

adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9043. By Mr. CLANCY: Petition of 20,000 signatures of Detroit and Wayne County, Mich., citizens praying for immediate payment in cash of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9044. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Mount Vision, N. Y., urging Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9045. By Mr. DE ROUEN: Resolution of Acadia Post, No. 15, American Legion, Department of Louisiana, Crowley, La., urging the Congress of the United States to pass adequate legislation pertaining to the needs of ex-service men and their families; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9046. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of the Sunnyslope Parent-Teacher Association, of Wenatchee, Wash., for the passage of the Hudson bill (H. R. 9986) for the supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9047. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Eaton County Guernsey breeders, requesting Congress to enact a new law taxing all yellow oleomargarine at least 10 cents a pound; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9048. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Battle Creek, Mich., urging the passage of the Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9049. Also, petition of Bellevue Village Club, requesting Congress to enact a new law taxing all yellow oleomargarine at least 10 cents a pound; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9050. Also, petition of Eureka Nutrition Club, requesting Congress to enact a new law taxing all yellow oleomargarine at least 10 cents a pound; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9051. By Mr. HUDSPETH: Petition of residents of El Paso, Tex., urging favorable action on House bill 15489 for the benefit of Indian war veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

9052. By Mr. HULL of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Prairie Farm Cooperative Creamery Co., requesting a tax on colored oleomargarine, in opposition to the recent ruling by Commissioner of Internal Revenue Burnet regarding palm oil in oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9053. By Mrs. KAHN: Petition of numerous citizens of California, favoring passage of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9054. By Mr. KIEFNER: Petition of Coleman Frazier Post, No. 39, of the American Legion, at Flat River, St. Francois County, Mo., urging payment in full of all adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9055. By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: Petition of the Baxley (Ga.) Woman's Club, requesting Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9056. By Mr. LEAVITT: Resolution of District No. 13, American Legion, Department of Montana, urging that a new hospital of at least 400 beds be constructed for the use of war veterans in the State of Montana; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9057. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolution of the American Exporters and Importers' Association, recommending a new member of the Cabinet to represent foreign commerce of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9058. By Mr. REED of New York: Three petitions indorsing the Sparks-Capper amendment to the Constitution to cut out approximately 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens and

count only citizens when making the new apportionment for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9059. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Resolution of National Cooperative Council of the Farmers' Cooperative Business Organizations, expressing appreciation of efforts made in behalf of agriculture by the Federal Farm Board in encouraging the organization of cooperative associations and opposing the enactment by Congress of any amendment to the agriculture marketing act and protesting against efforts made to destroy agriculture cooperation in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9060. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of East Grand Forks (Minn.) Post of American Legion, in support of immediate cash payment of face value of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9061. Also, petition of Minneapolis Building Trades Council, Minnesota, indorsing cash payment of soldiers' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9062. Also, petition of American Legion Post, of Henning, Minn., urging enactment of bill for immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates in full; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9063. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of Methodist Church of Gen. Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9064. Also, petition of the Sunday School of the Methodist Church, near Colby, Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9065. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of 55 ex-service men of Cedartown, Ga., asking the payment in cash of the face value of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9066. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of citizens of the fifth congressional district, San Francisco, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 7884; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9067. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Lions Club of East Liberty, approving proposed construction of a high dam and bridge connecting the Washington and Allegheny River Boulevards with Freeport Road near Aspinwall, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9068. Also, petition of Titusville Chamber of Commerce, Titusville, Pa., urging tariff on crude petroleum and its refined products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9069. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Greensburg, Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against an extra session of Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1931)

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Cutting	Hatfield	Morrow
Barkley	Dale	Hawes	Moses
Bingham	Davis	Hayden	Norbeck
Black	Deneen	Hebert	Norris
Blaine	Dill	Heflin	Nye
Elease	Fess	Howell	Oddie
Borah	Fletcher	Johnson	Partridge
Bratton	Frazier	Jones	Patterson
Brock	George	Kean	Phipps
Brookhart	Gillett	Kendrick	Pine
Broussard	Glass	King	Pittman
Bulkley	Glenn	La Follette	Ransdell
Capper	Goff	McGill	Reed
Caraway	Goldsborough	McKellar	Robinson, Ark.
Carey	Gould	McMaster	Schall
Connally	Hale	McNary	Sheppard
Copeland	Harris	Metcalf	Shipstead
Couzens	Harrison	Morrison	Shortridge

Smith	Thomas, Idaho	Wagner	Watson
Smoot	Townsend	Walcott	Wheeler
Stelwer	Trammell	Walsh, Mass.	Williamson
Stephens	Tydings	Walsh, Mont.	
Swanson	Vandenberg	Waterman	

Mr. WATSON. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. 4944. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Dahlgren, Va.;

S. 5319. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the French Broad River on the proposed Morristown-Newport Road between Jefferson and Cocke Counties, Tenn.; and

S. 5360. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills:

H. R. 2936. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Tittabawassee and Chippewa Rivers, Mich., with a view to the prevention and control of floods; and

H. R. 6668. An act to provide for discharging certain obligations of Peter R. Wadsworth, former superintendent and special disbursing agent of the Consolidated Chippewa Indian Agency.

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

S. 2643. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, approved May 23, 1928; and

S. 4665. An act extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5776) to provide for the advance planning and regulated construction of public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for aiding in the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 6810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept, without cost to the Government of the United States, a lighter-than-air base, near Sunnyvale, in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, and construct necessary improvements thereon;

H. R. 6867. An act to authorize appropriations for construction of a storehouse for ammunition at Fort Benjamin Harrison;

H. R. 8736. An act to authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Hocking River for the distance that it flows through Athens County, Ohio;

H. R. 9326. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to carry into effect provisions of the convention between the United States and Great Britain to regulate the level of Lake of the Woods concluded on the 24th day of February, 1925," approved May 22, 1926, as amended;

H. R. 9599. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out his 10-year cooperative program for

the eradication, suppression, or bringing under control of predatory and other wild animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, wild game, and other interests, and for the suppression of rabies and tularemia in predatory or other wild animals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12966. An act authorizing H. C. Brenner Realty & Finance Corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Cherokee and Osage Streets, St. Louis, Mo.;

H. R. 13262. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the city of Oakland, Calif., certain guns and mounts that were formerly in service on the Coast Guard cutter *Bear*;

H. R. 13522. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the State of Florida the silver service set donated to the U. S. S. *Florida* by the people of Florida;

H. R. 14043. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lease Governors Island, Mass., to the city of Boston, Mass., and for other purposes;

H. R. 14049. An act to provide for special assessments for the paving of roadways and the laying of curbs and gutters;

H. R. 14452. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.;

H. R. 14558. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville, W. Va.;

H. R. 14676. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Arlington, Oreg.;

H. R. 14689. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Cairo, Ill.;

H. R. 15137. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of an overhead viaduct across the Mahoning River at or near Niles, Trumbull County, Ohio;

H. R. 15276. An act authorizing the States of Alabama and Mississippi, through their respective highway departments, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Escatawpa River at or near Wilmer, Ala., and Latonia, Miss., connecting Mobile County, Ala., and George County, Miss.;

H. R. 15366. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River near Bemidji, Minn.;

H. R. 15433. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Little Calumet River on South Halsted Street at One hundred and thirtieth Street, in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 15434. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Fox River at Algonquin, in McHenry County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 15931. An act to provide for the relocation of statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins;

H. R. 16078. An act to amend the act approved June 2, 1930, providing for a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt for his leadership in the cause of forest conservation;

H. R. 16297. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), and acts amendatory thereof;

H. J. Res. 416. Joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of participation by the United States in the International Exposition of Colonial and Overseas Countries to be held at Paris, France, in 1931; and

H. J. Res. 462. Joint resolution to further provide for defraying the expenses of the International Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. PARTRIDGE presented the following resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, which were referred to the Committee on Finance:

Whereas the United States Government has established a policy of constructing hospitals for the care of the veterans of the various wars; and

Whereas Vermont is one of the few States for which hospitals have not been built; and

Whereas there now appears a real need for hospital facilities for Vermont, and this will become increasingly great within the next few years; and

Whereas it is undeniably true that the scenic advantages of Vermont are unsurpassed and that Vermont is renowned for the purity of its air and water and the health of its climate, making it an ideal location for a veterans' hospital: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont memorialize the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of such legislation as will enable the Veterans' Bureau to build a veterans' hospital in the State of Vermont for the care of sick and disabled veterans and for the housing of veterans' activities of the Federal Government; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each member of the Vermont delegation in the Congress.

EDWARD H. DEAVITT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
BENJAMIN WILLIAMS,
President of the Senate.

Approved January 28, 1931.

STANLEY C. WILSON, *Governor.*
STATE OF VERMONT,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of joint resolution relating to disabled veterans' hospital in Vermont approved January 28, 1931.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal at Montpelier this 30th day of January, A. D. 1931.

[SEAL.] RAWSON C. MYNCK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dallas, Tex., protesting against delay in considering the World Court protocols until next December and praying for their ratification this winter or spring, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Melbourne and Eau Gallie, Fla., praying for the passage of legislation for the barring of all immigration for a period of not less than two years, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Melbourne and Eau Gallie, Fla., praying for an amendment of the Constitution of the United States excluding aliens from the count of the whole number of persons in each State in apportioning Representatives among the several States according to their respective numbers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TYDINGS presented resolutions adopted by Annapolis Lodge, No. 622, Benevolent Protective Order of Elks, of Annapolis; Montfaucon Post, No. 4, the American Legion; and the Fleet Reserve Association, Branch No. 6, both of Baltimore, Md., favoring the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates of ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Maryland branch of the League of Nations Association in conjunction with the History Teachers' Association of Maryland, favoring the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE presented a petition signed by 505 citizens of the State of California, praying for the passage of the so-called Capper-Kelly bill, being the bill (H. R. 11) to protect trade-mark owners, distributors, and the public against injurious and uneconomic practices in the distribution of articles of standard quality under a distinguishing trade-mark, brand, or name, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, 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.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WALCOTT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cheshire and Hartford, Conn., 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.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions from the First Church of Christ, Scientist, of Norwalk; the First Church of Christ, Scientist, of Danbury; the First Church of Christ, Scientist, of Meriden; and the First Church of Christ, Scientist, Stamford, all in the State of Connecticut, praying of the passage of the so-called Vestal copyright bill, which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented petitions of the Lebanon League of Women Voters, of Lebanon, and sundry citizens of Granby, New London, Hartford, East Hartford, West Hartford, and Windsor, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the State Institute, under the auspices of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at Clinton, Conn., favoring the passage of legislation for the Federal supervision of motion-picture films, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MORROW presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, 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.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. COUZENS. I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit News of January 31, entitled "Mr. Mellon and the Veterans' Bonus, So Called." I desire particularly to have this called to the Senate's attention at this time because of the position the Secretary of the Treasury takes on the so-called payment of adjusted compensation.

In view of the great Secretary being alleged to have served under three Presidents, I desire to point out that the fact of the matter is that three Presidents have served under the Secretary of the Treasury.

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

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News of January 31, 1931]

MR. MELLON AND THE VETERANS' BONUS, SO CALLED

It must have been a painful surprise to the whilom acclaimers of Andrew Mellon as "the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton" to read his statement Wednesday to the Senate Finance Committee that the cash redemption of the soldiers' delayed compensation certificates "would upset the Nation's financial structure and greatly disturb world equilibrium."

Probably even more surprising was his assertion that, according to present indications, the Government would face a deficit of \$375,000,000 at the end of the current fiscal year—which certainly doesn't speak so well for the management of a National Treasury that for 14 years has been in receipt of the largest public revenues in the history of the world.

Elaborating his claim that the payment of the bonus would be an extremely hazardous undertaking, the Secretary thus expressed himself to the Senate committee:

"I can say without qualification that the Treasury Department could not sell \$3,400,000,000 of bonds at the present time except on terms which it would be very hard to justify and without complete disorganization of the Government and other security markets."

Without venturing at this time to challenge the soundness of the Secretary's opinion as to the difficulty of floating a \$3,400,000,000 Government loan, we can not refrain from calling attention to the striking contrasts between the picture which he draws of American financial conditions in 1931 and that which Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart has painted of them in 1917, the year we entered

the World War. In the brief but comprehensive history of the United States from 1910 to 1925 which he wrote for the thirteenth edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, Professor Hart thus describes the marvelous and rejoicing ease with which the United States raised literally tens of billions of dollars in that grand and glorious time when to stand at Armageddon and battle for the Lord was all in the day's work:

"Soon after the declaration of war by the United States, missions from the various allied countries were sent to America. The British mission, headed by Lord Balfour, British Foreign Secretary, reached Halifax April 20 and proceeded to Washington. The French mission, headed by Rene Viviani, the former premier, and including Marshal Joffre, landed April 24. Other missions came from Italy, Belgium, Russia, Rumania, and Japan. The United States was able at once to help the western Allies in their pressing financial difficulties. Taxes were low and little felt; money abounded. Under acts of Congress beginning October 17, 1917, the Allies received essential credits, which amounted eventually to \$9,500,000,000. These enormous payments were made possible by the Liberty loans. In June, 1917, 4,000,000 people joined in offering \$3,000,000,000 to the Government; and at the end of the war the interest-bearing debt had increased from \$972,469,000 on December 31, 1916, to \$25,234,496,000 in 1919. These loans were supplemented by the war revenue act (October 17, 1917) and later statutes, which laid a variety of new taxes, increased the income tax heavily, and combined with it an excess-profits tax to bring into the Treasury unreasonable profits likely to be made in the war industries."

Such is the glowing account which Professor Hart gives us of the generous way in which America, which was then the bread basket and cream jug of the allied powers, responded to the Macedonian cry of the visiting European missions for unlimited supplies of money and materials, although we notice that he neglects to tell us that when all the war expenses had been totaled up the American people found that they had paid over \$36,000,000,000 for the luxury of hating the Kaiser and fighting for an "idealism" which made them the partners of those European rulers and diplomatic feudists whose measureless ambition had given the world over to misery and death.

He also forgets to state that the "new taxes," including the excess-profits tax, still left a sufficiently wide margin of "unreasonable profits" to create more than 15,000 new millionaires in this country, not to speak of promoting the greatest "melon cutting" in the shape of extra cash and stock dividends in the history of modern industry and finance. All of which, it is hardly necessary to say, has laid a tremendous mortgage on coming American generations.

And what have we got out of it all? It seems to the News the answer to that question was given for us and for all the other warring nations by John Bright, the great English champion of justice and peace, in his memorable protest in 1854 against the Crimean War:

"The past events of our history have taught me that the intervention of this country in European wars is not only unnecessary but calamitous; that we have rarely come out of such intervention having succeeded in the objects we fought for. I believe if this country, 70 years ago, had adopted the principle of nonintervention in every case where her interests were not directly and obviously assailed, that she would have been saved from much of the pauperism and brutal crimes by which our government and people have alike been disgraced. This country might have been a garden, every dwelling might have been of marble, and every person who treads its soil might have been sufficiently educated. We should have less of military glory. We might have neither Trafalgar nor Waterloo; but we should have set the high example of a Christian nation, free in its institutions, courteous and just in its conduct toward all foreign states, and resting its policy on the unchangeable foundation of Christian morality."

Inasmuch as Woodrow Wilson himself admitted that our interests were not "directly and obviously assailed" by the Germanic powers (an opinion that has been emphatically expressed by nearly all of the authoritative governmental and military spokesmen for our late "noble democratic allies") and that we came out of the horrible conflict "without having succeeded in the objects we fought for," or rather which we professed to be fighting for, it would seem that Bright's noble protest against English intervention in foreign wars holds just as righteous condemnation of our own Government as it did for his government when he uttered it 77 years ago.

It is always an irreparably costly business—this paying the fiddler after the mad international war dance. But inasmuch as our Government, after the war was over, generously handed several billion dollars to various European nations because their war veterans and people were hard up, it does seem an unquestionable duty for our Government to be equally generous to its own war veterans when they are hard up. It may be difficult, as Secretary Mellon says; but what of it? Many duties are difficult, but nevertheless have to be performed. We are sure the people of the United States will support the Government in paying the full value of the so-called bonus certificates at once with much greater enthusiasm than they would show for cancellation of the foreign debts. And yet the advocates of that cancellation are the ones most opposed to payment of the veterans' certificates.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. COUZENS. As in open executive session, I desire to report back to the Senate, without recommendation, the

nominations of the three Power commissioners that were referred to the committee.

Mr. COUZENS, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which had been recommitted the following nominations for membership on the Federal Power Commission, reported them without recommendation, and they were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar:

George Otis Smith, of Maine;
Marcel Garsaud, of Louisiana; and
Claude L. Draper, of Wyoming.

REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS

As in executive session,

Mr. SHORTRIDGE, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nominations of several officers in the Customs Service, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Manufactures, to which was referred the bill (S. 5904) relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1445) thereon.

Mr. COUZENS, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3199) authorizing refunds to certain railroads of interest erroneously collected on account of overpayments under sections 209 and 212 of the transportation act, 1920, as amended, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1446) thereon.

Mr. NORBECK, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11285) to amend the Alaska game law, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1447) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 5810) to facilitate the use and occupancy of national-forest lands for purposes of residence, recreation, education, industry, and commerce, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1448) thereon.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10380) adjusting the salaries of the Naval Academy Band, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1449) thereon.

Mr. FESS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14) to make the Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem of the United States of America, reported it without amendment.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 6002) for the relief of Eva A. Kramer (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 6003) to authorize reinstatement of war-risk insurance of John D. Deardourff, deceased (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PARTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 6004) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Greene; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 6005) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Scappoose Bay, Columbia River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 6006) for the rehabilitation of the Stanfield project, Oregon; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A bill (S. 6007) for the relief of John W. Beck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 6008) to authorize and direct the appointment of Levin Milton Price as a first lieutenant, United States Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEAN:

A bill (S. 6009) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Douglass (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A bill (S. 6010) granting a pension to Ruth L. Retan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER (by request):

A bill (S. 6011) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain land in California for addition to the Cahuilla Indian Reservation, and issuance of a patent to the band of Indians therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 6012) for the relief of Alfred L. Hudson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 6013) granting a pension to Alice Clyde Stafford; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 6014) to provide a public terminal aviation field at Governors Island, N. Y., and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 6015) providing for the retirement of certain Medical Reserve officers of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

A bill (S. 6016) granting an increase of pension to Mary McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 6017) granting a pension to Christine Pedderson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 6018) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Hastings, Minn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. REED:

(By request.) A bill (S. 6019) to amend the World War Veterans' act, 1924, as amended; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 6020) to provide for the establishment of a permanent medical service in the United States Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 6021) granting a pension to Gwennie A. Philson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

A bill (S. 6022) to establish a term of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Huntington, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 6023) to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society United States Daughters of 1812 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEIWER:

A bill (S. 6024) relating to the improvement of the Willamette River between Oregon City and Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 6025) for the relief of Patrick J. Lynch; and
A bill (S. 6026) for the relief of Edward M. Watts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 6027) to provide for an investigation and report of losses resulting from the campaign for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 6028) authorizing the erection of a monument to the memory of Sacajawea or Bird Woman; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 6029) granting a pension to Philip Gump, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

(By request.) A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 245) authorizing the Secretary of War to cooperate with the county of Allegheny, Pa., in the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River in connection with the modification of Lock and Dam No. 2, Allegheny River, now authorized by law; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GOFF:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 246) authorizing the placing in the Capitol of a statue in honor of the American mother and other patriotic women of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

REDEMPTION OF INTERNAL-REVENUE STAMPS

Mr. HARRISON (for Mr. SIMMONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. SIMMONS to the bill (H. R. 10658) to amend section 1 of the act of May 12, 1900 (ch. 393, 31 Stat. 177), as amended (U. S. C., sec. 1174, ch. 21, title 26), which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL—RECONSTRUCTION OF SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. COPELAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 16654, the legislative appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 24, after line 4, insert the following:

"The unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$500,000 for the reconstruction of the Senate wing of the Capitol, contained in the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1929, is hereby continued and made available until expended."

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Messages in writing from the President of the United States making nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, which messages were subsequently referred to the appropriate committees.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 6810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept, without cost to the Government of the United States, a lighter-than-air base, near Sunnyvale, in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, and construct necessary improvements thereon;

H. R. 13262. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the city of Oakland, Calif., certain guns and mounts that were formerly in service on the Coast Guard cutter *Bear*; and

H. R. 13522. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the State of Florida the silver service set donated to the U. S. S. *Florida* by the people of Florida; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 6867. An act to authorize appropriations for construction of a storehouse for ammunition at Fort Benjamin Harrison; and

H. R. 14043. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lease Governors Island, Mass., to the city of Boston, Mass., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 14049. An act to provide for special assessments for the paving of roadways and the laying of curbs and gutters; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 8736. An act to authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Hocking River for the distance that it flows through Athens County, Ohio;

H. R. 12966. An act authorizing H. C. Brenner Realty & Finance Corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Cherokee and Osage Streets, St. Louis, Mo.;

H. R. 14452. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.;

H. R. 14558. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville, W. Va.;

H. R. 14676. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Arlington, Oreg.;

H. R. 14689. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Cairo, Ill.;

H. R. 15137. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of an overhead viaduct across the Mahoning River at or near Niles, Trumbull County, Ohio;

H. R. 15276. An act authorizing the States of Alabama and Mississippi, through their respective highway departments, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Escatawpa River at or near Wilmer, Ala., and Latonia, Miss., connecting Mobile County, Ala., and George County, Miss.;

H. R. 15366. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River near Bemidji, Minn.;

H. R. 15433. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Little Calumet River on South Halsted Street at One hundred and thirtieth Street, in Cook County, State of Illinois; and

H. R. 15434. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Fox River at Algonquin, in McHenry County, State of Illinois; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 9599. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out his 10-year cooperative program for the eradication, suppression, or bringing under control of predatory and other wild animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, wild game, and other interests, and for the suppression of rabies and tularemia in predatory or other wild animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 15931. An act to provide for the relocation of statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins; and

H. R. 16078. An act to amend the act approved June 2, 1930, providing for a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt for his leadership in the cause of forest conservation; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 16297. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 9326. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to carry into effect provisions of the convention between the United States and Great Britain to regulate the level of Lake of the Woods concluded on the 24th day of February, 1925," approved May 22, 1926, as amended;

H. J. Res. 416. Joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of participation by the United States in the International Exposition of Colonial and Overseas Countries to be held at Paris, France, in 1931; and

H. J. Res. 462. Joint resolution to further provide for defraying the expenses of the International Water Commission, United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

GEORGE ROGERS CLARK SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2643) to amend the joint resolution establishing the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, approved May 23, 1928, which was, on page 1, to strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive, and insert:

That there is authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by the joint resolution establishing the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, approved May 23, 1928, the sum of \$500,000. Appropriations made under this act and under such joint resolution shall not exceed

\$1,500,000, and shall not be in excess of such contributions of the State of Indiana, the county of Knox, the city of Vincennes, and other contributors (other than the United States), as have been or may be expended for the purposes specified herein, or as have been or may be made available solely for the purposes specified herein. Sums appropriated under this act or hereafter appropriated under such joint resolution, or heretofore appropriated under such joint resolution and unexpended on the date of the enactment of this act, shall be available for expenditure solely for the purposes of acquiring, grading, improving, and embellishing the site of and grounds adjacent to Fort Sackville, the erection of a monumental memorial structure and its ornamentation, the ornamentation of a bridge across the Wabash River adjacent thereto to be constructed by the State of Indiana and the State of Illinois, the protection of the grounds by a river wall, and the administrative expenses of the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission.

Mr. FESS. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wish the Senator would explain the amendment.

Mr. FESS. The bill as passed by the Senate included an appropriation of \$750,000. The House cut down the amount to \$500,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendment of the House.

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. FESS subsequently said: Mr. President, out of order I want to make a unanimous-consent request. Earlier in the day a message came over from the House of Representatives setting out the amendment to the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission bill. I moved to concur in the amendment made by the House. I was told that the only item in the amendment was a reduction from \$750,000 to \$500,000. Thinking that was all there was in the amendment, I moved to concur. My attention was called at once to a long-involved amendment which affected the original appropriation, and we do not want to concur with that. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment was concurred in be reconsidered and that the bill be sent to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered, the bill will be sent to conference, and the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Mr. FESS, Mr. HOWELL, and Mr. MCKELLAR.

"FREEDOM OF THE SEAS"

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article by J. M. Kenworthy, member of Parliament, on the subject of "Freedom of the Seas."

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

The article is as follows:

[From the New York Times, January 29, 1931]

FREEDOM OF SEAS—BRITISH AUTHORITY VIEWS IT IN RELATION TO GENEVA CONFERENCE

(By J. M. Kenworthy, M. P., lieutenant commander, Royal Navy)

LONDON, January 28.—The maintenance of aggressive armaments is a barometer of international relations. Failure to make substantial reductions in weapons is a symptom that the disease of war is still latent, especially in the European body politic.

Whereas before the great "war to end war" \$3,500,000,000 was spent annually by the nations of the world in preparations for war, to-day they are spending \$5,000,000,000, and this despite the compulsory limitation of the armaments of Germany, Austria, etc., and the world-wide economic crisis which has resulted in the impoverishment of large classes of populations everywhere.

Just a year from now—in February, 1932—a world conference on disarmament will assemble. Attended by all states which are members of the League of Nations and by the United States, Russia, and Turkey, it will mark the crisis in the attempts to secure the reduction of weapons of war. If the conference fails, no informed person will guarantee the peace of Europe, and therefore the world, even until 1940.

There will be an almost irresistible demand by Germany to be allowed to rearm, the rivalry between two potentially hostile groups of nations, headed, respectively, by France and Italy, will be accentuated, and it will be doubtful if the recently improved relations between England and America can continue.

NAVAL REDUCTION FIRST

Now the great military powers will never consent to substantial reductions of their armaments on land and in the air unless the naval powers are prepared to reduce their equipment substantially. No nation can to-day tolerate the possibility of its sea-borne trade being interfered with as it has been in the past,

Naval armaments are different from land armaments in that they are more easily limited because they are less easily concealed, and yet at the same time they contain the greatest menace to other nations. For example, Japan might maintain a standing army of 5,000,000 conscript soldiers, and no one anywhere would lose a night's sleep. But if Japan proceeded to double or treble her present naval forces, there would be alarms and panics not only on the Pacific coast but also in Canada, Australia, India, and especially Great Britain. Again, only the nations on her border are alarmed at the Russian land armies, but a great increase in the Russian naval force, especially of submarines, would be felt by every nation whose shores are washed either by the Mediterranean or the Baltic.

WILSON'S DOCTRINE SOUND

The history of attempts to reduce naval armaments since the end of the war, even including those at the peace conference itself, proves to the hilt the necessity of an honest acceptance of President Wilson's doctrine of freedom of the seas, which was only a restatement of the doctrine favored by generations of statesmen of the American Republic. In a world organized for peace the seas, outside of the recognized 3-mile territorial limit, should be free for the merchandise of all nations in peace or in war. To-day every civilized State is dependent for its prosperity on overseas trade. Apart from the growing importance of America's export trade she is dependent on overseas supplies of rubber and certain metals, such as tin. Great Britain and Japan can be starved out by a hunger blockade. Italy is particularly vulnerable, as holding the Straits of Gibraltar at one end of the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal at the other would strangle her commercially.

At the London naval conference last year France and Italy asked that this question of blockade be settled. France demands a bigger navy than Italy because not only must she secure her military lines of communication with northern Africa across the Mediterranean but her Atlantic trade routes are liable to interruption. The Italian demand of parity is based on the sound strategic argument that in case of war with France the bulk of the French forces would be concentrated in the Mediterranean to cut off her sea-borne commerce.

The second of President Wilson's 14 points for peace on which Germany undertook to lay down arms read as follows: "Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants." There was some demur on the part of Great Britain after the Germans had accepted these terms, and the British Government obtained the temporary support of France. Rather than recommence shooting, the matter was left in abeyance. It is known that President Wilson attempted to revive it at the peace conference and have a provision for freedom of the seas included in the peace treaties. But he was stoutly resisted by Lloyd George, the then Prime Minister, claiming to have an agreement with the opposition in the British Parliament. Supported again by France for diplomatic reasons, he overbore Mr. Wilson, and the provision for freedom of the seas was left out of the peace treaties. To this omission can be traced the naval rivalry which began in England, America, and Japan before the ink on the peace treaty was dry.

QUESTION AGAIN DODGED

With a view to checking this rivalry the Washington Naval Conference of 1920-21 was called. Again the question of the use of navies on trade routes in the event of future wars was dodged. As a consequence, although the building of great battleships was checked, a new rivalry commenced in England and America in the construction of cruising vessels, which were not limited as to numbers; and France and Italy immensely strengthened their flotillas of light vessels, especially submarines. At that time cruisers and flotillas were the greatest menace to commerce.

In an attempt to check the new cruiser rivalry, the Geneva Naval Conference of 1927 was summoned. It failed completely, and to that failure can be traced the neglect of this question.

On Ramsay MacDonald's taking office for the second time as Prime Minister of England conversations between the British and American Governments were reopened and led to the naval conference of 1930. Following on the breakdown of the Geneva naval conference, conducted on the British side by a Conservative government, a resolution was passed at the Labor Party's annual conference in October of the same year at Blackpool covering this very subject. The annual conference of the Labor Party decides the policy and elects the all-powerful executive committee. Without one dissenting voice the following resolution was passed:

"The conference calls on the Government to reopen negotiations with the United States with a view to obtaining a settlement of all outstanding political questions between them, including the question of the control of the sea in war time, the conclusion of a treaty outlawing war between the two peoples, and the drastic reduction of naval armaments."

Thus fortified, it was expected that Premier MacDonald would avoid the mistakes of his predecessors in three previous conferences and agree to decide on the future use of navies in order to limit or reduce them by agreement. Other delegates from the five powers participating in the 1930 conference were still further fortified by the universal signing of the Briand-Kellogg pact for the outlawing of war. Ordinary citizens of the countries concerned, who pay taxes for preparations for war and fight and die when war breaks out, had supposed the Kellogg pact outlawed "private war." But apparently it has not outlawed private blockade!

HOLDING TO OLD DOCTRINE

The British Admiralty clings to the eighteenth and nineteenth century doctrine of sea power despite the granting of theoretical parity in navies to the United States. There are ominous signs that with naval parity within reach the American Navy Department in its turn flirts with the idea of adopting the same doctrine.

One of the mysteries of the London naval conference is why the freedom of the seas was never discussed. In private conversations British delegates swore the Americans did not wish it discussed. Likewise Americans declared solemnly that the British had asked that it be not raised. Certainly the Italians attempted to have the subject ventilated and settled, while the French Government in an official note drew attention to the fact, which was indeed obvious, that no real settlement of sea armaments could be achieved unless the future use of navies on trade routes against peaceable merchant shipping was regulated.

In any event, the whole subject was avoided. Worse, in Article XXII of the treaty, rules for the polite sinking of merchant vessels by submarines on trade routes were drawn up, although it was in order to prevent such sinkings in the future that America entered the Great War and poured out treasure and the blood of her sons.

The result was that the 1930 conference was disappointing, as might have been expected. Relations between France and Italy changed definitely for the worse. Far from reducing existing fleets, the ratio fixed will lead to an actual increase in British cruiser strength and a considerable augmentation of the British submarine fleet. If the United States decides to build up to the agreed parity it will cost her a billion dollars.

There is a slight reduction in battleship strength, but the growing school of naval expert opinion looks on the great superdreadnought battleship as obsolete, especially in view of the menace of attack from the air. These costly mastodons are really only luxuries for the wealthiest powers. Yet just as individuals sometimes ruin themselves in gratifying desires for luxuries, so can nations. If the world conference for disarmament fails next year a new race in \$45,000,000 battleships will surely start.

FREEDOM OF SEAS PARAMOUNT

Are we to learn from these lessons?

Unless the doctrine of freedom of the seas replaces the doctrine of right of blockade, real reductions in naval armaments at the conference next year will be far to seek. Then there will be no chance of obtaining corresponding reduction in military and aerial armaments and Europe will rattle on toward another war, with final ruin of the Continent and damage to the whole world as the result.

There is no time to be lost. There is just a year in which preparations can be made, conversations carried on, and, above all, education of public opinion on this question begun. There will be a far greater menace to merchant shipping, passengers, goods, and crews carried on such vessels in the next war than submarines were in the last conflict. I refer to the rapidly improving flying boats and seaplanes with aerial torpedoes and poison-gas bombs, for the use of which against merchant shipping no rules exist.

Failure of the forthcoming world conference would be the greatest disaster since the outbreak of the World War. Yet unless the highways of the seas are made free to all by honest agreement among the maritime powers its failure is practically certain.

CHAIN STORES

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the United States Daily of yesterday with reference to chain stores.

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

[From the United States Daily of Monday, February 2, 1931]

EFFECT OF CHAIN STORES ON LIFE OF COMMUNITIES—LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF WISCONSIN POINTS TO EVILS WHICH HE BELIEVES SYSTEM HAS INTRODUCED AND URGES REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

(By Henry W. Huber, Lieutenant Governor State of Wisconsin)

The day of reckoning has come with chain stores that are fast driving the country storekeeper to the wall, with consolidations of enterprises to stifle competition and boost prices on the consumer and with a growing financial dictatorship that tells the farmer what will be paid for his crops—not what the crops are worth in labor and industry.

The chain store is a vital question that strikes to the very life-blood of society. This question is not only attracting the attention of the people of Wisconsin but of the whole Nation.

What has become of the neighbor who ran a grocery store and bought the products of the near-by farmer? He has been crowded out by the chain grocer. Maybe members of the community may save a few pennies on a package of raisins or a dozen oranges, but they have lost a real citizen in their community. In the place of the home grocer has come the clerk for the chain grocery, whose home is in some far-away city and who is interested only in sales, the profits of which take wing out of the community.

What has become of the home-owned city meat market? It has become an adjunct of a distant city-owned packing house or unit in a chain of butcher shops interested more in volume of trade than in the question of how advanced is the city or how much better is school and community life.

What has become of the general merchandise store? It is now owned by a New York chain that demands the profits of the

day's business for use in Wall Street almost before the sales of the day can be checked.

Monopoly has seized the commercial life of village and city for a ruthless exploitation that is planned and managed from Wall Street. Monopoly is interested only in profits. Monopoly wants a quick return and the highest cash profit it can get and still hold the business. Chain monopoly is fast sapping the rich blood of community life. It is the most blighting curse that has struck this country.

The chain-store issue is a form of monopoly that strikes at the very root of the home. Ordinarily in discussing a monopoly the effect has been so far away that people can not readily understand the evil of the system. But in the chain-store monopoly people will become interested. It is the greatest evil of any system of monopoly that has ever come into existence, because it aims at the home.

Should the chain-store monopoly securely fasten itself upon Wisconsin, our children's children will be like peasants and the property which rightfully belongs to them will be owned and controlled by absentee landlords in the large community centers.

It is reported "that in one State alone over 300 stores went out of business during a period of a little more than three years; that 61 chain stores are now filling the places once occupied by these 300 independent stores." That is exactly what is taking place with the mercantile establishments of every State in this Union.

Scores and scores of small towns have been wiped off the map, so to speak, and homes and business buildings of such towns are of little value.

The chain store must be met by an educated opposition. Wisconsin business men should take a lesson from California. Independent grocers there have formed themselves in federations and have been able to so organize that the inroads of chain stores have been effectively checked. There should be organizations to study legislation which will work out a plan or plans which will no longer give advantages of taxation to the chain stores which are not enjoyed by the independent enterprise.

