 99-year lease provision with almost automatic renewal to the same corporation be changed so that the public welfare will be more adequately safeguarded. This has been done by Federal legislation. Whenever a corporation is granted lease to operate a natural resource, a limitation of earnings on actual capital investment should be required, all earnings above the statutory amount to be paid to the Federal Government. We request President Hoover to appoint special counsel to defend the recently revised Federal power act and various of its provisions which are being attacked by applicants for permits and licenses to construct hydro-electric establishments.

#### MUSCLE SHOALS

We favor such disposition of this project as will get the most fertilizer for agriculture, will retain title in the Government of the United States, will use all the power necessary at Muscle Shoals for making fertilizers and dispose of the remainder so as to benefit agriculture and preserve the public interests.

The board of directors of the A. F. B. F. is hereby authorized and directed to take such steps as are necessary to set up a committee truly representative of agriculture, authorized to develop and organize a corporation for the purpose of which would be the leasing and operating of Muscle Shoals on a cooperative basis embodying all the aforesaid principles, and so as to preserve the property in times of peace for agriculture and in times of war for the United States.

#### FUNDS FOR AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

Cooperative marketing and the economic problems of agriculture have been recognized by and incorporated in such Federal laws as the cooperative marketing act and the agricultural marketing act. All representatives of the Federal Government, therefore, should not only feel free to, but should cultivate the desire to advance the economic and cooperative marketing program of agriculture. With this end in view we strongly urge Congress immediately to provide ample funds with which to cooperate with State, county, or membership funds in furthering agricultural extension work in order that the official representatives of this work may be removed from local influences antagonistic to cooperative marketing, and may be correlated with the work of the Federal Farm Board and of farm organizations.

#### NATIONAL LAND POLICY

The land policy of our Nation has been until recently one exclusively devoted to bringing new areas into production. That policy should now be modified to discover ways and means by which land can be taken out of production. An effective way to reduce the acreage of our staple farm crops is to plant submarginal farm lands in forests. Another method is the expansion of areas in public parks, which will not only reduce productive areas but will furnish national playgrounds for our population. Grazing areas might well be increased. A national forestry program is outlined in the McNary-Clarke, the McNary-McSweeney, and the McNary-Woodruff Acts, which taken together provide for re-possession of marginal lands, research in forestry matters, and acquisition and planting of additional forest areas. This program, however, is inoperative to the extent that appropriations are not available to carry it forward. We accordingly advocate all appropriations necessary to put into effect the forestry program of these



three acts. We urge cooperation between Federal and State Governments in this work. Attention is called to the necessity on the part of State governments of removing the tax burden on forest areas until they become productive. Initiative in forestry matters by private agencies is recommended. The protection of forest areas from fire to be secured by the building of forest trails and roads is also urged.

All matters relative to or affected by land or reforestation policies should be placed in the United States Department of Agriculture.

#### ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATIONS

We urge the enactment during the present session of Congress of the McNary-Haugen engineering experiment station bill which contains provisions for establishing engineering experiment stations in connection with the land-grant institutions in all States under terms and provisions similar to those which established the agricultural experiment stations.

#### STABILIZING THE UNIT OF VALUE

We recommend to President Hoover the appointment of a commission to be composed of farmers, bankers, economists, and representatives of other groups to study plans and report thereon to Congress to stabilize the value of the dollar so that periods of depression and inflation can be in future more definitely guarded against.

#### PATENT LEGISLATION

We favor legislation which will require that the owners of a patent issued by the United States Government shall produce the commodity covered by such patent in our Nation in quantities to meet American requirements.

#### POSTAL AFFAIRS

We favor the policies of the Post Office Department, recently announced, which in large measure are identical with those advocated by the American Farm Bureau Federation for several years. The problem of efficiency and economy in postal matters; the adding to volume of business as a method of bringing in revenue rather than increasing the rates on heavier classes of mail; the elimination of too frequent city deliveries; the consolidation of rural and city routes wherever possible; and the elimination of public service charges from the deficits which the Post Office Department formerly has had; all are developments which will in time, if not immediately, place the department on a self-sustaining basis. We, however, doubt that the proposed one-half cent per ounce increase in rate on first-class mail, the destination of which is beyond the point of mailing, and the frequently proposed increases in parcel-post rates, are in keeping with the other policies of the department which stress increased volume rather than increased rates. We particularly appreciate the establishment of a director of parcel post, who shall devote the entire energy of his organization to the development of more parcel-post business.