Such legislation should check deceptive advertising by these stores. The man who buys soap of a well-known brand for a cent less in a chain store seldom discovers that he has bought an ounce smaller bar. The same is true with the sales of many canned goods. Legislation should protect the public from such practice.

Coincident with the chain-store invasion in the last few years, the resources of the State banks of Wisconsin have fallen off more than \$45,000,000. Before then they were increasing, and in 1927 the increase was \$22,000,000. The resources of Wisconsin State banks of December 31, 1927, were \$637,600,000. On December 31, 1929, the resources of Wisconsin State banks as recently announced by the banking department were \$591,200,000. The decline in the year 1929 was about \$20,000,000.

Community life is being robbed of its profits and its industries. Chain stores, chain oil stations, chain drug stores, chain insurance companies, and mail-order houses are taking the profits of the storekeeper and the farmer and the business man of Wisconsin and distributing it outside of the State.

There are those who say that other factors—the decline of farm values, expansion, and speculation—have caused this depletion of the resources of Wisconsin banks. These other factors may have had a part, but an important rôle was played by the chain system.

The six big national chains operating in this State have increased their stores in the Nation 144 per cent between 1920 and 1928. These same stores increased their national sales 176 per cent in the same period.

While the farmer has found it difficult to hold on to his acres and labor has been often out of employment, the chain-store magicians of finance have been increasing their stores and business all over the Nation.

If further evidence were wanted, it is to be found in the bankruptcy records of Wisconsin. There were 61 merchant bankruptcies in Wisconsin in 1921; there were 243 in 1928, and 229 in the year 1929. The home merchant has been ruined financially by the hole-in-the-wall chain store, which has little invested, pays comparatively little in taxes, and makes no contributions to community progress. The chain absentee ownership system of merchandising is rapidly forcing home activities out of business. The percentage of failure to total operating commercial concerns in 1920 was about one-fourth of 1 per cent. In 1929 the per cent of failure had jumped to almost 1 per cent.

The idea of merging all kindred enterprises has seized the commercial life of village and city for a ruthless exploitation. In hundreds of cities of this country independent merchants that have been the support and brace for upbuilding community life have been sucked into a merging vortex, designed and planned to drain elsewhere the profits of community activity.

Financially, a great many smaller cities of this country will become mere suburbs. The independent community life of many a city and hamlet of this Nation that has been the pride of citizens is to be turned into a financial vassalage.

Congress and the legislature are now in session. I sincerely hope some constructive legislation will be enacted to curb the unfair practices and monopolistic tendencies of the chain system.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that

the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 16415, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, as announced the other day, I shall pursue the same policy, and therefore object to the request of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I feel under the circumstances that I am justified in moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I dislike to object to the Senator's request, but so far as I have any knowledge the bill has just been brought to our attention. None of us, except members of the committee, have had an opportunity to read it and the only opportunity we will have to learn of its contents will be by having the bill read now. I think in the interest of expedition it will be better to have the bill read at length so that Senators may be advised of its contents.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator object to dispensing with the formal reading of the bill?

Mr. KING. I do not like to object, but I ask the Senator, in view of the fact that so few Senators are familiar with the contents of the bill, if it would not be better to pursue the course which I have indicated?

Mr. JONES. I want to see if I understand the Senator. Of course, the formal reading of the bill might be dispensed with and then the bill read word for word for amendment, the committee amendments to be disposed of first, and then, of course, the bill would be open to individual amendments. Does the Senator object to pursuing that course?

Mr. KING. No; I have no objection to that course.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we all know that the reading of an appropriation bill for action on the committee amendments receives very little attention as a usual practice. Senators are not then in attendance in any considerable number. Later on when debate on the bill begins and attention is called sometimes to committee amendments which have been agreed to informally without any debate or any special consideration it becomes necessary to reconsider some of the committee amendments in order to have a fair consideration of them. When a Senator wants to have a reconsideration of a committee amendment which was adopted under those circumstances, it has been the custom that there would be no objection; but we found in the consideration of a recent appropriation bill that there was a good deal of difficulty about that and it was necessary to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. If we can have an understanding that under the conditions I have mentioned the Senator from Washington will not object if some Senator later on wants to reconsider a committee amendment, I would have no objection to his request.

Mr. JONES. I would have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS FROM DROUGHT

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, several times during the discussion of emergency measures it has been

pointed out that the limitations imposed in the act itself and by regulations relating to the feed, seed, and fertilizer loan fund will make it difficult, if not impossible, to use a large part of the fund. I have received literally dozens of telegrams relating to that subject. Among them is a message which was received this morning from the mayor of the town of England, Ark., which place has become somewhat well known because of the incident which occurred there when several hundred people appeared and demanded food. I send to the desk the telegram referred to and ask that the Secretary read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

ENGLAND, ARK., February 2, 1931.

HON. JOE T. ROBINSON:

Unless something is done in the feed line of livestock at least 85 per cent of land will not be cultivated around England. Banks unable furnish funds to buy feed. Stock unable to work. Any number have died. Something must be done. Please wire your answer. This telegram is sent at the request of approximately 20 of our large planters who are unable to finance their own plantations.

W. O. WILLIAMS, Mayor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also send to the desk the answer to the telegram and ask that it may be read.

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

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 3, 1931.

MR. W. O. WILLIAMS,
Mayor, England, Ark.:

Your message received. The only Federal funds available for feed are carried in the \$45,000,000 loan bill, and use of that is limited to work stock. Pending set-up for administration of feed loan bill, Red Cross has in some instances made advances for feed; but I do not think there is any claim that requirements in this particular are being met. The bill authorizing loans to supply the Capital Stock of Agricultural Credit Corporation passed the Senate two weeks ago, but no action yet in the House. It is believed this will finally become law, but whether it will pass House and be put into operation in time to save large numbers of livestock from dying of starvation I can give no assurance.

JOE T. ROBINSON.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also send to the desk a telegram from Mr. F. B. Murphy, of Paris, Ark., that town being located in the western part of the State. I understand that Mr. Murphy is well acquainted with conditions in his county. His message relates to the administration of the seed loan fund. I ask that this telegram may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

PARIS, ARK., January 30, 1931.

Senator JOE T. ROBINSON:

No applications complete. Farmers afraid of restrictions. Making no headway. Soon be too late.

F. B. MURPHY.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also send to the desk a telegram from the county agent in Grant County, Ark., which is in the central southern portion of the State, and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SHERIDAN, ARK., January 31, 1931.

JOE T. ROBINSON,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Our farmers reluctant to mortgage all crops for seed, feed, and fertilizer. Fear that they can not obtain food for families will prevent many using loans. Red Cross here holds out no assurance that they can continue to meet the demands along this line.

W. B. VINZAND, County Agent.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also send to the desk a telegram from the Sheridan Rotary Club of Sheridan, Ark., relating to the same subject, which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SHERIDAN, ARK., February 2, 1931.

JOE T. ROBINSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Many of our farmers hesitate to mortgage crops for feed, seed, and fertilizer without some provision for food during the crop season assured. Many will not be able to take advantage of loans this reason. Red Cross gives no assurance aid will continue through crop season.

SHERIDAN ROTARY CLUB.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, Col. Elgan C. Robertson, who is chairman of the feed-loan organization in Lee County, in the State of Arkansas, recently declared that, in his opinion, it was doubtful whether a single farmer in Lee County would be able to avail himself of the fund under the seed and feed loan bill for the reason that it is equally, if not more, essential to secure food for those who work the crops, and that the mere supplying of feed to work stock does not solve the problem. I ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Arkansas Democrat, one of the leading daily newspapers of the State of Arkansas, relating to this phase of the subject.

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

The editorial is as follows:

[From Arkansas Democrat, January 30, 1931]

THE FIRST FEDERAL LOAN

M. Williams, Greene County farmer, is selected to receive the first Federal drought loan granted an Arkansas applicant. He applied for a \$75 loan. His application said he had an 80-acre farm near Lefe, Ark., and will plant 29 acres. Ten acres will be in cotton, 14 in corn, 3 in oats, and 2 in hay.

Accompanying announcement of the loan comes a statement from the chief loan administrator in which he denounces as "ridiculous" the contentions of certain Arkansans that Federal seed and feed loan allowances are insufficient for Arkansas cotton farmers.

Col. Elgan C. Robertson, chairman of the feed-loan organization in Lee County, had told newspaper men that he doubted a single farmer in Lee County would be able to take advantage of these loans. What farmers of Lee and other counties in this section need, he said, is not so much seed and fertilizer as feed for livestock.

This brought the retort from the food administrator that "we won't have any trouble getting rid of the money." Colonel Robertson had declared that \$30 a head to buy feed for stock for the work season was only half enough. But the administrator says allowances were based on a survey and "we know what the actual cost in each section is."

We quote these two authorities merely to show that the Federal feed and seed loan policy apparently is based on the theory that just enough to avoid starvation is enough to lend the farmer—a policy now being followed by the Red Cross in distribution of food.

J. W. Sargent, county agent for Pulaski County, says more than half the applicants for Government loans in this county will be able to qualify. That is good news, but what of the applicants in other counties? How many will be able to meet the requirements necessary to get money for their crops?

What of the farmers who have ownings sufficiently large to be known as "plantations"? Ninety-five per cent of such farmers not only have on their hands the burden of buying feed and seed, but the problem of feeding their tenants or share croppers. What can or will be done for those drought sufferers?

Of course, any amount loaned to any number of farmers, regardless of how few they are, is welcome. But let it not be thought that Federal farm loans is going to solve our agricultural problem as a whole. They will help a little, but mighty little, and the sooner that fact is realized the better.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, sufficient time will be taken to point out to Senators that the only emergency measure which has so far passed Congress, save the bill for the speeding up of certain construction, under which latter bill little has been done, is the seed loan bill, and while a liberal sum was appropriated for the purposes of that measure, the restrictions in the act, and in the regulations for its administration, are of such a nature that very little benefit is to be expected from it.

I wish to take this occasion to say, in a very few words, what I think the Senate fully realizes, namely, that there has been a display of indifference or inefficiency in the disposition of emergency measures which the Senate almost unanimously recognizes as necessary, which is almost incomprehensible; certainly such a course is inexplicable. Does not everyone realize that the proper way to deal with matters

of this kind is promptly and decisively? Who fails to realize that indecision and hesitation and indifference merely defer the day when some decisive action must be taken or the most serious results accepted?

Does anyone believe that he who promoted and insisted upon the appropriation of \$25,000,000 from the Federal Treasury to feed starving Russians and \$100,000,000 to supply the wants of other foreigners is moved by considerations of sound economics in opposing any appropriation from the Federal Treasury for the benefit of hundreds of thousands of fellow Americans who are threatened with starvation? Does any newspaper editor or newspaper correspondent believe that Members of the House of Representatives who voted to impose on the Red Cross the distribution of \$25,000,000 for the aid and encouragement and relief of drought sufferers in the Soviet Republics of Russia or who voted and insisted upon imposing on the Red Cross the obligation to distribute \$100,000,000 for the benefit of Europeans, who were not worse off than hundreds of thousands of American citizens now are, were moved by the desire then to destroy or embarrass the Red Cross? Do we not all recognize the fact that the claim made by the leader of the majority in the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Rules in that body that to consider an appropriation for the benefit of starving Americans is so violative of sound principles of government that it must not be contemplated for a moment is an example of hypocrisy that must shock those who are familiar with the fact that both those gentlemen in the Russian case and in the Belgian case recognized the principle as wholly sound and consistent?

At another time it is my purpose to go into this subject more fully. The best brief statement I have seen giving emphasis to the incorrectness of the position taken by those who now declare that it is an unconscionable act to divide the burden of paying the expense of the relief required between the generous hearted whose benevolence has already been taxed almost to complete exhaustion by steady and continuous drafts and the Federal Treasury is by the St. Louis Star of January 31. Does it not seem strange that they who thought it advantageous to make liberal appropriations from the Federal Treasury for the benefit of foreign sufferers now find it worthy of condemnation even to seek a measure of relief for Americans and impose a part of the burden on the whole people of this Nation?

What is there bad or unfair in asking all the people to contribute something in this great crisis? How is it sound and just to insist that those who are generous must be made to bear the entire expense or no relief shall be granted?

I ask that the clerk read and I call the attention of Senators to the statements and arguments in the editorial published in the St. Louis Star of January 31.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Star of January 31, 1931]

LOAVES AND FISHES

What would be thought of our military commanders if, in conducting a war, they refused to maintain a line of communications because Caesar burned his bridges behind him?

They would be exactly on a par with those who say that the United States Government should not relieve a million starving Americans because the Roman Empire fell after distributing free corn among the poor.

Rome fell, not because free corn was distributed but because a fat and fatuous aristocracy paid no attention to conditions that made free corn necessary. But that is neither here nor there. The plain fact is that we have in the United States at this moment an emergency as unusual as war, as disrupting as war, equal to the devastating effect of war upon a civilian population. Yet, facing this emergency, the President of the United States and those sharing his philosophic detachment employ every obstructive effort to prevent it from being met as a public responsibility.

A drought, even though it affected a vast area and a vast population, could under ordinary circumstances be met by ordinary methods of relief. Chronic suffering in the cities, in ordinary times, could be handled indefinitely by the usual agencies. Unemployment, even though affecting millions, could be coped with for a brief period by the communities affected.

But we have at this time a combination of chronic suffering, unemployment, and drought piled together in the midst of a

prolonged business depression. What senseless chatter is it that says this whole extraordinary burden must be met by voluntary gifts from the generous hearted, because in some mysterious way it would be bad for everybody if everybody had to help bear the expense?

Government aid is called a "dole," and the dole is bad. Of course it is. So is war. But when you are in a war you have to fight or run away. And when conditions require Government aid to starving people you have to furnish it or run away from the responsibility.

Charity is like medicine—a bad habit, but an occasional necessity. Continued charity will ruin any man's life, no matter whether it comes from the Government, a private organization, or from the family next door. The "dole" isn't harmful to the recipient because it comes from the Government. It is dangerous because, persistently given, it means that the Nation is failing to cope with a rotten economic situation. That is what it meant in ancient Rome. That is what it means in England to-day.

Does that mean we should not meet an emergency with the concerted force and wealth of the Nation? Does it mean haggling over theories when people are starving?

Talk about the Roman corn laws! What will the historians of 4000 A. D. say if they discover from the archives of 1931 that the United States Government held 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in granaries, to avoid glutting the market with food supplies, while a million people vainly begged for flour in their cupboards and bread in their stomachs?

If Jesus came back to earth at this moment and repeated the miracle of the loaves and fishes, He would be accused of corrupting the people with a dole. The Department of Agriculture would convict Him of a plot to depress the price of wheat. He would be too dangerous a man to have out of jail, arousing discontent and disturbing the complacency of satisfied citizens and rut-minded political leaders.

Meeting an emergency ought to sharpen the vision for preventing its recurrence. Drought is beyond human control. Employment is not. Distribution is not. It is those who have no ideas for dealing with a problem in the future that fear to face it in the present.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I have here a very able editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, a very conservative paper published in Virginia, which I ask to have read for the consideration of the Senate, and then I desire to make a few remarks about it. It is very short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading of the editorial? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of February 3, 1931]

THE RELIEF WRANGLE

Confidence of the people in their government is seldom subjected to a test as severe as that provided by the disgraceful squabbling between the President and the Senate over the question of providing food and medical care for the million or more small farmers who were made destitute by the drought. Hoover, the great humanitarian, help of the helpless, comforter of the poor, feeder of the hungry in all other lands and nations, discovers that treating hungry Americans as we have treated hungry Belgians and Russians would violate some precious principle of our Government.

Not even during the reigns of Harding and Coolidge has the Washington arena offered a more depressing spectacle. We have grown accustomed to chief executives who played politics from night to day, who never permitted themselves the luxury of plain and honest talk on any important political issue; but for any man to be able to see only the political aspects of drought relief is to establish a new "low" in statesmanship.

It may be that the Senators who are demanding passage of the relief measure are playing politics also, but there is really little point in scrutinizing their motives. The facts—admitted by both sides—are that upwards of a million of our farm population must have aid from somewhere if they are not to suffer hunger, some of them die of starvation and others from the diseases which result from malnutrition. That is enough to know. Whatever their motives may be, those Senators who are determined to force an extra session if the relief bill is not passed are in the right. Whatever ills may come of an extra session (and they may be many) ROBINSON and his followers should disregard all fear of consequences in their fight for the relief appropriation.

And, of course, there is no earthly excuse for making that extra session necessary. The President's following can recognize and admit the inevitable and permit the relief bills to pass; or it can persist in its bullheadedness, force the extra session, and then pass the relief bill. For a group as numerous and as determined as the Democrats have mustered in the Senate must be met halfway if the measures which are necessary to the operation of the Government are to be acted upon.

President Hoover has done more than delay the extension of help to a million of our citizens who need it. He has endangered temporarily, at least, the prestige of an organization which has always had the unreserved support and sympathy and confidence of the American people. It can hardly be doubted that he has been partly responsible for the sorry figure the Red Cross has cut

in this controversy. A few weeks ago Chairman Payne appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee with the assurance that there was no need either for a Federal appropriation or a popular collection by the Red Cross. Within four days both he and Mr. Hoover had reversed themselves and called for \$10,000,000 from the people. Then it was made known that the Red Cross would not expend the \$25,000,000 even if Congress made the money available.

This quibbling over the manner and method of relief has not helped the Red Cross to raise the \$10,000,000 which it now says is needed. Nor has it silenced the relief advocates in Congress. They are more than ever determined to make available some Federal relief money before they adjourn, and they will do so, regardless of what agency assumes the responsibility of distributing it. A reasonable compromise has been suggested—and promptly turned down by the Hoover followers. It is that \$15,000,000 be appropriated, to be spent when and if the need for it becomes apparent. If the President is wise, he will exert himself to see that this compromise is accepted.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, let us in a brief way present clearly the issue that has been precipitated between the President and the Senate.

When this drought—which was the most extensive drought this country has had for more than a century—came with its devastating ruin through 22 or 23 States, the President recognized the extent of it and the destruction engendered by it; and he appointed committees in these States to devise a method of meeting the situation. They were appointed in all the States under the direction of the President and under his control. All of these representatives—the most prominent men in these States—met here, and devised a plan of giving relief to the drought-stricken region. The character of the men appointed can be recognized from the fact that the leader in Virginia was ex-Governor Byrd, one of the most prominent, conservative, thoughtful business men of our State.

These men met, conferred with the Secretary of Agriculture, and devised a plan to give relief to a curse that had come not in a century before. They prepared a bill calling for \$60,000,000, which was introduced in the Senate and in the House. In the Senate the bill was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the assistant Republican leader.

I appeared before the Agricultural Committee to urge the passage of that bill, recommended by the men that the President had trusted to bring relief to this distressed situation. The bill was reported as recommended by his committee. This committee, appointed under the direction of the President, had said that was the minimum amount that could be used for the commendable purposes that the President had called them together to accomplish in the form of relief.

That bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate by the chairman of the committee, the assistant Republican leader. It came to the Senate, and it passed the Senate unanimously. No man raised a protest against it. The situation had been investigated. The number of people in every State had been ascertained. The number for Virginia was given. Organizations were appointed from county to county in Virginia, consisting of leading citizens, to ascertain the facts of the situation and report to Governor Byrd. I understand the same method of procedure was had in all of the 22 or 23 States.

The bill passed the Senate unanimously and went to the House, and for the first time objection was engendered. It was said the objection was occasioned by the President, and I have no doubt that is true.

What occurred? First, the amount was reduced from \$60,000,000 to \$30,000,000. Second, the terms of the bill were changed.

Let us see now what the issue between the President and the Senate is. Let me state it clearly, distinctly, and fairly. The Senate had passed a bill recommended by the President's drought relief commission providing that there should be advanced to the citizens of the States affected with the drought \$60,000,000. For what purpose? First, it was a loan, not a dole, not a gift. It was a loan to help agriculture.

Second, it was provided that in order to obtain a loan one must be engaged in production. No one could get the benefit of it unless he were engaged in the production of a crop. If he stopped producing, if he stopped raising a crop, the ability to get a loan ceased. That had been the underlying principle followed in those States for years by banks, by merchants, to assist the farmers in raising crops. The loans were limited to that. The farmers did not ask for a dole. All they asked the Government to do was to lend them money enough to make another crop, and they would pay the money back. The loans were limited to those engaged in production, and if one ceased to produce, his chance of getting a loan ceased.

Third, it was limited to the drought sections, the devastation in which was greater than any we had had for more than a century. Only those sections would get any benefit from the measure. An applicant for a loan had to declare that his State was one of the drought-stricken States, and that there was a situation of distress entitling him to come under the terms of the measure.

The bill as it passed the Senate authorized loans for food for man, feed for cattle, and fertilizer and seed. The practice of making such loans is followed down in the South and in the West to assist in the raising of crops, loans to tenants, to those who are not able to raise crops without loans. Assistance is given by a system known as advances, to enable them to get food for man and beast, and fertilizer and seed, and then the production of the crop proceeds, and one takes his chance of getting his money back out of the crop when it is raised.

Fourth, the Government would have a first lien on the crop, ahead of the merchant, ahead of the bank. The Government would have the first lien, in order that it might be safe in its loans.

When the bill went to the House, the House said "We will not authorize loans for the purchase of food for man, though he may be engaged in production. You must eliminate the provision for loans for food for man, and we will consent to the appropriation of \$30,000,000." Finally, under the conference report as agreed, \$45,000,000 was agreed to, eliminating food for man.

Now what is the issue? The issue is plain and clear, with the President and the House on one side and the Senate on the other. The House and the President say, "You can not get this provision for relief unless you pledge that you will feed only animals engaged in production, and for seed and fertilizer." In other words, they are willing to furnish money to buy feed for a mule engaged in production, but a man who is engaged in production and raising a crop may starve if he can not get money from some other source. Men may do all the quibbling they please, but that is the issue over this question: "We will feed a mule producing, but we will not feed a man producing."

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

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. How can a farm producer obtain the money with which to procure food for those who work the crop if he gives a first mortgage on the crop in order to obtain seed, feed, and fertilizer?

Mr. SWANSON. In other words, he gives a lien on his crop to feed his mule, and precludes himself from having any credit on which to get the food to feed his starving family. That is the issue the President has raised, and we are willing to meet it.

It never has been the case that any man made a difference in making advances or loans South for the raising of crops, so that he had to exclude the feeding of people engaged in the same production. It is nonsensical. It is impossible. A man could not get the privilege of securing a loan from this fund unless he could in honor say, "I will use the loan to feed a mule, and I pledge that not a cent of it shall go to feed my starving wife or child." That is the condition that is imposed. Of all the folly and nonsense, when an issue is created over a measure of relief in a time of great distress, this takes the lead.

That is the measure which precipitated this tremendous fight between the Senate on the one side and the House and the President on the other. I would like to have some one explain to me, in common sense, how, when an industrious man goes out, he can work without food, he can work without subsistence, any more than a mule can; why a mule should be kept in good health and the man prohibited from having any food whatever from the same source.

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

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Possibly the administration takes the viewpoint that even though the man who is plowing the mule may from hunger drop dead between the plow handles, the mule will go on producing.

Mr. SWANSON. That is the folly of the contention here.

Mr. President, it is utterly impossible for a farmer to raise a crop if he has no credit and has no money with which to get food. Of all the folly that I have ever seen in this Capitol, in the 35 years I have been here in public life, this takes the lead, tearing the Nation all asunder over the question of whether the Federal Government shall confine itself to feeding mules, and refuse to feed starving human beings.

Everybody knows that that is the issue. We did not ask that the people should have doles. We simply asked that they should have the privilege of borrowing money, giving a first lien on the crop, a lien ahead of that of everyone else, in order that they might raise their crops. Is not this Nation interested in 22 States being put on a productive basis? Is not this Nation interested in seeing that production shall go ahead, and that the farmers should not fail in the raising of their crops for lack of some aid?

When the President realized the extent of the disaster he knew the local communities could not meet it. In Arkansas over a hundred banks have failed. In Virginia banks have failed, but not as many as failed in Arkansas. The banks have failed because the farmers could not pay the advances heretofore made, because the merchants had made advances to the farmers, and they could not meet their obligations. It is utterly impossible to get any advances from those banks, any advances from the merchants, any advances from the fertilizer companies, because they are all loaded with debt and helpless to extend any further credit.

Here is the President of the United States, known as the great humanitarian, made President because he fed a starving world out of the Treasury of the United States, refusing to aid these starving men, who simply ask the privilege of getting a loan for 12 months and have the privilege of proceeding to work to raise a crop to relieve their distress and to benefit this great country.

Mr. President, that is the issue when reduced down to the ultimate facts. Shall a farmer be forced to give a lien on his crop—a first lien—to feed a mule, and for the purchase of feed and fertilizer, and preclude his credit to borrow money to feed his family? Shall he be refused a cent of relief if he diverts any of the money from feeding a mule to feeding his starving wife and family? If he makes a diversion, loans will be no further extended.

It seems to me in common sense, it seems to me from an economic standpoint, it seems to me from a humanitarian standpoint we should pass the bill as originally reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, authorizing the appropriation of \$60,000,000 for advances to farmers, to give them relief, so that they may raise another crop.

It seems to me that any administration which can not do that, which stands as a barrier, in this economic crisis, and prevents this assistance being extended, is unworthy of being sustained by the American electorate, I do not care whether the President is a Republican or a Democrat or a Progressive.

The time has come when the President of the United States must recognize conditions, must not be influenced by pride, must not be actuated by stubbornness, but must recognize a condition which he himself has appointed a

commission to investigate, a commission which recommended this method of relief.

As far as I am concerned, I am willing to meet the issue. I am willing to let the fight go on between the Senate and the President on the measure his commission of relief recommended unanimously, which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate recommended unanimously. I am willing to share the responsibility of an extra session if a million people must starve on account of the stubbornness of the Chief Executive of this country.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, this morning I received a communication from the St. Louis Red Cross in the form of a letter written by a lady named Mrs. Frank V. Hammar, a brilliant woman, a thoughtful woman, one not given to exaggeration, who has been at the head of the American Red Cross movement for many, many years.

On the letterhead I find the names of distinguished men and women from my community. No one would question their veracity. No one would refuse to accept their judgment upon this subject. This lady states that there are 900,000 individuals in Arkansas, Missouri, southern Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas who need—what? Food, clothes, shoes, medicine. I shall ask that the letter may be inserted in the RECORD, because to me it is convincing evidence that the situation has not been exaggerated. When we find in those few States after investigation that 900,000 people are actually in want, it should follow without question that something immediate should be done for their relief; there should be no delay. There is actual suffering, as this lady points out. I ask that in printing her letter in the RECORD the names of the directors and officers of the Red Cross chapter be likewise printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COUZENS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

[National officers: Herbert Hoover, president; Charles E. Hughes, vice president; Robert W. DeForest, vice president; John Barton Payne, chairman; William D. Mitchell, counselor; Miss Mabel T. Boardman, secretary; Ogden L. Mills, treasurer. Directors: Dr. Fred W. Bailey, W. K. Bixby, Bert H. Lang, Mrs. J. Porter Tirrill, Mrs. Peyton T. Carr, Mrs. Ross Bowles, Ingram Boyd, Charles Wiggins, Mrs. W. T. Donovan, Mrs. J. B. Rule, Frank M. Mayfield, J. Lionberger Davis, Mrs. Horace Rumsey, Dr. Borden S. Veeder, Mrs. Henry C. Scott, Frank V. Hammar, Mrs. G. H. Capen, Tom K. Smith, D. K. Catlin, Mrs. E. T. Senseney, George D. Markham, Col. Stephen E. Lowe, A. L. Shapleigh, Edmund F. Brown, John R. Shepley, Garneau Weld, Mrs. Joseph W. Bray, Robert A. Holland, F. O. Watts, Rolla Wells, Mrs. Sidney Schwab, Mrs. Max Kotany, Mrs. H. G. Mudd, George A. Meyer, Archbishop J. J. Glennon, Benjamin Gratz, Rabbi Samuel Thurman, Bishop Frederick F. Johnson, Alfred Fairbank, W. Frank Carter, J. H. Holliday, J. L. Mauran, J. Sheppard Smith, Dr. Harry F. D'Oench, Harry F. Knight, Ernest W. Stix, Mrs. Frank V. Hammar, Mrs. Marcus A. Hirsch, Mrs. George Warren Brown, Mrs. John T. Davis, jr., Dr. Malvern B. Clopton, Oliver F. Richards. St. Louis chapter officers: Mrs. Frank V. Hammar, chairman; Bert H. Lang, vice chairman; Oliver F. Richards, treasurer; Robert A. Holland, secretary; P. H. Byrns, executive secretary]

AMERICAN RED CROSS,
ST. LOUIS CHAPTER,
St. Louis, Mo., January 30, 1931.

DEAR FRIEND: This is a story of slow accumulation of misery. The absolute exhaustion of family food supplies following the breakdown of normal facilities.

The country literally cries for your mercy and for your aid. You may have given to many things—and that in itself is a reward. But to-day the need of 21 States is greater than it has ever been in any other calamity.

Financially, we are substantially behind. We hope for \$220,000; \$95,000 has been pledged. We need your support—anything, but something, please—to-day.

Our request could not be inspired by a deeper thought or greater reverence for the cause of suffering humanity. There are at this very minute in the drought area of Arkansas, Missouri, southern Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas over 900,000 individuals in actual want—and this is from only 7 of the 21 States in the drought regions.

We want this money for individuals who need our help, not for organization expenses. We want it to fight pellagra, that dread disease. We want it to prevent the spread of influenza. We want it for medicine, for food, for clothing, and for shoes. If you could see the cases—pitiful, desperate—that come to us every day, your heart would bleed with sympathy and you would dig down into your pocketbook and give whatever you could. You would give with the satisfaction of knowing that you were doing something to help in a situation the intensity of which you did not appreciate before.

We simply must answer the cry of the helpless, the suffering. If you haven't already done it, please put your name on our roll of honor. Give something! We need it badly—now. In the spirit of mercy, please send what you can for the Red Cross—your Red Cross.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. FRANK V. HAMMAR, *Chairman.*

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a letter with reference to relief in Iowa.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 3, 1931.

Senator SMITH W. BROOKHART,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROOKHART: You will be gratified at the information in the telegram given below. Your constituent at Shenandoah, Iowa, Henry Field, and his organization through their broadcasting station, KFNF, have not waited for the Red Cross or any other agency to bring relief to our fellow sufferers in the drought district.

In that little town of 6,000 people and the community surrounding they show the big heart which is so essentially a part of the American people. They realized their fellow citizens in the South were hungry and cold. Their neighbors were suffering. They were not afraid of any dole, but they wanted to relieve distress, and they went at it directly. Why can't our Congress respond in the same splendid spirit, instead of making a political football out of human misery?

The appeal made over the Henry Field broadcasting station has brought real results. Other broadcasting stations might do well to follow this lead. The following telegram tells its own splendid story:

SHENANDOAH, IOWA, January 31, 1931.

Hon. W. D. JAMIESON,
Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.:

Please note Saturday's Shenandoah Sentinel report on our famine relief drive. We have already loaded five carloads of supplies and will load two more Monday. The total value will run to probably \$10,000. This was done through an appeal by Frank Field and James Pearson to listeners of KFNF, and they certainly responded nobly. Judge Frederick Fischer will accompany the cars to Arkansas for us.

HENRY FIELD.

I want to commend you for the good work you are doing.
Cordially,

W. D. JAMIESON.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I send to the clerk's desk a communication addressed to me by G. E. Kellogg, of San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire the communication read?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

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

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

PAY THE VETERANS' BONUS CERTIFICATES

(Copyright by G. E. Kellogg, January, 1931)

Secretary Mellon opposes the bonus payments to World War veterans, because it would necessitate the issuing of \$3,500,000,000 of bonds by the Government, and his patriotic impulses are paralyzed by the thought of the "immense sum lost in interest." He does not worry, however, over the "immense sum" paid in interest by the veterans when they use their bonus certificates as collateral for loans. That being the case, let us see just how much and what kind of interest Mr. Mellon really has in the welfare of the men who sacrificed their jobs and staked their lives for the welfare of the Government when it needed help.

There is supposed to be no class distinction or class legislation in this land of the free. Therefore "equality of opportunity," about which President Hoover has talked so much, demands that the veterans be treated as generously as Uncle Sam treats the bankers. Here's how.

A Government bond is the Government's promise to pay the amount called for in the certificate—at maturity.

A bonus certificate is the Government's promise to pay the amount called for in the certificate—at maturity.

A bond is delivered to the banker in exchange for money.

The bonus certificate is delivered to the veteran in exchange for service.

The bond and the bonus certificate are each a promise of the Government to pay face value at maturity, and Uncle Sam always keeps his promise to pay. Therefore the bonus certificate is absolutely as good as a Panama Canal bond.

When the banker receives the Panama Canal bond he is allowed to deposit it with the Government and receive the face value of the bond in bank notes—without interest. And the banker is allowed to use the bank notes as legal tender money until the bond is redeemed. What is more, Secretary Mellon does not worry about the loss of interest.

Now, if "equality of opportunity" means anything, the veteran should be allowed to deposit his bonus certificate with the Gov-

ernment and receive its face value in bonus notes that would circulate like the bank notes—without interest—until they are redeemed.

If bonus certificates are as good as Panama Canal bonds, bonus notes should be as good as bank notes; and the issuance of the face value of the bonus certificates to the veterans at this time—when the veterans need the money, would be a simple demonstration of real "equality of opportunity"—and there would be no "immense sum lost in interest."

Congress should establish "equality of opportunity" by enacting a law that would make bonus notes possible.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, to my mind that is an unanswerable argument in favor of paying a cash bonus to our brave distressed ex-service men. As I said once before, the paying of this money now would put into circulation about \$3,000,000,000. We need more than that added to the \$4,000,000,000 now in circulation. The Government ought to have between \$8,000,000,000 and \$10,000,000,000 in circulation all the time. It is a strong indictment of the Government that in 1919 there was more money in circulation in the United States, when the population was smaller, when business enterprises were fewer, than there is in circulation now in the year 1931.

Mr. Mitchell, a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate yesterday, and I quote from an Associated Press dispatch appearing in the Washington Post of to-day with reference to his statement:

As a means of curbing stock-market inflation, Charles E. Mitchell, New York financier, yesterday demanded repeal of the capital-gains tax.

Mr. President, this tax is perhaps the fairest tax in the world. The Government now levies a tax upon profits derived from speculation on the New York Stock Exchange. It obtains a few million dollars from this source. I submit to the Senate that it is certainly a fair tax. Men go upon the exchange frequently speculating in fictitious stocks, stocks that have no actual existence. Frequently they win on the exchange by selling short in an organized movement to break the market, to cause a crash, and probably to produce a panic; but they win millions on the deal. Those methods are employed for that purpose. I submit again that profits made in this way certainly ought to be taxed. But here is a big New York financier, Mr. Charles E. Mitchell, coming before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate and instead of suggesting how the New York Stock Exchange can be curbed and how wild and reckless speculation can be prevented he is asking to take the tax off of the vast profits made in speculation on the exchange.