#### BUTTER SUBSTITUTES

The increasing use of imported vegetable oils is very harmful to the dairymen, to the producers of our vegetable oils, and to our animal industry. We favor Federal legislation which will require the payment of the Federal tax on any and all oleomargarine products made in the form or semblance of butter, whether or not such oleomargarine is colored artificially or naturally. We urge the use of butter instead of oleomargarine in Federal and State institutions.

#### TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

Voluntary action of the railroad executives in granting reduced freight rates on livestock and feed for the benefit of approximately 1,000 drought-stricken counties is greatly appreciated. The Hoch-Smith resolution continues to be, in our judgment, the most equitable basis upon which freight rates on farm commodities can be based. We advocate a continued study of the general economic influence of consolidation of railways before such consolidation too generally is put into effect by Federal legislation.

#### RADIO

Agriculture occupies such an important economic place in national affairs that it is justified in asking an allocation to it by the Federal Radio Commission of such wave length or lengths, cleared channels, and power as are necessary permanently to preserve its rightful interests on the air.

#### COMMENDING SECRETARY ARTHUR M. HYDE

We commend Secretary Arthur M. Hyde, of the United States Department of Agriculture, for his promptness and courage in calling public attention to the depressing price effects of recent short selling of wheat on the Chicago Board of Trade. His record as Secretary and ex officio member of the Federal Farm Board has been one of statesmanlike approach to all questions of agricultural interest, and his knowledge of and sympathy for the welfare of the farmers of our Nation is appreciated. It is a pleasure to work with a public official who is fearless in his advocacy of agricultural betterment.

#### EDUCATION

Equality of opportunity is a national guarantee under the terms of the Constitution. To make this guarantee fully effective in matters of elementary education requires that the immense wealth of the entire Nation contribute to the education of the child in the least-favored community. Methods of Federal aid for various other well-established projects having demonstrated their usefulness

and practicality should be followed in this enterprise; and no new and untried plan of projecting the Federal Government into the educational field should be experimented with.

#### TRUCK AND BUS REGULATIONS

It is evident that Federal regulation of motor busses and trucks which qualify as common carriers and do interstate business will soon be enacted. The traffic of busses and trucks on our publicly built highways has developed to such proportions that public interest and public safety require regulatory legislation. The length, width, weight, speed, rates, and services of these modern commercial vehicles all need to be subject to control by a proper Federal law. However, legislation and regulations of the Federal Government should not be so stringent as to remove the competitive features between the older and newer forms of transportation which the present system is now thought to secure. No single Federal agency should be permitted such latitude of administrative and regulatory control as to place all transportation on the same basis as to rates and services. Agriculture needs to use the newer and more economic method of transporting its products to the railroads, and to the markets both local and terminal, and to the rapidly developing river systems of our country.

#### CHILDREN'S BUREAU

We insist that the Children's Bureau remain in the Department of Labor.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT REGARDING ALIENS

We favor an amendment to the Constitution excluding aliens from being counted in making up apportionment of Members in the Lower House of Congress.

#### FARM WASTES AND INDUSTRIAL OUTLETS

It is a consummation much to be desired that not only farm wastes but salable farm products should find industrial outlets in our own Nation as well as abroad, and so have access to markets other than those furnished by the animal and the human stomachs. The surplus question is one which for its proper solution demands that these commodities be disposed of in larger amounts industrially. It needs to be pointed out, however, that great difficulties are encountered in establishing industrial plants within our continental boundaries to provide outlets for these wastes and products when competitive industrial products made from foreign wastes and farm products, and financed in many instances by American capital, have access to our markets too freely. It is idle to speak about developing such industrial markets in our Nation so long as this condition exists. It must also be recognized that ignorance of the desperate necessity to get additional markets for our agricultural products through the industrial route causes, sometimes even among our own citizens, conflicts which prevent the rapid development of industrializing the market for such products.