Mr. President, those profits run not into hundreds of dollars, but they run into hundreds of millions and into billions of dollars. And yet here, while we are battling in the Senate to bring relief to the starving people of 21 States of the Union, Mr. Mitchell appears before a committee of the Senate and suggests that the tax of the Government be taken off of these colossal profits of millionaires on the New York Stock Exchange. Mr. Mitchell was asked if he thought the rediscount rate of the Federal reserve system in New York, reduced to 2 per cent, was too low. Listen to what the morning paper says about his reply:

Under questioning he said he did not regard the existing 2 per cent rediscount rate in New York too low. He said he was discouraged with what he termed the "sloppiness of credit" and added, "Easy money is generally one of the factors in the revival of business."

Mr. President, we are talking about easy money now. If we use this money to pay to the ex-service man of the United States, we are putting \$3,000,000,000 in the hands of people who will spend it, and it will get into circulation at once. These men will buy the necessities of life—supply their wants and prevent them from starving. Mr. President, I agree with Mr. Mitchell's argument that easy money is necessary to revive business. The putting of \$3,000,000,000 into circulation would do more to bring prosperity to the United States than anything else we could do.

How can Mr. Mellon justify his course in the face of the facts set out in Mr. Kellogg's letter which I had read at the

desk? A Panama Canal bond is purchased from the Government, and the owner of it brings it to the United States Treasury and borrows the cash on it when he deposits it, the Government keeping the bond. He can take that money out and circulate it, loan it over and over again at interest, and then finally bring it back and turn it into the United States Treasury and have the Government pay him the face value of his bond with interest. That is what we are doing for the purchaser of the Panama Canal bonds.

But that is not all, Mr. President. A national bank can purchase \$1,000,000 in Government bonds. It can bring those bonds to the United States Treasury and simply pay the Government to print money to the value of the \$1,000,000, the Government holding the bonds of the national bank. The bank can take that money and put it in its coffers and loan it out to citizens here and yonder, over and over again, collecting interest on it and all the while drawing interest on its bonds then in the hands of the Government. Finally the bank brings back the notes issued by the Government and has its bonds paid in full when it has had the use of Government money without a cent of interest all that time, for months and it may be for years.

Mr. Mellon is very much afraid that we will get too much money in circulation. Mr. President, the people are suffering to-day because of a dearth of money. There is not enough money circulating in the body of American business. There is paralysis in the body of business. Business is nearly dead. Why? For want of sufficient blood in its veins. We hear almost every day of some patient in a hospital who has been in an automobile accident and that the loss of blood makes it necessary to have a blood transfusion. Blood is obtained and put into the veins of the person whose greatest need was blood. Mr. President, that is the situation with American business to-day. Money, the lifeblood of business, has been taken out of the veins of business in great quantities. The money changers in the temple of American liberty have extracted the blood from the veins and the body of business until business is pale and weak and nigh unto death. We are calling for more money so as to give a transfusion of blood—money, the lifeblood of business.

Mr. President, the burning question at the Capitol now is how to relieve the suffering of men, women, and children in 21 States; and here comes a big financier from New York, Mr. Mitchell, who asks the Government to take the tax off the great profits made by the speculators on the New York Stock Exchange.

Something has been said here about why Rome fell. Some would have us believe that it was the distribution of free corn to the poor that caused Rome to fall down among her beautiful hills and die. That was not the cause, Mr. President. It was because the wealth of Rome had been concentrated into the hands of the few. In the language of Clark in his *Lost Atlantis*:

The few claimed all the increase
From ocean, soil, and air,
Precious stones and gems and metals,
Flocks and grain and fruitage rare.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Alabama, I understand, has made reference in his remarks to Mr. Mitchell. The Senator will recall that Mr. Mitchell said if the adjusted compensation bill shall be enacted into law it will break a great many small banks? I wonder how many of those banks will fail if the soldiers' shall deposit their \$2,000,000 in them?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Georgia. The suggestion of Mr. Mitchell that the settlement of the soldiers' bonus in cash would cause many small banks to fail is ridiculous. One reason such action would not cause many of those banks to fail is that a great many of them have already failed, and I can not understand the

logic of the suggestion, as my friend from Georgia has said, that depositing money by the soldiers in those banks will help to break them.

Yet that is what is being said. Mr. Mitchell has stated and Mr. Mellon has also stated that the putting of this \$3,000,000,000 into circulation would seriously interfere with business. How can anybody take such a position as that? Mr. President, to illustrate, a man goes out into the country where there has not been rain for a long time. Crops are suffering and rain is needed. This man sees the clouds gathering and he sees the lightning flash and he hears the thunder roar. Rain is in prospect, and the farmers are praying for it to come, but some one says, "I hope it will not rain, for if it does it will destroy the crop prospect and injure vegetation," when as a matter of fact the only way in which crops can be made and vegetation revived is to have refreshing rains, rains sufficient to wet the soil. That is the way to put life into the plants and make them bear fruit. That is what it is necessary to do with business to-day, and money is the rain of business. Money is necessary to the success of enterprise and industry of every kind, whether it is that of the small individual or of the big concern; and yet to-day we have the money kings "holding tight" the purse strings of the Nation, sitting heavy on the strong box, and refusing to let money sufficient to meet the needs of everyday business get into circulation.

It seems to me that any sound political economist can see the value of my suggestion to put more money into circulation when to-day the country is struggling and business is suffering greatly because we have not a sufficient amount of money in circulation.

However, I was about to state, when interrupted, what it was that helped to bring about the downfall of Rome. Concern for the welfare of the individual was minimized, and the rights of the masses were trampled upon by the money kings. Instead of giving each one a fair chance in the struggle of life, they were seeking power, and more power the leaders craved, and more power they got. Rome reached that time in her degeneracy until Pertinax marshaled his soldiers and offered to sell the emperorship for \$500,000; and the doom of Rome was sealed.

Mr. President, we have a situation now out in Arkansas and in some places in my State and other States that remind us of the days that preceded the fall of the Roman Empire. And yet we are the richest government in all the world. The Washington Star last night—listen to this—carried an article under these headlines:

American income highest in the world. Total of \$75,000,000,000 estimated for 1930 by our economists.

The income of the United States is the greatest in all the earth, and here we are with pitiful reports read day after day in this body from men, women, and children on the verge of starvation, and we can not get adequate relief to them.

Mr. President, I saw a statement the other day to the effect that Alabama had made more cotton last year than it made the year before and therefore was not entitled to very much relief from the funds provided by Congress for citizens in distress there and elsewhere. I want to acquaint the Senate and the country with the terrible situation that exists amongst many cotton producers in my State.

When the farmer planted the crop of 1930, cotton was bringing about 8 cents a pound more than it is selling for to-day, or \$40 a bale more. To-day it is bringing around \$50 a bale, which is 4 or 5 cents a pound below the cost of production. What matters it to him that he made more cotton than he made the year before if it is worth less than the smaller crop made the previous year? He can not sell it for a price that will cover the cost of production; the money that he expended in producing that crop, the debts incurred, the obligations made, are hanging around his neck like a millstone, and now he comes with his products into a dead market and the price offered is below the cost of production. He can not buy the necessities of life; he can not even get the price that it costs to produce the cotton by selling it at the prices that obtain to-day.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I want to ask the Senator two questions. First, was there a drought in Alabama?

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. How many counties were affected?

Mr. HEFLIN. There are 38 listed where the drought was severe, and there is suffering from drought in all the other counties except 4 or 5 out of 67.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have been interested in what the Senator said about the depreciation in the price of cotton. I have been receiving numerous letters from the South protesting against the agricultural marketing act, and many of the letters contain allegations that the depreciation in the price of cotton is somewhat due to the operations of the Federal Farm Board under that act. I should like to have the Senator's view about that.

Mr. HEFLIN. I myself have had quite a number of complaints regarding the activities of the Federal Farm Board. I have had deep sympathy with the board in the terrible situation which has confronted it and which now confronts it. I voted against the confirmation of some of the members of that board. I believed that the board could do good; I am not satisfied with the results of the efforts of the board; but I am still hoping that the board will do something to lift the price of cotton out of the valley of despond where the price is below the cost of production. The price of cotton is much lower than it was at this time a year ago. No cotton should be sold for less than 15 and 20 cents a pound.

The selling prices of all cotton goods justify a much higher price for cotton.

Mr. President, to recur to the subject I was discussing, that they say the farmer has more cotton now than he produced in the previous crop year, but that is no reason why he is not in dire distress. He is in great distress; he owes the merchant, and if he sold every bale of his cotton he has or had he could not pay what he owes the merchant. He has already sold it all in thousands of instances, and the debts due the merchant still hang over him. He owes the bank, and he can not pay the bank. If he had cotton he could not eat it, and he can not sell it at a profit. That is the situation that confronts tens of thousands of cotton farmers to-day.

Mr. President, I helped to pass through Congress a farm loan bill under which the farmer was permitted to borrow money and buy a home and farm. He could pay back his loan over a long period of 30 or 35 years at a rate of interest of 5 per cent. It was my purpose and the purpose of those who supported that measure to encourage farmers everywhere to buy farms, to own farms; and thousands and hundreds of thousands of them availed themselves of that law and purchased homes and farms. I regret to say that they are losing their homes now by the hundreds and by the thousands. That, to me, is a deplorable picture; it is a sad and calamitous thing for our farmers and for our country. These men are losing their homes because of no fault of their own. Drought, hard times, business depression, the lack of sufficient money in circulation, panicky conditions have driven them to the point where they are unable to meet their payments to the Government. Then what happens? Their homes and farms are put upon the block and sold. They are turned out after making improvements on the farms for years, after living there and becoming attached to the place they see all their labor spent in vain; the payments they have made are gone up in smoke and they are driven out and down the road empty handed. It is to me a sad and pitiful sight.

Mr. President, every one of those farmers is suffering, not only financially but suffering physically and mentally. His morale is being broken, and he is despondent and downhearted. That is the way to make reckless, desperate citi-

zens. These men ought to be helped to hold their homes and farms.

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

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

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

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator raises quite an interesting point when he suggests that where farmers have had good seasons and big crops they are still unable to get any return from those crops. If they undertake to market them they find that transportation charges and other expenses in that connection eat up all the proceeds, and often they are, as the expression goes, "in the red"; that is, they actually have to pay freight to get their products to market. They not only derive no profit out of what they produce, but they burden themselves with additional expenses when they attempt to market it.

Is there any real difference in the actual situation where farmers are unable to produce any crop because of the drought and the situation where they do produce a crop but can not get it to market? They are just about as bad off as if they had suffered a drought are they not?

Mr. HEFLIN. That is absolutely correct. Thousands of farmers who have made good crops have found the price of those products so low and the freight charges required to get them to market so high that their entire crop operations for the year have been unprofitable.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am inclined to agree with the Senator as to the Federal Farm Board, which was organized and created in order to devise a proper system of marketing and distribution. I want to give them a chance, and I have been hoping they would solve this problem. They have not so far done so, and I do not think they have made much progress in that direction. It is true, however, that all over the country where splendid crops are actually produced the producers are not only unable to get the cost of production but they are unable to get the crop to market without additional expense. It seems to me, therefore, it is largely a question of economic distribution that we have to deal with.

Mr. HEFLIN. I thank the Senator for his very valuable suggestion.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Do I understand the position of both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Alabama to be that the farm marketing act has not yet been tried out sufficiently long to determine whether or not it is a success, and that the Senators are still holding in abeyance their judgment as to its success?

Mr. HEFLIN. So far as I am concerned I am not satisfied with what has been accomplished, but I want to give it every opportunity to show that it is of value to the farmers of America.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think both Senators agree with me, however, that there has been a growing protest throughout the country against the operations of the act. My mail contains a constantly increasing volume of protests, particularly from business men throughout the South and other people interested in the cotton business.

Mr. HEFLIN. There is no doubt that there is widespread complaint about the activities and nonactivities of the Farm Board. The farmer, who formerly got 18 cents a pound or 20 cents a pound for his cotton—20 cents meant \$100 a bale and 18 cents meant \$90 a bale—is not satisfied now, when the price of cotton has fallen down to \$50 a bale; and he ought not to be satisfied with the present price. He can not produce cotton at that price and live. He will have to get a better price or go out of the cotton-producing business.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for just a minute further in reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Massachusetts?

I am very largely in the attitude of the Senator from Alabama with respect to the Federal Farm Board. I realize, of course, that the question of transportation is lodged with the Interstate Commerce Commission; but it seems to me the Federal Farm Board has to consider and exert its influence in some way to deal with the question of transportation. I have not figured out how the board can do it; but certainly that is a question that enters into its success in dealing with the marketing problem.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator would not say it was a success up to date, would he?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I think not. I think it has been rather disappointing; but I think there are possibilities there, and I should like to give them a further chance.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I introduced in the Senate a resolution calling upon the Federal Farm Loan Board to make a report upon the number of farmers who had purchased lands through loans from the Government and how many of them had failed to make their yearly payments and had lost their homes and farms. In other words, how many of them had been foreclosed. I wanted to get a report upon this situation. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] introduced a resolution along the same lines as mine, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and he and I agreed that we would support his resolution, which has passed the Senate, calling upon the Federal Farm Loan Board to give us this information.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has introduced a bill providing that wherever the farmers in the drought-stricken areas or in other places are unable to meet their payments for 1930 the amount due the Government shall be counted in the body of the debt and carried for three years. I submit that that is a wholesome and a just and a fair proposition. Why can we not make this additional loan to these farmers in order to save farms and save homes, when we are loaning \$500,000,000 to the railroads?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to remind the Senator, in connection with his reference to farm loans, that in the case of irrigation in the West Congress allows \$5,000,000 to those people, \$1,000,000 a year, to save them from being foreclosed. We are asking nothing for the cotton section in the way of loans more than has already been given to the irrigation section.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is true. The Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct about that.

Mr. President, since I have been in Congress, the House and the Senate, I have never failed to vote for a measure to give a fair deal to the people in every section of the country. We are living in a very unusual time. Things are out of joint the world over, they tell us. Economic conditions are serious and disturbing the world over, and we are striving as statesmen to bring relief to American people in distress and to solve the problem that confronts us. We are obliged to deal with these extraordinary conditions in an extraordinary way.

The surgeon does not operate until all other treatment has failed with his patient. When the other remedies have been exhausted and the time for heroic treatment has come we see the surgeon's knife, and the patient is operated on and the cause of his desperate illness is removed. Maybe it is a cancer. Maybe it is a tumor; but in order to remove it an operation is necessary, and when this disturbing element has been taken out of the body the physical health of the patient is restored.

The body of American business is sorely afflicted. A cancer is eating upon the vitals of business. That cancer, in one form, is the New York Stock Exchange. It has already eaten into the vitals, and it is now injuriously affecting the livelihood of every man and woman in the Nation. How many Members of the House and Senate are grappling with this question and trying to solve it? Instead of our putting an end to it, curbing its activities, confining its activities to legitimate business—the buying and selling of

shares in stocks and bonds—the speculators are selling fictitious stuff. If there are 100,000 shares in a concern, they sell a million. Watered stock and fictitious stuff are dealt in; and a crash comes and a billion dollars is lost in a single day.

My God! Is it not time we were doing something to relieve legitimate business of this destructive and deadly evil? Are Senators and Members of the House afraid to tackle this giant evil? It looks so. What are we coming to in this Government?

Mr. President, if a farmer mortgages a mule that he does not own, he is put in the penitentiary. If a merchant sells something that is not his, he is arrested and punished; but a stock gambler, unhampered and unfettered on the stock exchange, can sell in unlimited quantity the stuff they speculate in, stuff that he does not own, and with it run prices up or beat them down on the exchange, clip his coupons, and make his millions, and then everybody says, "O he is a smart guy." They do not even talk about arresting him. You let the giant evil go on undisturbed, but you seize the little fellow and punish him. That is the philosophy of some statesmen.

I am reminded of a little doggerel that a brother of mine found in a newspaper in London:

The law imprisons man or woman
Who steals a goose from off the common,
But lets the greater culprit loose
Who steals the common from the goose.

In a little different form we have that situation here. We will pounce upon the little fellow who violates the law, but when it comes to the big fellow we say, "Excuse me; I did not recognize you at first," and he passes on undisturbed.

That is one of the great evils in our country to-day. Speculating in cotton and speculating in wheat in unlimited quantities are two other great evils. We permit the speculator on the grain exchange to sell billions of bushels of wheat when we do not make one-fiftieth of the amount dealt in on the exchange. It is not in existence. The farmer is holding his wheat, we will say. The price is below the cost of production. He is trying to hold it until it yields a profit; and these speculators go on the exchange and sell, in competition with him, ten times, a hundred times, a thousand times the quantity of the wheat he has. They beat down the price in the market where he has to sell, and he comes, despondent and heavy-hearted, with his produce and dumps it on a market where he must sell below the cost of production; and he goes home empty handed, with debts hanging over him, with fear haunting him that his home and farm will be sold from under him.

The cotton exchange does the same thing. We produce 14,000,000 bales of cotton, and they sell 250,000,000 bales. The farmer says, "I am going to hold my cotton until the price goes up to the point where it will yield a profit." They say, "You will? Watch us beat your price down by selling something we call cotton, just the word cotton, in unlimited quantities." They go upon the exchange, and they sell this stuff. To-day, the price will be 10 cents. To-morrow, the report will go out that: "The cotton exchange price broke yesterday half a cent a pound. It is down to around 9½ cents," and not a pound of cotton has been dealt in. They have only sold the name of cotton in unlimited quantities; and the farmer who sells his cotton in the open market must take 9½ cents, the price fixed by selling counterfeit cotton against the actual cotton. Yet cotton is the only American product every pound of which is converted into money, and every dollar's worth of which contributes to the financial wealth of the United States. Cotton gives to America the balance of trade, and brings into our country every year more gold than the world's annual output; and yet those who produce it are having a hard struggle because they are forced to sell this great American staple below the cost of production.

These are three of the four giant evils. The other one I touched on briefly at the outset and that is the lack of sufficient money in circulation to meet the business needs of the American people.

Senators, this country never will prosper as long as the volume of money in circulation depends upon the whim and caprice of the money lords of America. The Government owes it to the people to see that sufficient money is kept circulating in the body of business—an amount sufficient at all times to meet the business needs of every man and of every woman in the United States. I challenge any Senator to deny the soundness of that proposition.

The Government demands the exclusive right to print bills and coin money and the exclusive right to supply the people with the money needed to answer the needs of their business. In the old days a coon skin had a certain value, and was used as a medium of exchange in various communities. Gold and silver nuggets were used as a medium of exchange and a measure of value. But one day the Government said, "You must get rid of all these measures of value and mediums of exchange. The Government is going to coin money. The Government is going to print bills for use as money in the United States; and anybody who prints or coins anything for use as money is a counterfeiter and will be arrested, prosecuted, and punished." So the Government assumed the authority and the responsibility to supply the money necessary at all times to meet the daily needs of the American people.

And I submit to the Senate that it is the duty of this Government to do that, and I further submit to the Senate that this Government is not doing that to-day.

Money is the lifeblood of business, and the body of business is prone upon the ground, well nigh paralyzed for want of sufficient blood flowing in its veins.

If I had it in my power, I would put \$4,000,000,000 in circulation in 30 days, and I would guarantee to the Nation a return of prosperity in 60 days. That is all that is needed. Curb the activities of the stock exchange, curb the activities of the cotton exchange and of the grain exchange, pay the soldiers their bonus, and put that \$3,000,000,000 in circulation, and you will see business shake off the sickening habiliments of depression and put on the wholesome and healthy robes of prosperity. Business is crying out for lifeblood, and the lifeblood of business is money.

Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I had intended to. I want to say to Senators that this sad and distressing situation among the farmers of the South and West has made me very unhappy. I know what is happening there. It is a sad picture to me to see a farmer who has lived in a community for 15 or 20 years, perhaps longer, called on by an officer, who says, "I have come to foreclose the mortgage." The farmer says, "Well, I am mighty sorry," and the tears come to his eyes, and his children gather around him and cry, and his brave wife stands there and drops a tear in silence. The home place is being sold and the farm is to be taken from them, with all the improvements the man has made. A farm home is broken up, and the farm family set adrift, with nothing to live upon and no home to shelter them.

Mr. President, if free government is to live, this thing has got to stop. Senators will recall the dream of old Pharaoh. He had a dream about seven fat years and seven lean years. He was told to store an abundance of grain during the seven fat years to serve the needs of the people during the seven lean years. We in the United States have been passing through the seven fat years, with America's income bigger than that of any Government in all the world.

What did Pharaoh do? He accumulated grain during the seven fat years, and when the lean years came what happened? The people in great numbers came to buy grain.

What happened then? They got a supply of grain and went away satisfied. But after a while their grain supply was gone and they had to go back to buy more grain. They took that home, and by and by they consumed it, and then they said: "Our grain supply is exhausted, but we have no more money with which to buy grain." And then Pharaoh's men said: "Take your golden trinkets, silverware, and metals of every kind and go up and buy grain." They did so, exhausting their household goods. They got another

supply, and they consumed that. They went back again, and what did Pharaoh's agents tell them? "Go bring your sheep and your cattle." They did so, and they got grain again on which to live for a time. Finally they came again, and Pharaoh's agents said, "Go bring the deeds to your land," and the work of Egyptian bondage was complete. God help us to-day to respond to the needs of American farmers in distress before they, like the farmers of Egypt, become serfs in the kingdom of American agriculture.

I plead to-day for the relief of a drought-stricken and a poverty-stricken people in 21 great States of this Union, proud, patriotic, upstanding, brave people, who are worried, troubled, hungry, and in great distress because the wolves of sheer want are howling around their doors. God help us to do our duty in this trying hour.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] told us yesterday of a report from the Red Cross, telling of a mother down in Tennessee with four little children, hollow eyed, emaciated, begging the mother for something to eat. She had some rancid grease, which she was mixing with a little meal to cook them some johnnycakes. This white mother in America is facing starvation with her little children. It is the duty of this great Government to see to it that starving men, women, and children are fed.

It is estimated that more than two millions of people in the drought-stricken area are suffering for want of food and clothing. They have been overtaken by a drought, a condition over which they have no control is upon them, and they are crying to us to "come and help us or we die."

Let me give a note of warning to Senators on the other side. I sympathize with the President. I know he has a hard and difficult situation to deal with. I fear that somebody is misinforming him. Senators, here is what is going to happen one of these days: We are going to have reports coming here, if something is not done quickly, of men, women, and children dying of starvation and funerals being held to bury them in a land where there is more wealth than in all the other countries in the world. Will we permit such a thing to happen? God forbid.

Mr. President, I commend the Red Cross for what it is doing, but it is not able to meet the requirements of the hour. It is not reaching and feeding the hungry as they should be reached and fed. It is doing something, but it is not doing enough.

The Government, which can lend \$500,000,000 to the railroads; the Government, which can lend one hundred and thirty-five to one hundred and fifty million dollars to the Ship Trust; the Government, which will permit national banks to buy bonds and then deposit them with the Government and have the Government issue money to the amount of the bonds, and take it out and use it and charge interest on it, can certainly rise to the occasion now and come gladly and lovingly to the rescue of the distressed and starving and save men, women, and children and make them happy once more in this the greatest government in all the world. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must warn the occupants of the galleries that there must be no demonstration of approval or disapproval.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this controversy over human relief has been injected into this body and the House of Representatives and before the President, creating a sharp difference of opinion and an issue which daily has become more exaggerated, disturbing the orderly procedure of the Congress. I am sure there is not a Senator who desired to create an issue on this question, and, of course, no one believes that the President desired to raise this issue. It is just a situation that has been thrown upon us, which, in my opinion, able men, conscientious legislators, ought to be able to settle humanely and in the public interest.

This is no time for men of high standing to become piqued, for leaders of thought to lose their heads, either the Congress or the President to become so irritated over the issue that we or he can not think along straight lines.

My 20 years' experience in the House and the Senate has taught me to observe that all legislation is a matter of com-

promise. I have never been able to have my way in all things; I have not desired it. I have sought counsel and advice. I have desired cooperation, because I have appreciated that only through that avenue could I reach my goal.

So it would seem to me that there may be in this controversy not an issue but a mere difference of opinion, and I am glad that in the statement issued by the President only this afternoon he has seen fit to express himself in a more conciliatory spirit, and it seems to me he has opened the way by which the Congress and the Executive might get together.

For my part, that is all I want, and I do not see how in good grace anyone should desire more. The fact that I might think that \$25,000,000 or \$50,000,000 is necessary in order to relieve the distress and the suffering in the afflicted area does not make that amount absolutely the correct one, but the thing to do is to clarify the situation, and for all of us with a common purpose to try to get together and adjust our differences.

The statement of the President which has just been given to the press, as I have said, is more conciliatory than some of the statements heretofore issued from the White House. I notice that he says—and I congratulate him upon the expression:

I do not wish to add acrimony to a discussion, but would rather state the case as I see its fundamentals.

He has that right. Nobody believes that he wants to add acrimony to the controversy. In his statement he reiterates largely what his expressed views have been in the past and again states his reasons. At the close of the statement he makes this very significant suggestion:

I will accredit to those who advocate Federal charity a natural anxiety for the people of their States.

Of course, it does not take any stretch of the imagination for one to conceive that, but I am glad to know that the President in his heart believes that those of us who made an effort to obtain some measure of relief for our people were actuated by motives conscientiously formed. Then this further very significant statement comes from the President's pen:

I am willing to pledge myself that if the time should ever come that the voluntary agencies of the country, together with the local and State governments, are unable to find resources with which to prevent hunger and suffering in my country, I will ask aid from resources of the Federal Government because I would no more see starvation amongst my countrymen than would any Senator or Congressman.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I believe that statement is true. I am not that hard-hearted nor am I that partisan that I believe the President of the United States, if he knew it, would see starving people left unaided in the United States even though he thought some other way should be found to relieve them. But the trouble about this controversy is that the President believes that the situation can be taken care of through the Red Cross and that it is being taken care of now. I have no doubt he conscientiously believes that. But others differ with him. For my part, I think the preponderance of the evidence which has come to us shows that the Red Cross is not now able to take care of the situation, and will not be able to take care of it; that it can not raise sufficient funds to take care of the situation; and that it will not be taken care of if we leave it solely to the Red Cross agencies. I say that not disparagingly of the fine efforts and heroic work of the Red Cross.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. I would like to have the Senator explain then why it was that the President appointed commissions in 22 or 23 States to go and investigate the situation and report to him. Why did he ask the Red Cross to do it at that time?

Mr. HARRISON. I think he should have done it.

Mr. SWANSON. Why should he have asked it at that time? Why did he have to appoint commissions in 22 or 23 States to examine into the situation and report to him and advise with him and then, when they reported unanimously that the condition was such that Federal aid must be invoked, refuse to do anything about it?

Mr. HARRISON. I believe in the recommendation of the commissions. I believe the President should have accepted them.

Mr. SWANSON. When does the Senator think the President ought to be satisfied to proceed to act—now or next June or July?

Mr. HARRISON. Of course he should act now. If the Senator will wait and let me explain myself fully I think he will understand exactly what I am driving at and he will know exactly my position.

I stated that I believe that the President honestly believed the money could be raised by the Red Cross. The Senator from Virginia does not believe that it can be done in that way. I do not believe it. The two able Senators from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON and Mr. CARAWAY] do not believe it. There is hardly a Senator on this side of the aisle who believes it. But I think some way can be found and ought to be found to clarify this situation and bring about some common understanding.

Mr. President, I have seen very few occurrences in this body which so impressed me as did the one on yesterday. The distinguished and eloquent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in one of the greatest oratorical flights of speech to which I have ever listened, expressed my viewpoint on the whole situation. No one with a heart could have failed to be touched. Men who are at times partisan and usually cold in politics were seen with tears upon their cheeks, moved by the fine flights of oratory and the sincere and sympathetic expressions of the Senator from Idaho for the people in our section of the country.

I believe that the heart of America is charitable. But what are we trying to do? We have not asked for anything exceptional here. The one controversy about which we have all been so distressed, the one controversy that has been raging here, has been over the provision which I want to read once more and analyze briefly, the \$25,000,000 appropriated out of the Federal Treasury.

There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$25,000,000, to be immediately available—

That is significant, because we want to take care of the situation now.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. That is not the beginning of the controversy. The controversy first was over the \$60,000,000 loan for food for man and for beast, and for fertilizer. That is where the controversy began. The controversy began because it was proposed to appropriate money for food for mules and other beasts, while at the same time refusing to appropriate money for food for human beings.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is right. That was the beginning; and all of us appreciate the fact that if the Secretary of Agriculture had not spoken up and if the President had not raised his opposition to the \$60,000,000 appropriation, it would have been made instead of \$45,000,000.

Mr. SWANSON. The other matter came up later.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but the \$25,000,000 item is largely the matter now in controversy.

Mr. SWANSON. No; we still can pass a bill providing for \$60,000,000 if the President will permit it.

Mr. HARRISON. The amount that is now in controversy in the conference committee is the \$25,000,000, which is—

To be immediately available and to be expended by the American National Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food.

Who can object to supplying food? As was said by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] just a little while ago, we made provision to supply food for animals, but are

unwilling to supply food and medicine and assistance for human beings.

Mr. SWANSON. That is for a dole, a gift. Our proposal was to make it a loan to produce a crop. That is where the controversy started.

Mr. HARRISON. I appreciate that.

Mr. SWANSON. That is not the only controversy between the President and the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not want to go back to trace the history of the whole controversy from the beginning. The one proposition that is now before us, with which the President and the Congress are grappling, is the proposed appropriation of \$25,000,000. The provision continues:

Supplying food, medicine—

Who could raise any objection to supplying food and medicine?—

medical aid, and other essentials to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency to persons otherwise unable to procure the same.

Then there is another provision that if it does not take all of the sum of \$25,000,000 which is appropriated the remainder shall be turned back to the Treasury of the United States:

Any portion of this appropriation unexpended on June 30, 1932, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, the Seventy-first Congress closes on the 4th day of March. Congress does not meet again until next December, unless an extraordinary session is called, and that is up to the President to determine. We have no alternative in the matter. We can not dominate that situation unless we want to filibuster here to defeat appropriation bills during this Congress and thus force an extra session by that method. If the ordinary procedure is pursued we will not meet after the 4th of March until next December, after many months shall have elapsed. When we have departed for our homes and when the present situation continues, as it seems it will continue, and as it becomes more aggravated, as it seems it is becoming more aggravated, what is to happen then, Mr. President? This fund can be used during the months intervening between the 4th of March and next December as an insurance, so to speak, as a reservoir that might be tapped in order to relieve the distress and suffering in those sections that need it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In line with that suggestion of the Senator I wish to emphasize the fact that in the State of Kentucky, and I am sure the same condition exists elsewhere in the drought area, the drought has been in existence for more than a year. In my State we are hauling water all over the State to supply even cities. The water level beneath the surface of the earth is so low that it will take 12 inches of rain to supply the wells and creeks and streams again. If that condition continues indefinitely, it will make it impossible to produce a crop in 1931. In what condition will those people be with Congress in recess for nine months and with no funds to relieve their distress?

Mr. HARRISON. They will be in a horrible condition, Mr. President, a most distressing situation—a situation that should not be permitted, if within our power to prevent it.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. HAWES. Having in mind the suggestion of the Senator that some compromise agreement might be reached, and having in mind the necessity for the use of a large sum of money, would not a proper compromise be for the Congress of the United States to loan to the Red Cross a fixed amount of money, \$25,000,000 or \$50,000,000, and let the Red Cross repay that loan to the Government if they were able to collect it from the people?

Mr. HARRISON. I may say to the Senator that the suggestion may be a very good one, but I think the President

should accept the \$25,000,000 proposal now before us. I think he should accept the other relief measures that we have passed by a vote of more than 2 to 1, by an almost unanimous vote in most cases, in fact.

I can not and would not offer a defense or an excuse for the position taken in his refusal to accept the \$25,000,000, especially in view of the fact that the Congress is to adjourn on the 4th of March not to meet again, unless there is an extraordinary session of Congress, until December next.

But if the President is right in his contention, conscientiously moved, I am willing to concede, as expressed in his statement of to-day, what objection could there be to the conferees writing into the bill a provision that only in the event that the situation is being taken care of through charitable institutions such as the Red Cross, that then the money shall not be used, but that if it is necessary in order to relieve distress and suffering such as exists now, then the \$25,000,000 or so much of it as may be needed shall be used. That would be carrying out the ideas expressed by the President in his statement of to-day, because he said that this money should be raised through charitable institutions, that that is the American way, that that is in keeping with our traditions and institutions. I do not agree with him about that.

Many times, as has been pointed out in the debates here, we have appropriated money out of the Federal Treasury to be used to relieve distress in this country. It has been provided in large and small amounts and to every section of the country. Many times has it been related here how the President himself asked for \$100,000,000 to be expended in relieving Europe, to take care of the hungry people there. Reference has been made to the \$20,000,000 he asked to take care of the distress in the Volga regions of Russia and the \$10,000,000 appropriated at his request for the purpose of feeding the little children of Germany in 1924. I voted for those relief measures. I believe that every Senator voted for them because we were touched by the human appeal involved. We wanted to extend assistance to the starving and distressed people in every part of the world. When I voted for those measures, it was not because I thought more of the people of Europe, the people of Russia, the people of Germany, than those of my own country. I have never been able to reconcile or understand the position of anyone who might believe it humane and right to tap the Federal Treasury to take care of suffering in Russia and in Europe, but that it was un-American, save through the Red Cross and other charitable agencies to care for the suffering among our own people.

The Federal Treasury is not more sacred to respond to the call of distress to foreign peoples than to the call of distress among our own citizens.

But, Mr. President, carrying out the President's thought that he would invoke every agency of the Federal Government, that he would draw upon all the resources of our own country, if he could not raise this money through charitable organizations, in order to take care of the suffering and the afflicted in this country—if that be true, I can not see why any objection can be raised to the appropriation of \$25,000,000, which perhaps may not be used and which ought not to be used if the situation can be taken care of through the Red Cross; but the money will be there; it will be a guaranty that relief will be afforded, that suffering will be ameliorated to some degree, and that some relief will be granted to those who are in distress. So, Mr. President, I do not believe the President is giving up wholly his conviction in this matter—as he terms it, a principle—when he will accept this amendment, and on the theory that the money will be spent only in the event that the Red Cross and other charitable organizations can not take care of the situation.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. Does not the Senator know that every appropriation passed by the Senate for the purpose of providing relief, including the \$60,000,000 appropriation, left the

expenditure absolutely and entirely in the judgment and will of the President?

Mr. HARRISON. That is correct.

Mr. SWANSON. So, instead of it being any reflection on the President, it seems to me that not within my knowledge has the Senate ever shown such confidence in the President.

President Wilson was given \$100,000,000 for the emergency of war, but we voted to give President Hoover \$60,000,000 to spend for food for man and for beast, and for fertilizer for the farm, and then in the \$25,000,000 appropriation for those in destitution and distress we left the disbursing of the fund to his judgment and to his will. He would not need to spend a cent of it unless he thought the conditions warranted.

So, I repeat, instead of the Senate reflecting on the President, it has shown more confidence in him than it has shown in any President during the last 35 years, so far as I know, and he certainly has no grievance, other than his own unwillingness to take the responsibility and to administer the relief designed to aid those in destitution and distress.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. All of the relief bills do that, do they not?

Mr. HARRISON. I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SWANSON. That was done in the \$60,000,000 appropriation voted by the Senate and in the \$25,000,000 appropriation. Discretion is left to him, and if we adjourn, the responsibility will be on him to exercise his judgment and his will. What is a President for if he can not be an executive officer and carry out the will of Congress in its desire to relieve distress. Is he to hide behind those who say that it would establish a bad precedent, when the expenditure of the \$25,000,000, just as in the case of the other appropriations passed by Congress for relief of distress, if left to his will? The Senate has not reflected on him, but has shown more confidence in him than ever I saw reposed in any President in my time. This talk about a grievance against the Senate seems to me to be absurd. I think he ought to accept it to-morrow, and, if he does not want to spend a cent of it, he need not do so. If he considers there is distress he can spend it, but certainly it can not be claimed that Congress has not shown a disposition to aid him and leave it to his will and judgment. So what ground is there for any claim that he has a grievance against the Senate?

Mr. HARRISON. I think the Senator is eminently correct in his assertions that we have given to the President great authority to spend these large sums of money, and that in this particular measure we are also placing responsibility on the President to expend it through the American National Red Cross.

Mr. President, I would go further. If the Red Cross does not want to spend it—and apparently it says it does not—I do not believe that there would be any objection to clothing the Secretary of Agriculture or clothing the President himself with the authority to spend it, if necessary, in order to take care of the appalling distress in the situation which now confronts us. I believe that all of us are trying to drive at one common goal and that is to relieve distress and to help the situation, and it seems to me that there ought to be a getting together.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will yield, if it is a question of appeasing the pride of the President and letting him think that he has gotten something, I am willing to appease his pride. If it will appease his pride and make him think he has gotten something, let him be given the same authority he has already been given in the matter of relieving distress. I want to suggest that the proposal made by the Senator from Mississippi is not as full in giving the President authority as the bills which were passed by the Senate and sent to the House, which were unlimited in the authority given.

Mr. HARRISON. I agree again with the Senator; the Senator and myself are not in disagreement about the proposition, but we want to get together if we can.

Mr. SWANSON. I suggest then that the Senator see the President and address his remarks to him, and if he wants his power limited in handling the matter in order to satisfy

his pride and a compromise can be reached in that way, I will agree to it, but the Senator's remarks ought to be addressed to the President and not to the Senators. We have done nothing to the President; we have given him unlimited power.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. HAWES. I trust the Senator from Mississippi will make some other suggestion than that the duty be imposed upon the Secretary of Agriculture. Why not select some other Cabinet officer?

Mr. HARRISON. I do not care what Cabinet officer may be selected; I am not concerned as to which one may be charged with the responsibility. I want something done.

Mr. HAWES. We have had some experience with the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with farm problems.

Mr. HARRISON. In order that we may compose our differences, if giving the responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture to expend the money would do that; personally, I would be glad to agree to such a provision.

Mr. SWANSON. I am willing to consent to that. If the President would rather act indirectly than directly I have no objection. Some would rather act directly and some indirectly. I do not know what the President prefers about it; all I want is to obtain relief for those who are suffering and in distress.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, we hear much in the newspapers about an extra session of Congress. Through a steady propaganda the business interests of the country are being led to believe that there is going to be an extra session of Congress. Every effort is being exerted to frighten some into the belief that in that event much unwholesome and unwise legislation will be passed. Personally I do not care if there is an extra session of Congress. If some legislation that, in my opinion, should be passed, could be passed through an extra session, then I would say "yes." But I know that can not be done—that the President will thwart our plans and veto such wholesome and needy legislation. I am not concerned about an extra session doing any harm. It could be a means of doing much good. The country need not be frightened about the passage of unwise and radical legislation. The Congress is a pretty sensible aggregate of individuals, and has the interest and welfare of the country at heart quite as much as those who constantly criticize it.

I am, however, perfectly willing to bear the responsibility. I would rather maintain my place in public life by standing on the side of humanity than standing for some mercenary proposal; and even though an extra session of Congress would affect business, if such a session were necessary in order to take care of and provide relief for those who are suffering in this country, then I desire to remain here and help do the job. The business people of the country who appear so frightened about this prospect should analyze the situation. We have done in this instance nothing more than past Congresses have done. We have done what President Hoover has asked other Congresses to do; we have done what President Hoover has suggested and has almost coerced Congress in doing on other occasions. So there is no defense nor will we offer any defense on that particular score.

If an extra session shall become necessary the blame is going to lie at the door of the White House and not at the door of the Congress of the United States. It may lie also at the door of the House of Representatives if it persists in carrying out the wish of the President. I look into the faces of men who have been in this body for a long time, and I believe they will bear me out in the statement that no finer cooperation in the passing of appropriation bills and the consideration of measures on the calendar has been exhibited than during the present short session of Congress. There has not been a single obstacle thrown in the way of orderly procedure. We have proposed our amendments; we have called for the yeas and nays upon certain questions, but we have made no attempt to clog the machinery of the Senate. There has been a fine spirit of cooperation, and it

does not lie in the mouth of any man either in the White House or sitting in the editorial room of some Republican newspaper to say that the Democrats have done otherwise than cooperate.

If the President wants to insist upon the adamant position that he has taken, if the House of Representatives wants to insist that no appropriation shall be made for full relief, and is not willing to compose the differences at all, then, of course, there is going to be an extra session of Congress; but do not blame us for that result. We are trying to help humanity. We do not say to the President in the amendment which we have adopted, "You have got to spend the money if it is unnecessary to do so; but we give it to you, or we give it to the Red Cross, and it may be spent as the emergency may arise, a report to be submitted to Congress, and the amount not expended to be returned to the Treasury."

The newspapers that are publishing certain types of editorials and the business element which seem to be terrified may know what is coming up in the short session of Congress. I do not know whether there will be any adjusted-compensation legislation during the present Congress or not. It looks to me like there will not be. I know there is a sharp difference of opinion as to what kind of a bill should be reported and what kind of legislation should be enacted. I have my own ideas as to what kind of legislation should be passed. I would now pass a bill similar to that which has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. GARNER, the Democratic leader there, which is similar to the bill introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], paying the present value of the certificates to those who want them cashed. I would take into consideration at the same time the 25 per cent that was given to them when the law was written, and I would at the same time adjust the interest rate so that the boys who fought for this country should not be compelled to pay more interest to the Government than the Government has to pay for the money which it has borrowed from the bondholders of the country. However, there are others who believe that the full face value of the certificates, which are not due until 1945, should be paid and should be paid now. If there shall be an extra session of Congress, that proposition will be on the doorstep of Congress. Who will be to blame for it if any blame shall be attached on that account? The President of the United States, of course, is against it because the Secretary of the Treasury is against it, and they work in harmony; they know how they feel about these questions. So when the extra session of Congress shall come on I wish to let it be known that Senators on the other side played a part in laying before the Congress for consideration and passage a bill which in all probability the President will veto, but which might be passed over his veto.

Those who become frightened every time some important question comes up for consideration in the Congress, such as the power question, the soldiers' bonus, tariff, and what not, can take their cue, and the gentleman in the White House can take his cue and will bear his part of the responsibility if these questions shall be considered at the extra session of Congress.

If an extra session of Congress is not desired, the Republican majority had better play ball a little bit. Why do they not show the same spirit that has been shown from time immemorial when legislators get together upon some great and important questions by giving here and there a little, each one not ascribing to himself all the wisdom in the world, but conceding to the other fellow the same honesty of purpose and the same conscientious motives in his suggestions and his plans as actuated him. If we will all, including the President, work on that basis, with an eye single to giving real relief to the people who are in distress in certain sections of the country, we will work out the problem and we may be able to avoid an extra session of Congress. Otherwise there is not any way out of the difficulty and the Republican Party must bear the burden of it.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, it is significant that the two hours and a half which have been occupied to-day have

been filled wholly by voices from the other side of the Chamber.

I have no desire to interfere with that monopoly. I wish merely to point out that another voice emanating from that political group has been heard within the last few days, when a formal caucus was called to serve notice upon the Senate that unless the Senate and the Executive should do what that caucus demanded there would be an extra session of Congress. So be it, Mr. President.

There is also another Democratic voice, more powerful, more far-reaching, and much more consistent, as I view it, than any which has been raised either in the party caucus held the other day or upon the opposite side of the Chamber here this morning. It is the voice of the greatest Democratic newspaper in the country, in which I find in this morning's edition, as its leading editorial, double-led, a few remarks which I ask may now be read by the clerk and included in the brief statement I have just made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the New York World of Tuesday, February 3, 1931]

DEMOCRATS, BEWARE

The Democratic Party is playing with dynamite. In the last week its leaders in Congress have placed it in the position where it can properly be charged with an irresponsible willingness to raid the Public Treasury. If the party does not extricate itself promptly from this position, if it sponsors the soldiers' bonus and the dole, if in fighting for these measures it forces an extra session and identifies itself with inflation and subsidy, it will have achieved the miracle of reestablishing the morale of the Republican Party.

The present drift of policy among the Democrats in Washington is sentimental, greedy, and unprincipled. Unprincipled, because there is no principle so fundamental to historic Democracy as opposition to the substitution of Federal for private and local action. Greedy, because the prime mover behind proposals like the one to distribute cash to veterans is a desire to buy the votes of veterans. Sentimental, because the proposal to use Federal money for so many different kinds of relief is put forward by men who believe or pretend to believe that relief will not be furnished by the sound method of local effort plus private contribution.

Among the causes which gave the Democrats their great victory last November was the disgust of the voters with the recklessness of the Republican Party in taxing the country to benefit protected industries. If the Democrats now proceed recklessly to tax the country to benefit special blocs of their constituents, they can make no case against the Republicans. If they pass the bonus and the dole, they must be silent about the tariff. For to denounce the tariff and accept the bonus and the dole would be like the kettle calling the pot black.

The only way forward for the Democrats is to retreat from the folly into which they have blundered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, this is a very good time to exercise judgment and to refrain from intemperate statement.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] has just had read into the Record an editorial from the New York World. It has relationship to the redemption in cash of bonus certificates. It is not my intention at this time to enter upon a discussion of that subject further than to point out to the Senator from New Hampshire, and to others who may be interested, the fact that the suggestions relating to legislation on that subject have come from both sides of the Chamber in the two branches of Congress.

I recall that among the first to raise that issue during this session was the brilliant "Young Turk" from Michigan, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; and I recall that numerous other Senators on the other side of the Chamber have given expression to their views regarding the subject. The same is true in the House of Representatives.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] is a very remarkable person. His individuality is notable, distinct, and charming. His resourcefulness is quite generally recognized and his affability is simply immeasurable.

Mr. President, if there is an extra session of Congress, in my judgment it will result because the President and the House of Representatives refuse to accede to measures supported by the majority of Republican Senators. It will result because of a strange and unaccountable indifference to issues and to relief legislation which challenge and invoke the concern of the people of this Nation. Let me say now that

I am no champion of an extra session of Congress. As everyone here knows, it has been my purpose and policy to contribute in every possible way to the enactment of the legislation generally regarded as essential to escaping the necessity for an extra session of Congress.

Both Houses are almost evenly divided. Marked differences of opinion exist as to the correct methods and policies to be pursued regarding legislation of permanent significance. It is certain that many measures favored by those who sit on this side of the Chamber and some who are on the other side of the Chamber, if enacted, would encounter Executive veto. But from the very beginning, Mr. President, it has been understood, in so far as I am capable of making it understood, that fair and adequate emergency measures must be enacted during the present session of the Congress, or the administration must accept the responsibility for an extraordinary session, even granting that if such a session be held there would still exist many of the difficulties that are being encountered now.

Anyone is at liberty to say that political motives underlie the attitude thus asserted. If partisan political motives prompt that position, I am unconscious of it. Long before this session of Congress convened the Chief Executive of this Nation—who had established a world-wide reputation as leader in movements of relief in times of great disaster or peril—summoned to the city of Washington prominent citizens from every State within the drought-stricken region. It was announced that relief committees would be organized to cooperate with a national committee headed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Promptly there came to the Capital individuals from every State in the territory affected. They conferred together for a prolonged period, reached a conclusion, and announced it. That conclusion was that \$60,000,000 would be required of the Federal Treasury in order to provide from national sources that measure of relief which the President's own agencies contemplated would be necessary.

The representatives from the territory concerned went back home, effected county and township organizations, made surveys of the existing conditions and estimates of probable future requirements, and submitted their report. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]—a patriotic representative of a great constituency—moved promptly to carry out the will and purpose of the agency set up by the Chief Executive. His joint resolution was unanimously reported to the Senate. After due consideration, it was unanimously passed by the Senate. In that joint resolution the representatives of the administration recognized the equality of the man with the mule, recognized the necessity for making provision to supply food for both man and beast in the season approaching when crop production must be resumed.

If the Secretary of Agriculture had not receded from the position which he took as the representative of the President in the assembly of the President's chosen spokesmen from the various States, if the President and the Secretary of Agriculture had gone forward and advised the enactment of that measure, there would have been very little controversy as to other measures. But for some reason which has never been explained the Secretary of Agriculture changed his attitude. He declared, in the conference to which reference has been made, in favor of a Federal appropriation for relief in the drought-stricken areas aggregating \$60,000,000. Before a committee of the body at the other end of the Capitol he subsequently stated that he had no recollection of any such agreement or conclusion. Recently a great man who was a member of the President's drought-relief committee, ex-Governor Byrd, of Virginia, issued a telegram challenging the Secretary of Agriculture to call back together in conference the men who had heard his statement, in order that they might then reach a conclusion as to whether the Secretary of Agriculture had changed his position. No action was taken on the demand of the former Governor of Virginia, thus warranting the conclusion that he correctly stated the facts, and that for

some mysterious and unexplained reason the Secretary of Agriculture had taken backwater.

In his statement issued this morning, President Hoover declares that it was generally understood from the beginning that there should be no Federal appropriation to relieve those who are suffering from want of food, and suffering from cold, in the drought-stricken areas, and that the entire obligation should rest on charitable organizations.

Who entered into any such understanding? In the message I sent to the President of the United States, when he asked that there be no filibuster against appropriation bills, I declared to him explicitly that the legislation of this session, in my judgment, should embrace adequate relief measures, and that his cooperation in the passage of such measures was hoped for and expected.

Is there any Senator who will insist, from the knowledge he possesses of the conditions which exist in almost one-half the territory of this Union, that adequate relief has been granted? If there is any who does so insist, let him rise now, for we are facing an issue which must not be evaded. If there is any Senator who takes the position that the Congress of the United States has done what the President's agencies thought should be done in the beginning, any Senator who believes that the Congress has done its duty in the passage of emergency measures, let him state it now, or "else forever afterward hold his peace."

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. Will the Senator give us the total of amounts appropriated by Congress?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. No; I do not know the total of amounts appropriated by Congress. The Senator may state that if he desires to do so.

Mr. MOSES. What I am seeking to bring out is with reference to the total number of those claimed to be in distress, and the relation between that number and the total appropriations made by Congress plus the sum of money given from private sources.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well; I will discuss the subject, if the Senator desires to have me do so.

I have asked that any Senator who believes that the Congress has met the standard contemplated by the President's commission rise and say so. We passed a measure contemplating the speeding up of the construction of Federal buildings, with a view to giving employment to a considerable number of unemployed.

We passed what is known as the feed, seed, and fertilizer loan bill, carrying \$45,000,000. Already to-day that bill has been discussed in its relation to the value which it has in the sections which it is designed to relieve.

Mr. MOSES rose.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does the Senator desire to ask me a question?

Mr. MOSES. No; I merely wanted to say that I think the Senator has misinterpreted the question I asked him. What I am trying to get at is the relation of the total sum available for relief to the total number of people who claim to be in distress. Knowing that, it might be possible to take up the challenge of the Senator. I particularly wished to rise in my place now in order that I might not be estopped under the Senator's declaration that otherwise I must forever hereafter hold my peace.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, it is notable by all who hear this colloquy that the Senator from New Hampshire, instead of responding to the challenge, has asked a question.

There was an appropriation of \$45,000,000 for seed, feed, and fertilizer loans, and that requires, as it is being administered, that everyone who secures such a loan must pledge practically all the security he has, and must divest himself of any opportunity to secure food.

Why is it that some who take a part in this controversy fail to realize that the first requirement of a crop grower is food for himself and for his family? Why is it that those who are opposed to adequate relief insist that it is perfectly

appropriate that the Federal Government shall make loans to feed work stock, but that it is violative of all principle to make loans to feed the people who work the stock?

When anyone answers that question to his own satisfaction there will be some basis for argument that this Congress has taken steps to provide adequate relief for those who are in distress within the drought regions.

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. GLENN. I rise to obtain some information, if possible.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no doubt the Senator needs it.

Mr. GLENN. I admit that; which is more than some other people who need it will admit.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Perhaps the Senator can supply me with some information.

Mr. GLENN. I am trying to get some information—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is it the Senator desires to know?

Mr. GLENN. With which perhaps the Senator from Arkansas may be familiar.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well. The Senator must not take my attempts at humor too seriously.

Mr. GLENN. Not at all. I really would like to know—and I know the Senator from Arkansas has given this matter his very close attention—to what extent the various States affected by the drought have through their general assemblies made appropriations in an effort to take care of their own people. I am not asking that as a matter of argument or of controversy. I am simply seeking to elicit the information.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I can not give the Senator the information in detail which I would like to supply.

Early last summer relief committees were organized in the State of Arkansas, and contributions were made, privately and publicly, for supplying the wants of those who were in distress, and quite large sums were expended in that way which have not been accounted.

The Legislature of the State of Arkansas met on the second Monday in January last, just a few weeks ago. No statute has finally passed and been signed by the governor, but a number of measures are pending looking toward very liberal action on the part of the State.

One measure passed the house of representatives authorizing a bond issue of \$15,000,000 to provide food for the people who are in distress. Another, providing for the appropriation of a considerably smaller sum, passed the other branch of the general assembly. There are also pending measures providing for bond issues approximating \$20,000,000, to authorize the construction of what are known as farm-to-market roads.

One of the difficulties, however, of the final enactment and execution of such measures grows out of the fact that the State itself, in its political character, has suffered comparably to the citizens, and that for the time being many of the citizens are unable to meet their tax obligations. There will be a moratorium as to taxes, in all probability, until August or September. Those who are able to do so will be expected to pay as promptly as possible, but there are many citizens, including most of the farmers, who would, if compelled to pay their taxes now, have to permit proceedings for sale for taxes on the part of the State government. So that the problem to which the Senator has referred in itself presents very great difficulty.

Let me say this to the Senator, however, that notwithstanding the fact that there are 500,000 people out of about 2,000,000 in the State who are now on the roll of the Red Cross to receive charity, notwithstanding the fact that most of the banks of the State have closed and are not functioning, and that most of the merchants are unable to make any advances, the people of the State are promising to meet their assessments and to contribute their share to the \$10,000,000 which the Red Cross is seeking to raise.

If there is implied in the question of the Senator from Illinois any suggestion that the people of the State of

Arkansas are indifferent to their obligations or to their duties, I think in the answer I have given him he will find that the implication is unfounded.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield gladly.

Mr. GLENN. I did not intend, and I endeavored to make it clear that I did not intend, to start any controversy. I was trying to get some information. I have seen advertised recently a four-and-a-half-million-dollar bond issue of the State of Arkansas for hard-road purposes within the last 30 days, and in this great distress—and I am familiar with it, because I am really a neighbor of the Senator, living in that end of Illinois which is adjacent to his State—I was wondering whether the general assembly of his State had been called together into extraordinary session to deal with this great problem and whether or not it had made any appropriation at all up to this time. I am not seeking controversy; I am seeking information.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Have I answered the Senator to his satisfaction?

Mr. GLENN. The Senator has, stating that there has been no appropriation made up to this time, but that there are some bills providing for appropriations now pending.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wish to extend the explanation, appreciating the spirit in which the Senator makes his inquiry.

The advertisement to which he refers relates to bonds which were authorized some time ago, probably before the beginning of the distress period. Those bonds have not been sold; and, frankly, there will be great difficulty in selling a large bond issue under the present conditions of the bond market. I do not expect to go into that in great detail. The Senator is probably better informed about it than I am.

But it does seem appropriate to say that during the last two years there has been what to me is an unaccountable decline in the price of bonds, even the very best private bonds, and there was during 1929 a diversion of investments from bonds to stocks which culminated in the disaster that occurred on the stock market a little more than a year ago.

I am not able to say what legislation the State will enact or what measure of relief may be relied upon from the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas; but I do know that, granting that it shall do all that we may hope for, there is requirement for the measures that have been presented here and which have received the approval of the Senate.

The President in his statement this afternoon expresses disappointment that one branch of the Congress and some Members of the Senate are not willing to leave this matter entirely to the Red Cross. He said that it is our customary way of dealing with such problems, and that it is a departure from sound principles to permit the Federal Government to take any part in meeting a situation like that which now exists.

Mr. President, has President Hoover forgotten how he came here and asked the Congress to appropriate \$25,000,000 for drought relief in Russia? Has the President of the United States reached the conclusion that there is something particularly virtuous in giving aid to starving Soviets, but that it is entirely damnable to show the same consideration to starving Americans?

Has the President forgotten that he came here and urged the Congress to appropriate \$100,000,000 for the relief of Belgians and other Europeans at a time when he said the resources of the country were so completely exhausted that it was unfair to invoke the assistance of charity or the Red Cross; and that it was sound and just to require contributions from the Federal Treasury?

I have on another occasion pointed out that these appropriations which President Hoover, then citizen Hoover, so earnestly advocated and justified in argument were made at a time when many citizens in the country were enjoying large profits from business incident to the war activities of the Nation, and that they were better able then to meet the expenses incident to relieving starving humanity by private

charity than our citizens are now, when we all must realize that almost every community in the United States has been under the obligation for a prolonged period of raising funds and making contributions to meet the requirements of persons out of employment, of citizens who are in great distress.

There is a measure of injustice in demanding of the people of our country that they make charitable contributions for purposes of general relief. I am anxious to see the Red Cross drive succeed, and I am giving it all the assistance that I feel capable of giving. I know it has been said, and I think unfairly said, that any proposal that the Federal Government shall pay a part of the expense of this great task is a blow at the Red Cross.

Why, Mr. President, it was not considered a blow at the Red Cross just a few years ago when my eloquent and charming friend from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] asked the Congress of the United States to appropriate liberally for the relief of the friends and wards of the Government in Porto Rico. I recall that then the Red Cross did its part and the Federal Government did its part. There was no suggestion then from Mr. John Barton Payne or President Hoover or anyone else that such a policy and practice was calculated to dry up the sources of charity in the United States. It is unfair and unjust under present conditions to demand both of the people who are to be relieved and the people who are to relieve them that they contribute all of the funds that are to be provided to meet the requirements of the present disturbing condition.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. May I say to the Senator that the picture which he has painted this afternoon of conditions in the State of Arkansas, the efforts that the legislature is making in the face of great difficulties, and the number of people there who are starving and will receive aid from the Red Cross is one which must make everyone feel that this is an unusual and extraordinary situation in which the Federal Government should aid. I do not believe that there are many States that are in the same situation.

But I do not desire to interrupt the Senator to debate that matter. I merely rose because of his reference to Porto Rico in order to straighten out my own position in the matter in regard to Porto Rico.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Will not the Senator do that at some other time, because I am not seeking to make any attack upon my friend. I thought I was complimenting him. I would rather he would straighten out his own record at his own leisure. It is not a matter of very great concern to me.

Mr. BINGHAM. But the Senator misrepresented my position.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, if I have done that, I apologize.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator misrepresents my position with reference to granting money to the Red Cross at that time to aid Porto Rico.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, no; I did not say that.

Mr. BINGHAM. I so understood the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, no; I said nothing of the kind. What I said in substance was that the Senator from Connecticut advocated an appropriation on the part of the Federal Government, which was made, a liberal appropriation, too, and at the same time the Red Cross did its share, and that there was cooperation between the Red Cross and the Federal Government. I could not understand and, I repeat, I can not understand why it is possible for the Red Cross and the Federal Government to cooperate in Porto Rico and impossible for each of them to do the best they can in the United States. When the Senator from Connecticut answers that question he will disclose more information than I think he possesses. [Laughter.]

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. With pleasure.

Mr. COUZENS. I would like to ask the Senator if there is any difference between the Senator's contention now and what was proposed when the commissions about which the President spoke got together and recommended the \$60,000,000 appropriation? In other words, if we were to comply with the recommendations of those commissions now, would the Senator be satisfied?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I have said from the beginning, in every speech I have ever made on the subject, that the people in distress would prefer loans to charity from the Federal Government, and it was only as a result of the refusal of the body at the other end of the Capitol to recognize their right to loans for food that I was prompted to insist upon supplementing the funds of the Red Cross with adequate appropriations to provide food in order that the people might escape the danger of starvation.

Mr. COUZENS. I do not think the Senator answered my question. In other words, if we were to appropriate \$60,000,000 recommended, in the aggregate including the \$45,000,000 and \$15,000,000 more, letting it be used as a loan for food for humans and for animals as well, would the Senator be satisfied?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have said since I began this discussion that, in my opinion, if that arrangement had been made in the beginning there would be little difficulty at the present time. If the Senator is prepared to offer that as a compromise of the existing controversy, I will be ready to answer him; but I do not think he ought to ask me to recede from the \$25,000,000 amendment upon the mere hope that somebody may offer the \$15,000,000 to be loaned, as we all understood was provided in the joint resolution of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I will reserve judgment on that question until some one makes a proposal that there is some opportunity to carry out. If the \$15,000,000 provision had gone through in the McNary joint resolution, as it ought to have gone through, there being no excuse for its failure, there probably would not have arisen the necessity for asking to supplement the Red Cross fund in so far as the drought-stricken region is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Having read rather carefully the regulations and restrictions under which the \$45,000,000 will be loaned to farmers, which, in my judgment, will deprive many thousands of them of the opportunity to borrow under that measure, I am wondering whether any amount we might provide as a loan would ever reach the hungry people if the Department of Agriculture or any other agency threw around it the same restrictions that have been thrown around the seed, feed, and fertilizer appropriation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is entirely true. The feed, seed, and fertilizer loan is not going to be very effective. Earlier in the day I attempted to establish that fact from evidence which has been placed in the Record. If it is necessary I will review that for just a moment before passing back to other phases of the subject.

The seed, feed, and fertilizer loan as it is being administered requires the farmer to give a first mortgage on his crop, and requires the landlord and the tenant to waive all claim to the crop in favor of the loan, which means that the ordinary farmer, five out of six of them I should say, will be unable to avail himself of the seed loan because he must reserve his crop for loans which will also include food. Now why the mind of the President can not grasp that fact, why the Secretary of Agriculture can not grasp that simple statement, I am unable to comprehend. It looks to me almost axiomatic that the farmer must live and his family must live while he is growing the crop, and that it is poor satisfaction to him to know that his mule or his cow is enjoying the luxury of food while he himself and his family are being deprived of that very necessary commodity. It is a strange arrangement. It is an unreasonable provision.

Then it is said that if a man makes any misrepresentations in order to get a loan he will be put in jail and fined a very large sum, which means that he must be very careful in securing and using the fund loaned under the seed and fertilizer law for the purposes contemplated by that act, and that he is in some danger of going to jail if he takes from his mule the corn purchased by the borrowed money and gives it to his wife or his baby. Has it come to a time when the principles upon which this Republic rests require measures of that character?

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am sorry to interrupt the Senator, but while he is reciting the conditions under which loans for feed would be made, I should like to remind him that people against whom judgments have been recorded, or on whose property mortgages have been placed, must have them waived before they can get any relief.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I have received a number of telegrams in the last two days from chambers of commerce to the effect that the seed loan administration insists that the Federal land banks must waive foreclosure, and all mortgagees or claimants must waive any right to an interest in or a lien on the crop before a seed loan will be granted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Just one moment. That means that a large number of persons who are most in need of the seed and feed loans can not get them, because the land banks and other creditors probably can not make the waiver that is required. Now, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Do I understand the Senator to say if any farmer who might be in need of seed under this appropriation already has a mortgage on his farm of record in the courthouse that the holder of that mortgage must go and release that mortgage of record, or must enter into a written agreement not to foreclose it while the crop is being raised before the farmer who applies for a loan can secure it?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; the holder of the mortgage must waive his lien and make it subordinate to the feed, seed, and fertilizer loan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, under those conditions, that would apply to practically every farmer; because there are very few of them who do not have mortgages of record on their farms at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Last year there was not 1 farmer in 10 in the drought-stricken regions who was able to satisfy the mortgages he had made on last year's crop and the mortgage that he had placed on his land. So the result will be that unless the prior mortgagee, the man who actually already has a mortgage on the property, waives it or agrees not to foreclose, there can be no loans made.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CARAWAY. About all that can be expected, if the Government is to do anything for our people, is that they must become foreigners. If they move to Russia, then they can get relief.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, yes. That reminds me of a little story which was printed in the Washington Herald from the pen of George Rothwell Brown. We all know him, and we all know that he is not unfriendly to the powers that be. George Rothwell Brown said—now listen:

The Red Cross refuses to accept \$25,000,000 from Congress for the relief of the destitute. There is not anything in it for the Albanian. This raises the question as to whether the Red Cross is an adjunct of the White House or an adjunct of the American people, as it seems chiefly concerned now in the relief of Mr. Hoover.

Mr. President, if I had made that statement, from limit to limit of this country the gentlemen in the press gallery would have sent the message, "ROBINSON is injecting politics; he is trying to play politics"; but that comes from the pen of a man who has been a Republican, God forgive him [laughter], ever since I first knew him.

One of these days, when time permits, I want to have something to say a little more in detail about the course the Red Cross has taken in this matter and something to say about the influences which prompted it to abrogate the function that has made its name great and glorious in periods of distress.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. Right on that point I desire to say that in January, 1919, when the present occupant of the White House, as Food Administrator, was, in a sense, importuning the Congress of the United States to appropriate \$100,000,000 to feed the distressed people of European nations, a proposition was made in the other branch of Congress to amend the bill so as to require that the expenditure of that money should be committed to the National Red Cross. The discussion over that proposition was very energetic and in like measure bitter. It occupied the attention of the House of Representatives for an entire week, and 117 Members of that body voted to take from the President of the United States, through Mr. Hoover, the right to expend the \$100,000,000 and commit its distribution to the Red Cross. Does the Senator from Arkansas recall whether or not the Red Cross then precipitantly adopted a resolution saying to the Congress of the United States that it would refuse to spend that money if committed to its care?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do recall that it did not such thing. My colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] yesterday discussed the subject just referred to by the Senator from Virginia in its relation to the Russian appropriation. He did not, in so far as my memory goes, however, explain that the same thing that he said about the Russian appropriation had equal application to the large appropriation made for the benefit of all Europeans except those residing within the Central Empires. When the latter measure was presented to the House of Representatives—the measure appropriating \$100,000,000 from the Federal Treasury to feed foreigners, adopted at the urgent request of Mr. Hoover, who insisted then that it was unfair to rely on private charity and entirely just and proper to draw on the Federal Treasury—the present chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, Mr. Wood, of Indiana, offered an amendment. He thought the President ought not to make a distribution of that nature; but it never occurred to him, or to Representative SNELL, or to Representative TILSON, that it was unsound in principle to appropriate money from the Treasury to feed starving people even though they were foreigners and we owed no direct responsibility to them. The one thought that inspired their intense activities at that time was that the distribution ought not to be made by the President, but that it ought to be made by the American National Red Cross. At that time the Red Cross never raised its voice against distributing Federal funds. It was willing, apparently, to take \$25,000,000 of the money of the people of the United States and go across the sea and enter the soviet republics and administer to sufferers there the funds of the people of the United States.

When Mr. Wood presented the amendment to the joint resolution carrying an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the relief of foreigners and insisted that the proper agency to make the distribution was the Red Cross, neither Mr. John Barton Payne nor anyone representing the Red Cross raised a voice in protest. When the Porto Rican incident arose, and it was expected that Federal money would be spent, along with moneys collected by volunteer contributions, no one then suggested that it was an unfriendly act to the Red Cross to ask its cooperation in such relief measures.

Mr. GLASS and Mr. BINGHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and if so, to whom?

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

Mr. GLASS. I call attention to the fact that when Judge Payne appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate he took the position that should the Government appropriate a large sum of money for present relief there could be no other effective agency than the Red Cross for its expenditure.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And he stated that if the Congress asked the Red Cross to make the distribution his organization would comply with the request.

Mr. GLASS. Quoting from Judge Payne, he said:

If the Government, for instance, should make a large appropriation to be used for food, how on earth would anybody create an organization to administer that relief unless he should get some such organization as the Red Cross possesses?

I interrupt the Senator because to me, Mr. President, the most distressing aspect of this whole thing is the disclosure that the National Red Cross will permit itself to be used for purposes not designed in its charter or in the proper conception of its functions.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have a great deal of sympathy with the Senator's position regarding the refusal of the officials of the Red Cross to accept the money proposed to be appropriated, and I say personally, without representing anyone but myself, that I think it was a mistake on their part; I think that, as one of the great national agencies for the relief of distress, it was their duty to take any money which Congress may have appropriated and use it to the best of their ability and with all their organization and their capacity to do so.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BINGHAM. But in regard to the Porto Rican matter, the Senator has been misinformed, because the Red Cross did not at that time receive any money from the Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I never said that the Red Cross had received any money from the Government.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, no; the Senator has simply misunderstood what all Senators about me here understood perfectly. I said that the Federal Government made an appropriation, and that the Red Cross used funds received from voluntary contributions, and that there was cooperation, and there is no reason now why there could not be the same cooperation.

I think that will satisfy my friend; and, supporting what the Senator from Connecticut has just said, although I had not intended to go into that phase of the subject this afternoon, just a day or two ago I received a letter from a college president in one of the States. It does not seem to me advisable to publish the name of that president. I have not his permission to use his letter in debate; but I am going to read some extracts from the letter in order to show how the action which the Red Cross has recently taken in refusing to distribute funds from the Federal Treasury is appealing to men of high intellectual and moral standing. This letter is similar to hundreds that have come to me within the last few days. It is dated January 29:

MY DEAR SENATOR ROBINSON: I read with amazement last night that the Red Cross had announced that it would not accept the administration of the proposed \$25,000,000 Government relief fund. There is no excuse for this action by the Red Cross. It is, as Senator COPELAND said, a crime against humanity.

Then I omit from the letter certain personal allusions in which the Senate would not be interested, and resume the quotation:

I regard the action of the central committee of the Red Cross as an unwarranted interference in the orderly progress of legislative measures through Congress in which they, as representatives of the Red Cross, had no interest whatever. They were merely to be the channels of administration. As individuals, they might be concerned about the relative efficiency of Government aid contrasted with private benevolence; but as representatives of the Red Cross they had no interest and should have been silent.

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. What happened? The Senator has hinted at it; but what happened between the time when Judge Payne was before our committee and the time when this announcement was made?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is just what I was about to discuss.

Mr. COPELAND. I am glad the Senator is going to discuss it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But there is a lack of information on that subject. If the head of the Red Cross announced to a committee of the Congress that while the Red Cross did not invite Federal contributions for expenditure through its agencies, if the Congress did make appropriations for that purpose it would carry out the purpose, one would think that before changing that attitude some explanation would be given. The fact is that the attitude taken by the Red Cross was for the sole purpose of attempting to defeat the \$25,000,000 appropriation; to make it appear, if you please, that even though the appropriation were made, it would not be distributed or expended.

Ask yourself what happened to cause this change of attitude. There is only one power or influence on this round globe that could have driven Mr. John Barton Payne from the sane position that he occupied when he appeared before the committee to the position that he took when he announced that the Red Cross would not expend any Federal funds whatever; and that influence, in all probability, is the Chief Executive of this Nation, who is the President of the Red Cross.