Among the prominent industrial products which should offer great avenues for marketing our wastes and our crops are: Starch from such crops as corn, wheat, rice, and potatoes; dried-egg products from our seasonal surplus of fresh eggs; alcohol from the lower grades and damaged quantities of grains and potatoes; wall board from cornstalks and similar fibrous material; casein from fluid milk; and sugar from the corn plant. We specifically request that all departmental regulations which limit the use of corn sugar be repealed. The foreign competitive products which prevent much of the above-described development are: Tropical starches from Java and equatorial countries, dried eggs from China, blackstrap molasses for distillation purposes from Cuba, and vegetable oils from the Philippines and elsewhere. A national laboratory to discover new uses for farm wastes and to develop industrial outlets for farm products should be established.

#### PREDATORY ANIMAL ERADICATION

The expenditure of Federal and State appropriations in annual amounts only sufficient to exterminate predatory animals and rodents approximately as rapidly as their natural increase is an unwise use of public funds. The 10-year program of control and eradication as outlined in the contemplated program of the U. S. D. A. should immediately be put into effect.

#### TAXATION

We approve the report of the A. F. B. F. committee on taxation, which is as follows:

"The committee on taxation recommend the reaffirmation of the entire series of resolutions adopted last year with the following changes:

"Amend section 3 by adding a paragraph numbered 7, to read as follows:

"7. Urges the adoption of more efficient methods of assessment.

"Amend section 4 by substituting for the present paragraph numbered 3 the following:

"3. Supports proper control of expenditures by requiring publication of proposed budgets or bond issues before their adoption, and by permitting a reasonable number of taxpayers to appeal from proposed budgets or bond issues to State tax boards, the hearing on each such appeal to be held in the taxing district concerned.

"We recommend that the officers of the American Farm Bureau Federation invite representatives of all national industrial groups and organizations to a conference to discuss the formation of a national commission on taxation, which shall study and recommend action on such problems as:



"1. The coordination and reallocation of taxing powers between the Federal Government and the States.

"2. Adequate recognition by State and national governments that the benefits of education and highways are not local, but are largely state-wide and national, and that the burden of their support should be equitably distributed.

"3. The cooperation of all national groups in securing the proper reorganization of taxing districts and political subdivisions, in establishing control of budgets and bond issues by taxpayers, in establishing better methods of assessing and levying taxes, and in insuring the most rigid economy in the expenditure of public funds.

"4. The use of taxes derived from new sources to reduce the present unjust taxes on property, especially real estate.

"5. Further use of the power of the competition among the States in any Federal Government to limit unfair forms of taxation.

"We further recommend that the conference consider the establishment of such a national commission on taxation on a permanent basis with funds adequate to enable it to employ a proper staff of experts for its service.

"We finally recommend that the proposed conference be held in some middle western city in January or early in February, 1931."

#### APPRECIATION

*Resolved*, That this convention desires to express its deep appreciation to the city of Boston and its mayor, James W. Curley, for the generous provisions made for its entertainment and for the personal interest of his honor, the mayor.

*Resolved*, That to Governor Allen, to Dr. Arthur W. Gilbert, commissioner of agriculture, and to A. W. Lombard, deputy commissioner, the convention extends its hearty thanks for their parts in preparing the New England Farm Products and Agricultural Antiques Show for our instruction and entertainment, and for their effective work in perfecting the arrangements for this convention. We are also grateful to the State departments of agriculture of the New England States, and especially to the Massachusetts and other State farm bureaus, organizations, and individuals that have assisted so generously in making this a most pleasant and successful convention.

Respectfully submitted.

E. A. O'NEAL, *Alabama*.  
C. E. HEARST, *Iowa*.  
C. R. WHITE, *New York*.  
W. H. SETTLE, *Indiana*.  
R. W. BLACKBURN, *California*.  
EARL C. SMITH, *Illinois*.  
GEO. M. PUTNAM, *New Hampshire*.  
CHESTER H. GRAY, *Secretary*.

#### EDITORIAL FROM COLUMBUS DISPATCH ENTITLED "AT THE ECONOMIC CROSSROADS"

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Columbus Dispatch entitled "At the Economic Crossroads!"

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

[From the Columbus Dispatch of Sunday, January 4, 1931]

The year 1931 opens under circumstances in which the Nation finds itself sharply confronted with the necessity of rightly appraising the duty of Government to adjust more equitably those economic conditions which are rapidly becoming more acute.

The evolution of the methods of production on the farm, in the mill, and in the mine; in construction, in transportation—from the single artisan or the small groups of workers of a generation ago, to the gigantic output by mass production to-day has definitely altered the economic structure on which has been built our standard of living.