Does not Mr. Payne owe the obligation to explain why one day he said, "Oh, yes; if you ask us to do it we will do it, though we do not wish to," and another day, a few days later, he said, "No matter what you provide, we will not accept one dollar of Federal money for distribution; our funds must come alone from voluntary contributions"?

The New York Telegram, in an editorial entitled "Save the Red Cross," comments on this course of the organization under its leadership; and this editorial and other editorials make important distinctions between the Red Cross as a whole and the group that sat around a board here in Washington and, probably under the influence and direction of the President of the United States, took an action which has shocked the entire Nation, and which has done more to impair the influence of the Red Cross than any act that any Senator or Representative could possibly perform. It is pointed out that there was no excuse for declaring that, even if Congress should make the appropriation, its action would be futile, no matter how badly the sum might be needed.

You remember that the provision under consideration expressly provides that it applies only to those who are unable to obtain food in any other way or from any other source. It left the executive or distributing agency entirely free to withhold expenditure or disbursement. It could have been expended only in the event the funds of the Red Cross were inadequate to meet the requirements of those in distress for want of food. With more than 1,000,000 persons on the Red Cross roll receiving doles, with three or four months ahead before there can be a great diminution in this number, and with the prospect that the number will greatly increase during that three or four months, we are told that we should fold our tents and leave the Capital and go home and assure the business world that there will be no extra session of Congress and leave these people to a peril which human language can not describe.

For my part, I do not intend to take that course, nor do I intend to encourage others to do so. Much as I should regret to be in Washington in an extra session of Congress this summer, rather than see an imperative duty neglected, I will gladly consent to sacrifice personal comfort.

I remember that just before the French Revolution began there was heard in a land of plenty the cry for bread. We

have in the granaries of the Federal Government almost 100,000,000 bushels of wheat; and yet 1,000,000 men, women, and children of your blood and mine are suffering for want of food!

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Before the Roman revolution, when the people became discontented and hungry, they were given a loaf of bread and a circus. Now we only give them a circus. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And a poor circus at that; a miserable one-ring circus, with no clown and no monkey. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to his colleague?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do.

Mr. CARAWAY. I think my colleague is mistaken about that. I think we have both the clown and the monkey; but I want to call my colleague's attention, if he will permit me, to this fact:

There sits in the gallery now a gentleman who is the engineer for a drainage district down in Arkansas. Some people have talked about the general situation and whether or not the people are willing to relieve their own necessities. That question was asked a minute ago. This drainage district, at the solicitation of the Red Cross, agreed to employ men. They are to get a dollar a day in food. If a man has a wife, he is permitted to work one day a week. If he has a wife and child, he can have two days' work a week. If he has a wife and three children, he can have three days' work a week. The longest, however, that any man may have work is five days a week. At a dollar a day for eight hours a day, doing the hardest work that men may do, 275 men, when the offer was made, came the first day. I am told, and I will have the figures before long, that the shortest distance walked was 3 miles, and up to 6 miles. So these men walked from 6 to 12 miles a day; they worked 8 hours a day; they got a dollar a day for it; and they did not have anything at noon. They had no lunch.

Then it was suggested by these drainage people that if the Red Cross would furnish the materials they would furnish the cooking utensils, and they would give these men a meal at 12 o'clock. That was done. They were given just what they could eat; and I was told not 20 minutes ago by the man who supervised it that many of them then pleaded for the privilege of taking home with them the grounds from the coffeepots so that they might reboil them to make them into coffee, and that men who were permitted to work one day a week walked 6 miles back and offered to work the rest of the time in order that they might have merely a midday meal the rest of the week! Yet somebody says that these people are just unwilling to work, and that the people there are asking for relief because they are too lazy to work! That fact is available to them if they want to look into it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, it is the old, old story. How strange it is that men who count themselves wise refuse to learn from history! How strange it is that men who themselves enjoy abundance are so slow to realize the extremity and the necessity of fellow beings! Always the world has known poverty and sorrow, and always it will know that misery is incident to human existence. But, Mr. President, can we not learn some lesson from the experience of other peoples?

Can we not derive some profit from their sacrifice and their suffering? You tell me that it is inconsistent with sound principles of government to require the whole people to contribute to the relief of a large number who are in distress? You tell me that it is bad for our civilization to use Federal funds in saving the lives of those who owe our flag allegiance, and who, through no fault of their own, have come to suffer peril from want? It is the old, old story: If we remain indifferent, if we insist that the comparatively few who are disposed and able shall make voluntary con-

tributions for relief in cases of widespread calamity, and that the people as a whole shall be entirely exempt from any such responsibility, there may come a day when, with measured tread and deafening cry, millions of deserving men and women will advance shouting "Bread! Bread! Bread!" to the destruction of public institutions.

There is no more sacred obligation on government than to yield back to those who sustain it some share of their contribution when necessity requires that course.

The President cites the instance when President Cleveland vetoed a bill of this nature. Yet those who were associated with the President's political party in the Congress voted unanimously to override Mr. Cleveland's veto, and everyone knows that in the years that have come and gone since Mr. Cleveland's day the Federal Government has established numerous precedents in which it has appropriated Federal funds for the relief of its citizens. Such cases have been cited in this debate. At the time of the San Francisco fire or earthquake \$500,000 was immediately appropriated. Money was appropriated from the Federal Treasury in the case of the fire at Salem, Mass., and in the Porto Rican case, to which reference has already been made. Numerous precedents have been cited in the Senate to show that it is the established custom of the Government, whenever a disaster is far enough reaching, to make a Federal appropriation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, was not the appropriation for the people of San Francisco about \$2,700,000?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; the original appropriation was \$500,000, and there was not one word from any Senator or Representative in opposition to the appropriation. There was not a word in opposition to the appropriation in the case of the fire in the city of Salem. Yet there were thousands of homes which could have made provision for those who were temporarily deprived of shelter by the fire. That situation could easily have been handled by charity. But the Federal Government elected to make an appropriation, and no one raised a voice in protest.

Now we hear that it is unreasonable and unjust, so unreasonable and so unjust that those who oppose this appropriation and other relief measures will permit an extra session of Congress, although they seem to think that that is the worst thing that can happen to the country.

Very well. Let them take their share of responsibility, and let us who want adequate relief legislation take our share of the responsibility, and, please God, the Government will still survive for some time yet to come.

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have concluded, but I will retain the floor and yield to the Senator.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I do not know whether this, among other precedents, has been cited in the course of the debate, which I have not been able to follow because of duties elsewhere, but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the Taft administration, in 1909, Congress appropriated the sum of \$800,000 to relieve the destitute people of Italy by providing for them food, clothing, medicines, and other necessary articles.

There is one single phase of that action which perhaps was never paralleled before. So insistent were the American people, through their representatives in Congress, upon affording that relief that the bill itself says:

In the execution of this act the President is requested to ask and obtain the approval of the Italian Government.

In other words, the Italian Government itself was too proud to ask this country for relief, and this country, through Congress, asked the Italian Government to permit it to afford the relief.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, what is the moral to be drawn from the measure which the Senator from Virginia has just cited? What is the inevitable conclusion, when we recall that our President insisted that it was righteous and virtuous to appropriate money for foreigners in Russia and in Belgium and in other foreign lands, but now insists that it is shameful and ruinous to appropriate moneys for our own people? It means that in such a conception of duty and of government one must be a for-

eigner and owe no allegiance to the Stars and Stripes if he is to secure sympathy and kind treatment from the United States.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the President's statement has frequently been referred to this afternoon, and I think it ought to be inserted in the RECORD in full in connection with the debate. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Of course I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

FEBRUARY 3, 1931.

The President said:

"Certain Senators have issued a public statement to the effect that unless the President and the House of Representatives agree to appropriations from the Federal Treasury for charitable purposes they will force an extra session of Congress.

"I do not wish to add acrimony to a discussion, but would rather state this case as I see its fundamentals.

"This is not an issue as to whether people shall go hungry or cold in the United States. It is solely a question of the best method by which hunger and cold shall be prevented. It is a question as to whether the American people on one hand will maintain the spirit of charity and mutual self-help through voluntary giving and the responsibility of local government as distinguished on the other hand from appropriations out of the Federal Treasury for such purposes. My own conviction is strongly that if we break down this sense of responsibility of individual generosity to individual and mutual self-help in the country in times of national difficulty and if we start appropriations of this character we have not only impaired something infinitely valuable in the life of the American people but have struck at the roots of self-government. Once this has happened it is not the cost of a few score millions but we are faced with the abyss of reliance in future upon Government charity in some form or other. The money involved is indeed the least of the costs to American ideals and American institutions.

"President Cleveland, in 1887, confronted with a similar issue, stated in part:

"A prevalent tendency to disregard the limited mission of this power and duty should, I think, be steadfastly resisted, to the end that the lesson should be constantly enforced that though the people support the Government, the Government should not support the people.

"The friendliness and charity of our countrymen can always be relied upon to relieve their fellow citizens in misfortune. This has been repeatedly and quite lately demonstrated. Federal aid in such cases encourages the expectation of paternal care on the part of the Government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character, while it prevents the indulgence among our people of that kindly sentiment and conduct which strengthens the bonds of a common brotherhood."

"And there is a practical problem in all this. The help being daily extended by neighbors, by local and national agencies, by municipalities, by industry, and a great multitude of organizations throughout the country to-day is many times any appropriation yet proposed. The opening of the doors of the Federal Treasury is likely to stifle this giving and thus destroy far more resources than the proposed charity from the Federal Government.

"The basis of successful relief in national distress is to mobilize and organize the infinite number of agencies of self-help in the community. That has been the American way of relieving distress among our own people, and the country is successfully meeting its problem in the American way to-day.

"We have two entirely separate and distinct situations in the country; the first is the drought area; the second is the unemployment in our large industrial centers, for both of which these appropriations attempt to make charitable contributions.

"Immediately upon the appearance of the drought last August I convoked a meeting of the governors, the Red Cross, the railways, the bankers, and other agencies in the country and laid the foundations of organizations and the resources to stimulate every degree of self-help to meet the situation which it was then obvious would develop. The result of this action was to attack the drought problem in a number of directions. The Red Cross established committees in every drought county, comprising the leading citizens of those counties, with instructions to them that they were to prevent starvation among their neighbors and, if the problem went beyond local resources, the Red Cross would support them.

"The organization has stretched throughout the area of suffering, the people are being cared for to-day through the hands and with sympathetic understanding and upon the responsibility of their neighbors who are being supported in turn by the fine spirit of mutual assistance of the American people. The Red Cross officials, whose long-devoted service and experience is unchallenged, inform me this morning that except for the minor incidents of any emergency organization no one is going hungry and no one need go hungry or cold.

"To reinforce this work at the opening of Congress I recommended large appropriations for loans to rehabilitate agriculture from the drought, and provision of further large sums for public

works and construction in the drought territory which would give employment in further relief to the whole situation. These Federal activities provide for an expenditure of upward of \$100,000,000 in this area and it is in progress to-day.

"The Red Cross has always met the situations which it has undertaken. After careful survey and after actual experience of several months with their part of the problem they have announced firmly that they can command the resources with which to meet any call for human relief in prevention of hunger and suffering in drought areas and that they accept this responsibility. They have refused to accept Federal appropriations as not being consonant either with the need or the character of their organization. The Government departments have given and are giving them every assistance. We possibly need to strengthen the Public Health Service in matters of sanitation and to strengthen the credit facilities of that area through the method approved by the Government departments to divert some existing appropriations to strengthen agricultural credit corporations.

"In the matter of unemployment outside of the drought areas important economic measures of mutual self-help have been developed, such as those to maintain wages, to distribute employment equitably, to increase construction work by industry, to increase Federal construction work from a rate of about \$275,000,000 a year prior to the depression to a rate now of over \$750,000,000 a year, to expand State and municipal construction—all upon a scale never before provided or even attempted in any depression. But beyond this, to assure that there shall be no suffering, in every town and county voluntary agencies in relief of distress have been strengthened and created, and generous funds have been placed at their disposal. They are carrying on their work efficiently and sympathetically.

"But, after and coincidentally with voluntary relief, our American system requires that municipal, county, and State governments shall use their own resources and credit before seeking such assistance from the Federal Treasury.

"I have indeed spent much of my life in fighting hardship and starvation both abroad and in the Southern States. I do not feel that I should be charged with lack of human sympathy for those who suffer, but I recall that in all the organizations with which I have been connected over these many years the foundation has been to summon the maximum of self-help. I am proud to have sought the help of Congress in the past for nations who were so disorganized by war and anarchy that self-help was impossible. But even these appropriations were but a tithe of that which was coincidentally mobilized from the public charity of the United States and foreign countries. There is no such paralysis in the United States, and I am confident that our people have the resources, the initiative, the courage, the stamina, and kindness of spirit to meet this situation in the way they have met their problems over generations.

"I will accredit to those who advocate Federal charity a natural anxiety for the people of their States. I am willing to pledge myself that if the time should ever come that the voluntary agencies of the country together with the local and State governments are unable to find resources with which to prevent hunger and suffering in my country I will ask the aid of every resource of the Federal Government, because I would no more see starvation amongst our countrymen than would any Senator or Congressman. I have the faith in the American people that such a day will not come.

"The American people are doing their job to-day. They should be given a chance to show whether they wish to preserve the principles of individual and local responsibility and mutual self-help before they embark on what I believe is a disastrous system. I feel sure they will succeed if given the opportunity.

"The whole business situation would be greatly strengthened by the prompt completion of the necessary legislation of this session of Congress, and thereby the unemployment problem would be lessened, the drought area indirectly benefited, and the resources of self-help in the country strengthened."

THE RED CROSS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there was published in the Commercial Appeal on Saturday, January 31, 1931, a very important editorial entitled "Shall the Red Cross be Made a Political Football?" I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

SHALL THE RED CROSS BE MADE A POLITICAL FOOTBALL?

If there is one thing in the make-up and course of conduct of President Hoover to be remarked above his strange genius for doing the wrong thing at the right time and the right thing at the wrong time, it is his obtuse obstinacy in doing things to strengthen the opposition to himself. In his handling of the tariff and farm-relief legislation, in his casting of the World Court into the maelstrom of political complications, in his introduction of the Wickersham report at a time when Congress was already entangled with many complications, and in his stubborn recessions from an untenable and almost inhuman position on drought relief he has alienated on occasions the support of both friends and foes.

However, nothing he has done has been so absolutely inexcusable as his cruel position in refusing food and other necessities to the human victims of the drought. Of all men, he was the last who might be expected to turn a deaf ear to the agonized

cry of human distress. He had come to the attention of his own country and the world through the liberality with which he dispensed the money and the food supplies furnished by his own country to the war-stricken Belgians and others. He had been advertised as the great humanitarian and the international Samaritan in relieving the distress of many nations and peoples.

But when it came to the matter of furnishing food to his own people he took a stand against appropriating one cent and was only forced from that brutal position by riots of the hungry and by reports of Red Cross agents that there were many starving mouths which must be filled. And even then he continued his unexplainable opposition to a Government appropriation for the prevention of starvation. He set out to substitute the hazards of voluntary contributions for the certainty of a Federal appropriation, and in doing so shaved the amount from \$15,000,000 to \$10,000,000, despite the insistence of those familiar with the situation that even the larger amount was too small.

The result has been a demand by the United States Senate for a Federal appropriation of \$25,000,000 to be spent through the Red Cross. Granted, for the sake of argument, that this amount is too large, which is not granted at all by its proponents, the fact remains that the expenditure of the money was to have been made through the national organization which has handled all other national and international situations demanding relief. Surely the Red Cross could be depended upon to spend the money wisely and judiciously without waste or stint. It had been trusted with all other appropriations, and it could certainly be trusted with this.

By taking counsel with the Senate President Hoover might have effected an agreement whereby the whole amount of voluntary and Federal contributions would have been limited to the \$25,000,000. But it is not recorded that he sought such an agreement. He has opposed the Federal appropriation by every means in his power. It has even come to the point where the chairman of the Red Cross appeared before a congressional committee to voice the opposition of himself and his organization. On its very face this activity of Chairman Payne was dictated by the President himself, which very logical assumption brings against the Nation's Executive the charge of projecting the Red Cross into the mire of politics.

It was bad enough to make a political issue of the hunger and distress of American citizens, but it is infinitely worse to make a political football out of the organization which was constituted for humanitarian work on any and all occasions. The evil of a political handling of a situation wherein human lives are at stake will pass with the passing of this situation, but the evil of smearing a permanent relief body with the mud of politics will unhappily abide through other similar situations. If possible, the use of the Red Cross to bolster the position of any branch of Government in a political row is more infamous and insidious even than the creation of a political mix-up that may cause human suffering and anguish.

AMENDMENT OF WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I have some communications in which certain amendments to the World War veterans' act are urged. I ask that these be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the communications will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The communications are as follows:

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY,
DEL VALLE-Y-MARES POST, No. 29,
Bernalillo, N. Mex., January 28, 1931.

Senator S. G. BRATTON,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: As requested by Mrs. J. W. Chapman, department president, a meeting was held January 25 to discuss about amendments so that disabled veterans and widows and children of World War veterans receive pension. Our unit is much in favor that these amendments pass.

Yours very respectfully,

Mrs. A. S. TRUJILLO, Unit President.

VAUGHN, N. MEX., January 24, 1931.

Senator SAM G. BRATTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Local American Legion auxiliary unit to-day adopted resolution urging that Senators and Congressmen of New Mexico take immediate action leading to passage of amendment to World War veterans' act, giving pensions to widows and orphans, etc.

Any help you can give toward the passage of the amendment will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

UNIT TO WAYNE JOHNSON POST, No. 53,
LILLIAN LONE, Secretary.

TULAROSA, N. MEX., January 23, 1931.

Hon. SAMUEL G. BRATTON,
Member United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Mescalero Post, No. 48, Chapter of the American Legion Auxiliary, indorses the request for immediate action on

the amendment to the World War veterans' act giving pensions to widows and orphans and service-connect all disabled veterans suffering from chronic diseases up to January 1, 1925. Also urge the passing at once of reasonable hospital construction program providing for hospitalization for all veterans.

We trust that you as Senator from New Mexico will support this program.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. PAUL L. PICKINGER,
President American Legion Auxiliary, Mescalero Post, No. 48.

BACA AND SANTISTEVAN POST, No. 71,
Costilla, N. Mex.

Mr. SAM G. BRATTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRATTON: We, the Unit Auxiliary of Baca and Santistevan Post, No. 71, apply a petition to have immediate action on amendment World War veterans' act giving pension to widows and orphans and all disabled suffering from chronic constitutional diseases up to January 15, 1925.

Also to pass at once hospital construction program providing hospitalization for all veterans.

We, the unit auxiliary, do depend on your services.

Yours truly,

Mrs. J. F. QUINTANA,
Unit President.
Mrs. DEMETRIO DEHERRERA,
Unit Secretary.

Mrs. J. F. Quintana, Mrs. J. C. Sanchez, Mrs. Demetrio Deherrera, Mrs. Jose B. Barela, Mrs. Ramon De Herrera, Mrs. J. T. Santistevan, Mrs. Adolfo Valdez, Mrs. Meliton Deherrera, Mrs. Remigio Espinoza, Mrs. Senslonite De Herrera, Mrs. J. T. Rivero, Mrs. F. Arellano, Mrs. Max Archuleta, Mrs. Toviias Maes, Mrs. Juan Roybal, Mrs. Dio Vallegos, Mrs. J. T. Gallegos, Mrs. Benito Segura, Mrs. Ursulita Segura, Mrs. Horacio Lovato, Mrs. Alfredo Arellano, Mrs. Domitilio Mederia, Mrs. Manuel Trujillo, Mrs. Ray Santistevan, Mrs. Julian Pactilla, Mrs. Luis Santistevan.

ERNEST A. MICHEL

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement in the matter of the ethics of Attorney General Mitchell upon the candidacy of Ernest A. Michel to be United States district judge of Minnesota, and also to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Itasca County Independent, Grand Rapids, Minn., of Friday, January 30, 1931.

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

THE ETHICAL ATTORNEY GENERAL, MR. MITCHELL

(Statement of Senator THOMAS D. SCHALL in the matter of the ethics of Attorney General Mitchell upon the candidacy of Ernest A. Michel, the choice of the entire Minnesota delegation for United States district judge of Minnesota.)

The Attorney General's only excuse for not approving Ernest A. Michel for United States district judge of Minnesota is, under his own statements and letters, that Michel has handled at times personal-injury cases and that, therefore, his standard of ethics is not what Mr. Mitchell thinks should be that of a Federal judge. I wonder if Mr. Mitchell's standard of ethics as indicated by the facts recited below is higher than that of Mr. Michel, whom he is presuming to condemn, ignoring the advice of the entire Minnesota delegation and the elective State officials, nearly 700 lawyers, a score of judges headed by the supreme court chief justice of Minnesota. Incidentally, Mr. Mitchell, though a native of the State, has never seen fit to submit his ambitions for office to the electors of Minnesota, but his friends made a political issue of Michel's appointment in the recent election, and insisted that if I was elected Michel would be appointed. The referendum went against Mitchell, and he now contests it through the newspapers. I have always believed that this was a representative Government, not a dictatorship.

In the case of Flannery, as Administrator of the Estate of Mary T. Hill v. Willcuts, Collector of Internal Revenue (which is reported in 25 Fed. (2d) 951), the tax officials required the administrator of the Hill estate to pay to the Government the sum of \$1,000,000 on the ground that certain transfers had been made and engineered before the death of Mary T. Hill, widow of the late James J. Hill, with the idea and intent of avoiding payment of inheritance taxes.

These transfers were made by the Hon. William D. Mitchell, who is now the Attorney General of the United States.

Upon the Government's action to recover this \$1,000,000 the United States District Court for the State of Minnesota directed that the Hill estate pay to the Government \$1,000,000, on the ground that these transfers were made in violation of the revenue act of 1918.

During the hearing before the United States District Court of Minnesota our present Attorney General, Mr. Mitchell, testified as follows:

"During the years 1919, 1920, and 1921 and for some time prior thereto I acted as attorney for Mrs. Mary T. Hill, of St. Paul, widow of the late James J. Hill. In that capacity I drafted, as her attorney, all of the indentures of trust or trust agreements exe-

cuted by her during and after the year 1919, including the so-called grandchildren's trust, executed November 25, 1919, and the so-called children's trust, signed July 19, 1920.

"* * * The records and accounts of this office [his law office] show that, commencing May 19 and for a period of several days thereafter, I gave my entire time and attention to drafting the children's and grandchildren's trusts."

Upon appeal the circuit court of appeals, one of the three judges dissenting, reversed the Minnesota district court, holding that the gifts in question did not constitute a part of Mrs. Hill's taxable estate. When this decision was rendered Mr. Mitchell had been advanced to the position of Solicitor General of the United States, and it rested solely with him to say whether the case should be appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. The United States district attorney of Minnesota wrote a strong letter to the Solicitor General, urging that an appeal be taken. It never was. This ended the matter and the Government did not collect the million dollars which the United States District Court for the State of Minnesota said was due it. The various transfers and agreements by which payment of this \$1,000,000 was avoided were drawn by the highly ethical William D. Mitchell, who is now the Attorney General of the United States. Apparently he did his work efficiently and well, because the Government did not get the million dollars.

Undoubtedly Mr. Mitchell had no qualms of conscience nor any strong feeling that the ethics of his profession would require that instead of making the trust agreements that he made that he have Mrs. Hill execute a will under the terms of which the same results could have been brought about. Had a will been executed, the Government would have received approximately the million dollars which the United States District Court for the State of Minnesota held it should have received. By reason of making the trust agreements the "right-thinking" Attorney General of the United States was able to so arrange the disposition of a portion of Mrs. Hill's estate so that the million dollars in question was not paid to the Government.

There is no question but that this conduct is ethical. It is highly unethical for a lawyer to tell some injured person he can recover damages against a corporation. It seems to all depend on which side you are on and the amount involved. If it is a million dollars it is all right. If the amount is five or ten thousand dollars for a personal injury it is all wrong.

The minds of "right-thinking" lawyers function in a peculiar manner. Maybe the Attorney General is right. In any event it is a certainty that Uncle Sam did not get the million dollars. As to the fee the Attorney General received for drawing these documents, we are not informed.

It seems to me that under any standard of ethics the Solicitor General should have seen to it that the question was laid before the Supreme Court for final decision. It was his duty as Solicitor General, and his alone, if for no other reason than that he had drawn the instruments which were intended to and did deprive the Government of its lawful revenue. The case was one which only the Supreme Court could settle, since the circuit court was divided and the district court had decided in favor of the Government. Clearly it was Mr. Mitchell's duty under any standard of ethics to see that the case was presented to the Supreme Court.

[Article appearing in Itasca County Independent, Grand Rapids, Minn., Friday, January 30, 1931]

DISCUSSED SOME POLITICS—MINNEAPOLIS MAN, HERE ON BUSINESS, SCORES ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL

Truman Pierson, international president of the Mississippi River Scenic Highway System, talked a little politics while in Grand Rapids to-day. He said:

"Minnesota, with a Democrat holding the title of Attorney General in President Hoover's Cabinet, is having a hard time of it securing the much-needed services of an additional Federal judge. Mr. Mitchell, of St. Paul, supposedly speaking for Mr. Hoover, openly defies the wishes of the State of Minnesota as so clearly recorded by the recommendation of United States Senators SCHALL and SHIPSTEAD, the 10 Congressmen from the State, and some high-up State officials as well.

"Much is made of keeping politics out of the judiciary by Mr. Mitchell who quite fails to cover the fact that he is playing politics with the choice of Minnesota for the Federal judgeship, Ernest A. Michel, of Brookside, Minn. His master stroke of willfully defying the people and playing politics with the judgeship is his statement issued this week evidently timed to have bearing on the so-called secret poll of the lawyers of the State, which poll is to close January 29 and puts Michel at a decided disadvantage in that it lines him up against the field, the ballots simply calling for the answer to the question, 'Are you for or against Michel?' Mr. Pierson said:

"I have been traveling about the State considerably of late and the impression I have received is that regardless of what the lawyers of the State think about it, one way or another, the great masses of the people have sovereign rights to their opinions in regard to the selection of judges. The feeling is that they, the people, as so ably represented in Washington by the present delegation in both upper and lower Houses of Congress, have spoken for Michel. Who, then, is Mr. Mitchell that he comes into the picture in opposition to the will of the people? Many are asking this, and in Duluth and the range country I have been receiving some answers the past few days. Summed up, they indicate that

while Michel may not be a corporation lawyer, may not be approved by the Steel Trust or the railroads, for example, nevertheless his whole life has been 43 years living close to the common people. While not, therefore, had Mr. Michel realized that out in this western country the people have reclaimed their government, at least with men, it appears to us that Mr. United States Attorney General Mitchell, of St. Paul, Minn., has an idea that no judge should be appointed for Minnesota without the advice and consent of the gentleman from St. Paul, who just does not jibe with the rest of the people of his State.

"Summed up, the prevailing opinion among laymen I have met is that Senator SCHALL should not be swayed from his position despite the Minneapolis Journal, its anvil chorus of State adherents, and obstacles set in the way of what is best for the people of all of the State who after all have as much right to interest themselves as any select group or special interest.

IMPROVEMENT OF INLAND WATERWAYS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, while we are talking about relief legislation and doles I want to call the attention of the Senate to the dole system through which the Government of the United States has for more than 10 years conducted a violent assault upon the money income of the people of more than 22 States, in the passing and application of the transportation act, resulting in freight rates so high that it forms a substantial reason for the reduction in income to agriculture, particularly of the States of the Mississippi Valley. Through the raising of freight rates, the Government has provided doles for the benefit of railroad security holders.

One source of relief from this attack upon the income of that section of the country apparent at this time is through the completion of the urgently needed inland waterway system.

I want to present for the RECORD a letter from James E. Smith, of St. Louis, former president of the Mississippi Valley Association, who is known, I think, to most of the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. This letter was written in April, 1925, stating the association's position on the question of the Government of the United States issuing bonds for the purpose of financing the completion of the inland waterways on a basis that will save millions of dollars in contracts and will complete the waterway system which, through this piecemeal legislation, we have been carrying on for the past 25 or 30 years without completion and without any practical results to the people of that part of the country.

I ask that the letter be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Is there objection?

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

ST. LOUIS, April 17, 1925.

Mr. HERMAN MUELLER,

Traffic Director St. Paul Association of
Public and Business Affairs, St. Paul, Minn.

MY DEAR MR. MUELLER: The Mississippi Valley Association is strongly advocating a Federal bond issue plan for the earliest completion of all the adopted river and harbor projects of the United States. This plan as formulated by the Mississippi Valley Association is contained in H. R. 9730, introduced by Hon. Stephen G. Porter, of Pennsylvania, copy of which is inclosed. To summarize: The six outstanding provisions of this bill are as follows:

(1) For the first time in the history of our waterway improvements, it puts the development of our rivers and harbors on a sound business basis.

(2) For the first time, it affords assurance that all approved projects, with few exceptions, will be completed within five years.

(3) It provides the means for their completion at the maximum economical rate, thereby obtaining construction economies not otherwise possible, and eliminating the needless wastes which our established policy has involved.

(4) It spreads the cost over a period sufficient for the bulk of it to be paid at the time the benefits are being obtained from the improvements and by the people who are deriving such benefits.

(5) It reduces the current drain on the Treasury at the time when the financial burden is so severe and the need for economy so great.

(6) As this bill applies to all adopted projects throughout the United States, the scope of its benefits is nation-wide.

We inclose with this letter a copy of a recent address delivered in the House by Hon. C. A. Newton, of Missouri, which clearly and forcefully emphasizes and details the arguments set forth above.

We shall be grateful for any consideration you may give this proposed plan. We are hopeful that it will receive universal approval.

Yours respectfully,

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION,
JAMES E. SMITH, *President*.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I want to quote from the last annual report of the Mississippi Valley Association convention, held at St. Louis, Mo., last November. They petitioned Congress that—

In financing the scheduled program as herein outlined it takes such measures as will provide the funds required by direct appropriations or other suitable financial arrangements which will enable the Government, and so the people of the United States, to obtain all the benefits incident to comprehensive contracts and continuing operation and construction.

The association has not receded from its declared policy, and it still believes that "the benefits incident to comprehensive contracts and continuing operation and construction" can not reasonably be expected from uncertain budget appropriations unless supplemented now by "other suitable financial arrangements."

I ask also to have included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a resolution passed by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress meeting in the city of Washington last December.

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

We urge, therefore, as a sound national policy the completion of all present authorized projects within the shortest possible time, not exceeding a period of five years from the date of adoption. Necessary additional appropriations should be made promptly as new projects are authorized and adopted. In view, therefore, of increased authorization of additional projects in the last river and harbor bill, and also because of the general economic situation, we urgently call upon the United States Congress to provide such necessary increase of funds as will carry out in good faith the 5-year program. Such a policy will be an aid to both our agriculture and our industry and will relieve unemployment by providing the continued operation and construction of important public works.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, there is a bill before the Committee on Commerce providing for a bond issue in the amount of \$500,000,000, the money to be used for the completion of this program within five years, this sum to be raised by an internal loan, and to be used in addition to all other appropriations for the purpose of completing the now authorized river and harbor program.

I respectfully call to the attention of Members of the Senate to this project, and ask their consideration of it with other measures which may be called up for relief in any proposed relief program.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE AT SISTERSVILLE, W. VA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4665) extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va., which was, on page 1, line 10, to strike out "1930" and insert "1931."

Mr. GOFF. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ADVANCE PLANNING OF PUBLIC WORKS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5776) to provide for the advance planning and regulated construction of public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for aiding in the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression, which were, on page 1, line 4, to strike out "1930" and insert "1931"; on page 2, line 23, after the word "office," to insert "of"; on page 4, line 7, after the word "to," where it appears the second time, to insert "it by"; and on page 7, line 16, to strike out "estimate" and insert "estimates."

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, in the absence of my colleague [Mr. WAGNER], who is in a committee room in another part of the Capitol, and with his approval, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

"THE WATER CURE"

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting and instructive article by the Secretary of the Interior, the Hon. Ray Lyman Wilbur, appearing in the February number of *World's Work*. The subject of the article is water, its various uses and applications in the Western States.

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

THE WATER CURE

(By Ray Lyman Wilbur—As Told to William Atherton Du Puy)

The western third of the United States grapples always with one stern fact that does not assuage farther east. A limiting influence exists in the block of States between Kansas and the Pacific, Canada, and Mexico—a region 1,000 miles wide and 2,000 miles long—that clips the wings of its possibilities. Because of it plant life is inclined to languish there, animals appear but fleetingly, and human habitations group themselves only in occasional clusters. Out West there is a shortage of water.

The 1,000 miles immediately to the east, nursed in the arms of the Mississippi, deep spread with alluvial soil, equitably rationed as to rain and sunshine, draw greater wealth from mother earth than does any other area in the world. The stretch on the Atlantic, adequately watered but less productive agriculturally, nourishes an industrial multitude.

There are 11,000,000 people in the western belt, 57,000,000 in the middle-western belt, and 52,000,000 in the eastern belt. And population and production are low in the westernmost strip only because it is short of that water which man needs to quench his thirst, lave his cuticle, and make his rutabagas grow.

Long ago this region settled up to the natural water line; it since has been able to grow only as man, exercising his ingenuity, raised that level. In two-thirds of the Nation water and to spare is always available. Little thought need be taken of it. But in the West it is the one element by which development is measured, and it will remain so through all the years to come. It is life beyond meridian 100.

Only in occasional spots in this great area is there enough rainfall to produce dependable crops without irrigation. Nature's sprinkling pots bring from 6 to 12 inches of precipitation a year, whereas in Connecticut they deliver 45 inches, in Indiana 40, and in Georgia 48.

WHERE RAINFALL ISN'T ENOUGH

There is a rainy strip along Puget Sound. Moisture-laden winds from the Pacific, climbing the Sierra Nevadas of California, create banks of snow against which the valleys below may draw checks. Generally, however, the natural water line is only high enough to sustain a pastoral civilization.

This rainfall water line was reached decades ago. Ninety-six per cent of this area must resign itself to these limited gifts of the clouds and forever remain sparsely populated and of low productivity. But there are exceptions. An area of 30,000,000 acres, as big as the State of New York, is so disposed that it can get more of the precious water of the waste lands than falls upon it. Kissed by irrigation, an unbelievable fecundity comes to it.

When water makes all the difference between barren desert, where the solitary saguaro stands sentinel, and carloads of strawberries in the early spring, it is obviously a matter of primary importance. Stripped of its lesser essentials, the problem of the West is water. When and where and how much may the water line be raised?

Take the Yakima Valley, in the State of Washington, for instance, as an element in the 4 per cent of western land that may be irrigated. The Yakima River is born of the snows on the east slope of the Cascade Range. Its tributaries water high crystal lakes and lead down to join the main stream, which flows 175 miles to join the mighty Columbia through an open valley where volcanoes of the past have piled ashes 200 feet deep rich with plant food. Little rain fell here, and nothing but sagebrush grew. Man came, diverted the stream flow, built up the Sunnyside division to the water line, created homes for 10,000 people. The Government looked over the ground, threw dams across the mouths of the crystal lakes, stabilized the stream flow below, took out more canals.

The result: One hundred thousand people living on 600,000 irrigated acres in an area where almost none found homes before. And such homes! They cluster among the apple orchards where a production yielding \$200 per acre per year is not unusual. There is that in the volcanic ash, the sunshine, and dry weather that gives these apples a rosinness of cheek, a firmness of flesh, and a keeping quality that have carried them into the market places of Yokohama, Rio de Janeiro, Cairo, and Danzig on the Baltic. The baled hay and the big unrivaled baking potato of these farms feed nonagricultural activities all about. A city of 30,000 people and a score of thrifty towns exist where sagebrush but yesterday was supreme.

Far to the south, in the burning deserts of Arizona, as a dot in a waste that is unbroken between San Antonio and Los Angeles, lies Salt River Valley, Eden of the borderland. Here in the beginning an erratic stream came out of the mountains, sometimes ran a roaring torrent but mostly seeped languidly into thirsty sands. Inspired by the Government's need for hay for Army mules, some rugged frontiersmen, back in the seventies, led a ditch from Salt River onto the desert and demonstrated the stu-

pendous yields where water is wedded with the desert silt. Ditches became canals, these multiplied themselves, Salt River Valley grew up to the water line which they established and boasted 20,000 people.

But the water supply was irregular, and floods ripped out diversion dams. The Government, 25 years ago, began its first great demonstration of welding mountains together, impounding flood waters, distributing them as needed, stabilizing the behavior of torrents, setting them to spinning turbines, developing communities under this new influence.

The enterprise has transformed this cactus-studded desert solitude into an intensively farmed, unbelievably productive, wide-awake, progressive, cosmopolitan, thrifty community that has no counterpart in all the world. Living here are 130,000 people, 67,000 of them in Phoenix, the metropolis of the Colorado River Basin. Yields from this irrigated land are such as to warrant values as high as \$2,000 an acre. Farming such lands has called forth a skill beyond the appreciation of tillers of eastern acres. Early lettuce goes out in refrigerated train loads. Single acres produce 700 boxes of grapefruit. Alfalfa, heritage of the early Spanish fathers, yields six crops a year. Date trees ripen their honeyed fruit in the city parks. Long-staple Egyptian cotton surpasses that picked along the Nile. Life in all its phases is in superlatives, and fairy stories come true daily.

BRIGHAM YOUNG—IRRIGATION PIONEER

The Snake River winds its tenuous way through Idaho and Oregon, carrying much water and inviting man to apply his ingeniousness to it. He has responded by raising the water level in the Snake Valley, and as a result 250,000 people live where before there was nothing of value at all.

Where the Rio Grande runs through New Mexico the early Spaniards developed a ditch here and there and built scattering adobe homes. The Government threw the most massive of its concrete dams across the Rio Grande at Elephant Butte, stored the floods, induced a steady flow—and brought prosperity to peaceful, semi-Latin communities that fringe the river for 150 miles.

But ahead of all of these was Brigham Young, who, traveling with his caravan on the way to Utah, told Jim Bridger, Indian scout, that he intended to plant a farming community beyond the mountains. Bridger pooh-pooed the idea and offered a thousand dollars for the first ear of corn that was grown.

It was July 24, 1847, and the plains were parched when these pioneers, after crossing Immigration Canyon, came out into Salt Lake Valley and unhitched their teams on the brink of a merry little stream afterward known as City Creek. That same afternoon they took their plows off their wagons and broke some of this dry desert land. The very next day the stream was diverted, the plowed land irrigated, and a batch of potatoes planted. This, it seems, was the first bit of irrigation ever undertaken by Anglo-Saxons.

LOS ANGELES GROWS UP

Here in the Great Basin wastes, out of which no stream finds its way, grew the first of the communities born of water under the hands of this race. Various streams coming out of the Wasatch Mountains were diverted and used for irrigation. Later a dam was thrown across the mouth of Utah Lake, 25 miles away. It was converted into a reservoir and tapped by canals which irrigated fertile fields below. Scores of expedients have been used to add to the water supply of the Salt Lake Valley. Each has contributed to the prosperity of this oasis and made additions to the population possible. To-day 200,000 people live in this region, which would have supported but a handful had man not taken thought of water and led it here to serve his purposes.

The classic example of how communities mount step by step as the water line is raised is furnished by the Los Angeles district. Here the Spanish settled 150 years ago and developed a pastoral civilization of a few thousand; the rainfall was not sufficient for crop production. Americans who followed increased the water supply by diverting the Los Angeles River into irrigation ditches and by pumping from shallow wells. By 1910 the population had run up to 200,000. It looked as though this community might provide water for drinking, for sprinkling lawns, and for Saturday-night baths for 50,000 or so more; but the end was in sight.

It was then that Los Angeles reached out beyond its own watershed, far across the Mohave Desert, 250 miles to the point where the Owens River, fed by the snows of the Sierras, was wasting itself into a brackish lake. Los Angeles diverted this stream and led it through the longest aqueduct in the world into her own front yard, there to multiply the crops of oranges, bungalows, and settlers. Because of this water, brought into the area where it could serve its maximum purpose, 2,000,000 people have been added in 20 years to the Los Angeles area. But the population is again approaching the water line. The capacity of the aqueduct can be increased, and probably 500,000 more people can be adequately supplied. That maximum will doubtless be reached in five years, for the population is increasing at the rate of 100,000 a year.

The Los Angeles district thus faces a predicament. In Imperial Valley, not far away, below sea level in a desert as absolute as exists anywhere in the world, nestles another community, born of water, that is likewise in a predicament. It grew of irrigation from the mad Colorado, and now that stream threatens to break from the sand-built ridge upon which it rides and engulf its child. The Government, fortified by its own rich experience and that of private enterprise, accepts the challenge of this great stream to come and shackle it.

A TRIPLE BENEFIT DERIVED

This flighty Colorado, which drains seven States, swells to mighty, muddy floods at certain seasons and subsides into insignificance at others. It carries twelve times as much water down its channel as does the Rio Grande, eighteen times as much as does the Salt River. The Hoover Dam, now under construction at Black Canyon, will store ten times as much water as does Elephant Butte, sixteen times as much as Roosevelt, and twenty-four times as much as the combined reservoirs of the Yakima. It is costing eleven times as much as the Rio Grande project, fourteen times as much as Salt River, and eight times the money spent on the Yakima. It is estimated that it will so raise the water line in the Southwest as to provide homes down there for four or five million more people.

When the Government built Roosevelt Dam it thought little of power. It was stupendously surprised when it found that it could sell enough of it to pay out the whole enterprise. It repeated its demonstration at Shoshone, at Minidoka, at Guernsey, Boise, and elsewhere. It became power conscious and figured with a pencil on the possibilities in the proposed Boulder (now the Hoover) Dam. It found that the power generated, though sold at a moderate price, will in 50 years pay out the entire project, together with interest on the money. Irrigation and flood control will be a gift. Bona fide contractors came forward and signed on the dotted line for amounts that would guarantee all repayments. The Government needed only to contribute its credit. Eventually it will have an income from this power that should turn back into the Treasury four or five millions a year.

This dam of titanic proportions, 200 feet higher than Washington Monument, the biggest thing of its kind ever undertaken in this world, is being slipped into the gorge. The largest artificial lake in existence will rise back of it, 100 miles long, 500 feet deep. Four-mile long, 50-foot wide tunnels are being driven through the canyon walls and will feed the power penstocks that spin dynamos. Electricity will ride away on the wires and bring cheap power to one whole corner of a nation. Tropically productive communities, of from 40,000 to 100,000 population, will spring up, sending to market such fruits and vegetables as can be grown no place else in the Nation.

A river full of water will be taken 260 miles across the plains, lifted over a mountain range, and plunged down onto the coastal plain about Los Angeles to raise the water line still more and permit an otherwise impossible growth of population. An adequate supply will be made available to all the communities between Los Angeles and San Diego, sitting on the Mexican border, where millions may come to live with irrigated rose gardens about their homes and with irrigated trees dropping ripened fruit into their laps. There will no longer be floods and Imperial Valley can give itself with impunity to playing the rôle of limited tropical-fruit basket to a great nation.

PROTECTING THE WATERSHEDS

Hoover Dam does not end the list of development enterprises in the West. The control of the Columbia River in the Oregon-Washington region is a bigger problem than that presented by the Colorado. The lower Rio Grande offers a dam site in the Big Bend country between Texas and Mexico that is international and might raise the water line all the way to the mouth of the stream. The Sacramento River, in California, calls loudly for comprehensive control. Sixty or seventy projects, scattered all over the West, have been presented to the Reclamation Service and invite development. Private enterprise is utilizing many more. The magic that lies in the storage of water in the dry country causes concrete giants to grow where nothing else will, and the conquest of floods that run to waste in a land of thirst has but begun.

The storage of these flood waters is not the sum total of contributions that may be made toward raising the water line in the arid West. That whole region between the Great Plains and the Pacific needs to be considered from the watershed standpoint.

When rain falls on land that is covered with vegetation it is held, soaks in, finds its way slowly into streams, contributes to an equitable flow down their courses. When it falls on bare hillsides it runs off quickly, tears the unprotected surface as it goes, results in destructive erosion, produces floods, fills waterholes and river bottoms with mud, goes to waste. These facts have become well understood. In the dry country, however, they have not called forth the constructive action they deserve.

WASHINGTON'S CHANGING ATTITUDE

The chief contributor to this failure of the watershed properly to contribute to equitable stream flow has been the Government itself. The Government, still the greatest landowner in the West, controls 300,000 square miles of public land out there—an area greater than the State of Texas, than that eastern stretch of States between Tennessee and Maine. This is land that is not sufficiently productive to attract settlers. It includes desert land, mountainous country, rolling plains covered with grass in varying degrees. When white men came buffalo ranged knee deep in verdure over much of it, and elk and antelope fed in millions through its mountain parks.

But the Government has stuck to its "open range" policy. Whoever would might bring his herds and flock onto public lands and graze them at will. In the end so many came that the range was nipped clean and the grasses disappeared, the best first, until finally next to nothing remained. Rains fell and cut great gullies in hurrying away from where they were needed to vast repositories of the deep, where they would serve no purpose at all.

Desolation increased. Conditions are bad and growing worse west of meridian 100.

Twenty-odd years ago President Roosevelt created a commission to study the public-land question. It reported that the usefulness of these areas was being destroyed by overgrazing, and it recommended control looking to the restoration of the range. Despite that finding, little or nothing has been done toward protecting or restoring the range. Now Congress has provided for a new commission to make a similar study in the light of two decades more of practical experience.

President Hoover has asked, also, that this commission give him an opinion on the advisability of turning public lands over to the States in which they are located. Those States, it would seem, would have a more direct interest in their proper administration than a distant, central government. Besides which, these are local problems out beyond the Rockies, with which Massachusetts and Maryland have little to do. The States most interested have put 30 Representatives in Congress out of a membership of 435. The 405 are apathetic and uninformed as to these western problems. Might it not be well to crowd a little self-government back on these States?

A NEW UNIT IN GOVERNMENT?

Much of the legislation involved was passed decades ago, when conditions were very different from what they are now. The reclamation act, for example, contemplated the irrigation of public lands in undeveloped regions. To-day there is but little irrigable public land, and western communities have grown to a point where they are able to participate in local undertakings. Incidentally such undertakings as those of reclamation, requiring organized action on the part of members of the community, provide unusual training in common action for the benefit of all. The West's experience in community development, supplemented by a quarter of a century of study and cooperation from the Federal Government, has left a rich heritage. The time has come when the local communities and the States themselves should take over many details that have hitherto been handed from Washington.

At just this point there appears another type of problem that seems to call for the development of a new unit in government. It is exemplified in the problem of the control of the Colorado. This is not primarily a national problem, for it concerns only the Southwest. It is more than a State problem, for a whole group of Commonwealths are interested in it. It is properly a regional problem. The National Government has certain interests in it, as has the individual State. But being regional it should be handled, and in fact is being handled, by the group of States affected. An experience is here being accumulated for which, in future, applications may be found that need not necessarily be limited to the West.

THE JONES LAW AND THE MAGNA CHARTA

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, Senator Clarin is one of three Filipinos who have served continuously as legislators from the first opening of the Philippine Assembly.

He is chairman of the committee on finance, has been a member of various important committees, and at different times acted as president pro tempore of the Philippine Senate.

He is a man of fine ability, understands the aspirations of his people; he has always presented them as being unitedly in favor of Philippine independence.

The following speech is interesting historically. It is another assurance that all classes of the Philippine people have interpreted the Jones law as a national promise made by the American people. They count upon its fulfillment. An entire generation of Philippine children have been taught this in their schools and elsewhere. They have come to rely upon it and, in my opinion, as an American citizen, having investigated the historical aspect of this subject, they are entitled to rely upon it.

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

Mr. President, while the enemies of our national emancipation are doubting the value and merit of the preamble of the Jones law, on the other hand there are among us those who consider this law as the Magna Charta of the Filipinos, in allusion probably to the English Magna Charta. Mr. President, as I take opportunity to speak on this occasion, I do so with the intention of discussing the preamble of the Jones law by sustaining and affirming that this preamble, as well as the very law, can compare favorably with the Magna Charta of England, to which much importance is attached in the sphere of political rights. To make good this assertion, it is necessary to touch upon the process of the passage of the Jones law as well as of the Magna Charta, and to study the significance and reach of either one and the vicissitudes which both legislations have undergone after acquiring their legal existence. I shall therefore speak first of the Magna Charta.

The whims and excesses tantamount to despotism committed by King John, from the time he wore the crown of William the Conqueror, were of such nature that the terrifying specter of misery hovered constantly over the heads of the oppressed people. Composed of heterogeneous elements that were asserting their own

rights by reason of ethnology and history, the subjects of the English Crown, under the weighty pressure of their misfortunes, laid aside their internal hatred toward each other that they might fuse their sentiments in the cause of common sufferings, enabling themselves in this way to bring about the nucleus of a compact clothed with sufficient force to deal with the sovereign power on the strength of equality. The nobility, in common understanding with the clergy, headed the movement of protest against the monarch's abuses, and although this, in the beginning, evaded to take cognizance of the exposition of grievances which had been presented to him, later, however, was compelled to accede to their demands in view of the attitude taken by the nobility. The document sanctioned by King John to this effect is known in history as the Magna Charta. Despite the measures that had been taken, at the suggestion of Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, to guarantee the stability of the constitutional conquest, King John soon violated his obligations prescribed by the famous document, by announcing his stand through the force of the terms. As the barons had appraised the significance of the delicate situation due to the determination of the King, reinforced morally by the no less support of Pope Innocentius III, implored the help of Philip II, King of France, by offering to his son Louis the Crown of England. The war having been declared between the barons and the King, with the intervention of Philip II in favor of the former, death cut short the career of the English King, the scepter passing thereafter to the hands of his son, Henry III, who was then 10 years old. Although the regents of the King under age negotiated a peace on the part of the Crown, with the insurgent elements on the basis of the recognition of the citizens' reclaimed rights, under certain restrictions, and although years after, Henry acknowledged the Magna Charta in a most solemn manner, "as man, as Christian, as gentleman, and as duly anointed and crowned king that he was," later on, however, this English sovereign, following the nefarious and reproachable policy of his father with regards to the Magna Charta, gave cause to a bloody war between the nobles and the Crown.

The nobles, headed by Count Leicester, received the whole-hearted support of the people, making them partakers of the fundamental rights allowed in the constitutional document, before the time of the armed struggle broke out, thereby obtaining signal victories over the army of King Henry. But due to some differences which later on popped up among those who had sustained the armed protest, its cause became weakening; and when pessimism seemed to possess them, with the hopes of reconquering their rights granted in that famous document were all given up, Henry III, thinking probably that with his victories he could not maintain the moral peace in his kingdom upon the enforcement of obedience of the people to his authority by means of force, changed forthwith radically his attitude by ratifying in its whole entirety the rights recognized in the Magna Charta. These are the historical salient features of the inauguration of England's Magna Charta. Although this document did not contain any political concession which could be considered at present as of paramount importance, save the limitation of power of the royalty concerning the subsidies of war, it served notwithstanding as the basis whereby the conquests of the people would become more extensive up to the formation of the English Parliament, which, as it has been functioning, is the invulnerable bulwark of the people's freedom in Great Britain and at the same time is the supreme and unlimited source of the power of the nation, the creator of all positive right; in such a way that, in the presence of the unquieting and menacing aspect of the fall of powerful thrones in the European countries and before the ultraradical ideas which acquired there an overwhelming success, during and after the Great War, it was said that the English king had made it understood that at any time the country would shift to a republican form of government he would be willing to respect the popular will, abdicating his crown, which for centuries his glorious forebears had been displaying with pomp and magnificence.

From the events which preceded the promulgation of the Jones law, the beginning and origin of which we have to search at the pre-American epoch, I shall now proceed to prove the gist of my speech.

The uneasiness and the maltreatments which the Filipinos received during the Spanish hegemony leading to the revolt against Spain's sovereignty did not find any satisfaction in the pact of Biak-na-bato, so that upon the declaration of the Hispano-American War the country saw in it the best opportunities to carry into effect the realization of its national aspirations. And as the Filipinos needed the cooperation of the Americans that they might be freed, these in turn saw in the Filipinos a good chance for the perpetration of their military purposes in this part of the Far East, where for three centuries the Iberian lion haughtily ruled under the ægis of the Castilian banner.

If, indeed, that pact between the supreme leader of the Philippine revolution and Admiral Dewey was not reduced in written form as regards our independence, which fact later gave way to subterfuge and misrepresentations that amounted to the negation of its existence, there is, however, a strong and irrefutable presumption in favor of the real existence of that pact, inasmuch as it would be absurd to suppose that the Filipinos expelled the Spaniards from their country just to put the Americans in the country in their stead, as their new masters. Furthermore, if we are going to take into consideration that when the Filipinos took their arms in 1896 against Spain they had already aspired to their freedom and independence, aside of the fact that during the time we allied ourselves with Americans we never did anything that could constitute an estoppel against our national aspiration. When the city of Manila surrendered to the American forces, with

the cooperation and help of the Filipinos, strained relations among the Filipino and American soldiers took place in view of the fact that the latter pretended to establish in these islands their sovereignty, to which the Filipinos vehemently objected. This question resulted in the outbreak of hostilities between the Americans and Filipinos, and notwithstanding the fact that that armed struggle resulted in our physical collapse, it did not, however, subdue the fighting spirit of the islanders so as to give up their supreme ideal. On the other hand, the President of the United States, as well as high official representatives in these islands, used to inject in us the hope that some day we would also be independent; and thanks to this policy the country did not see fit to be pessimistic and hopeless; on the contrary, many of its leaders cooperated with the government duly organized here to bring about peace by employing at times vital measures as well as the arts of persuasion toward those who preferred to be on the battlefields creating public disorder after the great majority of the Filipinos had already reconciled themselves with their fate in acknowledging the sovereignty of Uncle Sam.

As I have previously stated, although the Filipinos did not give up their ideal, despite the fact that their arms did not triumph, very little opportunity did we have to make our campaign in behalf of our national cause in the United States before the establishment of the Philippine Assembly. The proindependence manifestations exercised their own sphere of influence within the confines of the Philippines at that time; but once the Philippine Assembly, under the wise leadership of Speaker Osmeña, was invested with the popular character our independence campaign received more impetus, not only here but also in the United States. During the existence of the Philippine Assembly there were resolutions passed that faithfully interpreted the people's sentiments in their appeal to the Congress of America for the granting of freedom. To this effect the Philippine Resident Commissioner at Washington, who was representing the Philippine Assembly, did voice the longings of the islanders for their independence in the American Congress. The proindependence campaign which from 1912 was espoused by the other commissioner that represented the Philippine Commission, found good response in Congress and in the administration since 1913, and thanks to these favorable circumstances the Jones law was approved in 1916, the preamble of which is as follows:

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

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

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

Although in the Jones law, as it was approved, the Clark amendment authorizing the country to attain its freedom within four years after the approval of said law, was eliminated, the Filipinos received it nevertheless with warm signs of rejoicing, because they saw in the preamble the guaranty of the acquisition of their national freedom, aside the facts that it contained dispositions showing a decided forward step in the conquest of democracy and popular liberties. It is to be noted that the spirit of the people was about to reach its lowest ebb due to the friction encountered between the Philippine Commission and the Philippine Assembly when the former was integrated by a majority of American members. The climax of the populace's jubilee was staged when Manuel L. Quezon, the then resident commissioner, returned to this country after President Wilson had sanctioned that legislative measure that bore constitutional character. On this occasion all Provinces sent their official representatives to Manila to receive with befitting honors the bearer and the conqueror of our Magna Charta. By virtue of the Jones law was organized a more autonomous government with two colegislative chambers the members of which are elected by popular franchise, and with departmental secretaries who, save the secretary of public instruction, are appointed by the governor general with the consent of the senate.

The Jones law's precepts being transcendental, it is not my intention at present to deal with them extensively inasmuch as they are not the object of controversy between those who sustain it and those who fight our national freedom's cause; and granting that there was a time that some efforts were made whereby this law would be amended so as to restrict the privileges of both colegislative bodies, above all that of the senate, referring to their executive functions, these reactionary tendencies at any rate did not meet with the American Congressmen's approval; and at present we may rest assured that this agitation is practically a dead issue which has already marched stealthily and silently to the graves of the forgotten.

One of the points that bears similarity between the Magna Charta and the Jones law is the fact that both are concessions granted by sovereigns—the English King and the American Commonwealth. The former was given in behalf of the subjects of the English Crown and the latter in behalf of an American colony. King John was compelled to grant the Magna Charta to his vassals due to the menacing attitude of his subjects who no longer tolerated the royal tyranny; on the other hand, the Jones law, with its preamble,

was given to us by the Congress of the United States of America with the President's sanction, through a spontaneous act when he heeded and took cognizance of the demands of freedom of the Filipinos, as formulated by their legitimate representatives in time of peace and order.

When the American Congress expressed in the aforementioned preamble that "it was never the intention of the people of the United States in the incipency of the war with Spain to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandizement, but, on the contrary, it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize the independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein," that high legislative body wished to make amends for the wrong it had inflicted upon the Filipino people when the Americans asked of them their help to down Spain during the war. The American Congress in this part of the preamble seems to presume that there was an understanding between the Americans and the Filipinos as the latter had acted. President Wilson's declaration, in sanctioning the Jones law, manifesting that he was rejoicing over the adoption of such a measure, as he had understood that the Filipinos were losing faith in the Americans, affirms my assertion.

Several years after the passage of the Jones law some one tried to challenge the spirit of the preamble; others based their objection on the fact that the preamble does not form part of the law and consequently it does not bind the United States; while others believed that the promise of independence expressed in the preamble has been the most unfortunate act Congress had ever enacted, taking into consideration America's interests in the Far East and the fact that we need above all to develop economically and that we are also exposed to any foreign aggression, and that we failed, when, under the Harrison régime, we were given greater participation in the government management of our own domestic affairs. Mr. President, history repeats itself. We saw that King John, despite the fact that he had authorized the Magna Charta, did not hesitate later on to ignore it, and Henry III, after his oath, followed also in the footsteps of his father. This conduct of the two sovereigns of England is another case in parallel in which there exists a common point of comparison between the Jones law and the Magna Charta, with the sole difference that the enemies of the former are not the very authors thereof. Fortunately enough the detractors of the Jones law preamble do not represent the true public opinion of the American Commonwealth, in which we trust for its righteousness and for its sacred principles dedicated to the tenets enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. What is to be deplored up to the present time is that this great, magnanimous country has not as yet expressed its sovereign attitude toward the Filipinos' cause.

Inasmuch as I have already mentioned the motives upon which rests the objection to the Jones law preamble, I shall endeavor now to refute same.

Taking for granted that this preamble does not form part of the Jones law, it is however an incontrovertible fact that it constitutes a moral promise of the American people to the Filipinos, a promise which bears a stronger significance than that of a treaty. On the other hand, treaties are made with the understanding and common accord of both contracting parties, and in the United States it is imperative that treaties should receive the Senate's approval before they can be considered binding and valid. The Jones law, right at the start when the Filipinos accepted it and supported it, assumed the aspect of a moral compact between two countries; and the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States having concurred thereto in its approval, with the President's sanction, it is beyond doubt that this compact has a much stronger moral force than a treaty, in the approval of which the lower Chamber does not take part. I say that the Filipino people accepted and supported it through their Resident Commissioner at Washington, because the Philippine Assembly, the provincial boards, and municipal councils adhered to the Jones law by means of approved resolutions. In many nooks and corners of the islands people gathered in solemn meetings to adopt resolutions of adhesion to be sent directly to the American Congress and to Representative Jones, author of the law, while it was under consideration of that high legislative entity. Furthermore, as I have said just a minute ago, its approval was enthusiastically received by the country with uproarious demonstrations of joy, and the fact that we also organized, on our own accord, an armed force to be placed at the disposal of the United States during the World War, it was thereby made manifest the Filipinos' gratefulness to America on account of the passage of the Jones law and specially on account of its preamble. If the Jones law has a stronger moral force than a treaty, I may assert that it has much stronger moral force even than those treaties entered into in consequence of international war, in which there is a victorious party and a conquered one. And to be more explicit, I shall dare say that the Jones law, with its preamble, has stronger moral obligation on the part of the United States than the treaty celebrated in Paris to end the Hispano-American war has on the part of Spain. In that treaty Spain was forced to accept by circumstances the terms imposed by the winning nation, and, once it was all over, Spain, however, did not care a bit to contest it. I now believe, Mr. President, that those persons who intend to undermine the moral obligation contracted by the American people toward us by virtue of the Jones law, are taking advantage of our weakness and unheeding the dictates of their conscience, for their reasonings bear the very character as the excuses of a bad payer.

If the preamble of the Jones law is a moral obligation contracted by the American people toward the Filipinos who have given their assent thereto, it is not only therefore a stronger moral force than a treaty, as I have said already, but it would remain binding, even should the American Congress declare null and void the Jones law, lest the Filipinos express their acquiescence to the annulment and abolition thereof. If an ordinary contract is a law between the contracting parties and it can not be declared void without the mutual consent of the makers thereof, I therefore maintain that these governing principles upon which are based the eternal precepts of morality and justice promulgated by conscience are perfectly applicable to the obligation contracted by the American Nation toward the Filipino people.

Even if we were to take from the Jones law that aspect of a moral treaty between the United States and the Philippines, and were we to suppose that the American Congress did pass that law with its preamble without any intervention of the Filipinos in the course of its preparation, nor even of their adherence to that law before or after its passage, yet under these circumstances the preamble is not subject to abolition in so far as affects the declaration of the American Congress that in waging war against Spain it was not its intention to pursue territorial aggrandizement, but, on the other hand, it is and it always has been the intention to relinquish its sovereignty in the Philippines and recognize its independence as soon as a stable government can be formed. And, given the case that the American Congress should ever abolish or declare null and void the law in its entirety, still that part of the preamble I have recently cited will remain in force without affecting at all the abolition and annulment of the Jones law. The reason for it is simple enough: That portion of the preamble to which I refer has the earmark of a confession of purpose which impelled the United States to wage war against Spain and to take possession of these islands. This confession having been made in the solemn manner by the American Commonwealth, through its Congress, how, then, can it be withdrawn without besmirching the honor of America as a nation and without becoming the greatest laughingstock before history and universal conscience? The Congress of the United States can abolish the Jones law, but the part of its preamble concerning the declaration of purposes of the Nation in waging war against Spain and taking possession of the Philippine Archipelago will remain intact, for there is no human power that can destroy it. What the American Nation declared to be a truth through its Congress in 1916 can not be asserted as a falsehood through the very Congress to be constituted in years to come. To sustain it otherwise would be to legitimize and sanctify perjury.

If a person interested in a case brought before the courts of justice makes a willful declaration concerning some facts, but later on, upon seeing that his declaration can be prejudicial to his own interests, withdraws it or changes it radically, how will this person appear before the public—above all, before righteous neighbors? How in the world will his posterior declaration merit credence so as to rebut his former statements? And how can that person be acquitted when against him a charge of perjury is presented?

The American people, which considered as a scandal and an indignity the German Chancellor's statement at the beginning of the World War to the effect that treaties are mere scraps of paper, can not have a Congress which, abusing the weakness of a small country, commits the injustice of violating a sacred obligation contracted toward this nation before the eyes of the world and commits a flagrant contradiction in declaring historical facts which affect its integrity and decorum as a people; otherwise such an act would be a blot and stigma on the history of a big country, which, upon gaining its freedom from the British yoke, proclaimed the sublime principles of democracy and liberty. The American Nation which applauded the declaration of its President, in marshaling its armies on the fields of battle against the Central Powers so as to make the world safe for democracy, could not consent to the perpetuation of a similar attack upon the honor and dignity of nations.

The question whether the compact and the declaration of purposes expressed in the preamble of the Jones law ought to have been inserted or not is no longer a subject of controversy from the moment that American Congress so disposed. The juridical principle that asserts, "In whatever manner a man pledges himself to an obligation, he remains bound to it," can be exactly applied to the obligations contracted by a country with another; and the objection based on the fact that concession of Philippine independence might affect America's interests in the Orient can not prevail over this moral compact and intrinsic force of the preamble of the Jones law, aside of the fact that we are ready to make those adjustments with America which equity demands for the very same interests.

It is asserted that we must fortify ourselves militarily and develop economically before we may consider ourselves free and independent. This condition, however, is not contained in the preamble of the Jones law; consequently, it is rather unjust to require it of us as a previous condition of our independence. Besides, we can not fortify militarily our country nor can develop it economically on a greater scale while we remain under the sovereignty of the Americans. In the first place, because the American naval and military forces in this part of the globe will not consider such an act with kind eyes, and who knows if this particular step will give rise to a conflict between the Americans and the Filipinos? Incident to this contingency, the consequence

thereof would be disastrous on our part in all respects, because it is a well-known fact that the string snaps at its weakest point, and we are, unfortunately, the weakest point. In the second place, we can not develop economically because we need foreign capital, and what happens at present is that the American money magnates are loath to come here in view of the uncertainties of our political status, and on our part we are also apprehensive of the entry of American capital while we are subject to the sovereignty of the United States, lest the invading capital gobble us up entirely. Viewing the matter in the light of the common saying that the Americans "got us by the neck," economically and politically speaking, we are indeed at a very decided disadvantage to struggle economically and politically with our masters. The example of the countries around the Caribbean Sea is disquieting. But why require of us such onerous prerequisites? Is there an independent nation at present in the world which from the beginning of its national existence or from the time it severed relations with its mother country was already militarily and economically organized in the manner we are required to show up? The very American Nation was not in similar condition when it got its independence. At any rate, America had less inhabitants than the Philippines and its commerce was weak, nay, much weaker than ours at the present time; and it would have not attained its apex of greatness and prosperity had it continued under the protection of British sovereignty, with the régime existing when the thirteen Colonies revolted. The authority of the hero of Bagumbayan, Dr. Jose Rizal, is also brought into play to justify the motives of submitting us to an economic development as the first step toward our freedom; but to this argument I shall reply that when Rizal emitted his opinion in this wise the islands were not so progressive as they are now. "Distingue tempora et concordabis jura" is an old maxim among the Latins, and I beg leave to repeat it on this occasion.

There is another objection to the effect that when we were allowed to exercise a greater control in our domestic affairs during the Harrisonian régime, we failed miserably. This objection lacks ground. Its supporters will never be able to adduce concrete facts to make good their arguments, for we, on the other hand, can cite the statement of Governor Harrison, made in the United States after the establishment of a government here in conformity with the Jones law that that government functioned better than many State governments. President Wilson in his message to the Congress of America certified that a stable government existed here in accordance with the requirements of the Jones law preamble, and recommended to Congress the granting of independence as promised in that preamble. Perhaps to counteract the impression produced by that presidential message upon American public opinion, President Harding appointed the Wood-Forbes Commission to investigate the management of the government under the Harrisonian administration. That mission did not find irregularity of serious nature in the participation of the Filipinos in the government; it did, however, find that the Philippine National Bank, under a Filipino's management, had lost several millions, and on this point rests the accusation which is now flung at us in the sense that we had failed when we were given the chance of administering our internal affairs. This charge is rather unjust, because the Philippine National Bank, a semi-official institution, does not form part of the Philippine government. Furthermore, why make the whole country responsible for this failure in a banking institution? Are not failures of this type common in other countries that are independent, and yet has such an accusation ever been launched? Without touching upon the scandals committed by State governments, has not similar anomaly been unearthed in the Navy Department of the Federal Government in which was involved a malversation of funds amounting to \$140,000,000? Have we not been regaled with the news of recent happenings concerning the Teapot Dome disgrace wherein several members of the Cabinet were equally held responsible? Did not ex-President Coolidge publish articles defending the present administration of the Federal Government? This means to say that everywhere there is "something rotten in Denmark"; and it would be the height of folly to hurl accusations at our capacity to run our own government whenever similar irregularities are committed in this country.

Mr. President, we ought not to be frightened by the numerous forms of campaign leveled upon our heads by our enemies that try to make a failure out of the noble intentions of the United States expressed in the preamble of the Jones law; on the other hand, we must maintain ourselves undaunted in the struggles within the legal ground trusting in this preamble; and as Henry III of England voluntarily ratified and respected the Magna Charta, it is to be hoped that the magnanimous United States will not do less than that English monarch, because above all the obligation contained in the preamble of the Jones law is the product of a spontaneous act of the Congress of America. As to the rest, the provisions of the Jones law preamble are certainly very clear and explicit as regards the intention of giving us our independence, whereas in the Magna Charta which gave rise to the formation of the British Parliament, there is not even a hint concerning the creation of the legislative body, and yet the limitation of power of the British Crown with respect to the taxes for purposes of war, which compelled the King to recur to the representatives of the nation for its approval, served as the basis of the British Parliament; and as the Magna Charta of England is the source of the happiness of its people for having obtained their freedom by means of this historic document, so we also armed by this expectation fully hope that the Jones law preamble will be the instrument of our final redemption.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The clerk will proceed to read the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR TO-MORROW

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, there were submitted this morning from the Committee on Interstate Commerce the names of the three Power commissioners whose nominations had been recommitted to that committee. I inquire of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNary] whether we might not at this hour to-morrow, 4 o'clock p. m., have an executive session for the purpose of considering those nominations and other matters on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. McNary. Mr. President, I think it eminently fair that some notice be given of an executive session. I agree with the Senator that we might have an executive session to-morrow at the hour suggested, provided that will give time to make final disposition of the matter.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am inclined to think so. I do not think there will be any extended debate on it.

Mr. McNary. Also for the consideration of other matters on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think so.

Mr. McNary. I am agreeable, and at 4 o'clock p. m. to-morrow I shall move that we proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator is apprehensive that business on the Executive Calendar will not be dispatched if the motion is made at that hour, I would suggest 3 o'clock instead of 4 o'clock.

Mr. McNary. That is satisfactory to me.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. The sooner the bill is enacted into law, of course, the sooner its provisions will go into effect. It is estimated that the bill will furnish employment up to the 1st of July for 25,000 or more men. In other words, if we get it through to-day, it means an additional day's work for 25,000 men between now and the 1st of July.

I feel that I should present the conference report at this time and ask for its immediate consideration. Let me say that it is a full agreement except that there are seven or eight amendments which the House conferees, under their rules, have to take back to the House, so they are reported

necessarily in disagreement; but, as I have said, there is a tentative agreement that the House conferees will ask the House to agree to those amendments.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to make a statement in reference to the report and the bill before any action is taken upon it. I believe there is not a Senator on either side of the Chamber who would justify or uphold the action of those representing the body at the other end of the Capitol in reference to one particular item in the bill. I do not think that the language itself would meet the approval of any Member of this body.