The genius, industry, and enterprise of the American people in opening up and developing the almost limitless natural riches of this continent and their penetration into every mart and corner of the world, in commerce, finance, and influence, have resulted in the amassing of a national wealth with which nothing in the entire range of history remotely compares.

National fiscal policies, such as the tariff, have played some part, but these too often have taken the form of governmental underholds and have generally resulted in a more or less unequal distribution of wealth by the creation of a rich class of corporations and individuals, and a consequently lessened share to millions of our people entitled to a greater return for their industry.

This condition was becoming apparent prior to the World War and found expression in the political upheaval of 1912.

The sudden projection of the civilized nations of the world into war in 1914 required a turning aside from consideration of economic questions to those of patriotic duty in the crisis.

A world engaged in destruction demanded enormous production, particularly in America, and inventive genius, capital, man power, industry, the instrumentalities of transportation and governmental agencies were marshaled for that purpose.

Mass production then, or soon after, became the accepted order, and the world emerged from the struggle with its economic mechanism basically changed.

The succeeding years witnessed an enormous development in new fields, such as the automobile, road building, public and pri-

vate construction, accelerated natural development and kindred enterprises which for the time absorbed the man power, while inflated world-wide credit sustained the ever-growing overproduction.

The crash of 1929 and the distressing year of 1930 have inaugurated a different era in America and brought clearly into view the unbalanced economic factors that so disturbed the public mind prior to the World War, which event merely delayed the present reckoning.

Millions of willing, earnest, honest, capable men and women are, through no fault of their own, out of employment. Other millions have had their incomes sharply reduced.

Their right and ability to earn a living for themselves and those dear to them have been replaced by the cold, scientific accuracy of the machine.

Modern civilization requires machines. Those we have will remain, and they will be increased in number and utility. But the hard fact is that millions of Americans, due to their operation, no longer have that full opportunity spoken of in the immortal Declaration of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

It is the duty of government to find a solution of this problem. Sound thinking, brave resolution, and action will be required.

The politician must give way to the statesman. Fake questions such as prohibition, farm relief, and uplift doctrines costing the taxpayer hundreds of millions, the principal effect of which is intended by politicians and interested groups to confuse the public mind, should be retired, while honest, intelligent men endeavor to give their country patriotic service in a real cause.

The rich beneficiaries of stock dividends, the trusts, all forms of organized wealth, the grasping utilities that are absorbing the usufruct of the development of America, should decide to submit to some form of restitution, as nearly just as may be.

These millions in America have to live, and in comfort, and there is, in the aggregate, sufficient national wealth for all to live decently.

Call it a form of socialism; call it the dole; or what you will—this difficult problem is now pressing for solution.

Individual enterprise and its reward must always remain the very heart of American civilization if it is to endure.

But those who lead in the creation of wealth, who have acquired much more than a competency, the inheritors and holders of organized wealth and in particular those corporations which are the principal owners and beneficiaries of these same machines, and public utilities that have absorbed such an enormous part of the accumulated wealth of America must change their attitude. They will be guilty of perpetuating an egregious wrong, an injustice to these millions of unemployed, if by their own initiative they do not find a way, through properly adjusted taxation, unemployment insurance, or other means, to bring about a more equal distribution of the national income.

#### CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN JOHN J. RASKOB AND FRANK R. KENT

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, recently some matters have arisen in connection with the Republican National Committee. Our friends the Democrats have been kind enough to place the matters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now, there is some controversy in their party, and we want to be as courteous to them as they have been to us. Further, in the spirit of fair play in this controversy which has arisen between Mr. Raskob and Mr. Kent, I fear that, owing to the great publicity bureau at the command of Mr. Raskob, Mr. Kent's views may not have a fair opportunity of being presented to the country.

Accordingly, I offer for printing in the RECORD at this point, in connection with my remarks, the article in this morning's Baltimore Sun entitled "A Reply to Mr. Raskob"; an editorial in the Baltimore Sun entitled "Raskob and Kent"; and another article in the Baltimore Sun of this morning entitled "Editorial Observations on Kent-Raskob Correspondence."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Illinois whether the article or letter to which these papers he states constitute a reply have been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. GLENN. I am not sure whether they have been or not.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Then I shall object to the printing of these matters in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

#### RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, January 15, 1931, at 12 o'clock meridian.