This is an emergency measure. Certain amounts in the bill were appropriated to meet the desperate condition of unemployment throughout the country. Amongst those were certain appropriations relating to naval projects on the part of the Government. There was under contemplation and is now before the Committee on Naval Affairs the question of our quota under the naval agreement as to certain vessels that should be constructed. In conference with the Secretary of the Navy I asked him with reference to the navy yard at Charleston, S. C., the only naval station south of Norfolk on a coast line of 3,500 miles, facing the Caribbean, the south Atlantic, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Panama Canal, south of the boneyard of the Atlantic, which is Cape Hatteras with her shoals and dangerous currents that extend for hundreds of miles out into the ocean. I asked the Secretary of the Navy if the Charleston Navy Yard might not be allowed to bid for the construction of certain destroyers. He promptly answered that it would be allowed to do so.

It developed that the superstructure of certain of the ways, having been constructed of wood, they are unfit now for the work for which they were constructed. The Bureau of Yards and Docks took every station on the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific coast and provided for emergency work to aid the unemployed and to provide adequate facilities for carrying on our naval activities. It is a curious fact that in the bill, as the text will show, every naval station was provided for except the navy yard at Charleston, S. C., for which not a penny was appropriated; there was not even any reference to it. It was not estimated for by the Budget Bureau nor was it provided for by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, when my attention was called to this fact, I went before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. The Secretary of the Navy happened to be present, and also Admiral Parsons, who is the head of the yard and dock activities of the Navy Department. When I called attention to the omission the Secretary of the Navy seemed a bit surprised that that item had been overlooked or had been left out, and before the committee he indorsed the proposition that ways at the Charleston yard should be provided for and provided for now. He used language that was rather suggestive, to the effect that it was nothing but justice that this yard should partake of the emergency appropriation.

In addition to that, Admiral Parsons, who, as I stated, was present, and to whom the Secretary of the Navy referred, saying that perhaps he could better state the situation than he, the Secretary, unequivocally indorsed it. He went further than my suggestion before the committee in that respect. He said, "I do not think that under our policy it would be wise to construct the wooden ways," and that in the different navy yards they had been superseded by concrete ways which were practically permanent.

The question was asked: In case of need, in an emergency, in case of war, what about the use of the ways at the Charleston Navy Yard? He said they would be very necessary; and, not only that, but that they were essential in the construction of destroyers, for which Charleston had been promised an opportunity to bid.

It was also developed that the equipment of that yard was ample for the construction of destroyers, but all that would amount to nothing if the ways were not put into proper form, not only for the construction of destroyers but, according to testimony of Admiral Parsons, for lighter craft, such

vessels as heretofore have been built and launched at the navy yard at Charleston.

The committee on the part of the Senate unanimously incorporated the provision in the bill. I felt that as the injustice, as the Secretary of the Navy had pointed out, had been brought to the attention of my colleague in the Senate, and the provision had been incorporated, it would find no difficulty in being incorporated by the representatives in the other branch of Congress. The conferees on the part of the House, however, according to the information I have, steadfastly refused to allow the item to remain in the bill, although it involved only \$150,000 for the only navy yard on a coast line of 3,500 miles. North of Hatteras, to Portsmouth, N. H., a distance of 700 miles, there are 7 navy yards and 14 dry docks. If those were spaced according to miles, there would be a dry dock every 50 miles and a navy yard every 100 miles. South of Hatteras, on a coast line of 3,500 miles, there is but one navy yard. While there is an emergency appropriation for every navy yard north of Hatteras, there is not one dollar of such appropriation for the lone navy yard to the south of Hatteras.

Mr. President, if we are to provide for the employment of the unemployed, why discriminate against the only navy yard on the South Atlantic, and the Gulf coast, too, for that matter? I understand that the major objection was that the item was not estimated for by the Budget Bureau. I am not going to discuss this afternoon the question of the Budget Bureau. I do not believe there is a Senator on this floor who would not vote that the same treatment be accorded to the people who need employment in Charleston as is accorded to those who are employed in the other navy yards, even though the navy yards were as thickly placed on the South Atlantic and Gulf coast as they are on the North Atlantic. Why discriminate?

This afternoon I called on the Secretary of the Navy and asked him if he would not see the officers of the Budget Bureau and have this item estimated for, as I have been informed that if that bureau would submit an estimate perhaps the objection would be removed.

Mr. President, I do not want to be a dog in the manger; my opposition does not assume that aspect. It is simply a question of my duty not to my section alone—though, of course, I have a duty there—but to all sections to endeavor to have observed a decent regard for fair play. While appropriations have been made for all the navy yards on the West coast and on the East coast north of Cape Hatteras, for the only navy yard on all the southern coast, including the Gulf coast, not one penny is proposed to be appropriated.

The Secretary of the Navy himself, in the presence of the committee, and in the presence of the Senator who has charge of this bill used the significant language that, even if there were not an emergency, the appropriation would be just, and Admiral Parsons indorsed it and backed it up as being a necessity in order that there might be utilized the only harbor of refuge that would be available in case of accident to any of our vessels in the South Atlantic, the Gulf, or the Caribbean, without endangering them by being towed or trying to go under their own power around Cape Hatteras.

It is not pleasing to me, and it does not argue very well for the powers that be, that I and the representatives of the southern section of the country must stand here and plead for ordinary decent treatment in a matter that is national. We do not propose to defend our country sectionally; we did not do it in the World War. The boys from South Carolina have a record of which I am proud and which is equal, if not superior, to that of any who helped to break through the Hindenburg line and bring the first ray of hope to a beleaguered world. We may have some very great faults, but, thank God, the lack of spirit and bravery is not one of them.

For the 22 years that I have been a member of this body I have tried to take a national view of national questions. What, Mr. President, do you suppose my feelings are when I have to stand before the Senate and plead against sectional legislation?

I have asked Admiral Parsons and the Secretary of the Navy to appear before the Budget Bureau and request an

estimate for this item. They are now doing that, and I am going to ask the Senator who has the conference report in charge to withhold its consideration until noon to-morrow, when I am promised a report; not, in case the report is favorable, that I shall insist on the item being incorporated in this bill, but I want to ascertain whether or not the Budget Bureau is going to put me in an attitude where I can with some degree of confidence ask that the item may be incorporated in the second deficiency bill or in the naval appropriation bill. I am entitled to that consideration at the hands of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I have not taken up the time of the Senate with matters which were not essential. I appear now under a feeling of resentment. If this thing were done accidentally or through oversight, then, of course, it would relieve me of the feeling I have; but if it were done in a designed, calculating manner, then, Mr. President, I will, out of self-respect, out of regard for my country at large and for my section of the country in particular and for my State, have to do the best that I can to keep this sort of thing from happening.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Was the request made of the Budget Bureau to incorporate this item in the bill?

Mr. SMITH. After the Secretary of the Navy had indorsed it and Admiral Parsons, who had charge of yards and docks, to which the item pertains, had said that it would be looked after, I thought I had gone far enough to point out to the committee what had been done, and the committee unanimously incorporated the item in the bill.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And no point of order was raised against it when the bill was before the Senate?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, no.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. So that the amendment was adopted by the Senate?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. I do not think a point of order against the amendment would have been sustained, because it was considered by a standing committee and incorporated by the committee in the bill; but no point of order was raised; it was adopted by this body as were the other amendments and went to the other House.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Now, may I ask the Senator this question: Under the procedure this item may be incorporated in another or second deficiency bill?

Mr. SMITH. It may be.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Or it may be added to and incorporated in the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. But to have it placed in either the second deficiency bill or the naval appropriation bill, does the Senator understand that it is necessary to have an estimate by and the approval of the Budget?

Mr. SMITH. That is what I understand. I understand that perhaps the conferees on this bill would not have had this difficulty had there been an estimate by the Budget.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am directly interested in procedure because I have an item which went out upon a point of order, and I wanted to have the matter cleared up.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President and Senators, I do not want to give way to just how I feel. I want to talk about this matter dispassionately. We are responsible, as legislators, for providing the law and the money to put the law into effect for the common defense, and the upkeep of those things that do defend our country.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. JONES. A moment ago the Senator submitted a proposition to me. I sympathize with the Senator's position; and, as I say, the conferees on the part of the Senate held out for this item just as long as they felt there was any possible hope for it. As a matter of fact, it was the last item that was finally dealt with in conference. So I

feel that the Senate conferees have done all that they could for the Senator's item.

Now, I want to appeal to the Senator on this phase of the matter:

As I said a while ago, it was estimated that the items incorporated in this bill and agreed to by the conferees will furnish labor for the unemployed to the extent of about 25,000 men between now and the 1st of July. In other words, every day that we delay here in the Senate means the loss of a day's work for 25,000 men. Under all the circumstances, I know that the Senator does not want to have that occur.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I state to the Senator that it is not very consoling to those in my section who want to enjoy the largess of our Government to be sacrificed while 25,000 men elsewhere are being taken care of? I do not think I would be just to myself and to the people employed in and around the Charleston yard to say, "Because the Budget for some reason did not estimate for you, although you were indorsed by the Secretary of the Navy and by the admiral who has this matter in charge, and by the Senate committee, I am going to let the other 25,000 men begin work at once. I yield because it is very urgent that somebody should get relief, but not you—not you."

No, Mr. President. I will tell you: I think I would be indorsed by my colleagues if I should ask the Senator just to allow this matter to go over until I hear from the Secretary of the Navy; and he promises to let me hear from him by 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I can not think that the laborers at the Senator's yard would say, "Because we can not get a day's work we are going to keep 25,000 of our comrades out of a day's work." They would not say that. Of course, they would regret that they do not get it, too.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not want to go into that phase of the matter at all, for the reason that unless there are grounds upon which the discrimination can be defended Congress has no right upon the premises before us to deny the laborers in that navy yard participation in an emergency matter that is as needful in the Charleston yard, perhaps more needful, than in any other yard on the Atlantic seaboard. It is very little to ask.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, how much is the item?

Mr. SMITH. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars. While millions are appropriated elsewhere, \$150,000 is asked there. That was Admiral Parsons's estimate for permanent concrete ways. I am only asking the Senator for this slight delay, not to prejudice the bill. It is going to pass, perhaps; but I am sure he and the other Members of the Senate who have charge of this bill will, if the Budget estimates for the item, do what they have done in this case, but with better means of sustaining it, if it is put on another bill.

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

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I had an item which went out on a point of order; and I understand that it may be in order later on if the Budget estimates and reports it.

I personally sympathize very much with the views expressed by the Senator from South Carolina. I feel that the Senator is entirely right in the position he takes; but may I suggest that if the item which concerns him may be taken care of in the second deficiency bill or in the naval appropriation bill, relief can be found in that way. Therefore, I venture to express the thought that he would not succeed by holding up this conference report and sending it back to the conferees, or asking them further to consider it, and that he may obtain relief in the way suggested, as I hope to obtain it.

Mr. SMITH. Whether I shall have to try, with what friends I may muster here and at the other end of the Capitol, to have this item incorporated in legislation is going to depend entirely upon whether or not the Budget will estimate for it. Had I dreamed that the indorsement of

the Secretary of the Navy and the admiral would be unheeded at the other end of the Capitol, and that they were going to use as an occasion—perhaps not the cause, but as the occasion—of their objection to the item that it was not estimated for, I should have sought to have that done. But after the indorsement of the Secretary of the Navy and of the admiral I thought they would look after the matter, since they had committed themselves to it, and never gave myself any further concern until I heard that it was violently objected to on the part of the House.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. On the merits?

Mr. SMITH. It could not have been on its merits, for I take it that they have good common sense over there.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH. I do.

Mr. GLASS. It has been explained to the Senator from South Carolina that the objection was largely technical, because the matter had not been estimated for, and the conferees did not want to start the precedent of putting in the bill matters that had not been estimated for. The Senator has been assured by his colleagues on this side at least, and I think on the other side, and the conferees on the bill, that if an estimate comes up the matter will be included in the next deficiency bill, the framing of which will be begun the latter part of this week.

Mr. JONES. Or the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. GLASS. Or the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the Senator from Virginia a question. Suppose the Budget absolutely refuses to send down an estimate. In that event, what remedy would I have?

Mr. GLASS. I do not see that there is any remedy for the Senator so far as this particular conference report is concerned.

Mr. SMITH. I am not talking about this conference report.

Mr. GLASS. The remedy the Senator would have then would be to try to include it, the opposition of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. SMITH. Precisely; and then have the same objection to meet in those bills that is made in this one. If there were any other method by which I could have the item incorporated in the second deficiency bill or in the naval appropriation bill, I should be perfectly willing to let this bill go and try my chances with those two measures.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, of what advantage would it be to the Senator to obstruct the consideration of this bill when he has just exactly the same opportunity to override the refusal of the Budget in the next deficiency bill and in the naval appropriation bill itself?

Mr. SMITH. The idea is that if this is an emergency matter, and the project was incorporated here in order to put it on a parity with the other emergency items in this bill, this is the appropriate place for quick action on an emergent project.

Mr. GLASS. The Senate conferees were simply unable, as hard as they tried to do it, to convince the conferees of the other House to that effect.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the experience I have had with this bill is not very promising as to what may occur in the others, but I am going to make this statement:

As efforts are now being made—honestly, I believe—to get an estimate from the Budget, I am going to allow this bill to pass; but, so help me God, if there is no estimate made, and I have not an opportunity with the estimate back of the item to include it in the other bills, I shall call on my friends who have so valiantly stood by this item this time to help me see that justice is done before this session of Congress shall have adjourned.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, and will the Senator stand by me and help me similarly?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; for I want to state here and now that I have been greatly encouraged by the attitude of the Senator from California in all matters with which I have

tried to impress the Senate. I think he is a man of extraordinarily high intelligence, because of his appreciation of what I have had to say.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I present the conference report and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the conference report? The Chair hears none, and the report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15592) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17, 24, 32, 33, 34, 37, 48, 74, 85, 86, 91, 92, 95, and 109.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 94, 98, 101, 102, 104, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, and 137, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$96,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000," and in line 7 strike out "\$103,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$57,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Forest Service: For construction of improvements for the protection and administration of the national forests, including telephone lines, fire breaks, dwellings, offices, miscellaneous small structures, and for fences and water-development projects for range control and other purposes and for combating epidemic insect infestations on the national forests adjacent to Yellowstone National Park and threatening the park timber and invaluable timber stands in northern Idaho, \$354,800."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Bureau of Biological Survey: For construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of buildings and other structures, dams, fences, telephone lines, roads, installation of electricity and water system, cold-storage plants, septic tanks, and for surveying wild-life refuges, and so forth, in connection with bird and game reservation and other field activities in Arizona, Arkansas, California, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, or elsewhere, and for the control of injurious predatory animals and rodents, \$300,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"Tuberculosis building: For the construction and equipment of the second floor of the tuberculosis building, \$120,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 8, 11, 15, and 18 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following respective amounts: "\$206,000, \$18,000, \$11,000, \$15,000" and in line 18 strike out the sum "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sum "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$4,420,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Navy yard, Washington, District of Columbia: Improvement of heating system, \$20,000; improvement of power plant, \$25,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Submarine base, New London, Connecticut: Replace building numbered 42 damaged by fire, \$50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"AIR CORPS

"Air Corps, Army: For construction and repair of technical buildings, \$504,800; and torque stands and repair of buildings and equipment, \$366,300; in all, \$871,100."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$471,005"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard: For construction of buildings and utilities at camps, \$1,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: "\$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"Cemeterial expenses: For general repairs at national cemeteries, \$131,712."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 4, 18, 27, 76, 79, and 105.

W. L. JONES,
REED SMOOT,
FREDERICK HALE,
CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,

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.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations how much effort was made to sustain amendment No. 103. That is the amendment which provides for very necessary work to be done by the Quartermaster Department over in Arlington Cemetery.

Mr. JONES. I remember that matter. We urged it very strongly in conference. If I am permitted to give the reasons which actuated the House conferees, I will say that one of them stated that they felt that we are providing a very great amount of Government work around Washington City. That was one reason which actuated them. They felt that they could not accept that amendment under all the circumstances.

Mr. REED. I realize, of course, that the conferees can not get every Senate amendment agreed to, and I am not criticizing the conferees—

Mr. JONES. I appreciate that.

Mr. REED. This is the matter in which the War Department is very much interested. It is necessary for the completion of the work in Arlington Cemetery that the money should be appropriated. There must be an administration building there, and it seemed to the department and to those who pay a good deal of attention to the affairs at Arlington Cemetery that this was the best possible time to do it.

Mr. JONES. I would say this, too, that the House conferees felt that if they considered it of sufficient importance to get an estimate sent down to be included in the general deficiency bill, it could be considered in connection with that.

Mr. REED. The Senator does not think, then, that the matter is so far foreclosed that it could not be considered with possible success in the last deficiency bill?

Mr. JONES. I do not think so. Possibly I ought to say a word about the amendments on which we reported disagreement, but which I said the House conferees were taking back to the House. I will make a brief statement.

One amendment was with reference to the provision of salaries of Senators appointed to fill vacancies. The House conferees will recommend the provision as inserted in the bill in the Senate.

In reference to the Bureau of Reclamation, we put on an amendment suspending payments to the Treasury for five years. We have reached a tentative agreement on two years. That will give us plenty of time to work the matter out in a regular and proper way and take care of the situation as it is developed.

The provision for a vessel for Alaska the conferees have tentatively agreed upon.

With reference to the Lynchburg post-office situation, the House conferees are going to recommend to the House that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

With reference to the Public Health Service and rural sanitation, the House conferees are going to recommend to the House to adopt \$2,000,000 instead of \$3,000,000, as we passed it through the Senate.

With reference to the Shiloh National Military Park road, in which the Senator from Tennessee is very much interested, the House conferees have tentatively agreed to the provision as we put it into the bill, and will recommend its adoption in the House.

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

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was looking through the conference report to see what disposition had been made of the amendment I offered, and which was agreed to, about the \$3,000,000 for rural sanitation. Just as I finished I heard the Senator say something about that. What is the status of that?

Mr. JONES. We have tentatively agreed on \$2,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was that agreed to among the conferees?

Mr. JONES. There was a tentative agreement among the conferees, and the House conferees will recommend to the House that that sum be agreed to by the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator did not bring that in as a part of the conference report?

Mr. JONES. We had to bring in a disagreement on that amendment, because this was only a tentative agreement, and under the rules of the House, apparently, the House conferees have to take certain things back to the House. So we had to report a disagreement, but the understanding is that the House conferees will recommend the adoption of \$2,000,000 by the House.

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

The report was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. I ask that we proceed with the independent offices appropriation bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to read the bill for action on the amendments of the committee.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Office of the President," on page 2, line 10, after the word "President," to strike out "\$96,180; in all, \$126,180" and insert "\$97,200; in all, \$127,200," so as to read:

Salaries: For Secretary to the President, \$10,000; two additional secretaries to the President at \$10,000 each; personal services in the office of the President, \$97,200; in all, \$127,200.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, these amendments the clerk is now about to read are simply amendments to carry out the average salary provision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, to increase the total appropriation for the Executive Office from \$532,-380 to \$533,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the heading "Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission," on page 6, line 22, after the figures "\$50," to strike out "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay for the cost of widening and paving B Street NW., as provided in the approved project, except for such portions as may abut upon Government-owned property, and not in excess of 40 per cent of the cost of widening and paving of that portion of the said street which so abuts" and in lieu thereof to insert "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay for the cost of reconstructing and paving B Street NW., as provided in the approved project, except for such portions as may abut upon Government-owned property, and not in excess of 40 per cent of the cost of such repaving of that portion of the said street which so abuts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Board of Mediation," on page 7, line 22, before the word "of," to strike out "\$186,685" and insert "\$187,045," and in line 23, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$141,500" and insert "\$141,860," so as to read:

For five members of the board, at \$12,000 each, and for other authorized expenditures of the Board of Mediation in performing the duties imposed by law, including personal services; contract stenographic reporting services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); supplies and equipment; law books and books of reference; not to exceed \$200 for newspapers; periodicals; traveling expenses; rent of quarters in the District of Columbia, if space is not provided by the Public Buildings Commission, and rent of quarters outside the District of Columbia, \$187,045, of which amount not to exceed \$141,860 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 25, to increase the total appropriation for the Board of Mediation from \$188,185 to \$188,545.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Board of Tax Appeals," on page 9, line 14, before the word "of," to strike out "\$608,640" and insert "\$609,460," and in line 15, before the word "may," to strike out "\$546,839" and insert "\$547,659," so as to read:

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the work of the Board of Tax Appeals as authorized under Title IX, section 900, of the revenue act of 1924, approved June 2, 1924, as amended by Title X of the revenue act of 1926, approved February 26, 1926, and Title IV of the revenue act of 1928, approved May 29, 1928, including personal services and contract stenographic reporting services to be obtained by renewal of existing contract, or otherwise, rent outside the District of Columbia, traveling expenses, car fare, stationery, furniture, office equipment, purchase and exchange of typewriters, law books and books of reference, periodicals, and all other necessary supplies, \$609,460, of which amount not to exceed \$547,659 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 19, to increase the total appropriation for the Board of Tax Appeals from \$653,640 to \$654,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Efficiency," on page 10, line 2, before the word "of," to strike out "\$199,770" and insert "\$200,970," and in line 3, before the word "may," to strike out "\$193,720" and insert "\$194,920," so as to read:

For chief of bureau and other personal services in the District of Columbia; contract stenographic reporting services; contingent expenses, including traveling expenses; supplies, stationery; purchase and exchange of equipment; not to exceed \$100 for law books, books of reference, newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed \$150 for street-car fare; in all, \$200,970, of which amount not to exceed \$194,920 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 7, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Efficiency, from \$200,270 to 201,470.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 10, line 10, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$849,570" and insert "\$872,430," so as to read:

Salaries: For three commissioners and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$872,430.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ought to say, in justice to the Senate, that there is an addition to the field force provided in the amendment, as well as a salary increase. One of the commissioners urged that they be removed from the classification law. We did not feel that we ought to make an exception in their case, because if we should do that we would be asked to make exceptions in a great many cases. So we left the commissioners' salaries unchanged.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 11, after the word "force," to strike out "\$557,540" and insert "\$566,840," so as to read:

Field force: For salaries of the field force, \$566,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 6, before the word "of," to strike out "\$27,840" and insert "\$28,080," and in line 7, before the word "may," to strike out "\$23,840" and insert "\$24,080," so as to read:

For examination of presidential postmasters, including travel, stationery, contingent expenses, additional examiners, and investigators, and other necessary expenses of examinations, \$28,080, of which amount not to exceed \$24,080 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 14, to increase the total appropriation for the Civil Service Commission, from \$1,644,542 to \$1,676,942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commission of Fine Arts," on page 12, line 25, before the word "of," to strike out "\$9,475" and insert "\$9,695," and on page 13, line 1, before the word "may," to strike out "\$6,200" and insert "\$6,420," so as to read:

For expenses made necessary by the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 104), including the purchase of periodicals, maps, and books of reference, and payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the commission in attending meetings and committee meetings of the commission either within or outside of the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the commission, \$9,695, of which amount not to exceed \$6,420 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 5, to increase the total appropriation for the Commission of Fine Arts, from \$9,775 to \$9,995.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Employees' Compensation Commission," on page 13, line 18, to strike out "\$522,980" and insert "\$526,380," so as to read:

For three commissioners and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including not to exceed \$1,000 for temporary experts and assistants in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$8 per day, and for personal services in the field; for furniture and other equipment and repairs thereto; law books, books of reference, periodicals; stationery and supplies; traveling expenses; fees and mileage of witnesses; contract stenographic reporting services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; and miscellaneous items, \$526,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 11, to increase the total appropriation for the Employees' Compensation Commission from \$4,730,480 to \$4,734,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Board for Vocational Education," on page 15, line 20, before the word "of," to strike out "\$94,380" and insert "\$95,280," so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For carrying out the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories," approved February 5, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 20, secs. 15b, 15c), \$95,280, of which amount not to exceed \$68,500 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 25, before the word "of," to strike out "\$77,960" and insert "\$77,980," and in the same line, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$56,880" and insert "\$57,000," so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For making studies, investigations, and reports regarding the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons and their placements in suitable or gainful occupations, and for the administrative expenses of said board incident to performing the duties imposed by the act of June 2, 1920 (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 35), as amended by the act of June 5, 1924 (U. S. C., title 29,

sec. 31), and the act of June 9, 1930, including salaries of such assistants, experts, clerks, and other employees, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, as the board may deem necessary, actual traveling and other necessary expenses incurred by the members of the board and by its employees, under its orders; including attendance at meetings of educational associations and other organizations, rent and equipment of offices in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference, law books, and periodicals, newspapers not to exceed \$50, stationery, typewriters and exchange thereof, miscellaneous supplies, postage on foreign mail, printing and binding, and all other necessary expenses, \$77,980, of which amount not to exceed \$57,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, at the end of line 11, to strike out "\$14,740" and insert "\$15,000," so as to read:

Cooperative vocational rehabilitation of disabled residents of the District of Columbia: For personal services, printing and binding, travel and subsistence, and payment of expenses of training, placement, and other phases of rehabilitating disabled residents of the District of Columbia under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation of disabled residents of the District of Columbia," approved February 23, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 29, secs. 47-47e), \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission," on page 20, line 11, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "\$255,695" and insert "\$256,495," and in line 12, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$212,620" and insert "\$213,420," so as to read:

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the work of the Federal Power Commission as authorized by law, including traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings which in the discretion of the commission are necessary for the efficient discharge of its responsibilities; contract stenographic reporting services, and not exceeding \$1,000 for press-clipping service, law books, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals, \$256,495, of which amount not to exceed \$213,420 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, including five commissioners at \$10,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 18, to increase the total appropriation for the Federal Power Commission from \$260,195 to \$260,995.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Radio Commission," on page 21, line 10, before the word "of," to strike out "\$465,380" and insert "\$466,820," and in line 11, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$365,880" and insert "\$367,320," so as to read:

For five commissioners, at \$10,000 each per annum, and for all other authorized expenditures of the Federal Radio Commission in performing the duties imposed by the radio act of 1927, as amended, including personal services, contract stenographic reporting services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), printing and binding, rental of quarters in the District of Columbia, newspapers, periodicals, reference books, law books, special counsel fees, supplies and equipment, which may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$25, traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings which in the discretion of the commission are necessary for the efficient discharge of its responsibilities, and other necessary expenses, \$466,820, of which amount not to exceed \$367,320 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Trade Commission," on page 22, line 6, before the word "of," to strike out "\$1,731,766" and insert "\$1,745,986," and in line 7, before the word "may," to strike out "\$1,316,924" and insert "\$1,329,144," so as to read:

For five commissioners, at \$10,000 each per annum, and for all other authorized expenditures of the Federal Trade Commission in performing the duties imposed by law or in pursuance of law, including secretary to the commission and other personal services, contract stenographic reporting services to be obtained on and after the approval of this act by the commission, in its discretion, through the civil service or by contract, or renewal of existing contract, or otherwise, supplies and equipment, law books, books of reference, periodicals, garage rental, traveling expenses, including not to exceed \$900 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the commission, at meetings concerned with the work of the Federal Trade Commission, not to exceed \$300 for

newspapers, not to exceed \$200 for newspaper clippings, foreign postage, and witness fees, and mileage in accordance with section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission act, of which \$150,000 shall be immediately available, \$1,745,986, of which amount not to exceed \$1,329,144 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, including witness fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 12, to increase the total appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission from \$1,761,766 to \$1,775,986.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Accounting Office," on page 22, line 17, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$4,052,620; in all, \$4,062,620" and insert "\$4,118,320; in all, \$4,128,320," so as to read:

Salaries: Comptroller General, \$10,000; for Assistant Comptroller General and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$4,118,320; in all, \$4,128,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 12, to increase the total appropriation for the General Accounting Office from \$4,297,620 to \$4,363,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "George Washington Bicentennial Commission," on page 24, line 22, after the word "acts," to strike out "fiscal year 1931," so as to read:

For carrying out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the comprehensive observance of that greatest of all historic events, the bicentennial of the birthday of George Washington," approved December 2, 1924 (43 Stat. 671), and all other activities authorized by the act entitled "An act to enable the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans," approved February 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 71), including personal services without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended, and civil-service regulations, traveling expenses, furniture and equipment, supplies, printing and binding, rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, and all other expenditures authorized by the above acts, \$338,195, to be available until expended, for each and every object of expenditure connected with the celebration notwithstanding the provisions of any other act relating to the expenditure of public moneys, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the executive committee, or such person as may be designated by him to approve vouchers.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Washington would let this amendment go over. I presume we will shortly be concluding our business for the day, anyway. I do not know that there will be any objection to the amendment, but some discussion of this provision may involve this amendment.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator thinks it will involve any amendment which there might be a desire to discuss, I am perfectly willing that it should go over.

Mr. NORRIS. I am satisfied the Senator will do what is right about it, but so as to avoid any possibility of anybody else objecting, I would prefer having the amendment go over unacted on.

Mr. JONES. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to make the same statement about the amendment on page 25, line 9, under the heading of "Housing Corporation." I would like to have that go over.

Mr. JONES. I suppose the Senator would also want to have the amendments on pages 26 and 27 go over?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; all amendments relating to the Housing Corporation.

Mr. JONES. I had hoped we would be able to dispose of those this afternoon. Would the Senator want to take some little time?

Mr. NORRIS. I think there will be some Senators who are not here now who will want to participate in the debate on some of those things. I would not want to have them taken up without calling for a quorum.

Mr. JONES. They may be passed over then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be passed over without prejudice.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission," on page 27, line 14, before the word "of," to strike out "\$3,090,900" and insert "\$3,113,280," and in the same line, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$2,569,160" and insert "\$2,591,000," so as to read:

For 11 commissioners, at \$12,000 each; secretary, \$9,000, and for all other authorized expenditures necessary in the execution of laws to regulate commerce, including one chief counsel, one director of finance, and one director of traffic at \$10,000 each per annum, traveling expenses, and stenographic reporting services to be obtained on and after the approval of this act by the commission, in its discretion, through the civil service or by contract or renewal of existing contract, or otherwise, \$3,113,280, of which amount not to exceed \$2,591,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, exclusive of special counsel, for which the expenditure shall not exceed \$50,000; not exceeding \$3,000 for purchase and exchange of necessary books, reports, and periodicals; not exceeding \$100 in the open market for the purchase of office furniture similar in class or kind to that listed in the general supply schedule; and not exceeding \$139,000 for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 10, before the word "of," to strike out "\$1,504,420" and insert "\$1,507,000," and in line 11, before the word "may," to strike out "\$252,840" and insert "\$255,000," so as to read:

Regulating commerce: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce compliance with section 20 and other sections of the act to regulate commerce as amended by the act approved June 29, 1906 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 20), and as amended by the transportation act, 1920 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 20), including the employment of necessary special accounting agents or examiners, and traveling expenses, \$1,507,000, of which amount not to exceed \$255,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 2, before the word "of," to strike out "\$534,660" and insert "\$539,460," and in line 3, before the word "may," to strike out "\$94,340" and insert "\$95,000," so as to read:

Safety of employees: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to keep informed regarding and to enforce compliance with acts to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads; the act requiring common carriers to make reports of accidents and authorizing investigations thereof; and to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate and test appliances intended to promote the safety of railway operation, as authorized by the joint resolution approved June 30, 1906 (U. S. C., title 45, sec. 35), and the provision of the sundry civil act approved May 27, 1908 (U. S. C., title 45, secs. 36, 37), to investigate, test experimentally, and report on the use and need of any appliances or systems intended to promote the safety of railway operation, inspectors, and for traveling expenses, \$539,460, of which amount not to exceed \$95,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 16, before the word "of," to strike out "\$48,260" and insert "\$48,380," and in line 17, before the word "may," to strike out "\$34,880" and insert "\$35,000," so as to read:

Signal safety systems: For all authorized expenditures under section 26 of the act to regulate commerce as amended by the transportation act, 1920 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 26), with respect to the provision thereof under which carriers by railroad subject to the act may be required to install automatic train-stop or train-control devices which comply with specifications and requirements prescribed by the commission, including investigations and tests pertaining to block-signal and train-control systems, as authorized by the joint resolution approved June 30, 1906 (U. S. C., title 45, sec. 35), and including the employment of the necessary engineers, and for traveling expenses, \$48,380, of which amount not to exceed \$35,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 13, before the word "of," to strike out "\$504,865" and insert "\$508,885," and in line 14, before the word "may," to strike out "\$79,880" and insert "\$80,000," so as to read:

Locomotive inspection: For all authorized expenditures under the provisions of the act of February 17, 1911, "To promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto" (U. S. C., title 45, sec. 22), as amended by the act of March 4, 1915, extending "the same powers and duties with respect to all parts and appurtenances of the locomotive and tender"

(U. S. C., title 45, sec. 30), and amendment of June 7, 1924 (U. S. C., title 45, sec. 27), providing for the appointment from time to time by the Interstate Commerce Commission of not more than 15 inspectors in addition to the number authorized in the first paragraph of section 4 of the act of 1911 (U. S. C., title 45, sec. 26), and the amendment of June 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 822, 823), including such legal, technical, stenographic, and clerical help as the business of the offices of the chief inspector and his two assistants may require, and for traveling expenses, \$508,885, of which amount not to exceed \$80,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 3, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$3,554,368" and insert "\$3,583,588," so as to read:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof," by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities, approved March 1, 1913 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 19a), including one director of valuation at \$10,000 per annum, one supervisor of land appraisals, one supervising engineer, one supervisor of accounts, and one principal valuation examiner, at \$9,000 each per annum, and traveling expenses, \$3,583,588: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia if suitable space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, every amendment in the bill from this point on relates to average-salary provisions. I ask unanimous consent that they may be agreed to en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and all the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The first of the amendments agreed to en bloc was, on page 31, line 20, to increase the total appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission from \$9,412,473 to \$9,475,593.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 32, line 22, before the word "of," to strike out "\$1,028,070" and insert "\$1,030,790," so as to read:

For scientific research, technical investigations, and special reports in the field of aeronautics, including the necessary laboratory and technical assistants; contracts for personal services in the making of special investigations and in the preparation of special reports; traveling expenses of members and employees, including not to exceed \$500 for expenses, except membership fees, of attendance upon meetings of technical and professional societies; office supplies and other miscellaneous expenses, including technical periodicals and books of reference; equipment, maintenance, and operation of the Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory; purchase, maintenance, operation, and exchange of motor-propelled, passenger-carrying vehicles; personal services in the field and in the District of Columbia; in all, \$1,030,790, of which amount not to exceed \$1,550 may be expended for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 818), and not to exceed \$116,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 8, to increase the total appropriation for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, from \$1,051,070 to \$1,053,790.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Personnel Classification Board," on page 34, line 16, after the word "devices," to strike out "\$218,850" and insert "\$220,830," so as to read:

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the work of the Personnel Classification Board, as authorized by the classification act of 1923, as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, telegrams, telephone service, printing and binding, law books, books of reference, periodicals, stationery, furniture, office equipment, other supplies, street-car fares (not exceeding \$100), purchase and exchange of typewriters and labor-saving devices, \$220,830.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital," on page 35, line 6, before the word "including," to strike out "\$2,793,250" and insert "\$2,847,490," so as to read:

For personal services in the District of Columbia, \$2,847,490 including not to exceed \$25,000 for intermittent and seasonal employees at per diem rates of compensation to be fixed by the director.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 21, to increase the total appropriation for the office of Public Buildings and

Public Parks of the National Capital from \$5,541,445 to \$5,595,685.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Smithsonian Institution," on page 38, at the end of line 21, to strike out "\$38,644" and insert "\$38,764," so as to read:

For expenses of the general administrative office, Smithsonian Institution, including an additional assistant secretary at \$9,000 per annum during the present incumbency, compensation of necessary employees, traveling expenses, purchase of books and periodicals, supplies and equipment, and any other necessary expenses, \$38,764.

The next amendment was, on page 39, at the end of line 3, to strike out "\$54,060" and insert "\$54,180," so as to read:

International exchanges: For the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, including necessary employees, and purchase of necessary books and periodicals, and traveling expenses, \$54,180.

The next amendment was, on page 40, at the end of line 2, to strike out "\$37,620" and insert "\$37,680," so as to read:

Astrophysical Observatory: For maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, including assistants, purchase of books, periodicals, and apparatus, making necessary observations in high altitudes, repairs and alterations of buildings, preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations, traveling expenses, and miscellaneous expenses, \$37,680.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Museum," on page 40, line 11, to strike out "\$154,580" and insert "\$155,060," so as to read:

For cases, furniture, fixtures, and appliances required for the exhibition and safe-keeping of collections; heating, lighting, electrical, telegraphic, and telephonic service, repairs and alterations of buildings, shops, and sheds, including approaches and all necessary material; personal services, and traveling and other necessary incidental expenses, \$155,060.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 21, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "\$618,890" and insert "\$621,050," so as to read:

For continuing preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government, and from other sources, including personal services, traveling expenses, purchasing and supplying uniforms to guards and elevator conductors, postage stamps and foreign postal cards and all other necessary expenses, and not exceeding \$5,500 for preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications, and not exceeding \$3,000 for purchase of books, pamphlets, and periodicals, \$621,050.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Gallery of Art," on page 41, line 2, after the word "expenses" to strike out "\$45,220" and insert "\$45,400," so as to read:

For the administration of the National Gallery of Art by the Smithsonian Institution, including compensation of necessary employees, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, traveling expenses, uniforms for guards, and necessary incidental expenses, \$45,400.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding," on page 41, line 16, before the word "of," to strike out "\$1,153,804" and insert "\$1,156,924," and in line 17, before the word "may," to strike out "\$903,871" and insert "\$906,991," so as to read:

Total, Smithsonian Institution, \$1,156,924, of which amount not to exceed \$906,991 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Geographic Board," on page 43, at the end of line 10, to strike out "\$9,178" and insert "\$9,238," so as to read:

For salaries and expenses of the United States Geographic Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia, and for stationery and office supplies, \$9,238.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 13, to increase the total appropriation for the United States Geographic Board from \$10,678 to \$10,738.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Shipping Board shipping fund," on page 47, line 4,

before the word "act," to insert "appropriation," so as to read:

Provided further, That the unexpended balances of the sums made available by the independent offices appropriation act, 1930, for reconditioning and operating ships for carrying coal to foreign ports shall continue available for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1932.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration," on page 50, line 8, after the word "administering," to strike out "\$110,228,707" and insert "\$111,078,587," so as to read:

Administration, Medical, Hospital, and Domiciliary Services: For all salaries and expenses of the Veterans' Administration, including the expenses of maintenance and operation of medical, hospital, and domiciliary services of the Veterans' Administration, in carrying out the duties, powers, and functions devolving upon it pursuant to the authority contained in the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans," approved July 3, 1930 (46 Stat., 1016), and any and all laws for which the Veterans' Administration is now or may hereafter be charged with administering, \$111,078,587:

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 17, to increase the total appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, from \$866,012,732 to \$866,862,612.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 18, to increase the total appropriation carried in the act from \$1,052,768,140 to \$1,053,872,344.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there is a committee amendment on page 34, line 1, which I now offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 34, line 1, after the word "services," insert the following:

And without reference to civil service rules and the classification act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, just what does that mean?

Mr. JONES. I do not believe myself in the suspension of the civil service rules unless it seems to be absolutely necessary. I have a letter from Colonel Grant with reference to this situation reading as follows:

With further reference to Senate hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill, the following language was eliminated on the floor of the House from the item for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission:

" * * * and without reference to civil-service rules and the classification act of 1923, as amended; * * * "

This commission will be required to purchase \$4,000,000 worth of property during the next fiscal year as provided in the Capper-Cramton Act and the employment of technical and real-estate experts who have many years experience under local conditions is necessary for economical purchases. The Civil Service Commission does not maintain a register of this class of personnel and indeed it would prove difficult to establish such a register. This commission employs some experts in this work under existing authority and to be required to recognize at this time and await civil-service approval would obviously be a handicap.

Furthermore, outside the District of Columbia the available maps are not adequate and it would not be safe to make purchases without an official survey and better mapping of the topography. In order to start this work promptly survey parties have been organized under the foregoing authority, and to disorganize these parties now in the midst of their work would manifestly be very harmful to their work.

It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the Senate Appropriations Committee consider the advisability of reinstating this language.

I think the Senator will appreciate the situation.

Mr. COUZENS. For how long a period are these people to be employed?

Mr. JONES. He says within the next year.

Mr. COUZENS. And for what purpose?

Mr. JONES. For the acquiring of lands in the District for governmental purposes.

Mr. COUZENS. Does it extend beyond the period of this appropriation bill?

Mr. JONES. Oh, no; the provision only affects this appropriation bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It would be very difficult for civil-service employees to value land in the District. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I offer another committee amendment, on page 48. This is a provision exactly in accordance with a similar amendment adopted on the War Department appropriation bill with reference to purchases in the United States, changed only, of course, to conform to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the amendment be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, strike out lines 18 to 22, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That in the expenditure of appropriations in this act for the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, the said corporation shall, when in its discretion the interest of the Government will permit, purchase for use, within the limits of the United States, only articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States, notwithstanding any existing laws to the contrary.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, after line 6, insert the following:

The authority granted to the United States Shipping Board by the second deficiency act, fiscal year, 1928, to enter into contracts to make loans from the construction loan fund is hereby increased from \$150,000,000 to \$185,000,000.

Mr. JONES. I may offer a short explanation of this amendment. In the deficiency appropriation act, passed about eight days after we passed the shipping act in 1928, it was provided that contracts for these loans should not be made beyond \$150,000,000, instead of \$250,000,000, as provided in the act itself. That has all been contracted except some \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000. If we make no provision of this kind, they could not contract up to the \$35,000,000 provided in the bill. The amendment practically covers that amount.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It is a committee amendment approved by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, after line 17, insert as a separate paragraph the following:

No part of the funds of the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be available for the maintenance of a sea service bureau.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter addressed by Andrew Furuseth to the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

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

The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 6, 1930.

HON. EDWARD H. WASON,
Chairman Subcommittee on Independent Offices,
Committee on Appropriations, House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE COMMITTEE: Inclosed please find copy of general petition dated November 15, 1929, relating to the abolition of appropriation for the sea service bureau, operated by the Shipping Board.

The inclosed petition was prepared before the report of the Shipping Board was available, and therefore deals only with the past.

On pages 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 122 of the Annual Report of the United States Shipping Board, fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, there are additional new facts, or comparatively new, which are herein respectfully brought to your attention, because by these facts the reasons for the abolition of the bureau are seriously reinforced. On page 42 the report says:

"It is obvious that with the gradual transfer of the publicly owned fleet to private American ownership, as a result of the Shipping Board's vigorous sales policy, the board finds itself concerned more and more with marine and dock labor employed in connection with privately owned American vessels. During the fiscal year 1928 the board sold all its remaining services on the Pacific, and

during the year covered by this report it has also disposed of its passenger lines on the Atlantic. This latter transaction takes it entirely out of ocean passenger service and at the present writing (June 30, 1929) leaves the Government operating but 17 cargo lines, 4 of which it is hoped may be sold in the near future."

Notwithstanding that no Government-owned vessels are operated from Pacific ports, there are two sea service bureaus operated at Seattle and Portland, in duplication of the shipping commissioners' offices operated according to law in these places. The reason given by the bureau for operating these offices, and others, is that the shipowners desire it. The shipowners' reason—if they were to tell the truth—is that the bureau is doing the work previously done by the crimps and doing it at Government expense, since it can not now be safely done by the crimps at the seamen's expense. This is the shipowners' reason everywhere. The sea service bureau helps them to disregard the law in the manner stated in a circular sent to Senators and Members of Congress in 1928, and found on page 2 of the seamen's petition of November 15, 1929.

On page 122 it is stated that the board operated 135 vessels, 11 of which have been sold and are now in process of delivery, so that 224 vessels will now be operated. To find the men for those vessels—men of the kind desired by the shipowners—sea service employment offices are being operated in 12 ports where there are shipping commissioners' offices, which under Government control, will furnish the men without cost but, of course, in accordance with law made by Congress.

On page 47 the bureau states that it has placed 65,906 seamen on vessels. Among these seamen it reports 28 masters who, of course, are placed by the owners or managers; 359 deck officers, who are always placed by the owners, the port captain, or by the masters; 10 chief engineers, who are always placed by the owners or operators; and 531 officers in the engine department, which officers are usually placed by the owners, the port engineers, or the masters. The masters, by the way, under the law, are to place all the men under them on the vessels in their proper ratings.

The report, on page 47, further says that the bureau has placed 20,599 able seamen on vessels.

The supervising inspector general stated in 1928, in answer to an inquiry made, that in 1927, 16,633 able seamen were needed for inspected vessels (p. 3 of petition). We thus find from the report that the Sea Service Bureau has, in the 12 ports in which it operates, placed 3,966 more able seamen than in 1927 were needed to man all the inspected vessels trading from all the ports of the country, including the Great Lakes.

Using round figures, approximately correct, the Shipping Board operates 225 vessels. Of the 235 operated on page 122, eleven are reported sold and in process of delivery, so that 225 would be fair for the present. These vessels trade to Europe, South America, and the Far East, making on an average eight trips per year. Each vessel employs eight able seamen, including the boatswain, and we thus get 14,400 able seamen employed by those vessels for each year, if new able seamen are employed at the beginning of each trip. This gives about 175 per cent of a turnover. If we subtract 387 deck officers and 541 engineer officers, among whom the turnover is small, then 1,444 petty deck officers, and 5,200 petty engineer officers, among whom the turnover would be about the same as among the able seamen, and add to this figure the 14,400 able seamen, we will yet have about 40,000 persons to fill the places of the remaining crew. This would be impossible but for the fact that a very large number of men employed in the coastwise and intercoastal trade are placed by the Sea Service Bureau. The number of men placed in foreign-going vessels and in vessels engaged in the coastwise and intercoastal trade is not segregated in the report, but that the latter number is very considerable is plain from the figures given above, and the turnover indicated both in the foreign and in the coastwise places of employment filled on ships by the Sea Service Bureau is so great that it is impossible, under this system, to develop efficient men to man our merchant marine.

From a national defense point of view, vessels are an asset, but vessels without efficient men to man them are a liability that grows with the number of vessels. Whether this question of the Sea Service Bureau and system used by it is approached from a safety point of view or from a national defense point of view, it fails entirely to accomplish the purpose declared by Congress, and I respectfully submit that it should be abolished.

Most respectfully yours,

ANDREW FURSETH.

Charles Wilson, being duly sworn, deposes and says: I am a citizen of the United States, 62 years of age, 5 feet 8 inches, weigh 165 pounds, in excellent health, and in possession of all my faculties.

I have been following the sea for a livelihood in the steward's department for 35 years, and for the last 25 years I have been acting in the capacity of a chief steward. Since 1920 I have been almost continually employed by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation as chief steward on ships operated by it through operators from Galveston and New Orleans, on vessels operated by their operators, the Lykes brothers. I have been employed on the steamships *Youngstown*, *Marne*, *Nishmaha*, and others.

My last employment was for the Consolidated Navigation Co., operators for the Fleet Corporation, on the steamship *Winona Country*, running out of Baltimore to England.

On the 24th day of October, 1927, I wrote the following letter to Captain McCaulder, who is the head agent of the Fleet Corporation in Baltimore:

S. S. WINONA COUNTY,
Manchester, England October 24, 1927.

Captain McCATLDER,
United States Shipping Board, Baltimore.

DEAR SIR: I herewith respectfully beg to inform you that on joining this vessel as chief steward in Baltimore last September I experienced a lot of opposition from the sea service bureau in regard to getting good reliable men for my department. At the request of Mr. Agello, the port steward, I engaged the cooks and messmen beforehand, knowing them to be sober and trustworthy men who had sailed with me on other vessels. At the S. S. B., however, Captain Hagues told me that I had nothing to do with picking my men; it was up to him to send the men needed on board. Yet I know for a fact that the chief steward of the S. S. *Eastern Dawn* that very day was permitted to pick his men at the S. S. B. This rather astonished me, as I always enjoyed the privilege to pick good, capable men while sailing out of Galveston, New Orleans, Boston, and New York. In these ports the S. S. B. cooperates with the steward and this is the only way to get decent and efficient men on board. There are in Baltimore a class of men who only join these ships for no other purpose than going on a good spree when they get across. They are either on board drunk or absent altogether. I have two of these specimens on board now. It has always been my aim to keep these undesirables off these ships, as they are only a disgrace to the country in general and to the merchant marine in particular. I fail to see what possible objection the S. S. B. can have to a man trying to employ respectable men in preference to drunkards and wasters. Any scheme that keeps these undesirables off the ship ought, to my way of thinking, only be too welcome. I brought this vital matter to your notice for no other purpose than to try and stop the hiring of men that are entirely unfit for the work.

If you think that my complaint in this matter is justified I shall esteem it a favor if you would permit me to call upon you personally on our return to Baltimore.

I beg to remain, dear sir, yours faithfully,

CHAS. WILSON, Chief Steward.

The facts contained therein are true.

In the 18th day of January, 1928, I was given the following letter of recommendation from the master of the said steamship *Winona County*:

FLEET CORPORATION,
STEAMSHIP "WINONA COUNTY,"
Baltimore, Md., January 18, 1928.

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that Charles Wilson has served on the above-named vessel from September 22, 1927, to present date, and I have found him reliable and capable man; attentive to his duties at all times and strictly sober, and will recommend him to anyone in need of his service.

R. B. ATHERTON,
Master Steamship "Winona County."

I have other letters from masters of other vessels, equally testifying as to my good character and ability. As a result of this letter I was relieved of my position and told that I was not wanted any longer.

I was discharged by the Consolidated Navigation Co., the operator of the Fleet Corporation, by the marine superintendent, Dutton. Through the port steward for the Consolidated Navigation Co. I was informed that the reason for my discharge was because I had written this letter and for no other reason. I shall continue to seek employment on any other vessels where I can find employment.

I wrote to Mr. Axtell, an attorney, when I was in Baltimore to ascertain if I had any cause of action because of my improper discharge. I have been informed that I have no case, because I had not signed on for a new voyage and then discharged. I was not permitted to sign for a new voyage.

I am making this affidavit at the request of Mr. Axtell, in order that facts therein contained may be made public, may be filed with the committee in Congress, who may be interested in the matter, and brought to the attention of the head of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation or any others who are interested in the American merchant marine.

I wrote the letter simply because I thought that they would appreciate it and because I assume that maybe having to do with the operation of American vessels they would be interested in improving the service. I find that such is not their case—in this instance at least.

CHAS. WILSON.

Sworn to before me this 28th day of February, 1928.
(Copy signed but not sworn to. Original used elsewhere.)

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Washington expect to conclude the consideration of the appropriation bill to-night?

Mr. JONES. No, Mr. President; we can hardly finish to-night.

Mr. McNARY. Then I desire to move a recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion for just a moment?

Mr. McNARY. Certainly.

WRITINGS OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Library I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5724) authorizing the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to print and distribute additional sets of the writings of George Washington, and I submit a report (No. 1450) thereon.

In explanation of the bill let me say that in making provisions for publication of Washington's writings, which are now in progress of publication, the first two volumes having already been printed, we made requirement that there was to be no distribution until the final volume was published. There will be 25 or 27 volumes in all. We are told that the Printing Office will scarcely have space to store the volumes up to the time the work is completed, which will be probably four years from now. That is one feature of the law that had to be changed.

Then, it is desired to have printed a thousand volumes for distribution rather as advertising. The director of the centennial wants to print those at his own expense. He could not do it without our giving him leave to do it. I have incorporated in the bill an amendment to the law permitting him to do that. These two changes in the law are approved by the committee unanimously. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us what method of distribution of the other copies will be used?

Mr. FESS. There will be 25 copies given to the Congressional Library. There will be a copy to each of the members of the Cabinet, to each Senator, to each Member of the House of Representatives, and then there are to be 2,500 copies sold at actual cost.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as I understand from the Senator's statement there is a provision in the bill allowing somebody to print 1,000 copies at his own expense.

Mr. FESS. Yes; the director wants to do that.

Mr. NORRIS. Where is it to be done?

Mr. FESS. In the Government Printing Office.

Mr. NORRIS. What is he going to do with those copies?

Mr. FESS. They are to be distributed by the commission.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator think it proper to let an official do that in that way?

Mr. FESS. He wants to do it and he can not do it unless we agree to it.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that, but he is going to use the Government Printing Office and Government machinery.

Mr. FESS. He gets nothing out of it. He wants to do it for the commission.

Mr. NORRIS. Is he going to sell the copies?

Mr. FESS. No; he turns them over to the commission. He wants to print them himself. We provided for a certain number and he wants to add 1,000 copies.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection if they go to the commission in its official capacity.

Mr. FESS. That is what is to be done with them.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood the Senator to say that the official as an individual was going to have 1,000 copies printed.

Mr. FESS. It is to be done for the commission.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator about the probable cost of the printing?

Mr. FESS. I do not know what the estimated cost is. There is an appropriation of \$56,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, if it is printed by the Government as a public document, it is then frankable.

Mr. FESS. No. There is a distribution fixed, 1 copy to the President, 1 to the Vice President, 1 to each member of the Cabinet, 1 to each Senator, 1 to each Member of the House of Representatives, 25 to the Congressional Library, and so on. Then there are 2,500 copies to be sold at actual cost by the Government.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Under the proposed bill are the volumes to be distributed as they are issued?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the nature of the document?

Mr. FESS. The complete writings of George Washington.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to enable the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans," approved February 21, 1930, is amended by striking out all preceding the last sentence therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"That the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington established by the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the comprehensive observance of that greatest of all historic events, the bicentennial of the birthday of George Washington,' approved December 2, 1924 (hereinafter referred to as the commission), is authorized and directed to prepare, as a congressional memorial to George Washington, a definitive edition of all his essential writings, public and private (excluding the diaries), including personal letters from the original manuscripts or first prints, and the general orders, at a cost not to exceed \$56,000 for preparation of the manuscript. Such definitive edition shall be printed and bound at the Government Printing Office and shall be in about the same form as the already published diaries of George Washington and shall consist of 25 volumes, more or less. There shall be 6,000 sets of such edition, 4,500 of which shall be sold by the Superintendent of Documents (1) at a cost of \$50 per set for sets sold to public libraries and institutions and societies of learning, and (2) the remainder of the 4,500 sets, at a cost equal (together with the receipts from the sets sold to such libraries, institutions, and societies) to the total cost under this section of preparing the manuscript and printing and binding the entire edition. The commission shall, upon the publication of each volume of the remaining 1,500 sets, distribute copies of each such volume as follows: Two each to the President, the library of the Senate, and the library of the House of Representatives; 25 to the Library of Congress; 1 to each member of the Cabinet; 1 each to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; 1 to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner; 1 each to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives; and 1 to each member and officer of the commission. Every such recipient eligible to receive any volume or volumes of such writings at any time prior to the issue of the final volume (but not later than December 31, 1935) shall be entitled to receive a complete set of such writings. The remaining sets, if any, shall be distributed as the commission directs, including such number of sets as may be necessary for foreign exchange. The usual number for congressional distribution and for depository libraries shall not be printed."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of such act of February 21, 1930, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The 1,000 extra copies (heretofore privately printed) of the first volume of such writings shall be considered to have been authorized by the commission, and the commission may accept a donation of such extra copies for distribution for reviews, advertising, and for such other promotional purposes as it may deem advisable. If the commission shall direct the Superintendent of Documents to sell any such extra copies of the first volume, he shall offer the same for sale at a cost per copy equal to the cost per copy of the first volume as computed under clause (2) of the third sentence of this section. Such extra copies shall be the only copies of any volume of the set distributed or sold separately."

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 4, 1931, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3 (legislative day of January 26), 1931

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE

Bromley Wharton, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 11, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa., in place of George O'Brien.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Arthur V. Cashion to be postmaster at Eudora, Ark., in place of A. V. Cashion. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Arch B. Smith to be postmaster at Osceola, Ark., in place of A. B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Omer B. Ewing to be postmaster at Scranton, Ark., in place of O. B. Ewing. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

CALIFORNIA

Edna J. McGowan to be postmaster at Belmont, Calif., in place of E. J. McGowan. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Ethel R. Nance to be postmaster at Coachella, Calif., in place of E. R. Nance. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Henry Metzler to be postmaster at Fowler, Calif., in place of Henry Metzler. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

James C. Tyrrell to be postmaster at Grass Valley, Calif., in place of J. C. Tyrrell. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Bert W. Miller to be postmaster at Hilts, Calif., in place of B. W. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Emerson B. Herrick to be postmaster at Lodi, Calif., in place of E. B. Herrick. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Charles G. Brainerd to be postmaster at Loomis, Calif., in place of C. G. Brainerd. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Charles S. Graham to be postmaster at Pleasanton, Calif., in place of C. S. Graham. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Richard J. Doyle to be postmaster at St. Mary's College, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Sherman G. Batchelor to be postmaster at San Bernardino, Calif., in place of S. G. Batchelor. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Leonard G. Hardy, jr., to be postmaster at South San Francisco, Calif., in place of L. G. Hardy, jr. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Anna R. Armstrong to be postmaster at Woodland, Calif., in place of A. R. Armstrong. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

COLORADO

William A. Russom to be postmaster at Bristol, Colo., in place of W. A. Russom. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Earl E. Ewing to be postmaster at Colorado Springs, Colo., in place of E. E. Ewing. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1931.

John L. Nightingale to be postmaster at Fort Collins, Colo., in place of J. L. Nightingale. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Theodore Stremme to be postmaster at Gypsum, Colo., in place of Theodore Stremme. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

CONNECTICUT

Burton Hodge to be postmaster at Roxbury, Conn., in place of Burton Hodge. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

HAWAII

William I. Wells to be postmaster at Haiku, Hawaii, in place of W. I. Wells. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Kenichi Masunaga to be postmaster at Kealia, Hawaii, in place of Kenichi Masunaga. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Alexander Moir to be postmaster at Papaikou, Hawaii, in place of Alexander Moir. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

IDAHO

Willis M. Sears to be postmaster at Albion, Idaho, in place of W. M. Sears. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1930.

George F. McMartin to be postmaster at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, in place of G. F. McMartin. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

ILLINOIS

Robert B. Marshall to be postmaster at Capron, Ill., in place of R. B. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Samuel H. Lawton to be postmaster at Delavan, Ill., in place of S. H. Lawton. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

William D. Chambers to be postmaster at East Moline, Ill., in place of W. D. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Edward S. Breithaupt to be postmaster at Gifford, Ill., in place of E. S. Breithaupt. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Richard W. Miller to be postmaster at Hamilton, Ill., in place of R. W. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Fannie Hicks to be postmaster at Ivesdale, Ill., in place of Fannie Hicks. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Lester B. McAllister to be postmaster at Oak Park, Ill., in place of W. A. Spickerman. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1929.

Fred A. Sapp to be postmaster at Ottawa, Ill., in place of F. A. Sapp. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

George S. Faxon to be postmaster at Plano, Ill., in place of G. S. Faxon. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

David S. Cossairt to be postmaster at Potomac, Ill., in place of D. S. Cossairt. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

William H. Fahnestock to be postmaster at Rushville, Ill., in place of W. H. Fahnestock. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Joseph C. Painter to be postmaster at Stronghurst, Ill., in place of J. F. Mains, deceased.

George J. Duncan to be postmaster at Villa Grove, Ill., in place of G. J. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Sylvester H. DePew to be postmaster at Zion, Ill., in place of S. H. DePew. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

INDIANA

Albert O. Cripe to be postmaster at Alexandria, Ind., in place of A. O. Cripe. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Lewis A. Graham to be postmaster at Decatur, Ind., in place of L. A. Graham. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

IOWA

Lloyd M. Poe to be postmaster at Blockton, Iowa, in place of L. M. Poe. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Benjamin H. Todd to be postmaster at Ida Grove, Iowa, in place of B. H. Todd. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Charles B. Abbott to be postmaster at Imogene, Iowa, in place of C. B. Abbott. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Oscar W. Larson to be postmaster at Odebolt, Iowa, in place of O. W. Larson. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Calvin L. Sipe to be postmaster at Sioux Rapids, Iowa, in place of C. L. Sipe. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Paul F. Wilharm to be postmaster at Sumner, Iowa, in place of P. F. Wilharm. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Joseph C. Allen to be postmaster at Zearing, Iowa, in place of J. C. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

KANSAS

Isaac A. Robertson to be postmaster at Alma, Kans., in place of I. A. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Jesse M. Foster to be postmaster at Clifton, Kans., in place of J. M. Foster. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Edward R. Dannefer to be postmaster at Cuba, Kans., in place of E. R. Dannefer. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Albert J. Deane to be postmaster at Fowler, Kans., in place of A. J. Deane. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Melvin F. Gardner to be postmaster at Greenleaf, Kans., in place of M. F. Gardner. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

James G. Frazer to be postmaster at Halstead, Kans., in place of J. G. Frazer. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Abe K. Stoufer to be postmaster at Liberal, Kans., in place of A. K. Stoufer. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Alta A. McCutcheon to be postmaster at Little River, Kans., in place of A. A. McCutcheon. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Raymond R. Norris to be postmaster at Marquette, Kans., in place of R. R. Norris. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Louis T. Miller to be postmaster at Ness City, Kans., in place of L. T. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Charles N. Wooddell to be postmaster at Nickerson, Kans., in place of C. N. Wooddell. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Luella Tapley to be postmaster at Quenemo, Kans., in place of Luella Tapley. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

George S. Robb to be postmaster at Salina, Kans., in place of G. S. Robb. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

KENTUCKY

James A. Leach to be postmaster at Beaver Dam, Ky., in place of J. A. Leach. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Thomas D. Jones to be postmaster at Clinton, Ky., in place of David Johnson, resigned.

Jewell S. Webb to be postmaster at Earlington, Ky., in place of J. S. Webb. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Samuel W. Crump to be postmaster at Glasgow Junction, Ky., in place of S. W. Crump. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Carl B. Marshall to be postmaster at Lewisburg, Ky., in place of C. B. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Newell R. Downing to be postmaster at Mays Lick, Ky., in place of N. R. Downing. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Lottie P. Thompson to be postmaster at Sadieville, Ky., in place of L. P. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Raymond B. Dycus to be postmaster at Smithland, Ky., in place of W. C. Barnwell. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1930.

LOUISIANA

Charles E. Burch to be postmaster at Roseland, La., in place of C. E. Burch. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

MAINE

John A. Babb to be postmaster at Dixfield, Me., in place of J. A. Babb. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

MARYLAND

Irving S. Biser to be postmaster at Frederick, Md., in place of I. S. Biser. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

MICHIGAN

Elmer R. Fate to be postmaster at Bellaire, Mich., in place of E. R. Fate. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Orin T. Mallory to be postmaster at Blissfield, Mich., in place of O. T. Mallory. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Gladys E. Gaskill to be postmaster at Delton, Mich., in place of G. E. Gaskill. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Sarah E. Beardsley to be postmaster at Garden, Mich., in place of Joseph Deloria, resigned.

Charles B. Curtis to be postmaster at Houghton Lake, Mich., in place of C. B. Curtis. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

MINNESOTA

Frank L. Lane to be postmaster at Bigelow, Minn., in place of F. L. Lane. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Walter N. Ostrom to be postmaster at Braham, Minn., in place of C. O. Hallstrom, removed.

Frank A. Lindbergh to be postmaster at Crosby, Minn., in place of F. A. Lindbergh. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

George W. Kiefer to be postmaster at Lewiston, Minn., in place of G. W. Kiefer. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

MISSOURI

Leeta F. Wagy to be postmaster at Adrian, Mo., in place of L. W. Warnken. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

William A. Edwards to be postmaster at Bagnell, Mo. Office became presidential April 1, 1930.

George L. Pemberton to be postmaster at Charleston, Mo., in place of G. L. Pemberton. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

George S. Lorimer to be postmaster at Hickman Mills, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Edwin H. Laubert to be postmaster at Mayview, Mo., in place of E. H. Laubert. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

NEBRASKA

Edwin H. Springer to be postmaster at Brady, Nebr., in place of E. H. Springer. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

William A. Gibson to be postmaster at Cedar Rapids, Nebr., in place of W. A. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

James M. Fox to be postmaster at Gretna, Nebr., in place of J. M. Fox. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Hiram B. Cameron to be postmaster at Herman, Nebr., in place of H. A. Riley. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Harry A. Riley to be postmaster at Spalding, Nebr., in place of H. A. Riley. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

NEW JERSEY

Timothy J. Nevill to be postmaster at Carteret, N. J., in place of T. J. Nevill. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Raymond F. Reihl to be postmaster at East Paterson, N. J., in place of S. L. Caruth, resigned.

Frederick C. Docker to be postmaster at Oxford, N. J., in place of F. C. Docker. Incumbent's commission expires February 9, 1931.

NEW MEXICO

Winnie E. Pittman to be postmaster at Cloudcroft, N. Mex., in place of C. E. Herndon, resigned.

NEW YORK

Roof D. Miller to be postmaster at Fort Plain, N. Y., in place of R. D. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

William D. Shepard to be postmaster at Geneseo, N. Y., in place of W. D. Shepard. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Carroll F. Simpson to be postmaster at Phoenicia, N. Y., in place of C. F. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expires February 9, 1931.

Earl P. Milks to be postmaster at Scio, N. Y., in place of G. M. Watson, removed.

Henry E. Johnston to be postmaster at Spencer, N. Y., in place of H. E. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1931.

Brainard W. Russell to be postmaster at Windsor, N. Y., in place of B. W. Russell. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

NORTH CAROLINA

Theron C. Dellinger to be postmaster at Crossnore, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mina H. Aasved to be postmaster at Carson, N. Dak., in place of M. H. Aasved. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Josephine M. Lierboe to be postmaster at Turtle Lake, N. Dak., in place of J. M. Lierboe. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1931.

OHIO

Henry W. Gruver to be postmaster at Miamisburg, Ohio, in place of H. W. Gruver. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

PENNSYLVANIA

George R. Fleming to be postmaster at Haverford, Pa., in place of G. R. Fleming. Incumbent's commission expires February 9, 1931.

Norman S. Helff to be postmaster at Hummelstown, Pa., in place of W. P. Landis. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1928.

Harry A. Borland to be postmaster at Indiana, Pa., in place of H. A. Borland. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

John S. Steinmetz to be postmaster at Richland, Pa., in place of J. S. Steinmetz. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1931.

Jane R. Lohmann to be postmaster at Trucksville, Pa., in place of J. R. Lohmann. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

RHODE ISLAND

William H. Godfrey to be postmaster at Apponaug, R. I., in place of W. H. Godfrey. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

TEXAS

Gertrude M. McCraney to be postmaster at Santa Rosa, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Frank A. King to be postmaster at Whitewright, Tex., in place of B. P. Brents, removed.

UTAH

Annie Palmer to be postmaster at Farmington, Utah, in place of Annie Palmer. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

VIRGINIA

Lawrence L. Jacobs to be postmaster at Hanover, Va., in place of L. L. Jacobs. Incumbent's commission expires February 19, 1931.

Charles F. Flanary to be postmaster at Jonesville, Va., in place of C. F. Flanary. Incumbent's commission expires February 19, 1931.

Grace H. Jenkins to be postmaster at Powhatan, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

John J. Kivlighan to be postmaster at Staunton, Va., in place of J. J. Kivlighan. Incumbent's commission expires February 19, 1931.

Dandridge W. Marston to be postmaster at Toano, Va., in place of D. W. Marston. Incumbent's commission expires February 19, 1931.

WASHINGTON

Charles R. Bockmier to be postmaster at Granite Falls, Wash., in place of C. R. Bockmier. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Maud E. Hays to be postmaster at Starbuck, Wash., in place of M. E. Hays. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Arthur A. Bousquet to be postmaster at Wenatchee, Wash., in place of A. A. Bousquet. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

WEST VIRGINIA

John B. Hilleary to be postmaster at Buckhannon, W. Va., in place of J. B. Hilleary. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

William M. Kidd to be postmaster at Burnsville, W. Va., in place of W. M. Kidd. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Carl A. Dehner to be postmaster at Chester, W. Va., in place of C. A. Dehner. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Walter O. Deacon to be postmaster at Hurricane, W. Va., in place of W. O. Deacon. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Oliver A. Locke to be postmaster at Milton, W. Va., in place of O. A. Locke. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

WISCONSIN

Herman Rau to be postmaster at Chilton, Wis., in place of J. H. Wagner, removed.

Frederick N. Lochemes to be postmaster at St. Francis, Wis., in place of F. N. Lochemes. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Wilbur H. Bridgman to be postmaster at Stanley, Wis., in place of W. H. Bridgman. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, Thou art the one and profound remedy for human weakness and human sin. As a loving Father, Thou standest at the door of every heart and, with Thy fullness, art ready to enter. How we thank Thee for the greatness and the permanence of that love with which Thou hast loved us. Accept our deepest gratitude and continue with us in our great needs and ballast our very souls with wisdom and patience. Rekindle in us those mighty enthusiasms which shall make these days great and equip us as the strong sons of God. Thou hast two thrones—one in the highest heavens and one in the lowliest heart. All that Thou requirest of us is a beautiful and a humble life that deals justly, loves mercy, and walks with God in the chosen path of our high calling. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 14040. An act to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof.

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

H. R. 10166. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works at Philadelphia, Pa., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 722, Seventy-first Congress, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report on the enforcement of the prohibition laws of the United States.

PETER R. WADSWORTH

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Claims I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6668) for the relief of Peter R. Wadsworth, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,012.32, to be credited to the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians, for the purpose of discharging the obligations of Peter R. Wadsworth, former superintendent and special disbursing agent of the Consolidated Chippewa Indian Agency, Cass Lake, Minn., arising out of the failure of the First National Bank of St. Cloud, Minn., on June 17, 1925.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to pay, out of the money so credited, the unpaid claims of all Chippewa Indians against such agency arising out of such bank failure."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for discharging certain obligations of Peter R. Wadsworth, former superintendent and special disbursing agent of the Consolidated Chippewa Indian Agency."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in what particular does this change the House bill?

Mr. IRWIN. It is merely a matter of changing the language in the bill.

Mr. GARNER. Does it go any further than to appropriate a thousand dollars and odd?

Mr. IRWIN. It does not change the amount, \$1,012.32.

Mr. GARNER. What is the additional language? Does it authorize any future appropriation?

Mr. IRWIN. No; it simply changed the language to put it in a more parliamentary form.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House for one week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, is there any chance of getting any soldiers' legislation to pay now the adjusted-compensation certificates out of that committee?

Mr. HAWLEY. The committee is working very hard upon it, assembling the information. What the committee will do I am not authorized to state.

Mr. BLANTON. The ex-service men are appealing to the Members of the House from every State and district in the Union. They want to know what to expect, and we want to have some definite information to give them.

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

There was no objection.

PENSIONS

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16744) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain