retired for disability resulting from injury incurred in line of duty in time of war; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 12527) to amend the act approved May 29, 1930, for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 12528) to provide protection for textiles and other designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 12529) relating to the acquisition of restricted Indian lands by States, counties, or municipalities; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 12530) to amend the revenue act of 1932 by the addition thereto of a section imposing a special additional tax on the profits derived from short sales of potatoes, apples, and other perishable commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEENEY: A bill (H. R. 12531) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, entitled "An act to establish postal-savings depositories for depositing savings at interest with the security of the Government for repayment thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEAGALL: Resolution (H. Res. 258) for the consideration of S. 4780, an act to provide that advances under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act may be made for crop planting or crop cultivation including summer-fallowing during the year 1932; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCORMACK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 423) directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 12532) to authorize the presentation of a distinguished-service cross to Ralph Ellsworth Ladue; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 12533) granting a pension to Dilla Underwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 12534) granting an increase of pension to Cecelia Randall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 12535) granting a pension to Editha Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 12536) granting a pension to Deborah M. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TURPIN: A bill (H. R. 12537) granting an increase of pension to Annie C. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12538) for the relief of David Hughes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

8217. By Mr. AMLIE: Memorial of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, urging the pardon of Mooney and Billings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8218. Also, memorial of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, urging Federal unemployment compensation providing full compensation for the unemployed in all industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8219. Also, memorial of the County Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., urging a $5,000,000,000 prosperity loan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8220. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of continuation committee of the Southern California Conference for Christian Social Action, of Los Angeles, Calif., urging Congress to effect by due legislation those far-reaching changes in our whole economic, industrial, and financial structure as shall guarantee to every citizen the right to work, the right of access to the means of life and labor, commandeering under law, if need be, as under war-time emergency, such natural resources and such industrial equipment and exercising such powers of national credit as shall secure these just rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8221. Also, petition of board of directors of the Down Town Association of San Francisco, memorializing Congress to reduce the expenses of conducting public business and affairs to the end that there may be, at the earliest possible moment, a reduction of taxes, lest our people come to ruin and be consumed by government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8222. By Mr. KELLER: Petition of the citizens of Benton, Ill., asking that legislation be passed making the Big Muddy River a canal in southern Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8223. Also, petition of 79 citizens of Tamms, Ill., petitioning Congress the pass waterway bills, H. R. 9390 and S. 1963, and highway bills, H. R. 7237 and S. 2793, placing these forms of carriers under control of the Interstate Commerce Commission the same as the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8224. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Donald F. Clark, secretary Federal Employees' Union, West Point, N. Y., opposing 10 per cent pay cut and favoring a manufacturers' sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8225. Also, petition of E. E. Lightburne, of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, opposing the prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8226. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of E. E. Lighthouse, New York City, favoring the repeal of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8227. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition signed by Frank A. Weber, of Orion; Andy Oakes and John Press, of Grinnell, Kans., and 92 other farmers of Gove, Logan, and Trego Counties, and vicinity, favoring the repeal of the agricultural marketing act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8228. By Mr. WATSON: Resolution passed by the Jesse W. Soby Post, No. 148, American Legion Auxiliary, of Langhorne, Pa., favoring strong national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 1932

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 8, 1932)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. 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	Copeland	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Costigan	Jones	Robinson, Ind.
Bailey	Couzens	Kean	Sheppard
Bankhead	Cutting	Kendrick	Shipstead
Barbour	Davis	Keyes	Shortridge
Barkley	Dickinson	King	Smith
Bingham	Dill	La Follette	Smoot
Blaine	Fletcher	Lewis	Steiwer
Borah	Frazier	Logan	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	George	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Glenn	McKellar	Townsend
Broussard	Goldsborough	McNary	Trammell
Bulkley	Gore	Moses	Tydings
Bulow	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Norbeck	Wagner
Capper	Hatfield	Norris	Walcott
Caraway	Hawes	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hayden	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
Cohen	Hebert	Patterson	Watson
Connally	Howell	Pittman	White
Coolidge	Hull	Reed	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent as a member of the Geneva conference and that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is necessarily absent from the city.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 822, a bill (H. R. 11897) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, pending the vote I ask unanimous consent that at 12 o'clock to-morrow the unfinished business be laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4860) to provide for loans to States for the relief of distress arising from unemployment, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will see fit to renew that request just as soon as the War Department appropriation bill is passed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There are a number of other bills in the same status as the War Department appropriation bill. I will make the request now. Of course, if the Senator objects to it, I shall take my own course on it.

Mr. REED. I shall have to object now, Mr. President.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Then, Mr. President, I give notice that unless the War Department appropriation bill is disposed of some time during the day I shall move to proceed to the consideration of the bill to which I have referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11897) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill may be read for amendments, the committee amendments to be disposed of first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, the vote in the House of Representatives in favor of Philippine independence on April 4, 1932, was impressive, 307 for and only 47 against. Of the absentees I am informed that 42 Congressmen have since stated they would have voted for the bill if present.

The wisdom of the House in passing this bill is being sustained by public opinion. Each new magazine article or new book that appears confirms the wisdom of the action of the House.

Sherwood Eddy, in his recent book, the Challenge of the East, makes some significant statements. Mr. Eddy is a well-known author and a student of the Far Eastern situation.

In this book he reviews the situation in India, China, and Japan.

In discussing the Philippine question he said:

1. All thinking Filipinos and all Americans without exception desire that the present situation of unrest and of uncertainty should cease. The fevered demand for independence which meets with no clear response from America, with the consequent retarding of commercial development and of adequate constructive reforms by the Filipinos themselves, is like the uncertainty before a presidential election in America, multiplied tenfold and continued year after year. This tantalizing and paralyzing uncertainty must terminate.

2. Every intelligent, self-respecting Christian Filipino in the islands desires independence; and these Christians constitute more than nine-tenths of the population. We have found no people in the world so unitedly, so passionately, so insistently desiring independence as the Filipinos.

But if we ask when and how this independence should be granted, there is a clear division of opinion. To understand this difference we must realize two facts:

1. No other conquered and subject people were ever given such a large measure of autonomy, such hope and promise of early independence, or were so speedily prepared for it. The result of this artificial stimulation and encouragement on the part of Americans has been the practically universal demand for independence by all parties, all classes, all political leaders. It has become a fever, an obsession. Any political leader who asked for anything less than immediate independence would be considered a traitor to his country and would lose his political head.

2. As we have said, the economic progress of the Philippines has been so bound up with free trade exclusively with America that immediate independence would spell an economic catastrophe for the islands.

* * * * * * *

1. The bulk of the farming population, nearly 10,000,000 people, want their liberty because of the orations they hear every Independence Day and in election campaigns. They know little about the issues involved, but they will "vote right" and follow their leaders when the time comes for voting or for action.

2. Some thousands of the intellectuals, the whole student body, the youth movement, and their leaders and orators, want always and everywhere, in season and out of season, "the immediate, absolute, and complete independence of the islands." The spirit of this body is that of the American Colonists in 1776, and their spokesman would be Patrick Henry.

3. Some hundreds of the informed, responsible, and real leaders of the islands in government and all departments of life want independence as much as the youth just mentioned, but they are in touch with the economic realities and hope to gain independence, not as a sudden catastrophe but in a way that will benefit the islands and will be a credit to the United States. This third group is small, but it is perhaps more important than the other two combined and probably can carry the others upon any reasonable plan for independence which satisfies themselves. They want to end the present fever of uncertainty. They want independence at all costs and would prefer to have it immediately, even with severe economic loss, rather than to lose it or even to run the risk of its indefinite postponement. But they would infinitely prefer a period of transition that would enable them to reestablish themselves upon a new and sound economic basis upon one of the following plans:

The first choice of many would be the early granting of complete independence at a fixed date of from 10 to 30 years from the present. Economically it might be better to even have a longer period, but they all want to enter the promised land of freedom within their own lifetime. This is a passion with many of them who fought against the Americans in 1898. During the period of transition they desire complete internal autonomy, in order to be able, along with free trade with America, which is a basic essential with them, to begin to adapt their tariffs and trade relations with other countries so that sudden independence may not leave them unadjusted in their trade with the rest of the world.

Mr. President, the very latest book on this subject is entitled "America in the Pacific," by Foster Rhea Dulles, a well-known writer and student of Pacific and Chinese problems, who, in the conclusion of his work, has this to say:

The acquisition of the Philippines marked a new departure in our policy. That can not be gainsaid. If it conformed with the tradition that had steadily led us westward to an assertion of power and empire in the Pacific, it none the less clearly broke with the tradition that the United States was a Nation in which self-government, democracy, and equal rights were the basic principles of national life. It meant that at least temporarily we had forsaken our own established ways to follow the familiar path by which the empires of the past had risen to greatness and then collapsed as ambition overreached itself, the path along which the modern empires of Europe were struggling in jealous rivalry.

In no other instance of our expansion could this charge be sustained. It was only in the Philippines, with their alien millions demanding independence and increasingly resentful of the domination of the distant power which was the United States, that America had denied her heritage. It may well have been that under the circumstances, for which we were largely responsible, any other course would have provoked a conflict in the Far East. There is no doubt that many Americans sincerely felt that regardless of national interests it was our duty to hold the islands. But basically we took them for trade and empire. The questions still unanswered are whether they are really necessary for the maintenance of that position in the commercial and political world of the Pacific to which we feel ourselves entitled, and, even if that question is answered affirmatively, whether we can afford in justice to the Filipinos and to ourselves to hold them as unwilling hostages for national power.

It was perhaps inevitable, given the background of our expansion, the restless urge for national aggrandizement which characterized the whole world at the close of the nineteenth century, and the national ambitions of a young and aggressive nation, that in 1898 we should have temporarily ignored the traditions with which these forces were in conflict. But they have since been recalled. We stand pledged to grant the Philippines their independence.

Mr. President, by the time the Senate is ready to vote on this question they will find in the RECORD and in the hearings complete information covering every phase of this question so that it should not occupy a great deal of time in discussion.

I ask unanimous consent that the quotations from these two eminent authors may lie upon the table.

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

REPEAL OF EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting article by the distinguished American author, Walter Lippmann, on the subject of the proposed repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 8, 1932]

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

By Walter Lippman

REPEAL

The most effective argument against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment is that employed by Senator BORAH when he asks what "constructive alternatives" the repealers have to offer. Mrs. Boole, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and Bishop Cannon make the same point, and it is obvious from Mr. Rockefeller's letter to President Butler that he is somewhat troubled, too.

The repealers ought to welcome this challenge, for when the national prohibitionists ask for a "constructive alternative" they are obviously prepared to admit the principle that liquor might be legalized if it were adequately regulated. Senator BORAH could not sincerely ask for an alternative to prohibition if he were determined to insist that nobody must ever drink liquor again under any conditions. The problem, therefore, is narrowed down to the question whether by repealing the eighteenth amendment the prospect of a successful regulation of the liquor traffic would be increased or diminished.

In examining the consequences of repeal the first question to ask ourselves is what power to regulate would be left if the eighteenth amendment were removed. There would remain 20 States which have prohibition by their own constitutions. There would remain in every State the power to prohibit by constitution or by statute. The Webb-Kenyon law, adopted by Congress in 1913, would remain, compelling the Federal Government to prohibit shipments of liquor into a State if such a shipment violates the State laws. Congress would have the power to prohibit or regulate the importation of liquor from abroad. These two objectives—to prevent interstate traffic and to prevent importations—are just about all that Federal enforcement aims at to-day. They do not depend upon the maintenance of the eighteenth amendment.

On the other hand, repeal would revive powers to regulate liquor which do not exist to-day. In States which are opposed to prohibition it is impossible, under the eighteenth amendment, to have temperance legislation of any kind whatever. Laws to regulate the liquor traffic are unconstitutional under the eighteenth amendment. The consequence is that in States where the majority is antiprohibition there is no effective prohibition and there can be no alternative. It is no play on words, it is not mere repartee in debate to say to Senator BORAH that only by the repeal of the eighteenth amendment is it possible in wet territory to have a constructive alternative to the bootleg liquor industry.

Thus the repeal of the eighteenth amendment will not deprive the States of any power to prohibit or regulate that they now have; it will not deprive the Federal Government of any power which it effectively exercises; but repeal will empower States to regulate the traffic. It can be said in all sincerity and in all literalness that repeal of the eighteenth amendment will augment the total power of the people to deal with intoxicants. From the governmental point of view, the essence of repeal is not the restoration of liquor but the restoration of a suppressed power to regulate liquor. For in its effect upon New York or any other predominantly wet State the eighteenth amendment is simply a constitutional veto on temperance legislation.

Ever since 1913 the great argument for national prohibition has been that the States which wished to do so could not make their own prohibition effective if liquor was being sold freely on the other side of their borders. This, I take it, is Senator BORAH's position. What he needs to consider now is whether dry States would not be better protected against invasion if in the wet States liquor were legal and regulated rather than illegal and unregulated.

Unless he can convince himself that the Federal Government can and will suppress the bootleg-liquor industry, he must, if he is realistic, see that the practical choice is between a controlled and an uncontrolled liquor traffic. Can it be seriously denied that a legal and regulated liquor industry in the wet States can be more effectively prevented from invading the dry States than a bootleg industry run by outlaws and racketeers? I doubt that it can be denied, and, therefore, repeal would in fact aid those States which desire prohibition within their borders. By reviving the Webb-Kenyon Act they would enjoy all the Federal protection they now have under the eighteenth amendment, and besides they would have the additional protection which would come from driving the bootleggers out of business and substituting a controlled industry.

It is fair to say that repeal is a "constructive alternative" to the situation which now prevails. Not only would it leave intact all the constitutional and statutory prohibition in the States, not only would it leave intact the Federal power to protect dry States, but it would revive all the temperance legislation which the eighteenth amendment has suppressed and would for the first time in over 10 years empower the people of the thickly settled regions to protect themselves against the most gigantic industry ever known in the underworld.

What could be more "constructive," where the issue is one of constitutional powers, than a measure which will leave all effective existing powers intact and revive powers which have been lost? Surely Senator BORAH does not expect the repealers to submit to him for his inspection all the laws and ordinances, all the appropriations and appointments which each State would make if the repeal of the eighteenth amendment restored its power to legislate. The challenge of those who ask for a "constructive alternative" is answered when it is shown that repeal will increase and not diminish the real power of the American people to regulate liquor.

COMMERCIAL RADIO BROADCASTING

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Federal Radio Commission, transmitting a report in response to Senate Resolution 129 (72d Cong., 1st sess.), calling for a report from the Federal Radio Commission on the use of radio facilities for commercial advertising purposes and stating that "Commissioners Saltzman and Lafount do not agree with the statement contained in the views expressed in the answer to question 4, to the effect that additional legislation is necessary to enable the Federal Radio Commission to limit and control the amount of time used for commercial advertising purposes, believing that the provisions of section 4 of the radio act of 1927 give the commission the necessary authority," which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I present a petition signed by 700 citizens, merchants, and veterans of Latrobe, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation which would authorize full payment of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates, and I request that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the adoption of the furlough plan in preference to the 10 per cent pay cut in pending legislation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by members of the Woman's City Club of Oswego, N. Y., favoring retrenchment in governmental expenditures and the preservation of "a sane and economically safe Republic," which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Society of Colonial Wars in the State of New York, protesting against reduction in the numbers of the officers of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps and the adoption of any measures leading to a weakening of the national defense, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Lockport, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation to alleviate unemployment conditions, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Central Labor Council, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 3768, known as the Dill bill, proposing to permit checking accounts in postal savings banks for small depositors, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

ARTICLE BY DR. ARTHUR MACDONALD

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dr. Arthur MacDonald entitled "Brain."

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

The article is as follows:

BRAIN [1]

(By Dr. Arthur MacDonald, member of the District Medical Society, Washington, D. C.)

The brain is a mere extension of the spinal cord; both are of one piece. The spinal cord is fundamental, while the brain is more

[1] Reprint from the Medical Times, New York City.

or less accidental. Though the brain be an adventitious part of the spinal cord, it has, nevertheless, become the head of the nervous system and is different enough to have a separate name.

Though the brain often has great relative bulk and high complexity, it must be remembered (Piersol) that the spinal cord is the fundamental and essential part of the nervous axis, so that the degree to which the brain is developed is accidental, being dependent upon the necessities of the animal in the use of the higher nervous functions.

Though from the point of view of nature the brain is an accidental growth, from the human viewpoint it is all important, being the basis of mind, the highest function in man.

In consonance with this idea of the accidentality of the brain, from the point of view of nature, is the opinion of a specialist (Bolton) that the extreme end of the frontal lobe, which is the seat of the higher processes of association, is the last region of the brain to be evolved, but the first to undergo dissolution in mental decadence or dementia. In amentia this region is not developed. Also a fact of comparative anatomy may not be without significance: The spinal cord in man weighs from 1 to 1½ ounces; and relatively to the brain is as 1 to 40, but as we go down the animal scale this ratio gradually decreases, till in the mouse it is 1 to 4. In cold-blooded animals the relation is reversed and the spinal cord is the heavier; in the newt 1 to 105 and lamprey 1 to 133. Thus, in the earlier and fundamental stages of nature the brain was most subordinate, if it barely existed. Now, this adventitious character of the brain as a mere offshoot of the spinal cord may have its parallel in the realm of mind. Thus the furthermost development of mind might be said to consist in the metaphysical theories of philosophers, which are also of an adventitious character, being the most complicated (like the brain), uncertain, and changeable forms of consciousness. Briefly, all those activities, which are called intellectual, are the distinctive expression of the brain, as the organ of mind, which is absolutely dependent upon the brain as far as knowledge goes.

As we shall see, in the consideration of cerebral localization (page 12406), in the higher animals, including man, there is no consciousness in any part of the nervous system from which the forebrain has been cut off. That is to say, that not only thought but consciousness itself is absolutely limited to the brain, which exists without mind, but there is not a single instance known to science of the existence of mind without a brain.

It is further suggestive to note that in the dying hour thought and consciousness are usually the first to cease acting, while the unconscious organic functions, being fundamental, are the last to disappear.

I. WEIGHT OF HUMAN BRAIN

While the statistics of brain weights have been gathered by many writers in the past, but usually by very elemental methods, the first one to study more exactly the question of variation of brain weight was Karl Pearson, of the Eugenics Laboratory in London.

Marchand, one of the pioneers in the statistics of brain weight, did not give the body weight, because, for autopsy purposes in hospitals, the weight of the subjects was too variable to consider in relation to brain weight.

Marchand's brain data indicate that the brain reaches its full growth between ages 15 and 20, remaining constant to about age 50, and then gradually becomes less in weight. It will be noted, as we give the data, especially concerning the brain, by leading specialists, that frequently there is much variation in opinion, but it only illustrates the actual status of brain investigation, which is merely in its beginning.

In girl and boy at birth the brain is about the same in weight; the brain of the female averages a little heavier than that of the male; boy 367 grams (12 ounces), girl 396 grams (13 ounces). The relative weight of the brain to body weight in the girl is greater than in boy; thus boy, 1 to 8.3; girl, 1 to 8.0; later in life, from birth on with age and weight, the absolute brain weight increases so that up to 15 years of age this increase is from threefold to nearly fourfold; and from this time on the absolute weight of brain is greater in man than in woman.

TABLE 1.—*Relation of brain weight to body weight*

New-born boy	1:8
End of fourth week	1:7
End of twelfth week	1:5
End of first year	1:6
End of second year	1:14
End of third year	1:18
End of seventh year	1:12
End of twelfth year	1:23
End of fourteenth year	1:15–25
End of fifteenth year	1:22

In man the maximum brain weight comes between ages 15 to 30; in woman at age 14. In higher ages the brain weight decreases in man from 60 to 70; in woman from 50 to 60; the decrease is about the same in both sexes. At age 7 the brain averages 40 ounces, and at age 14 the brain often reaches 48 ounces. Beyond age 50 the weight slowly but gradually decreases at the rate of about 1 ounce in 10 years.

European brain weight averages from 1,350 grams (47 ounces) to 1,360 grams, or 48 ounces (Bischoff). Topinard (11,000 cases) makes 1,361 grams (48 ounces) the average for man and 1,200 grams (42 ounces) for woman.

Brains under 1,250 grams (44 ounces) in weight are abnormally small and those more than 1,550 grams (55 ounces) are abnormally large (Marchand).

A number of specialists in a series of 278 cases showed the maximum brain weight to be 1,810 grams (64 ounces) and the minimum about 960 grams (34 ounces). The mean weight from 20 to 40 years of age is, according to Boyd, 1,360 grams (48 ounces) for the male and 1,230 grams (43½ ounces) for the female brain. The brain appears to be heaviest between 14 and 20 years of age, and at the age of 80 has lost 90 grams (or rather more than 3 ounces). Broca makes the average 1,421 grams (50 ounces). Spitzka showed that in distinguished men the senile decrease in weight was delayed about 10 years, their average weight being 1,473 (52 ounces), 100 grams (3 ounces) above the European average.

Table 2 shows that taller persons average greater brain weight than those shorter in stature.

TABLE 2.—*Relation of stature to brain weight (Bischoff)*

Cubic centimeteral	Cubic inches	Grams	Brain weight (ounce)
150	9.0	=8.7	0.30
160	9.0	=8.3	.29
165	10.0	=8.1	.28
170	10.3	=7.9	.26
180	10.9	=7.6	.28
190	11.5	=7.1	.24

Table 3 also indicates that those with less body weight have greater brain weight. Thus, smaller men and women show a higher relative average brain weight.

TABLE 3.—*Relation of body weight to brain weight (Bischoff)*

Grams	Body weight (ounces)	Per cent brain weight
30,000	1,058	=3.7
40,000	1,411	=2.9
50,000	1,764	=2.5
60,000	2,117	=2.1
70,000	2,470	=1.9
80,000	2,823	=1.5

The specific gravity of the brain averages 1.036.

From the examination of 10 brains (5 for each sex) Dahlberg found the gray matter to average 53.6 per cent of the volume of the entire cerebrum; the nuclei averaged 3.6 per cent and the white matter 42.8 per cent.

Damlewsky showed the weight of the cortex to be 33 per cent of the total weight of the brain, weighing 1,324 grams (47 ounces) and having a total surface of 169,200 square millimeters (262 square inches). Donaldson found the cortex to form about 50 per cent of the brain weight; also that the thickness of the cortex may vary from 1.55 millimeters to 3.50 millimeters (0.04 to 0.13 inch), the average being about 2.9 millimeters (0.10 inch). The average length of the brain is about 165 millimeters (6.49 inches) and its greatest transverse diameter is about 140 millimeters (5.5 inches). The larger and deeper convolutions are similar in the two hemispheres; most of them are individually variable, but each convolution is homologous with that of the other hemisphere. In broad-headed persons (brachycephalics) the longitudinal convolutions and transverse fissures tend to break up and thus the amount of surface, and so of gray matter, is increased relatively to the whole brain. Intelligence of normal character is probably not possible in a brain less than 32 ounces in weight. The taller the individual, the greater his brain weight, yet short people have relatively heavier brains than tall. The cerebellum is usually one-eighth of the weight of the entire brain. The cerebral cortex varies in thickness and becomes thinner in old age. The cerebellum or hind brain weighs 140 grams (5 ounces), or about 10 per cent of the entire encephalon; it averages larger in man than woman and is relatively larger in adults than children, the converse of the brain. The cerebellum has especially to do with equilibrium.

TABLE 4.—*Average difference between brain volume and inner space of head (Rudolph, O.)*

Normal male (adults) ages:	Average difference in percentages
17	9.6
18	5.1
18	5.6
23	9.6
25	7.0
29	5.4
32	6.0
32	7.7
33	7.9
35	5.5
37	7.0
37	9.0
40	6.4
40	8.5
43	6.1
46	6.9
48	9.1
50	9.9

TABLE 4.—*Average difference between brain volume, etc.*—Con.

Normal male (adults) ages—Continued	Average difference in percentages
51	5.7
59	7.4
64	7.1
65	8.3
65	4.3
	7.21
69	15.3
72	20.9
75	18.9
78	26.7
82	15.1
	19.3

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BRAIN AND SKULL VOLUME

In Table 4 is given (in percentages) the average difference in adult males between the volume of the brain and the inner space of the head. This average difference is about 7½ per cent, with individual variations from 5 to 10 per cent.

This difference changes little in middle life, but after the age of 70 the difference is about double; that is, 15 per cent between brain volume and cranial capacity.

In a head with a cranial capacity of 1,400 cubic centimeters (85 cubic inches) there is about 100 cubic centimeters (6 cubic inches) of free space outside of the brain; but after the age of 70 this free space has about doubled, or is about 200 cubic centimeters (12 cubic inches).

The volume of the dura is on the average from 50 to 60 cubic centimeters (3 to 4 cubic inches).

BRAIN WEIGHT AND INTELLIGENCE IN ANIMALS

In general, it will be seen from Table 5 below that the larger the animal the smaller the relative size of brain. The whale's brain weighs 2,816 grams (99 ounces), and the elephant's 4,896 grams (173 ounces). While these are the largest brains among animals (Table 6), their weights relative to their body weight are very small (in the elephant, 1 to 500).

From Table 5 we see that small animals of the same vertebral class, as fish, amphibians, and reptiles, have, relative to body weight, larger brains. It is generally true in animals, as in man, that the brain weight is much greater, relative to body weight, in their young age than in their adulthood.

TABLE 5.—*Relation of brain weight to body weight (Ranke)*

Little European singing bird	1: 12	to 28
(Sajou)	1: 13	
Hapale penicillata	1: 22	
Saimiri	1: 24	
Sai	1: 25	
Magpie or jay	1: 28	
Uisti: Species of ape	1: 28	
Hylobates, leuciscus	1: 28	to 48
German woman	1: 35	
Mole, molewarp	1: 36	
German man	1: 36.58	
Callitrix	1: 41	
Lemur anjuanesis	1: 42	
Half-grown orang-outang	1: 51	
Half-grown chimpanzee	1: 51	
Cat	1: 82	to 156
Makato	1: 96	
Grown gorilla about	1: 100	
Papio	1: 104	to 170
Dove	1: 104	
Eagle	1: 160	
(Eidechse) lizard	1: 160	
Frog	1: 172	
Dog	1: 214	to 307
Carp	1: 248	
Hen	1: 347	
Sheep	1: 351	
Goose	1: 360	to 467
Salamander	1: 380	
Horse	1: 400	
Young elephant	1: 500	
Tiger and lion	1: 500	to 600
Ox	1: 500	to 800
Tadpole	1: 720	
Ostrich	1: 1,200	
Shad	1: 1,837	
Handschildkroto	1: 2,240	
Shark	1: 2,496	
Sea tortoise	1: 5,680	
Tunny fish	1: 37,440	

TABLE 6.—*Brain weights*

	Grams	Ounces
Elephant	4,896	173
Whale	2,816	99
Dolphin	1,775	62
	1,360	48
Cattle	754	27
Horse	517	18
Sea hog	504	17

TABLE 6.—*Brain weights*—Continued

	Grams	Ounces
Gorilla	416	14
Chimpanzee	387	13.6
Ass	377	13.3
Orang-outang	365	12.8
Stag	335	11.8
Papion	158	5.5
Wolf	133	4.6
Hog	122	
Wild boar	117	4.1
Dog (de terre)	116	4.0
Sheep	110	3.8
Gibbon	103	3.6
Baboon	94	3.3
Dog (de berger)	93	3.2
Macaroon	73	2.57
Wildcat	72	2.54
Jackall	71	2.50
Kangaroo	53	1.8
Dog	46	1.6
Dog (griffin)	45	1.58
Beaver	43	1.51
Cat	28	.98
Rabbit	26	.91
Ferret	8.70	.3
Dogfish	8.00	.27
Rat	1–4.00	.03–.14
Moles (24) average	.93	.02
Bat	.65	.01
Mouse	.37	.07
BIRDS		
Goose	30.0	1.05
Parrot (male)	7.65	.25
Parrot (female)	4.30	.15
Magpie (male)	3.00	.10
Magpie (female)	4.20	.09
Rooster	3.70	.11
Thrush	2.15	.08
Sparrow	1.90	.06
Canary bird	1.11	.03
	.68	.01
REPTILES (BATRACHIANS)		
Crocodile (70 kilos)	15.00	.62
Sea turtle	5.09	.18
Land turtle	.37	.01
Lizard	.05	.006
Frog	.01	.003
FISH		
Shark	9.4	.32
Pike	1.3	.45

Notwithstanding variations, it will be seen from Table 9 that there is a certain parallelism between brain weight and intelligence in animals.

The gorilla's brain (with a body weight nearly as much as man) weighs only 416 grams (13 ounces), which is less than one-third of man's brain weight, and is barely more than that of the human infant at birth.

THE RATIONALE OF COMPARATIVE BRAIN WEIGHT

As a general proposition, the higher the mental faculties are developed in the vertebrates, and especially in man at different ages, as well as in different individuals, the greater is the development of the cerebral hemispheres, in comparison with the rest of the cerebrospinal system.

In the same species or class the relative brain weight is greater in species of small stature than in those of large stature. It can be said that the influence of stature, or organic mass relative to brain weight, extends throughout the animal kingdom in such a way that with equal intelligence the small species have a relative superior brain weight to the large species; also, that the species of very small stature can excel species of very great stature and much superior in intelligence. Thus the influence of height on brain weight seems to overbalance that of intelligence. Thus the rabbit, whose brain weighs 26 grams (0.91 ounce), and the rat (much less in height), whose brain weighs one gram (0.03 ounce), are both, nevertheless, somewhat alike in intelligence.

It is natural to attach more importance to organs in proportion to their correlation with the brain. The function of nutrition, or at least locomotion, appears to be in relation with brain weight; the vegetative influence and that of locomotion over the brain weight can not be estimated, except in animals of the same class. Thus, the crocodile, in spite of its mass and the size of its nerves, has a very small brain.

The nutrition of the brain in man is very much independent of the general nutrition of the body; thus very delicate children are often well developed cerebrally.

The small animal species are more sensitive than the larger species. The surface of the body is greater relatively to its mass, as the body is smaller, and the sensitive nerves are relatively more developed to the volume of the body, as the height is less.

The brain or nervous center does not receive as numerous sensations, as various, and as complex in inferior animals as in the superior. Also, the brain does not receive as numerous, as various, and as complex sensations in species of small stature as in those taller.

The relation existing between the surface sensitive organs and the development of the parts of the brain responding to them is

shown by comparing the elephant with the dog. In the dog the sense of smell is at least as acute as in the elephant, yet its olfactive lobe is much smaller; but the olfactive lobe is connected with the volitions and movements of other organs, which in the elephant cover much more ground, so that, for this reason alone, the organ is larger, though the dog's sense of smell is more developed. Again, the elephant has a brain weighing 4,896 grams (173 ounces) and the whale 2,816 grams (99 ounces) (table). The elephant is intellectually superior and his senses and their number are greater; the variety and complexity of his movements involve an enormous mass and numerous coordinations requiring a large quantity of nervous elements, as the variety of actions with its trunk. Thus it surpasses the whale in intelligence.

The great weight (Table 5) of man's brain (1,360 grams=47 ounces) as compared with that of the gorilla (416 grams=14.6 ounces) may in part be explained in the comparison made between the elephant and whale. Thus in man the specialization of the thoracic organs, the many movements of the hand and movements for articulation, are more intimately connected with mental activity. Their relative volume appears to be related with the degree of influence exercised by the diverse organs over intelligence and with the degree of influence exercised reactionally by the brain over these organs. Thus, as to motor center, the brain controls less numerous, less various, and less complicated movements in the inferior species.

BRAIN WEIGHT AND INTELLIGENCE IN MAN

All the results of investigation of the brain do not appear to be in accord, and some are contradictory. This is especially the case in the question of the relation of brain weight and intelligence.

In the past this relationship was doubtless unduly emphasized, but at present certain mathematical specialists maintain that the relationship is so slight that it is negligible. Thus the pendulum has swung to the other extreme and, as usual, the truth may eventually be found in the golden mean.

Since no brain in a head less than 11 inches in circumference has been known to function normally, and since no brain weighing less than 32 ounces has been normal, it is evident that size and weight of brain have very much to do with intelligence, at least within certain limits. But the question is, Before we reach these limits what is the degree of relationship? In short, if after certain limits in size and weight the brain absolutely conditions normal intelligence, it is difficult to believe that this relation suddenly stops and has little or no significance. For this would involve a saltus, which is contrary to nature itself. The author is further doubtful, because there is relatively so little definitely settled about the brain that can be regarded as of a fundamental nature.

In the animal kingdom, in three-fourths of cases (see Tables 4 and 5), the species with the heavier brain show more intelligence, and this is especially striking when we come to man as compared with the lower animals. For, as man's intelligence is so much higher than that of the animal's, so his brain is correspondingly heavier. Thus in the animal nearest to man, as in the gorilla, the brain weight is from 400 to 500 grams (14 to 17 ounces), while in man it is from 950 to 1,800 grams (32 to 63 ounces). This certainly is a prodigious rise, or, rather, jump, the average for man being 1,350 to 1,450 grams (47 to 51 ounces), while the highest in the gorilla is but 500 grams (17 ounces). This saltus is not due to nature but to our ignorance of the doubtless many intervening species between the highest ape and the lowest man. These species may have been permanently destroyed, or are yet to be discovered.

TABLE 7.—*Criminals (M. H. Whiting, Biometrika, Vol. 81)*

Correlations of mentality with—

Age	= − 0.26 + 0.041
Temperature	= − .25 + .020
Pulse	= − .22 + .030
Respiration	= − .14 + .031
Height	= − .15 + .043
Weight	= − .32 + .040

By mentalities in this table is meant the weak-minded. The table shows that all the correlations are significant, and that the feeble-minded or those with less mentality have less weight, less height and age, but greater temperature, quicker pulse and respiration than the mentally normal. Congenital and other morbid defects of the brain are, in general, accompanied with corresponding deficiency in the range or power of the mental faculties and the higher instincts. Thus, according to Du Catte, every skull with a horizontal circumference less than 48 centimeters (18 inches) belongs to an idiot or imbecile.

TABLE 8.—*Anthropological study of 89 Members of Congress, with estimated brain weight and its correlations (MacDonald)*

Relation of physical and mental status	Arithmetical mean	Standard deviation	Coefficient correlation
Stature	177±0.41	5.8±0.29	0.55±0.05
Brain weight	1450±8.2	115±5.8	.63± .04
Body build	5709±36.3	515±26.0	

As this is the first[1] time any legislative body was ever studied from the scientific point of view, a few details may be given. The table shows that the degree of relationship between brain weight (estimated by an equation) and stature is 0.55±0.05, which is positively high, and the degree of correlation between brain weight and body build is still higher, being 0.63±0.04. The body build is obtained by dividing the chest girth (at armpits) by the stature. As body build increases we pass from slenderness to stoutness, or, rather, thicksetness. This high correlation (0.63±0.04) indicates that in general short, thickset people have heavier brains than slender persons. The correlation for height (0.55±0.05) is much higher than is usually the case, which is probably mainly due to the homogeneity of Congress. The average estimated brain weight of the 89 Members of Congress was 1,550 grams (55 ounces), which is much above the average (48 ounces).

TABLE 9.—*Brain weight and occupation (Matiegha)*

Occupation	Number	Brain weight	
		Grams	Ounces
Unskilled laborers	14	1,410	49
Skilled laborers	34	1,433	50
House servants	14	1,435	50.6
Expert workers	123	1,449	51
Mental workers	28	1,468	51.7
Professional workers	22	1,500	52

Table 9 gives the average brain weights of 255 persons, according to the nature of their occupation. It will be seen that as the intellectual status of the occupation increases the average brain weight increases. Though the numbers are not large, yet they are sufficient to create a probability of such tendency.

TABLE 10

	Number	Average age years	Brain weight	
			Grams	Ounces
Scientists (all)	57	64	1,463	51
Exact	12	67	1,532	54
Natural scientists	45	63	1,444	50
Artists and philosophers	25	59	1,482	52
Men of action (Government officials, statesmen)	14	65	1,490	53
Total	96			
Average			1,473	52

In Table 10 it will be seen that the representatives of exact science, such as mathematics, show the highest average brain weight (1,532 grams=54 ounces). Men of action, as statesmen and military men, come next (1,490 grams brain weight=53 ounces), then fellow artists and philosophers with a brain weight of 1,482 grams (52 ounces); and, finally, natural scientists, with a brain weight of 1,444 grams (50 ounces).

With exceptions, the intellectual status is indicated by the weight of brain. Thus the brains of men given to the most difficult intellectual thought, as in mathematics, perhaps involving the more complex mental mechanism, are shown in the exact scientists with an average brain weight of 1,532 grams (54 ounces).

Le Bon also shows 42 distinguished men with an average cranial capacity of 1,682 cubic centimeters (101 cubic inches) contrasted with the general average of 1,559 cubic centimeters (93 cubic inches). Also, 26 skulls (in the Museum of Natural History in Paris) of well-known men show 1,732 cubic centimeters (104 cubic inches) cranial capacity.

Also, Gladstone, in a study of a boys' school and medical students shows:

	Boys' head circumference		Medical students' head circumference	
	Millimeters	Inches	Millimeters	Inches
High intelligence	541	21	572	22.5
Average intelligence	526	20.5	562	22.12
Low intelligence	515	20.2	555	21.8

In the students the height of head showed a distinct increase compared with that of head length and head breadth. Binet calls attention to the distinctly greater head measurements of highly gifted children as compared with dull children.

More than 30 years ago the author made measurements (including head circumference) of 20,000 Washington school chil-

[1] The author made a statistical study of the United States Senate, published in Metron, Padua, Italy, 1923; also by La Revista Argentina de Ciencias Politicas, VIII, 15, and by the Anthropological Society of Bombay, India, 1923.

dren. This was the first time head measurements were made on a large number of children. The bright showed a distinctly higher average head circumference to the dull in head circumference for each age (Table 11).

TABLE 11

Age	Number	Bright	Number	Average	Number	Dull
		Inches		*Inches*		*Inches*
8	320	20.57	326	20.57	101	20.27
9	384	20.65	340	20.64	102	20.48
10	392	20.78	355	20.74	118	20.53
11	322	20.83	386	20.85	97	20.59
12	349	20.98	459	20.93	128	20.85
13	306	21.06	421	20.98	131	21.01
14	227	21.26	371	21.24	143	21.07
15	167	21.61	220	21.41	116	21.32
16	104	21.78	144	21.67	80	21.55

When in doubt, the teachers marked the pupils average, so that we have the positively bright and dull to compare. As will be seen, for every age, the average head circumference of the bright is greater than that of the dull boys. The same is true for the girls.

These 20,000 children were divided into higher and lower classes to eliminate any influence of social status, yet the results were similar.

Parchappe (1836), Broca (1861), and, later, Lacassagne and Cliquet (1878) have shown that men whose occupations require high intelligence have larger heads. Thus Da Costa Ferreira, of Portugal, gives:

TABLE 11½

	Number	Cranial capacity		Greater or smaller than the average	
		Clear	Cubic centimeters	Cubic centimeters	Inches
Professional people	23	1,629	99	57.2	2.4
Commercial people	49	1,598	97	25.9	1.5
Government clerks	11	1,590	96	17.5	1.03
Private clerks	52	1,584	95	12.2	.7
Hand workers	150	1,573	93	.9	.06
Day laborers	164	1,570	93	2.7	.15

In Table 12 will be found the names of 96 distinguished men, with their occupations, ages, and brain weight as given by Spitzka, collected from others. Quite a number were old men at death, whose brains had normally lessened in weight.

It is known that stature, body weight, and build may influence brain weight, yet such data in many of these 96 cases are wanting, and so can not be considered. Gambetta's brain is omitted, for it lost much of its weight through the use of a zinc chloride solution; lessening it in one hour 10 grams (0.3 ounce). Duval estimated its weight to be 1,247 grams (44 ounces) originally, it being reduced to 1,160 grams (41 ounces).

The average brain weight of these 96 distinguished persons is 1,473 (52 ounces), which exceeds the various averages for European brains by 75 to 125 grams (1 to 4 ounces). This does not allow for the advanced age of the series, the average of 92 cases (all all but 4) being 63 years of age.

Dividing these cases by nationalities, we have:

TABLE 11¾

	Cases	Grams	Ounces
United States and Canada	21	1,518	53
British Islands	14	1,473	51
Germany and Austria	38	1,443	50
France	17	1,440	50

Table 11 ¾ would indicate that United States and Canada are distinctly of greater brain weight (1,518 = 53 ounces).

TABLE 12.—*The brain weights (in grams) of 96 distinguished personages with their occupations and ages*

Name	Occupation	Age	Brain weight	
			Grams	Ounces
Ivan Turgeneff	Poet and novelist	65	2,012	71
G. Cuvier	Naturalist	63	1,830	64
E. H. Knight	Physicist	59	1,814	64
Theologian of Freiburg University.		42	1,800	63
John Abercrombie	Physician	64	1,786	63
Ben Butler	Lawyer	74	1,758	62
Edward Olney	Mathematician	59	1,701	60

TABLE 12.—*The brain weights (in grams) of 96 distinguished personages with their occupations and ages*—Continued

Name	Occupation	Age	Brain weight	
			Grams	Ounces
Herman Levi	Composer	60	1,690	59
W. M. Thackeray	Humorist	52	1,658	58
Rudolph Lenz	Composer		1,636	57
John Goodsir	Anatomist	53	1,629	57
Hosea Curtice	Mathematician	68	1,612	56
C. G. Atherton	United States Senator		1,602	56
W. v. Siemens	Physicist	68	1,600	56
George Brown	Editor	61	1,596	56
A. Konstantinoff	Litterateur		1,595	56
R. A. Harrison	Chief justice, Canada	45	1,590	56
F. B.W. v. Hermann	Economist	73	1,590	56
J. K. Riebeck	Philologist	61	1,580	55
Hans Büchner	Hygienist	51	1,560	55
K. Spurgheim	Anatomist and phrenologist	56	1,559	55
Edward D. Cope	Paleontologist	57	1,545	54
G. McKnight	Physician and poet	57	1,545	54
Harrison Allen	Anatomist	56	1,531	54
J. Y. Simpson	Physician	59	1,531	54
P. Dirichlet	Mathematician	54	1,520	54
C. A. De Morny	Statesman	54	1,520	54
Daniel Webster	U. S. Senator	70	1,518	53
Lord John Campbell	Lord Chancellor, England	82	1,517	53
Chauncey Wright	Philosopher	45	1,516	53
M. Schleich	Writer and orator	55	1,503	53
Thomas Chalmers	Theologian	67	1,503	53
Garrick Mallery	Ethnologist and explorer	63	1,503	53
Edwin C. Seguin	Neurologist	55	1,502	53
Napoleon III	Sovereign	55	1,500	52
K. H. Fuchs	Pathologist	62	1,499	52
Louis Agassiz	Naturalist	66	1,495	52
C. Giacomini	Anatomist	58	1,495	52
De Morgan	Mathematician	73	1,494	52
K. F. Gauss	do	78	1,492	52
Ch. Letourneau	Anthropologist	71	1,490	52
J. W. Powell	Geologist	68	1,488	52
K. v. Pfeufer	Physician	63	1,488	52
Wülfert	Jurist	64	1,485	52
Paul Broca	Anthropologist	55	1,484	52
G. de Mortillet	do	77	1,480	52
Lord Francis Jeffrey	Justice and editor	76	1,471	52
L. Asseline	Journalist	49	1,468	51
M. D. Skobeleff	General	39	1,457	51
Ch. H. E. Bischoff	Physician	79	1,452	51
Hugo Gylden	Astronomer	55	1,452	51
Larmarque	General	63	1,449	51
F. R. v. Kobell	Geologist and poet	79	1,445	50
Mihalkoviez	Embryologist	55	1,440	50
H. v. Helmholtz	Physiologist	73	1,440	50
Dupuytren	Surgeon	58	1,437	50
P. A. Siljestrom	Physician and pedagogue	76	1,422	50
Franz Shubert	Composer	70	1,420	50
A. T. Rice	Diplomat and editor	35	1,418	50
J. E. Oliver	Mathematician	65	1,416	49
Melchior Meyr	Philosopher and poet	61	1,415	49
Joseph Leidy	Morphologist	67	1,415	49
Philip Leidy	Physician	53	1,415	49
George Grote	Historian	75	1,410	49
Nussbaum	Surgeon	61	1,410	49
John Huber	Philosopher	49	1,409	49
C. Babbage	Mathematician and inventor	79	1,403	49
Jules Assezat	Journalist	45	1,403	49
A. Bertillon	Anthropologist	62	1,398	49
Fr. Goltz	Physiologist	68	1,395	49
Coudereau	Physician	50	1,390	49
Wm. Whewell	Philosopher	72	1,389	49
Henry Wilson	United States Vice President.	61	1,389	49
Rüdinger	Anatomist	64	1,380	48
Szilagyi	Statesman		1,380	48
H. T. v. Schmid	Litterateur	65	1,374	48
A. A. Hovelacque	Anthropologist	52	1,373	48
T. L. W. v. Bischoff	Anatomist	76	1,370	48
K. F. Herman	Philologist	51	1,358	48
Justus V. Liebig	Chemist	70	1,352	47
v. Schagintweit	Naturalist	51	1,352	47
J. P. Fallmerayer	Historian	71	1,349	47
John Hughes Bennet	Physician	63	1,338	47
Max v. Pettenkofer	Chemist	82	1,320	47
Seizel	Sculptor	50	1,312	46
J. G. Kolar	Dramatist	84	1,300	46
R. E. Grant	Astronomer	80	1,290	45
Walt Whitman	Poet	72	1,282	45
Robert Cory	Physician	55	1,276	45
Edouard Seguin	Psychiatrist	68	1,257	45
Fr. Tiedemann	Anatomist	79	1,254	44
v. Lasaulx	Philologist	57	1,250	44
L. v. Buhl	Anatomist	64	1,227	43
J. F. Hansmann	Mineralogist	77	1,226	43
B. G. Ferris	Jurist	89	1,225	43
F. G. Gall	Anatomist and phrenologist	70	1,198	42

Ninety-six persons in all. Average brain weight 1,473 (52 ounces).

Average age, 63.

There are cases of persons of ordinary ability, not to mention idiots, with brains of heavy weight; there are also cases of distinguished people with average, if not lower brain weight. Thus Shelley, Descartes, Foscolo, Donizetti and Schumann had small heads, and, presumably, small brains. But such cases are not the rule. The rule would seem to be three-fourths true and one-

fourth untrue. That is, the trend of leading specialists, as Ranke, Mannouvrier and Virchow, is that heavy brain weight suggests high mental capacity. The cases of heavy brains of idiots, feeble-minded, criminal, and insane are usually cases of disease. Also, large brains of ordinary people are often pathological. Then, also, abnormally large and heavy persons may for this reason alone have large heads, and so large brains. But, after all has been said, such cases are the exception and not the rule.

In Table 13 are given brain weights of additional distinguished men not in Table 12.

TABLE 13.—*Additional distinguished men*

Name	Occupation	Brain weight in grams	Cranial capacity in cubic centimeters
Robert Bruce	King of Scotland	1,499	1,595
Sir Thomas Browne	A writer	1,418	1,509
Ernst Haeckel (86 years old)	Scientist	1,575	
Name not permitted (Retzius)	Highly-gifted statesman	1,489	
Average		1,495	
Average, English skull			1,476

Multipying the cranial capacities of Bruce and Browne by 0.94 (Welchker), their estimated brain weights are 1,499 and 1,419 grams (53 and 50 ounces).

This table simply confirms the conclusions of almost all specialists that distinguished personages show distinctly higher brain weight than the general average.

BRAIN WEIGHT AND RACIAL INTELLIGENCE

It will be noted in the last half of Tables 14 and 16 that the more advanced nations have superior brain weight.

TABLE 14.—*J. B. Davis, Philos, Trans., 1868, 505–526*

	Number	Brain weight	
		Ounces	Grams
European races	299	48	1,367
Asiatic races	124	46	1,304
African races	53	45	1,293
American races	52	46	1,319
Australian	24	43	1,215
Oceanic races	210	46	1,319
		Grams	*Ounces*
Herzog: 113 Filipinos, average brain weight equals		1,333	47
Ziehen: Some 500 Europeans average brain weight equals		1,353	48

TABLE 15

	Grams	Ounces
105 English and Scotch (Peacock)	1,427	50
28 French (Parhoppe)	1,334	47
40 Germans (Huschke)	1,382	48
18 Germans (Wagner)	1,392	48.1
50 Austrians (Weisbach)	1,342	47.3
7 African Negroes (diverse specialists)	1,233	43
8 African Negroes (Broca)	1,289	45
78 Europeans (average)	1,403	
41 negroes	1,331	46.9
24 pure whites	1,424	50
25¾ white	1,390	48
47½ white	1,334	47
51¼ white	1,319	46
95⅛ white	1,308	46
22 1/16 white	1,280	43

The figures of Herzog and Ziehen, and also in Table 5, giving the results of some leading specialists, confirm the opinion that, as a rule, superior races have a superior brain weight.

TABLE 16—*Cranial capacity and race*

Races and nations	Number of skulls	Number of cubic centimeters
Australians	8	1,228 (73.3 c. in.).
Hottentots	3	1,233 (74 c. in.).
Peruvians	152	1,233 (74 c. in.).
Americans	341	1,315 (78.8 c. in.).
Negroes born in America	12	1,323 (79.3 c. in.).
Mexicans	25	1,338 (80.2 c. in.).
Negroes (in general)	76	1,347 (80.7 c. in.).
Negroes born in America	64	1,371 (82.2 c. in.).
Wild Indians	164	1,376 (82.5 c. in.).
Parisians	35	
Parisians (cemetery of)	117	1,409 (84.4 c. in.).
Parisians in twelfth century	115	1,425 (85.4 c. in.).
Germans	30	1,448 (86.8 c. in.).
Parisians of eighteenth century	125	1,461 (87.6 c. in.).
Anglo-Americans	7	1,474 (88.4 c. in.).
Parisians (private graves)	90	1,484 (89 c. in.).
German in general	38	1,534 (92 c. in.).
English	5	1,572 (94 c. in.).

Not being able to obtain the direct weights of the brain in sufficient numbers in the various races, we must take the cranial capacities as a general index of the weight of brain.

PREHISTORIC BRAIN WEIGHT AND CRO-MAGNON RACE

A prehistoric indication of relationship between size of brain and racial intelligence will be found in the great Cro-Magnon race, which flourished some 25,000 or more years ago.

It is generally held that the superior races eventually occupied western Europe. The Cro-Magnon race entered Europe from the east.

In Table 17 is given the "cube brain capacity" of various races, as will be noted from an examination of the table.

TABLE 17.—*"Cube brain capacity" (Osborne)*

	Male	Female	Maximum
Cro-Magnon cavemen of Mentone	1,550		1,590
Average modern European	1,450	1,300	
Race of Ofnet	1,400		
Living broad head race of Czechoslovakia	1,230	1,000	1,800
Native Australian race	1,310	1,154	
Native Indian Veddaks	1,000	1,040	1,400
Papuas of New Guinea	1,236	1,125	

The Cro-Magnons, the Greeks of pre-history, rank very high; they represent a blend of long and broad heads. Their very high modern brain power is shown by their extreme accuracy of observation of animal form as noted on the walls of their cave dwellings. It was a race of warriors, hunters, painters and sculptors. Though long headed, its face is very broad for its height, a unique feature. The upper part of the face is almost vertical, as in the highest types. Keith pronounces the Cro-Magnon characters to represent one of the finest races the world has ever seen. According to Ripley, this race is perhaps the most striking known instance of a persistency of population, unchanged through thousands of years. Such facts appear to indicate, that the human brain in the last 25,000 or more years has been growing less in weight.

Had this Cro-Magnon race enjoyed the advantages of a written language, we might have had a prehistoric Phidias and Raphael, a Socrates and Plato, a Shakespeare and Dante. The author heard Virchow say, while holding up before his students a Cro-Magnon skull: "Would that any of us had such a skull and its brain within."

CLOSE RELATION BETWEEN CRANIAL CAPACITY AND BRAIN WEIGHT

The close relation between cranial capacity and brain weight is shown from the following table of Bolk:

TABLE 18.—*Relation of brain weight to cranial capacity (Bolk)*

Age	Brain weight	Cranial capacity (per cent)
30	73.7	94.0
40	90.0	96.5
50	90.0	95.6
60	89.2	93.4
70	88.1	93.8
80	85.2	90.0
90	84.1	88.4
Over 90		81.5

After the age of 20 years the cranial vault does not increase in volume, and in woman after 15 years of age (Marchand's Handmann). This is not in accord with Bolk's table above. This, as so often happens, shows normal differences between not only individuals and groups but locations, countries, and racial antecedents. In general (Martin), based upon many authorities, the average European cranial capacity is 1,450 (87 cubic inches) for men and 1,300 (78 cubic inches) for women. Under 1,200 (72 cubic inches) capacity, Hottentots show 51 per cent; Australians, 45 per cent; Germans, 8 per cent; Chinese, 2 per cent.

Over 1,300 cubic centimeters (78 cubic inches) the Hottentots show 16 per cent; Australians, 28; Germans, 75; and Chinese, 92 per cent (Buschan).

The shape of the head may have some influence, since brachycephaly has greater volume in relation to its surface.

According to Scharpff and Richard, the difference between cranial capacity and brain volume is normally 10 to 16 per cent; higher figures mean atrophy and lower ones indicate a swelling.

CRANIAL CAPACITY AND SIZE OF BODY

Table 19, showing cranial capacity in relation to size of body, indicates that races of small growth have an absolute low average cranial capacity, and vice versa. Amadi has shown the same is true to a certain extent within races. But the variation between individuals is very great, from 1,100 to 1,700 cubic centimeters (66 to 102 cubic inches), which is attributed to heredity. The physiological limits are still greater, 950 and 970 cubic centimeters minima (56 to 57 cubic inches) (Adamanen), and (Trooler) maxima, 1,950 and 2,020 cubic centimeters (116 and 121 cubic inches).

TABLE 19.—*Cranial capacity and size of body (Amadi)*

Capacity of skull	Size of body		
	Great	Medium	Small
	Per cent	*Per cent*	*Per cent*
Great	36	29	19
Medium	47	54	42
Small	16	17	38

Among the same people the size of body and cranial capacity are proportional; but the size of body reaches its maximum much sooner than the cranial capacity, so that very great size of body may belong to somewhat small cranial capacity (Ranke).

ESTIMATING CRANIAL CAPACITY

The estimation of cranial capacity is not only of importance in itself but it is necessary for the calculation of brain weight from outside measurements of either the head or of the skull. To find out the amount of space in a skull, it appears that the same measurer, by diverse methods, can obtain close results, but for two or more measures the results are not so close and may differ from 15 to 40 cubic centimeters (1 to 2 cubic inches), which is 1 to 3 per cent of discrepancy, due to personal equation. This difficulty has led to finding of an equation for calculating the capacity of the skull from outside measurements of it, without measuring its inner space by seed, shot, sand, or water. This difficulty of anthropologists has been solved by the mathematicians who have constructed equations or formulas by which the space in a skull can be estimated almost as correctly as different anthropologists can do by the laborious method of filling the skull with seed, sand, or shot, and shaking it until every crevice is filled, before pouring the seed, etc., out of the skull in order to measure it.

When we consider not only the personal errors of various anthropologists but their different methods of measuring the skull, a mathematical formula with an error of not more than 40 cubic centimeters will serve to measure cranial capacity; especially so where the skulls are too fragile to be filled with sand or seed or shot and be shaken.

The Lee-Pearson formula is one which may serve as well as any. It is:

For males:

Cranial capacity = 0.000337 × length × breadth × height of head + 406.01.

For females:

Cranial capacity = 0.000400 × length × breadth × height of head + 206.80.

The prediction of cranial capacity of the living individual can be done with an average error of 3 to 4 per cent, and the prediction of the cranial capacity of a race, without the use of sand, seed or shot, can be done to a degree of accuracy comparable with that of the direct method, owing to the personal equation of the measures even when using the same method of direct determination.

ESTIMATING WEIGHT OF BRAIN FROM HEAD MEASUREMENTS ON THE LIVING

The ratio that brain weight bears to the outside measurements of the head in case of death from accident, or from acute diseases, or in death from wasting disease, shows that the diminution of brain weight in wasting disease even, though measurable, is small (Gladstone). In other words, the brain weight appears in general to be little affected by body disease or other conditions. The estimation of brain weight from outside measurements of the head on the living is only affected by the thickness of the scalp and hair. After middle age the hair and scalp become thinner with age; also the weight of the brain lessens, so that the proportion between the outside measurements of the head and brain is not materially affected by age.

Attempts to estimate the brain weight of the living in connection with cranial capacity are relatively recent. The difficulties are numerous. In a normal skull of 1,400 cubic centimeters (84 cubic inches) capacity there is about 100 cubic centimeters (6 cubic inches) of free space (see Table 4) without the brain, which probably increases after the age of 60, or possibly before.

The estimating of brain weight upon the living by means of equations is in its beginning; and doubtless there will eventually be a large number of equations, or formulas, each adapted to different races, and in the same race to different classes of individuals or groups.

Blakeman and Pearson have worked out numerous formulas to estimate brain weight upon the living, which are called "prediction formulæ." One of their main formulas for males is:

1. W (brain weight) = 1,987 P + 8,644 U − 1.1910 A + 1.7508 S + 36.8559, where P is product of head length, breadth, and height; U is head circumference; A, age; and S, stature. In this equation the probable error of prediction is 48.5 grams (1.7 ounces) and error of mean 57.4 grams (2 ounces).

Another formula is:

2. Male brain weight = 0.2519 P + 374.7628.

The probable error of prediction is 49.9 grams (1.7 ounces) and error of mean 59 grams (2.7 ounces).

This formula requires much less time to use, and the difference from the first one in probable and mean errors is small. The addition of more elements to the formula does not always improve it. The product (P) of the three head measurements is the foundation of the formula, for it should be remembered that the volume of an eclipsoid is proportional to the product of its three diameters.

The Lee-Pearson formula for estimating cranial capacity from outside measurements of the head is (head length-11) × (head breadth-11) × (head height-11) × 0.000337 + 406.01.

MODIFICATION OF THE LEE-PEARSON FORMULA

The author tested this formula, based on the results of 117 autopsies, and found it necessary to change the formula as follows: (head length-6) × (head breadth-7) × (head height-5) × 0.000337 + 406.01 = cranial capacity in cubic centimeters.

Then Welcker's method is used to estimate the brain weight from the cranial capacity, thus:

When the cranial capacity is—

1,200 to 1,300 cu. cent. (73 to 78 cu. in.), it is multiplied by 0.91
1,300 to 1,400 cu. cent. (78 to 85 cu. in.), it is multiplied by 92
1,400 to 1,500 cu. cent. (85 to 90 cu. in.), it is multiplied by 93
1,500 to 1,600 cu. cent. (90 to 96 cu. in.), it is multiplied by
1,600 to 1,700 cu. cent. (96 to 100 cu. in.), it is multiplied by

The reasons for subtracting 5 millimeters instead of 11 millimeters from head length, and 6 millimeters instead of 11 from head breadth, and 4 from head height instead of 11 are based upon measurements made at 117 autopsies on white males.

These changes of the Lee-Pearson formula are based upon the following table:

TABLE 20.—*117 male white, thickness of scalp (117 autopsies)*

Length of head minus length of skull = 4.9 millimeters (0.192 inches).
Breadth of head minus breadth of skull = 6.2 millimeters (0.243 inches).
Height of head minus height of skull = 5.3 millimeters (0.202 inches).

In the Lee-Pearson formula 11 millimeters (0.433 inches) are subtracted from each of the three head measurements, which is theoretically correct, the assumption being that the thickness of the scalp being approximately the same for each side of the head, and at the points from which the length and height are measured, should be doubled.

But at the autopsy table, first, the head and then the skull (after turning down the scalp) are measured. The results here are much less, as shown in Table 20; that is, instead of 11 millimeters, about half of 11 should be subtracted from the outside head measurements. To show the cause of this discrepancy, the author used a little pressure in measuring the thickness of the scalp directly in seven autopsy cases at the usual points for taking the three head measurements upon the living with the following results:

TABLE 21.—*Effect of pressure on scalp in millimeters in head measurements*

	Length	Breadth	Height
1	3.25 (0.127 in.)	3.50 (0.146 in.)	2.50 (0.098 in.)
2	2.50 (0.098 in.)	3.20 (0.125 in.)	2.50 (0.098 in.)
3	1.75 (0.066 in.)	1.50 (0.058 in.)	1.50 (0.058 in.)
4	3.00 (0.118 in.)	3.00 (0.118 in.)	2.00 (0.079 in.)
5	2.00 (0.079 in.)	2.00 (0.079 in.)	2.00 (0.079 in.)
6	2.00 (0.079 in.)	2.00 (0.079 in.)	2.00 (0.079 in.)
7	2.00 (0.079 in.)	2.00 (0.079 in.)	2.00 (0.079 in.)
Average	2.45 (0.095 in.)	2.06 (0.081 in.)	2.35 (0.091 in.)

Tweezers were used to bring slight pressure upon the scalp, as near as could be judged to the pressure made by the caliper points. The pressure on the scalp will vary, according to measurer, to bluntness or sharpness of caliper points and to haste or slowness in taking the measurements.

The patients in the Government hospital for the insane come from all sections of the United States. As is well known, most all brain estimates are based upon general hospital populations, which are not very representative of the general population of a country, as they are mostly from the lower middle classes. In addition, they are somewhat deteriorated from disease (especially chronic cases) and other various causes. In answering lay questions the author has humorously said: "Why, I find it almost impossible to get the brains of decent people."

It is probable, therefore, that most of the formulas[1] to estimate cranial capacity and brain weight upon the living from outside measurements of the head give results below the actual weight, especially when applied to the higher classes.

For estimating the cranial capacity from the skull circumference, instead of the diametrical product, the Lee-Pearson formula is:

[1] A number of specialists have given various formulas to estimate cranial capacity and brain weight upon the living. Pearl, Todd, Gladstone, in addition to Blakeman, Lee, and Pearson, would be useful to consult, as indicated in literature at the end of this article.

For males:

Cranial capacity = 7.060 × circumference − 220.98; probable error $= \frac{47.72}{\sqrt{n}}$

For females:

Cranial capacity = 5.974 × circumference − 1,705.73; probable error $= \frac{38.78}{\sqrt{n}}$

CEREBRAL LOCALIZATION

To consider properly the subject of cerebral localization would take us far beyond the limits of this article. Still, certain things might be noted in the way of refreshing our memory. The cerebral cortex makes its first appearance in reptiles; the first appearance of the fissure of Rollando is in the carnivora.

The significance of various fissures and convolutions in the human brain has been determined mainly by the investigation of the brain in the higher animals, where the brain has same general form as in man. The fissures and convolution pattern in a certain species of small monkeys show the surface of the hemispheres to be nearly smooth. Between the brain of this monkey species, and that of man, a series of brains show a gradual increase in the number and complexity of the convolutions and fissures of similar types. Thus, the orang-outang, chimpanzee, and gorilla have much larger and more numerous fissures than the other species of apes. While the gorilla's brain approaches the human brain more than any of the other apes, it is, however, very much nearer to the apes than to man.

Those areas of the brain whose office is known embrace such functions as are considered primary, common to all animals, and necessary in some way to natural existence. There then remain the unknown regions, the superior development of which distinguishes the human brain, and which may include those functions which place man far above all other animals. The sunken or concealed surface of the brain is twice that of the exposed surface. These fissures or sulci (200 in number) between the convolutions vary much in depth; some are 25 millimeters (1 inch) or more deep, others are shallow; the average is about 10 to 12 millimeters (one-third to one-half inch).

There are considerable variations of the fissures and convolutions on the opposite sides of the same brain, as well as in different persons.

In different regions of the cortex there is much variation in size, form, and arrangement of the cells. The most striking differences are seen in the motor cortex of the frontal lobe, which has very large giant cells.

It seems to be generally held (Mingazzini) that the speech area in the third left frontal convolution is liable to be well developed in orators. Thus Gambetta's third left frontal convolution was greatly developed, though his brain was a small one. So, in the case of Professor La Borde and other orators and jurists the speech area was highly developed but is often very much reduced in deaf and dumb persons.

The author noted a case of a man in the Government hospital for the insane who continually cried out for weeks "My God." Certain brain cells or brain areas must have been exercised to great excess. There should be a histological study of such cases after death, to determine the effect on the brain. It would be a great discovery to localize the cells affected, which, with all due respect, might be called the "My God" cells or areas of the brain. All cases in which the patient keeps repeating the same words should be studied after death, with a view to cerebral localization.

In man the tumor of the brain can help to show the function of the part of brain where it is; also, if other pathological conditions destroy or affect certain parts of the brain, the functions affected or stopped indicate the office of this part of the brain.

In persons of high intelligence the whole frontal region is generally large. This was especially true of the mathematicians Wright and Oliver (see Table 12). Moreover, in genius in general it is the parietal lobe that seems to be highly developed, as in the chemist Liebig and anatomist Doellinger. So the sight center of great painters was thought to be well developed; thus Raphael's skull was greatly developed in this region. Flechsig compared the brains of distinguished men and believes that the sensory centers are not directly connected with each other, but indirectly through association areas. Injury and disease in these areas tend to show that the function of these areas is higher intellectual activity. Thus, the frontal area, when injured, causes weakness in attention, in reflection, and in control over anger, self-appreciation, and other personal volitions and emotions. In many cases in which brains of great men have been studied there is complexity, due partly to the greater development of second and tertiary fissures, and partly to the more curved surfaces of the sulci, especially in the frontal and parietal regions, and there may be even a relationship of a particular type of mind in a special part on the brain. Also, in some great mathematicians the supramarginal convolution is particularly well developed. In skilled artisans the part of the brain connected with voluntary movements of hands and fingers has been noted in several cases.

Flechsig thinks the posterior area is concerned with experiences founded upon visual and auditory sensations, showing especially musical development. The anterior area, being in closer connection with the body sense area, may be concerned with experiences based upon internal sensations (bodily appetites and desires), and in alterations or defective development of this part of the brain may give a physical explanation of mental or moral degeneracy. Thus, histological studies of the brains of those mentally deficient bear this idea out; here the brain shows a distinct thinning of the cortex, and the maximum focus of this change is found in the prefontal lobes (anterior association area). In idiots this area distinctly undeveloped, and in the inane the atrophy appears to be marked in proportion to the degrees of dementia.

DEMONSTRATION OF CEREBRAL LOCALIZATION

If the cerebrum in the frog be removed, but care be taken not to interfere with the optic nerves or the thalami, the frog attempts to catch flies and shows other signs of initiative; it will avoid objects. But the cerebrum of the frog is very low in the scale of development compared with the other vertebrates. Thus, in the removal of the cerebrum of the pigeon, leaving the basal nuclei intact, the animal can carry on many coordinate activities; it can stand and perch without difficulty; if placed on its back, it gains its equilibrium at once; if pushed off its perch, it flies till it reaches a firm support; if disturbed on its perch, it will walk away, showing it can coordinate its leg muscles. If left undisturbed, it will occasionally open its eyes, move its head and pick its feathers. But it spends most of its time sitting quietly as though asleep. If aroused, it shows little or no excitement or fright. At De Boi-Reymond's lecture in Berlin the author saw a pigeon, whose brain had been removed, which did not pay the least attention to light flashed into its eyes, or to the sound of a pistol shot off near it; but when pushed off its perch flew around the lecture room without hitting anything until it fell to the floor exhausted. Results of experiments on rabbits, rats, and dogs are somewhat similar. Goltz's dog, without brain, showed complete loss of memory and intelligence, being a mere automaton. Such experiments show what the function of the cerebral cortex is in connection with the mentality of the animal.

The author witnessed another demonstration on a monkey (by Horseley) on the outer surface stimulation of the upper part around the fissure of Rolando, causing movements of the leg; and stimulation of the middle part, causing movements of the arm, and of the lower part, causing face and mouth movements. A lesion in the third frontal convolution on the left side is always associated in man with the loss of the power of speech called motor aphasia; this part is close to the motor center for muscles of tongue and mouth, and is called speech center. In most persons (right-handed people) the speech movements are regulated from a particular part of the left hemisphere, the corresponding part of the right hemisphere remaining dormant. When this part of the brain is injured in man there is loss of voluntary speech, the patient can not utter words at all or uses the wrong words. With lesion of the posterior part of the first temporal convolution on the left side is associated word deafness. With lesion of the cortex of the hinder part of the parietal lobe (near the visual center) is associated word blindness.

After transection of spinal cord or of brain behind the forebrain mental actions do not belong to the reactions of the nervous arcs posterior to the transection, but they do accompany the reactions of the nervous arcs in front and still connected with the fore brain; thus, if the spinal cord is severed, one does not have consciousness of his limbs, whose afferent nerves lie behind the point of spinal severance, but he can see them with his eyes. In the higher animals there is no consciousness in any part of the nervous system from which the fore brain has been cut off.

CONCLUSIONS AS TO THE BRAIN

These conclusions are based upon the studies of specialistic scientists, most all of whom are recognized as authorities in their lines.

A few of these conclusions may not always be in accord, but this is to be expected in a subject about which comparatively little of a fundamental nature is definitely determined. Yet all general statements concerning a developing subject, which may be, so to speak, four-fifths true and one-fifth untrue (due to exceptions), are important because they indicate the trend or direction in which to look for future research.

1. From the point of view of nature the brain is an accidental extension of the spinal cord and is dependent upon the necessities of the animal in the use of the higher nervous functions. But,

2. From the human point of view the brain is all important, being the organ of mind, the highest function in man. Yet,

3. According to nature, the extreme end of the frontal lobe (though the seat of the higher mental processes) is the last to be evolved and the first to undergo dissolution in mental decadence. And, in consonance with this,

4. The brain in the early stages of evolution was much smaller than the spinal cord, being most subordinate, if not barely existing. But,

5. This accidental character of the brain, as a mere offshoot of the spinal cord, has its parallel in the realm of mind, the furthest development of which is said to consist in philosophical and metaphysical thinking and theories, which are likewise most complicated (like the brain), uncertain and unstable. Briefly,

6. All intellectual activities, being a distinctive expression through the brain as the organ of the mind, are, nevertheless, absolutely dependent upon the brain. Thus,

7. In the higher animals, including man, there is no consciousness in any part of the nervous system from which the fore brain has been cut off. That is to say,

8. The power of thought is absolutely limited to the fore brain, which can exist without mind, but no mind can exist without a brain. Thus the subordination of mind in nature's realm is further suggested by the fact that,

9. In the dying hour thought is usually the first to go, while the unconscious organic functions endure until the end.

10. The brain probably reaches its full growth between ages 15 and 20, remaining constant to about age 50, and then gradually becomes less in weight at the rate of about 1 ounce in 10 years.

11. The weight of brain, relative to body weight, is greater in the girl than in the boy, but after the age of 15 the absolute weight of brain is always greater in man than in woman.

12. In the world in general the average weight of the brain varies from 1,350 grams (47 ounces) to 1,450 grams (51 ounces). As smaller men have relatively heavier brains, so women with smaller bodies have larger brains relative to their body weight.

13. Brains under 1,250 grams (44 ounces) are abnormally small and those more than 1,550 grams (55 ounces) are abnormally large.

14. The average maximum brain weight is 1,810 grams (64 ounces) and the average minimum brain weight is 960 grams (34 ounces).

15. Between the ages of 20 and 40 the mean male brain weight is 1,360 grams (48 ounces) and the mean female brain weight is 1,230 grams (43 ounces) and the brain appears to be heaviest between ages 14 and 20. But,

16. At the age of 80 the brain has lost, on an average, 90 grams (3 ounces), except, it has been shown, that in distinguished men the senile decrease in brain weight is delayed about 10 years, as compared with the average man.

17. It has been found that the gray matter constitutes about 54 per cent, the white matter 43 per cent, and the nuclei 3 per cent of the entire cerebrum, and that the weight of the cortex is 33 per cent of the total weight of the brain.

18. The cerebellum, or little brain, weighs 140 grams (5 ounces), about 10 per cent of the entire brain; it averages larger in man than woman, and is relatively larger in adults than children, the converse of the brain.

19. The difference in volume between the inner space of the skull and the volume of the brain is about 7½ per cent, with individual variations from 5 to 10 per cent. This difference changes little in middle life, but after the age of 70 it becomes about 15 per cent instead of 7½ per cent; that is, this difference doubles. So,

20. In a skull with a volume of 1,400 cubic centimeters (85 cubic inches) there is about 100 cubic centimeters (6 cubic inches) of free space outside of the brain, and after the age of 70 this space approaches 200 cubic centimeters (12 cubic inches).

21. The larger the animal, the smaller the relative size of brain, and the smaller the animal, the larger the relative size of brain. This is generally true in man.

22. Brain weight, relative to body weight, is much greater in young animals than when they reach adulthood, which also is true of man.

23. There is a certain parallelism in animals between brain weight and intelligence, notwithstanding variations.

24. The brain weight of the gorilla, though nearest man, is only 416 grams (13 ounces), which is less than one-third of the human brain (1,400 grams=49 ounces).

25. The higher the mentality of the animal, especially man, the greater is the brain, in comparison with the rest of the cerebrospinal system.

26. The influence of stature on brain weight extends throughout the animal kingdom in such a way that with equal intelligence small species have a relatively superior brain weight to the large species, and to such a degree that species with very small stature can excel species of very great stature who are much superior in intelligence.

27. The nutrition of the brain seems greatly independent of the general nutrition of the body; thus very delicate children are often well developed cerebrally.

28. The brain receives in superior animals more numerous, various, and complex sensations than in inferior animals, and also in taller animals as compared with those small in stature; and

29. As to the motor center, the brain controls less numerous, less various, and less complicated movements in the lower species.

30. The surface of the brain relative to its volume is much greater in small than in large mammals.

31. As to the relation of brain weight to intelligence in man, some mathematical specialists claim it is slight; but,

32. Since no human brain in a head less than 11 inches in circumference has been known to function normally, and since no brain weighing less than 32 ounces has been normal, it is evident that size and weight of brain must have very much to do with intelligence within certain limits, and it is difficult to believe that such relationship suddenly stops, for such a saltus is not in accordance with nature.

33. It seems to be generally true that those occupations which require more thinking show heavier brain weight.

34. The most advanced nations appear in general to have superior brain weight. Likewise,

35. Distinguished men, as compared with average persons, have distinctly heavier brains.

36. In 20,000 Washington school children the average head circumference of the bright was larger than in the dull for every age.

37. The great and superior Cro-Magnon race, existing 25,000 or more years ago, shows a higher cranial capacity than other races, and even higher than modern man, indicating that since that time, the human brain has been growing less in weight.

38. The complexity and depth of the convolutions of the brain, indicating area of gray matter, correspond with intelligence.

39. Naturally, skull capacity and brain weight are closely related in about a ratio of 100 to 90. This accords with the fact that the difference between skull capacity and brain volume is 10 to 16 per cent; more means atrophy, less means swelling.

40. Cranial capacity is less in races of small growth, and in the same race is proportional to size of body; but body size reaches its maximum much sooner than cranial capacity.

41. Cranial capacity may be estimated from its outside measurements almost as well as by direct methods of anthropologists, showing what mathematics can do. Likewise,

42. Brain weight of living persons may be estimated from outside measurements of the head by the following equation:

(Head length−6) × (head breadth−7) × (head height−5) × 0.000337+406.01, which multiplied by 0.90 gives the brain weight in grams. Thus by this equation

43. Measurements of 89 Members of Congress show their average brain weight to be 1,550 grams (55 ounces), which is very much above that of men in general.

44. To determine the functions of different parts of the brain depends mainly on the investigation of animals. Thus,

45. If the frog's brain be removed, it tries to catch flies, will avoid an object and shows other signs of initiative. Likewise,

46. After the brain of the pigeon is removed it can stand on the perch easily; if placed on its back, it rights itself at once. If pushed off its perch, it may fly until exhausted. If left undisturbed, it will occasionally open its eyes, move its head, and pick its feathers, but it spends most of its time as though asleep.

47. Results of experiments on rabbits, rats, and dogs are somewhat similar to the pigeon. One dog with brain removed showed complete loss of memory.

48. In a monkey stimulation of the upper part around the fissure of Rolando causes movements of the leg, of the middle part, causes movements of the arm and of the lower part, movements of face and mouth.

49. While the monkey brain in size approaches the human brain more than the brain of other animals, it is, however, very much nearer to the other animals than to man.

50. Those parts of the brain whose function is known are considered primary and are common to all animals, and also necessary in some way to their existence; but

51. There are unknown regions in the brain the superior development of which places man far above other animals. But in order to study these parts directly in man, human vivisection would be necessary, and it is sometimes performed by nature herself; thus,

52. If disease or tumor affects or stops action of certain parts of the brain, the functions so affected indicate the office of such parts or brain area; so

53. A lesion in the third left frontal convolution is always associated in man with the loss of speech, being close to the motor center for muscles of the tongue and mouth called the speech center, which has been found well developed in orators, as in Gambetta's brain, though otherwise a small brain; and

54. The sight center (in occipital lobe) of great painters is thought to be highly developed, as in the case of Raphael's skull in this region.

55. A lesion of the posterior part of the first temporal convolution on the left side causes word deafness, and a lesion of the hinder part of the left parietal lobe near the visual center results in word blindness.

56. Some specialists hold that the frontal region when injured causes weakness in attention, reflection, and lack of control over anger, and also defects in various volitions and emotions. And in general—

57. In persons of high intelligence, usually the whole frontal region is large, which is especially true of certain mathematicians' brains which have been studied.

SPECIALISTIC SOURCES OF THIS STUDY

Arthur (W.). On Relation Between Strength of Grip and Certain Mental and Sensory Characters. Biometrika, 1924, xvi, 299–327.

Beck (F. R.). Eine Methode zur Bestimmung des Schaedelinhaltes und Hirngewichtes am lebenden und ihre Bezeihungen zum Kopfumange, 8° Stuttgart, 1906.

Blakeman (J.), Lee (A.), and Pearson (K.). A Study of the Biometric Constants of English Brain Weights and Their Relationship to External Physical Measurements. Biometrika, 1905–6, iv, 124–160, Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, A. W. Histological Studies on the Localization of Cerebral Function, Cambridge (England), 1906, 4°, 361 pages.

Cunningham, D. J. Contributions to the Surface Anatomy. Cunningham Memoires of the Royal Irish Academy, 1892.

Donaldson, H. Journal of Comparative Neurology, ix, 1899.

Gladstone, R. J. A Study of the Relation of the Brain to the Size of the Head. Biometrika, vol. iv, 1906–7, pp. 105–123.

Hammerberg. Studien ueber Klinik and Pathologie der Idiotie Untersuchungen ueber normale Anatomie der Hirnrinde, Upsala, 1895.

Handman (B. E.). Ueber das Hirngewicht des Menschen auf Grund von 1914, in pathologischen Institut zu Leipzig vorgenommenen Hirnwaegungen, 8°, Leipzig, 1905.

Holzinger (K. J.). Note on the Relation of Vital Capacity to Certain Psychical Characters. Biometrika, 1924, xvi, 139–157.

Isserlis (L.). Formulæ for the Determination of the Capacity of the Negro Skull from External Measurements. Biometrika, 1914–15, x, Part 1, 188–193. Cambridge University Press.

Le Bon. Revue d'Anthropologie, 1879; also Davis, Philosophical Transaction, 1868.

MacDonald, Arthur. Experimental Study of Children, including anthropometrical and psycho-physical measurements of Washington school children, etc. In Annual Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1897–98, 325 pages. Washington, D. C. Also reprint.

MacDonald, Arthur. Man and Abnormal Man, etc. Senate document 187, Fifty-eighth Congress, third session, 780 pages, 8°, Washington, D. C., 1905.

MacDonald, Arthur. Mentality in relation to head circumference, etc. Journal of American Statistical Association, Boston, December, 1911, 9 pages, 8°, also reprint.

MacDonald, Arthur. Congress, being an anthropological study of 89 members, including estimation of brain weights.

Manouvier, L. Valeure des posees et des series cerebrales; comparaison du poids d'lencephale a la capacité cranienne Memoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris, 2 série, tome troisieme, Paris, 1885, 148–323.

Martin, Rudolph. Lehrbuch der Anthropologie, etc. Jena, 1914, I, 181 pages, 8°.

Matiegha, H. Ueber die Beziehungen des Hirngewicht zum Berufe Politische Anthropologische Revue, 1907.

Osborne, Henry Fairfield. Recent Discoveries relating to the origin and antiquity of Man, Science, May 20, 1927.

Pearl, Raymond. Variation and Correlation in Brain Weight. (Biometrika, Vol. IV, pp. 13–104, Cambridge, Eng.)

Pearson, Karl. The Skull of Robert Bruce, King of Scotland (1274–1329). (Biometrika, Vol. XVI, 253–273, Cambridge, 1924.)

Pearson, Karl, and Davis, A. G. On the Biometric Constants of the Human Skull. (Biometrika, Vol. XVI, 323–364, Cambridge, 1924.)

Ranke, Johannes. Der Mensch, Erster Band, Gewicht und Groesse des Gehirns, Zeite, 594–599, Leipzig, Wien, 1911.

Retzius, G. Das Gehirn des Astronomen, Hugo Gylden, Biologische Untersuchungen, viii, 1898; also Das Gehirn des Mathematikers, Kovaloeski, ix, 1900; Das Gehir des Physikers und Paedagogen, Adam Siljestroem, x, 1902.

Spitzka, E. A. A Study of the Brains of Six Eminent Scientists and Scholars. Trans. American Philosophical Society, xxi, 1907.

Rudolph, Otto. Untersuchungen ueber Hirngewicht, Hirn volumen und Schaedel capacitaet. (Prize, Inaugural Dissertation), Jena, 1914, 42 pages, 8°.

Sandon, F. A preliminary Inquiry into the Density of the Living Male Human Body. (Biometrika, 1924, xvi, 404–411.)

Scharpff. Hirngewicht und Psychose. Archiv. fuer Psychosen und Nervenkrankheiten, Berlin, 1912, xlix, 242–252.

Spitzka, Edward A. A study of the brain weights of men notable in the professions, arts, and sciences. Philadelphia Medical Journal, May 2, 1903.

WHAT IS WRONG, AND WHAT SHALL WE DO ABOUT IT?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech by Hon. Homer T. Bone before Delegates Seattle Unemployed Organizations.

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

HON. HOMER T. BONE'S PROGRAM

You have asked me to speak to you, the unemployed, on What Is Wrong and What Shall we Do About It.

The mere fact that you are here as part of the great organization of the unemployed who must depend on food furnished at public depots shows that there is a great deal wrong.

Concentration of wealth and the control of business processes are building a huge new feudal system, a heartless industrial feudalism in which the common man is the uncared-for serf. They are bringing about the destruction of free competition and the end of all independent business operations. This means the end of hope, of individual opportunity for your children and mine; it means that periods of starvation in the midst of plenty such as we are now facing will come more and more frequently unless this concentration of wealth is brought to an abrupt stop.

PLAYTHINGS OF BIG BUSINESS

The economic destinies and life of the Nation are in the control of a small group of men, who deflate and inflate at pleasure. This process is a deliberate one. We have all become playthings of big business. The power of these men to play with the welfare and happiness of the American people, a game designed to increase their own power and wealth, must be curbed. Unless it is curbed we will emerge from this crash—which lays the whole Nation prostrate—to find that a few men own nearly everything. Control that is now well-nigh supreme will have been transformed into absolute ownership. Nowhere is this process more apparent than in the operations of the great public-utility corporations—the Power Trust.

SAFETY OF REPUBLIC THREATENED

Continuation of this process means that the plight of the farmer, the workingman, the small business man will grow continually worse. There is vast wealth in the Nation—its natural wealth will continue to be here but a few will own it all. When that day comes it means the end of the Republic. The concentration of wealth has proceeded at such a rate that to-day 550 corporations do 80 per cent of the total volume of the Nation's business. Six per cent of the corporations hire 70 per cent of the wage workers. When these few corporations fire their workers they make no provision to feed and clothe them. The market of the farmer is destroyed. We then face what you are facing to-day.

MUST CARE FOR COMMON MAN

When such a situation arises—and it has arisen—it is the function of government to see to it that the common man is not permitted to starve in the midst of plenty, that he is given an opportunity to work and to sell the products of his labor whether that product be of the farm or factory. But what actually has happened? While pointing out that direct aid to farmers and unemployed would demoralize these men and injure the country the reactionaries in Congress have established a pernicious system of doles for big business. The responsibility of the Government—of our Government—can not be permitted to end there. The farmer and the workingman and the small business man are entitled to as much consideration as is Wall Street.

A system of old-age pensions and unemployment insurance should be enacted. The program of farm relief including the debenture plan espoused by those Senators in Congress who actually speak for the farmer should be enacted rather than any program of so-called farm relief designed by big business. We must have farm relief for the farmer, not farm relief for the banker.

DEFLATE MENACING FORTUNES

A system of income inheritance and gift taxes should be established as a part of the public policy of the Nation—taxes that would in themselves deflate the vast superfortunes that constitute a menace to the social welfare of the Nation. This should be done not as part of a mere tax program—not merely to balance the Budget for a single year—but as a deliberate public policy. Some of these superfortunes are the result of war profiteering. War profiteering is treason. In time of war private property, as well as men, should be drafted. By taxation we can return to the Nation some of the swollen fortunes which grew out of the last war. By the draft of private property in war time in the future we can prevent what happened in the World War when to each casualty list could be appended the name of a new millionaire.

PAY THE SOLDIERS' BONUS

The Government of the United States has promised to pay a bonus to the veterans of the Great War. It has actually said how much it will pay each man. This solemn promise to pay is part of the public debt. But the reactionaries in Congress, headed by the man in the White House, simply refuse to pay now when these men are out of work and hungry through no fault of their own. A ragged army of veterans is even now encamped in Washington, D. C., pleading with the Government to pay them their money now. This money must be paid sooner or later. But the reactionaries say: "They'll only spend it if we give it to them." That is true. They will spend the money for food, helping the farmer; for clothes, for shelter, helping the workingman and helping business. The Government should be as eager to pay its debts to poor veterans as to grant loans and give doles to big business.

STOP BUSINESS RACKETEERING

All forms of doles to private business grafters and racketeers should be abolished. Subsidies to financiers who get Government ships for a song and then sell watered stock in the shipping lines to those who have managed to save a few dollars; graft in the form of post-office leases; every form of dole and largesse to big business should be stopped. The present era of graft on the National Treasury is like the frenzied grafting of the French court prior to the revolution. The tremendous frenzy to balance the Budget—it is probably balanced by now—will result in validating the public securities issued by the Nation and will help creditors at the expense of debtors. This may be all very well, but what about validating the billions in securities dumped upon unfortunate people by these same big bankers who now are the principal creditors of the Nation; what about the billions in watered stocks of public utility and other companies which were sold to the people in the Coolidge-Hoover "new era." They apparently are to be left high and dry while the international bankers who defrauded our people are not only to go unwhipped of justice but are to be "taken care of." Compared with these so-called magnates of big business Al Capone is only a small-time racketeer.

ABOLISH CHILD LABOR

While you sit here considering how you shall get work and bread, thousands of children are working in the factories of America. They are in competition with you. The reactionaries in Congress and the State legislature who serve big business call this freedom. Every child, they claim, should have the freedom to work at low wages in competition with its parents or the parents of other children. We must put a stop to this sort of freedom—the freedom of corporations to exploit little children when men and women with families go hungry. Collective bargaining between capital and labor should include the major aspects of industrial conditions including the abolition of child labor by agreement as well as by law.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF UTILITIES

Our laws are filled with jokers that enable private utility combines to evade taxes and mercilessly skin the consuming public. You know that the public-utility corporations of our own State pay taxes on small valuations and, because the laws permit, charge

rates based on valuations several times as large. This defrauds every taxpayer as well as every consumer. But this is only the beginning of the iniquity of these utility corporations. So great has been their profit, so greedy have they been to consolidate their control over an essential of modern living which they own that they have bribed legislators, injected their propaganda into our schools, defrauded our investors, made a mockery of every law on the statute books and of every law of common decency. In Seattle and Tacoma we find the answer to all this. It is public ownership of public utilities. The right to seize our rivers, our waterfalls, and to use them first as a means of swindling people out of their savings and next as a means of forever paying profits on watered stock can be abolished only by this method.

BANKS MUST BE MADE SAFE

Many of you were not stuck by stock salesmen. You were thrifty, putting your money into a savings account. So many savings accounts are valueless to their owners because the institutions in which they were placed are either closed or bankrupt that some form of assurance of stability of banks must be given by law. The refusal of the bankers to meet the issue of unemployment by loans to cities and public bodies—their evasion of their responsibility as bankers calls for an addition to our system of public banking by which savings may be kept liquid for emergencies. The functions of postal-savings banks should be vastly widened and checking priviliges extended to postal-saving depositors.

LIQUOR AND PROSPERITY

I do not think that the mere repeal of the eighteenth amendment would guarantee lasting prosperity. The big issue is jobs, not jags. But the people have a right to vote on prohibition. If the people vote to restore liquor—if they do—then that business with all of its profits should go direct into the Public Treasury, not into the pockets of the Mellons and the Schlitz's.

END UNEMPLOYMENT FOR PROSPERITY

End unemployment and you end the depression. You help the farmer and the business man. Unemployment can be ended. There is still work to be done in this Nation. And if the bankers and industrial leaders have proven that their methods will not work then the people must elect men to the Government who will have the wit to start the wheels moving again and take such steps as are possible to see to it that they are not stopped again soon.

TRADE RECOVERY AND RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PITTMAN presented a letter from Robert D. Kohn, chairman executive committee, National Committee for Trade Recovery, New York City, N. Y., which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR TRADE RECOVERY,
New York City, June 6, 1932.

The Hon. KEY PITTMAN,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The National Committee for Trade Recovery sponsored by the Construction League of the United States represents the prominent national organizations of the construction industry. These member societies include approximately 120,000 individuals or firms engaged in construction work normally employing at least 2,000,000 men.

We have studied the legislation now pending in the Congress with reference to public works and strongly favor the plan proposed in the bill introduced by Senators WAGNER, ROBINSON, PITTMAN, WALSH, and BULKLEY, and known as S. 4755.

We urge your support for this bill, knowing as we do by experience that construction work amounting to at least one billion and a half dollars would thus be made possible and would employ directly over 1,000,000 men in the course of the year. In addition, collateral industrial, farming, and related employment would be afforded to great numbers by the expenditure of this amount of money by the workers.

The allocation of the credit facilities which would be provided by this bill should, in our opinion, be guided by technical advisers—engineers and architects—who would select such projects as would afford the maximum employment of workers who need it at the earliest possible date on a balanced program of works of the greatest usefulness.

We strongly urge upon you the support of S. 4755 as being most likely to carry this desirable end into effect.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT D. KOHN,
Chairman Executive Committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CONTINENTAL TRADING CO. (LTD.)

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, a few days ago information was carried by the press of an adjustment by the Treasury Department of the Government's claim against Henry M. Blackmer for delinquent taxes, the facts about the matter having been brought to the attention of the department through the investigation of the Continental Trading Co.

I have a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, telling of the settlement and of the recovery consequent upon that investigation. I ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, June 8, 1932.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated May 27, 1932, in which you ask to be advised as to the adjustment of the Government's claim against Henry M. Blackmer for back taxes, and that you be furnished with a statement of collections made in consequence of disclosures in the Senate investigation of the operations of the Continental Trading Co. (Ltd.), and of inquiries induced thereby.

The disposition of the income-tax case against Henry M. Blackmer in the Board of Tax Appeals, which has been pending since May, 1928, when jeopardy assessments were made to prevent the taxpayer from withdrawing his assets from the United States, resulted in payment to the Government of $3,669,784.47. This is $1,080,000 in excess of the amount paid into the collector for the New York district as a result of the jeopardy assessments, or some $844,000 more than the total amount of funds of Mr. Blackmer in this country which the Government had succeeded in impounding.

As to taxes and penalties asserted for the years 1920 to 1923, inclusive, which years included the Continental Trading Co. transactions, but also involved a number of other taxable transactions, the taxpayer in effect confessed judgment, paying the full amount maintained to be due amounting to $1,049,254.17 tax and $1,121,530.30 in penalties and interest. It is for these years of 1920–1923 that criminal indictments are pending under which Mr. Blackmer will be prosecuted if he returns to this country.

In the cases covering 1916, 1917, and 1919 the possibility of recovery by the Government depended upon proving fraud not connected in any way with Continental Trading Co. transactions. In addition to the difficulty of proving fraud for these years, the Government was faced with the contention that even though fraud could be proved, collection of the years 1916 and 1917 was barred by the 3-year statute of limitations of the 1916 revenue act. Disposition of the cases relating to the years 1916–1919 was accomplished by a compromise under which $1,500,000 was paid against the finally asserted liability for tax, penalties, and interest of $2,626,354.22.

The total payment made by Mr. Blackmer on May 13, 1932, to dispose of the civil cases was therefore as follows:

By offer in compromise 1916 to 1919, inclusive		$1,500,000.00
Under board order, 1920 to 1923, inclusive:		
Total additional tax	$1,049,254.17	
Penalties, 50 per cent	525,616.30	
Interest, 6 per cent	274,515.72	
Interest, 12 per cent	320,396.28	
		2,169,784.47
		3,669,784.47

As to the total amount of tax collections effected by the Government in consequence of the Senate committee's investigation, the letter of May 23, 1928, to which you refer, addressed to the chairman of the joint committee, states, as you will recall, that there was collected from the transferees of the Continental Trading Co. as income taxes, penalties, and interest assessed against that company for the years 1922 and 1923 the aggregate amount of $606,097.19; that letter also reports the collection from another source of additional taxes and interest in the total amount of $1,398,910.09.

The Blackmer investigation led to the investigation of a number of corporations and individuals with respect to transactions having no connection with the Continental Trading Co. These investigations have resulted in the collection of additional taxes from 11 individuals in the total amount of $17,667.71.

Cases of other individuals who received assets of the Continental Trading Co. are pending before the General Counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue in connection with protests and briefs which have been filed. It is anticipated that decisions will be reached in these cases in the near future.

Very truly yours,

A. A. BALLANTINE,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. THOMAS J. WALSH,
United States Senate.

TIMBER CONSERVATION

Mr. WALCOTT presented a statement submitted to the Timber Conservation Board at its meeting in Washington, D. C., June 8, 1932, by George D. Pratt, president of the American Forestry Association, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FOREST EMERGENCY

(Statement submitted to the Timber Conservation Board at its meeting in Washington, D. C., June 8, 1932, by George D. Pratt, president of the American Forestry Association)

The Timber Conservation Board was created by President Hoover to propose measures to aid in the stabilization of the forest industries and the ownership of forest land, and to assure the perpetuation of the country's forest resources. All the more important and long-standing economic problems involving public interests in

forest conservation have been studied. Since the board began its labors, however, the general economic situation of the Nation has become so acute that, in my judgment, the board is to-day confronted with an emergency situation that it can not ignore. I refer to the gradual disintegration of forest protection that has already set in and that threatens to expose to incalculable destruction the very resource the board is charged with perpetuating.

We can not evade the fact that a curtailment of forest activities along all lines, both public and private, has taken place, and that, due to the depletion of public and private funds, the protection of our forest resources against fire, insects, disease, and other natural enemies has been seriously weakened. The Federal Government and the States are being forced to economize on forest protection. Owners of private lands, driven by financial conditions beyond their control, are likewise curtailing or abandoning adequate protection of their resources. We are confronted with a breakdown in our whole established system of resource protection. If the process is permitted to continue, it will lay wide open to destruction forests and other renewable resources that are the very foundation of industrial stability and public welfare. It exposes to loss not only our forest assets but virtually all the complementary values inherent in stable forest-land administration, such as forage, wild life, soil fertility, scenic beauty, water supply, and the beneficial influences of forests upon floods and erosion.

This situation has become acute in many sections of the country, particularly in the South and the Northwest. The Governors of Idaho and Montana, for example, deem the outlook for the coming summer so critical as to warrant the issuance of proclamations calling upon their citizens for voluntary service to help protect the natural resources of their States. Destruction of forests and other renewable resources in the South during the past winter as a result of fires has been the greatest on record.

To my mind, adequate protection of our forest wealth, through this trying and dangerous period of economic chaos, is the great outstanding challenge to-day to conservation stability. As a Nation we must see our way through the present storm without throwing protection to the winds and giving fire a free run upon the bank of nature. I desire to urge with all possible emphasis that the Timber Conservation Board give this situation its earnest consideration and that it give vigorous expression to the need of incorporating adequate protection of our forests and other renewable resources as a definite and urgent project in National and State programs of reconstruction.

From a purely social standpoint the situation merits emphasis. The forest industries as a group are a source of employment next in importance to agriculture. Unemployment throughout the forest industries is now widespread and alarming. If the resources upon which these industries are dependent are permitted to be depleted and destroyed by a breakdown in protective systems, where shall these millions of dependents turn for a livelihood when more normal conditions of industry and trade are restored? In my opinion, American statesmanship to-day in its effort to lift our country out of its distress is failing to give proper recognition to the social and economic importance of protecting and maintaining the integrity of our forest assets during this period of forced economic readjustment.

Within recent weeks we have heard much of reconstruction programs to relieve unemployment and to start the wheels of industry. Various suggestions of public works calling for Federal appropriations and Federal loans have been proposed. Wisely and soundly, I believe, President Hoover has pointed out that such proposals, if they are really to be helpful, must distinguish between public works that are income producing or self-liquidating and public works which are nonproductive and which, therefore, place a charge upon the taxpayer and upon the Federal Budget.

The protection of our forest resources against fire and other destructive agencies is, to my mind, clearly an income-producing and self-liquidating project. It should qualify under the operation of the Finance Corporation just as much as protection of our banking institutions, for in the last analysis these institutions are dependent upon the natural wealth of the communities and States which they serve. As one of his relief proposals, President Hoover suggests a broadening of the authority of the Finance Corporation so as to authorize it to loan up to $300,000,000 to States in order to finance themselves through the period of distress. I believe it would be a wise and sound policy for the States and subdivisions thereof and for private owners to borrow money through the Finance Corporation to protect their forest assets, and that it would be a wise policy for the Federal Government to loan money through the Finance Corporation for this purpose.

The possible field of activities is a large and constructive one. It would include (1) necessary protection of private and public resources against fire, insects, and disease; (2) enlarged forest planting in those regions of the country where there is now a shortage of forest supply and where expansion of forest cover for watershed influence is merited by public and industrial considerations; (3) cooperation of Federal Government, States, and private individuals in works to control soil erosion and to maintain the flow and purity of our inland waters, particularly at the headwaters of streams; and (4) an expansion of forest research along those lines that will aid protection and the stabilization of the forest-employing industries.

As an illustration of the diverse possibilities for constructive endeavor, the national forests as a 160,000,000-acre forest property may be cited. Adequate protection of these public forests from fire alone calls for the construction of several thousands of miles of forest roads and trails, hundreds of lookout towers, thousands of miles of telephone line, networks of firebreaks, etc. Adequate protection also calls for the control of tree diseases and insect pests, such as the white-pine blister rust, bark borers, and leaf miners. In addition to the direct labor involved, the equipment, supplies, and material called for would aid in creating employment in factories, on farms, and on the great transportation systems. What is true of the national forests is equally true of the State and privately owned forest lands. Greater areas and less completely developed systems of protection on such lands magnify the possibilities of constructive work.

A rough estimate indicates that well over $100,000,000 could be profitably spent in the group of activities mentioned. It would be money well spent in that it would supply needed protection of basic resources, and it would furnish employment to upward of 200,000 people and relief to more than double that number of dependents. Protection of our natural resources, furthermore, is basic to our national credit at home and abroad. The project would help to stabilize land ownership and thereby afford some protection to local government against land abandonment and loss of taxes. It would aid in strengthening the foundation of agriculture by preserving the soil against erosion and property against destruction due to floods. And, above all, it would assure the preservation and enhancement of the natural capital upon which our basic industries and institutions depend and upon which future employment of labor depends.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from a prominent farmer of Lincoln County, Minn., which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

IVANHOE, MINN., *June 3, 1932.*

Mr. THOMAS D. SCHALL.

DEAR SIR: There can't be any doubt to any fair-minded Senator that something must be done at this session of Congress to aid the rural districts—the Frazier bill or some other measure to aid the farmers.

Lincoln County consists of only 15 townships, and in 1931 eighty-seven farmers lost their farms under foreclosure sales, and in 1932 there will be about double that amount. So it can readily be seen that in a few more years there won't be one-third of the farm homes in the hands of the farmers. Some radical action must be taken at once. Have farmed in Lincoln County since May 3, 1881, and never lived through such times before.

Yours truly,

MARTIN NELSON.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution sent to me by Hamlin Local, No. 103, of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America at Madison, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. THOMAS D. SCHALL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

ESTEEMED SENATOR: We, the officers and members of Hamlin Local, No. 103, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, desire to emphasize resolutions which have been sent to our representatives in Washington, and add the following:

One farmer in Lac qui Parle County sold a 540-pound hog on the South St. Paul livestock market. The net proceeds from the sale of this hog was $1.08 for the entire hog. One question we wish Congress to decide, In this deal who was the hog?

One veal calf on the South St. Paul market actually netted the farmer who raised the calf the sum of 2 cents.

We report above facts as proof of the unpleasant truth that the farmers of the Northwest are being robbed, and to call attention to the unavoidable results which will be the bankruptcy of the entire Northwest. In order to avert this calamity we plead for the passage of the following three bills at once:

First, the Frazier bill, to effect speedy though temporary relief. Second, the Swank-Thomas marketing bill, designed to protect the 500-pound hog. Third, the Wheeler bill, to correct the stringency in the national currency as it exists to-day.

Signed for the Hamlin Local, No. 103, of Lac qui Parle County. Minn., by its committee and officers.

H. P. KNORR, *President.*
H. A. NELSON, *Secretary.*
CARL CARSTENS,
A. M. CRANDALL, M. D.,
Committeemen.

MADISON, MINN.

GOVERNMENT AID IN EXPLOSIVE MATERIALS

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the agricultural council of the Duluth (Minn.) Chamber of Commerce.

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

Resolution adopted by the agricultural council of the Duluth Chamber of Commerce, Friday, June 3, 1932

Whereas it has come to our attention that efforts are being made at Washington to induce the Federal Government to turn over for use in clearing land of stumps, stones, and water certain excess and ageing explosive materials; and

Whereas there is a splendid precedent for this practice in the movement of war salvage explosive during the period 1921–1929, when Minnesota farmers were the beneficiaries to the extent of 10,000,000 pounds in materials and some hundreds of thousands of dollars in savings; and

Whereas land clearing is again very active, due to the effect of our farmers to insure ample stocks of feeds and foods and reduce their dependence upon outside sources of supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the agricultural council of the Duluth Chamber of Commerce petition our Representatives in Congress to act in association with and lend assistance to those agencies who are working to release these supplies, and that our secretary be instructed to send them copy of this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That copies of the same should be furnished the St. Louis County Country Club, the Minnesota Arrowhead Association, and the farm bureaus of the eighth district, and the press.

COMMENTS ON BANKING

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency a letter I have just received from one of my constituents.

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

STATE BANK OF TAUNTON,
Taunton, Minn., June 6, 1932.

Hon. THOMAS D. SCHALL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I hope that you can be depended upon to use your best efforts to defeat the present program of the financial "high binders" in putting over on the country in these trying times an entire new banking structure, as far as State banks are concerned. I doubt that you have any sympathy with this gang and that you will be found on the lines working to preserve some semblance of State rights.

When the Federal people control the whole banking structure I am afraid the small business is going by the boards; who knows how many bank failures have been caused by the distrust engendered in the minds of the public by the great group banking interests. More power to Tom Davis, that we have at least a few men who have courage to get up and tell those financial pirates what they have done to the public and what they intend to do.

It is my opinion that the present difficulties in the whole world have been more or less caused by financial greed. We have it right in our own small communities, where the representatives of the big bank interests are busily hammering away on how good the great group banks are and how poor the small country banks are, and in most cases if they had to liquidate their deposits to-day I actually believe the small banks now surviving would very likely measure up dollar for dollar with the great group institution loaded up to the gills with bonds of a lot of their own affiliates.

Very truly yours,

G. F. AHERN, *Cashier*.

LAKE MICHIGAN SHORE DRIVE

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter I have just received from one of my constituents.

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

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 7, 1932.*

Senator THOMAS SCHALL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Lincoln Park Board and the South Park Board of Chicago, Ill., have up to date spent several million dollars on the outer drive along the shore of Lake Michigan to take care of the congestion of motor traffic in Chicago. There is at present a gap of some four or six blocks at and around the Chicago River in this outer drive. Part of this construction work in this gap is now under contract, but owing to the bond market the two park boards have not been able to finance the completion of this work without paying excessive premiums for the bonds for financing. This work is now at a standstill.

It would take somewhere between four and six million dollars to complete this link in the outer drive and relieve the congestion especially in the loop where it is at its worst. To complete this work within this coming year would be a help to unemployment in Chicago, and to leave it uncompleted would be a calamity to Chicago with the world's fair next year.

The two park boards, I believe, have applied to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan of money to complete this work, giving bonds of the two park boards as security. While the bond market is temporarily off and the tax situation in Chicago is in a muddle, I believe these bonds, guaranteed by taxes from these two political subdivisions, are a sound investment for the future, which will, no doubt, be bought and sold at par by the public within a reasonably short time.

I would appreciate any efforts that you can conscientiously make to see that the temporary financing of this project is included in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation activities, or by some other method of temporarily financing by Congress.

Thanking you for your kind consideration of the above, I beg to remain,

Respectfully yours,

ALGOT F. JOHNSON.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 4673) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Female Orphan Asylum in Georgetown, and the Washington City Orphan Asylum in the District of Columbia," approved May 24, 1828, as amended by act of June 23, 1874, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 788) thereon.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 437) to require a contractor to whom is awarded any contract for public buildings or other public works or for repairs or improvements thereon in the District of Columbia to give bond for the faithful performance of the contract, for the protection of persons furnishing labor and materials, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 794) thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4835) to provide for the conveyance of the abandoned lighthouse reservation and buildings, including detached tower, situate within the city limits of Erie, Pa., to the city for public-park purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 789) thereon.

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

S. 4806. An act for the relief of Earl A. Ross (Rept. No. 790); and

S. 4807. An act for the relief of Frank P. Ross (Rept. No. 791).

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11944) to facilitate execution of and economy in field season contracts of the Forest Service, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 792) thereon.

He also from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 172) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to the American National Red Cross for relief of distress, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 793) thereon.

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

S. 4557. An act to authorize the addition of certain names to the final roll of the Sac and Fox Indians of Oklahoma (Rept. No. 796); and

S. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to carry out certain obligations to certain enrolled Indians under tribal agreement (Rept. No. 797).

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 26) to establish a commission to be known as the United States Roanoke Colony Commission to report a plan and program for the celebration in 1934 of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of English-speaking civilization in America on Roanoke Island, N. C., reported it with an amendment.

EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION AND RELIEF

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 4755) to provide for grants and loans to the several States to aid in relieving unemployment, to facilitate the construction of self-liquidating projects, to provide for the construction of certain authorized Federal public-works projects, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 795) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and placed on the calendar.

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. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 4864) granting a pension to Joseph Fisher; and

A bill (S. 4865) granting a pension to Elizabeth Jane Catron Mills Young; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4866) for the relief of St. Claire Livingston Dodd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 4867) granting a pension to John Doane Gardiner (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4868) granting an increase of pension to Harriet I. Gardiner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 174) providing for issuance of Army rations to unemployed World War veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 175) to exempt admission to the Olympic Games from the admissions tax; to the Committee on Finance.

REFERENCE OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 137) authorizing the calling of an international conference to consider and devise plans to increase the use of silver, and providing for expenses of American participation therein, introduced by Mr. KING on April 4 (calendar day of April 5), 1932, was taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LOANS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4860) to provide for loans to States for the relief of distress arising from unemployment, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO INDIAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. FRAZIER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 223), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs hereby is authorized to employ a special assistant to be paid from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $400 per month until otherwise provided by law.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3847) to amend the act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 3765) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Fourteenth National Convention of the American Legion at Portland, Oreg., during the month of September, 1932, and it was signed by the Vice President.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 7, 1932:

S. 2697. An act for the relief of Clarence G. Young.

On June 8, 1932:

S. 1357. An act for the relief of Nancy H. Rouse, Clara H. Simmons, W. H. Hays, Hallie H. Hamilton, and Bradford P. Hays.

On June 9, 1932:

S. 6. An act for the relief of the Union Ferry Co., owners of the ferryboat *Montauk;*

S. 326. An act for the relief of Abram G. O'Bleness;

S. 4401. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.;

S. 4581. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Clair River at or near Port Huron, Mich.;

S. 4635. An act authorizing the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Owensboro, and permitting the Commonwealth of Kentucky to act jointly with the State of Indiana in the construction, maintenance, and operation of said bridge; and

S. 4636. An act authorizing the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cairo, Ill., and permitting the Commonwealth of Kentucky to act jointly with the State of Illinois in the construction, maintenance, and operation of said bridge.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mr. VANDENBERG (for Mr. WATERMAN), from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on to-day, June 9, 1932, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 3765. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Fourteenth National Convention of the American Legion at Portland, Oreg., during the month of September, 1932; and

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution granting consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Commission and specifying the powers and duties thereof.

POPULAR VOTE IN PRIMARIES FOR FORMER SENATOR FRANCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from former Senator Jonathan Bourne, jr., relating to the votes for former Senator France in the presidential preferential primaries.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 6, 1932.*

To the Delegates and Alternates of the Republican National Convention.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: All must concede that confidence in government is a prerequisite for national contentment, happiness, and business efficiency.

The inclosed summary of the popular votes in the nine presidential preferential primary States in which Senator France filed, compiled up to June 3, clearly demonstrates the unpopularity of Mr. Hoover and his administration, but not necessarily of the great fundamental principles upon which the Republican Party was founded.

The theory that a President is entitled to a second nomination regardless of whether his first stewardship has been successful and beneficial to our country is fallacious, asinine, and suicidal.

If in war, would we retain a commander in chief who never won a battle and whose vaporous predictions for improvement were all failures? Certainly not. The Army would mutiny and substitute another commander in chief.

If ill, would we retain a doctor whose diagnosis had proven entirely wrong, whose remedies had all proven failures, with the result that the patient steadily grew worse? Certainly not.

No party subordinating the principles upon which it was founded to the personal ambition of any individual can or should succeed or hope to retain its entity.

You are burdened with a graver responsibility than any members of any previous national convention in our party's history in your selection of the party's nominees for the Presidency and Vice Presidency this month.

Mr. Hoover's renomination must result in his inevitable defeat and the resultant surrender to the Democratic Party of both Houses of our legislative branch as well as the administrative branch of our Government, including Federal patronage.

No party appreciating the evident unparalleled unpopularity and weakness of the candidate that it may nominate and hoping apparently for possible success through the mistakes that may be made and dissensions that may arise in the great Democratic Party can or should succeed.

The elimination by your convention of Mr. Hoover and the substitution of any other person would result in a beginning of the restoration of confidence, and hope would replace the despair now existing in the hearts of so many of the great masses of our population.

In your deliberations it is well to remember that should you renominate Mr. Hoover, notwithstanding your belief that he would be inevitably defeated in November, he would unquestionably organize the national, senatorial, and congressional committees and thereby place his blighting influence for four years longer on the political organization of our party, thus preventing its possible resurrection for a further four years and until another man be nominated as our presidential candidate, or the committees themselves demonstrate sufficient independence to wrest from a presidential nominee any opportunity whatever to name the officers or dictate the policies of the great party organizations, which supposedly go on for all time, while presidential candidates come and go.

Any person you members of the convention in your wisdom may nominate would be preferable to the renomination of Mr. Hoover.

All of you must concede that Senator Joseph I. France, during the past few months, has made the best single-handed campaign in our political history. The popular verdict as set forth in the accompanying summary demonstrates he has a message appealing to the American people.

The reaction from the audiences he has addressed that he impresses them rather as a "crusader for a cause than a candidate for an office" is one of the highest tributes ever paid any public man.

In my humble opinion, should you in your deliberative and collective wisdom select Joe France as our party's standard bearer he will lead the party to success and, when elected, prove himself one of the few really great Presidents our Nation has enjoyed in our history.

Very respectfully yours,

JONATHAN BOURNE, Jr.

Summary of the popular vote in the nine States in which Senator France filed and in which the law provides for a direct vote for the candidate

(Compiled by Mr. Howard M. Rice up to June 3, 1932)

North Dakota, 11 delegates; primary date, Mar. 15; popular vote:	
France	35,906
Hoover	0
Coxey	24,818
Illinois, 61 delegates; primary date, Apr. 12; popular vote:	
France	345,598
Hoover	1,750
Dawes	129
Lowden	79
Coolidge	95
Scattering	51
Nebraska, 17 delegates; primary date, Apr. 12, popular vote:	
France	40,481
Hoover	13,934
Pennsylvania, 75 delegates; primary date, Apr. 26; popular vote:	
France	352,092
Hoover	20,662
Maryland, 19 delegates; primary date, May 2; popular vote:	
France	17,008
Hoover	27,324
Uninstructed	1,236
(This vote for Hoover represents the office-holding organization, their friends and families. In 1928 the Hoover vote in Maryland was over 300,000. So that this vote is a virtual repudiation of the administration.)	
Ohio, 55 delegates; primary date, May 10; popular vote:	
France	44,853
Hoover	8,154
Coxey	75,844
Ross	48,867
New Jersey, 35 delegates; primary date, May 17; popular vote:	
France	141,276
Hoover	10,116
West Virginia, 19 delegates; primary date, May 17; popular vote:	
France	81,404
Hoover	0
Oregon, 13 delegates; primary date, May 20; popular vote:	
France	64,148
Hoover	17,639
(Vote received in 1,635 of Oregon's precincts out of 1,783.)	
Total popular vote on returns received to date (June 3, 1932):	
France	1,122,766
Hoover	99,579
Coxey	100,662
Ross	48,867
Total delegates:	
France	231
Hoover	19
Coxey	55
Ross	0

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11897) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under Title I—Military activities and other expenses of the War Department incident thereto—Salaries, War Department, on page 2, line 20, after the designation "Judge Advocate General," to strike out "$110,929" and insert "$113,294," so as to read:

Office of the Judge Advocate General, $113,294.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 4, after the word "causes," to insert a comma and the words "and for necessary per diem and traveling expenses in connection therewith," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That not to exceed $29,122 may be used for the employment of such experts, at rates of pay to be fixed by the Secretary of War, and other employees as may be required by the Judge Advocate General of the Army for the preparation of evidence for use in behalf of the Government in claims or suits filed in Federal courts on account of alleged patent infringements and other causes and for like services in connection with other patent matters and other causes, and for necessary per diem and traveling expenses in connection therewith, as authorized by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, at the end of line 4, to change the total appropriation for salaries, War Department, from $5,098,889 to $5,101,254.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, War Department," on page 5, line 16, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$144,000" and insert "including traveling expenses, $144,750," so as to read:

For stationery; purchase of professional and scientific books, law books, including their exchange; books of reference, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, maps; typewriting and adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; furniture and repairs to same; carpets, matting, linoleum, filing equipment, photo supplies, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor trucks and motor cycles; freight and express charges; street-car fares, not exceeding $750; postage to Postal Union countries; and other absolutely necessary expenses, including traveling expenses, $144,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Military activities, contingencies of the Army," on page 6, line 18, after the word "proper," to strike out "$8,000" and insert "and for examination of estimates of appropriations and of military activities in the field, $9,500," so as to read:

For all contingent expenses of the War Department and of the Army not otherwise provided for and embracing all branches of the military service, including the office of the Chief of Staff; for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, including the employment of translators and exclusive of all other personal services in the War Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices in the District of Columbia, or in the Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of War, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, and for examination of estimates of appropriations and of military activities in the field, $9,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Welfare of enlisted men," on page 8, line 14, after the words "salaries," to insert "and travel," and in line 21, to strike out "$69,540" and insert "$70,365," so as to read:

For the equipment and conduct of school, reading, lunch, and amusement rooms, service clubs, chapels, gymnasiums, and libraries, including periodicals and other publications and subscriptions for newspapers, salaries and travel of civilians employed in the hostess and library services, transportation of books and equipment for these services, rental of films, purchase of slides for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits, and for similar and other recreational purposes at training and mobilization camps now established or which may be hereafter established, $70,365.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Department—Pay, etc., of the Army," on page 8, line 24, after the words "pay of," to insert "not to exceed an average of twelve thousand," and in line 25, after the word "officers," to strike out "of the line and staff, $27,209,927" and insert "$31,833,427," so as to read:

For pay of not to exceed an average of 12,000 commissioned officers, $31,833,427.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 5, after the word "service," to strike out "$8,356,200" and insert "$8,545,011," so as to read:

Additional pay to officers for length of service, $8,545,011.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 11, after the word "list," to strike out "$12,914,948" and insert "$9,447,323," so as to read:

Pay of the officers on the retired list, $9,447,323.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 21, after the word "available," to strike out "$4,648,006" and insert "$6,281,824," so as to read:

Rental allowances, including allowances for quarters for enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available, $6,281,824.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Pennsylvania should give the Senate an explanation of this amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, most of the amendments which have already been agreed to relate to travel and are not actual increases in the appropriations. The House committee adopted a new plan, which will be found at the bottom of page 14. In a new item which they call "travel, military and civil personnel," they gathered together all of the travel items that occurred throughout the bill, including the travel items in river and harbor work, and other civilian activities. The net effect of that was to increase the apparent spending of the Nation for military purposes without there being any actual increase in that regard. The Appropriations Committee thought that that was not a wise innovation, and consequently we have entirely stricken out the provision that begins at the bottom of page 14 and have reinstated the travel items, without increasing them in the slightest, in the several provisions of the bill where they properly belong. That will account for a large number of the apparent increases on which the Senate has already acted and on which it will be asked to act. They do not represent real increases in the appropriation.

However, there is an item which has just been acted upon which does involve an increase, and that is the item beginning on page 8, line 24. The House of Representatives, by a fairly close vote, sustained the action of their Appropriations Committee in cutting from the Army 2,000 of its 12,000 commissioned officers. The Senate committee unanimously decided to reinstate those 2,000 officers, and that action causes an increase in the item of pay of the Army, which is found in the last line of page 8, but it also results in a corresponding decrease in retired pay, which is found on page 9, line 11. About $4,000,000 is added in the one place and about $3,000,000 is cut out in the other place.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The net difference, then, is about a million dollars?

Mr. REED. The net difference in these two items is about a million dollars.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And, under the arrangement made by the Senate committee, the matter will go to conference?

Mr. REED. Yes; the matter will go to conference.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I confess that a cursory examination of the report accompanying the pending bill affords me considerable disappointment. I had supposed that we were going to be able to find some economies in this measure, and that in the Army bill and the Navy bill there would be an opportunity for a reduction of at least $100,000,000. I am amazed to find that the committee has increased the amount of the bill as it passed the other House and that the bill as reported to the Senate carries an appropriation of $389,578,513.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah surely can not mean that this bill carries a larger appropriation than as it was passed by the other House? The Senate committee effected a net reduction of $3,000,000, and the House had effected a reduction of more than $50,000,000 under the appropriations for the current year. There has been a reduction in the military expenditures of the Government by this bill of 17 per cent. I doubt if any other department of the Federal service, carrying on its full activities as this one is, can show such a reduction.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Is it correct to state that the appropriations in the bill as it passed the other House have been reduced by the Senate committee $3,007,633?

Mr. REED. That is correct, Mr. President, and the House bill was $21,000,000 under the estimates, and the estimates were about $35,000,000 under this year's spending. Since this bill was reported to the Senate day before yesterday we have passed the economy bill, which, if enacted, will effect a further reduction of nearly $11,000,000 in the pay of the Army. When one takes that into account and realizes that we are cutting about $67,000,000 out of the military activities of the Army, I think it may be said that the Army has more than stood its share. The estimates for the Army——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. REED. If the Senator will permit me to finish this statement in one paragraph, then I will yield. The estimates for the Army submitted by the Budget Bureau for this year have been cut $80,000,000 under their request. There is no question but that the Army has taken a very savage cut.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Pennsylvania compares the appropriations for 1932 with those contained in the pending bill to that amount?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The appropriations in that bill were $445,000,000.

Mr. REED. That is right.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the Senator will recall that between $50,000,000 and $100,000,000 of those appropriations, as I remember, were for building purposes; in order to put men to work last year, enormous sums of money were spent in the erection of barracks and quarters and in other ways under the emergency arrangement.

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President, there were not "enormous sums" expended.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, very large sums were spent; we increased the appropriation very much last year on account of the President's plan to furnish work by means of building operations.

Mr. REED. But there are many such appropriations still retained in this bill. It carries an appropriation of $54,000,000 for rivers and harbors, thirty-one and one-half million dollars for Mississippi River flood control, and all that is charged against the Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true; but, at the same time, I can not understand why practically all other items in the bill were, at any rate, maintained and many of them increased, whereas a 10 per cent cut was made in the item for rivers and harbors, which keeps men at work.

It seems to me, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to say so, that this bill is one of the most extravagant bills that was ever brought before the Congress in the history of time. We spent before the war on the Army something like $100,000,000, and, with an expenditure of such a sum, we maintained an excellent Army, and we had nearly as many men in the Army then as at this time. Now, however, under the various operations of the War Department, we have a bill carrying the enormous sum this year of $389,000,000.

It is said that the House brought about some reductions, and that is true; but I want to say to the Senate that there is no effort in this bill to bring about the same reductions that have already been adopted in the case of the Interior Department appropriation bill and in the case of the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor, which have already been passed. When we consider the restoration of the 2,000 officers who were eliminated by the House—and I think there is great doubt whether such action would really bring about economy, because if 2,000 officers, many of them young men, are retired for life at three-quarters pay, it will be an immense burden on the Government—as a matter of fact, the reduction in this bill at the most can not be said to be more than 1 per cent, even taking the committee's report; and, when the furlough plan is considered in connection with it, if that plan shall finally be adopted, the reduction will not amount to more than 4 per cent; in fact, I doubt if it will amount to much over 3 per cent; indeed, I doubt if it will amount to more than 2 per cent. It is unfair to other departments to reduce their appropriations, as has been done by the Senate and the House in bills, some of which have become laws, whereas in the Army appropriation bill the appropriation is left practically where it was last year.

Mr. President, as I stated yesterday, I am going to offer a motion at the proper time in the consideration of this bill to recommit it to the committee with instructions to bring about further reductions.

Let me refer to some of the items in this bill.

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

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in just a moment. We are sending vast numbers of civilians to citizens' training camps; we are spending, I think, between two and three million dollars for that purpose; we are spending something like $6,000,000 for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. Both these activities may be very excellent in times when the Government has plenty with which to operate, but at a time when there are eight or ten million people out of employment in this country the Government ought not to be giving civilians instruction in citizens' training camps, even if the work is of some value to the country. I do not think it ought to be contributing these sums to that purpose at this time. I think they ought to be cut out. We can easily effect a 10 per cent reduction, if we go about it in a proper way, without hurting the Army at all.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that the House reduced the Army appropriations below the Budget estimate by about $20,000,000.

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President; by about $21,000,000.

Mr. BORAH. And the Senate added to that $3,000,000?

Mr. REED. No; the Senate reduced it $3,000,000 further.

Mr. BORAH. That is, added to the reduction?

Mr. REED. It added to the reduction.

Mr. McKELLAR. While ostensibly it reduces the appropriation $3,000,000, what becomes of the pay of the 2,000 officers who are restored? They have got to be accounted for in some way in considering the $3,000,000 reduction.

Mr. REED. No; Mr. President, that is taken care of by the increase in the pay of the Army in line 1, page 9.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, while the Senator from Pennsylvania is on the floor, I should like to ask him a question purely for information.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator for that purpose; indeed, I yield the floor.

Mr. BORAH. On page 3, there is an appropriation for the office of the Chief of Finance. What is the office of Chief of Finance of the Army?

Mr. REED. That is the office that has charge of the Army accounting; practically it is the auditing department of the Army.

Mr. BORAH. Does the work of that office necessitate an appropriation of $382,720?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. What does the appropriation for that office include—merely pay of officials and items of that kind?

Mr. REED. No; it covers the entire process of auditing that goes with the expenditure of all the appropriations contained in the bill. Compared with the size of the appropriation administered the amount expended for the purpose is about one-tenth of 1 per cent.

Mr. BORAH. It does seem to me extraordinary, though perhaps I speak with a lack of information, that it would take $382,720 to run the auditing department of the Army. I do not know what the items are which would constitute that $382,000 in which I am interested.

Mr. REED. I will try to get the individual items if the Senator desires.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator can give them in a general way; I do not care to go into details; but it would seem that the entire amount expended by the Army scarcely calls for a Finance Department which will expend $382,720 in administering it.

Mr. REED. I will try to get the Senator the breakdown of that item.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee speaks about moving to recommit the bill with the idea of offering his usual 10 per cent reduction resolution. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this bill comes here with a reduction of 17 per cent to begin with.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that is through the cutting down of the extraordinary appropriations that were made last year for the purpose of furnishing work to our unemployed citizens. It did not seem to furnish much work. It was not very effective, and so that is why it has been cut down by the House. But so far as the military activities of the Government are concerned, virtually they have not been cut down a cent. They have been increased rather than cut down.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think it is conceded that we have all been so busy in hurrying along, trying to conform to the desires of our leaders and our President to enact the necessary legislation that would balance the Budget, and such things as that, that we have not all had time to give consideration to the details of some of these appropriation bills.

We are confronted now with the statement of the Senator in charge of the bill that he expects to pass the bill in a couple of hours, and it may be necessary that we lay aside everything and let that happen; but in this hour of emergency, under existing conditions, when all of us are trying to reduce expenses, I am wondering why some of these things, good though they may be—and I think some of them have a great deal of good in them—should not be cut out entirely.

We have officers' training camps, civilian training camps, for the purpose of educating the young men of the country along lines laid down by the military department of our Government. I hold in my hand a training manual. It

is an official document, as I understand. It has 156 pages in it, showing how the young men of the country are trained, how and what they are taught. There is a lot of good in it, I think. There are a great many good things in it; but intermingled with them are some things for the teaching of which public funds never ought to be appropriated under any circumstances.

We may disagree, for instance, as honest men do, about very many principles of government. We may disagree as to whether public ownership of public utilities is the right thing. There is ample room for honest men on each side of the question. There is a fair judicial place for patriotic men and women on either side of, for instance, the public ownership of public utilities, whether a municipality should own its own electric-light plant or its street-car system or its waterworks; but I take it that it is no business of the Army to try to teach our people where they should stand on those controverted questions. Yet we are appropriating money out of the Federal Treasury for that very purpose, according to this official schoolbook that is used in training the young men.

Let me read a little from the introduction of it:

INTRODUCTION

National defense. Under the national defense act as amended in 1920—

This is issued by the War Department November 30, 1928, and, as I said, is a manual used in these schools by the officers of the War Department in teaching the young men of the country citizenship. That is the heading of it—

Under the national defense act as amended in 1920, the War Department, among its many other duties, is charged with the task of recruiting and training the young men of our Nation through enlistments in the Regular Army, voluntary enlistment in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps of high schools, colleges, universities, and in the 30-day training period in citizens' military training camps throughout the nine corps areas of the United States. The combined average yearly strength of these various units approximates some 260,000 young men between the ages of 16 and 25 years, the most critical period in the determination of their real value as citizens of our country.

It is therefore essential that the training of these young men embody, with their instruction in military science, at least a basic course in the science of government and the privileges, duties, and responsibilities of the individual citizen, in order that they may be returned to civilian life better equipped as the defenders of the institutions of our Government in time of peace as well as in time of war.

Training in citizenship is the most vital of all subjects to that nation whose system of government, security of property, and full power to express individual initiative are based upon the intelligence, education, and character of each individual citizen. Individual initiative is the product of slow progress in the development of the idea and ideals of self-government. It was cherished in the minds of the early Germanic tribes, transmitted by them in the fifth century to the conquered British Isles, there developed, and finally transferred in principle to the shores of America 300 years ago.

All beautiful, all fine, Mr. President; but under the guise of that beautiful introduction it goes on, page after page. They have, in these schools, tried to educate these young men that they say are in the most critical period in the determination of their real value as citizens. They have tried to teach them, for instance, that government ownership ought to be avoided; that it is ruinous. Now, they may believe that. I do not want anybody to misunderstand me. I do not criticize the man who does not believe in it. That is his right; but I say that it is no business of the Army to take our young men and try to teach them that, for instance, if they had a contest in their home towns over the question as to whether the city or the village should build an electric-light plant, good citizenship demands that they should be against any such poisonous thing as that.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator find that doctrine taught in the pamphlet from which he is reading?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I am going to come to that.

Mr. COPELAND. I shall be very much interested to hear it.

Mr. NORRIS. This is the schoolbook used in teaching these young men, and we pay for it out of Federal funds.

On page 99——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it true that the textbook of the Army teaches propaganda adverse to public ownership?

Mr. NORRIS. This is the citizenship that is taught, as I understand, in these training camps that are conducted for 30 days, and we pay for it out of our Federal funds.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is under the jurisdiction of the War Department?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. How does the War Department harmonize that sort of teaching with their now-developing policy of building on the various reservations these large department stores, where they do everything and sell everything to their own people, to the exclusion of the surrounding communities?

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, that is where the War Department puts the shoe on the other foot. When it works with them, they like it. When it does not, they are against it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. COSTIGAN. Is there in this pamphlet any defense of the War Department's own practices in running Government stores?

Mr. NORRIS. None that I know of.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Is that not part of the propaganda also?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, the way they handle these department stores is not in here; no.

Mr. COSTIGAN. On what authority has the publication, to which the Senator from Nebraska directs our attention, been published?

Mr. NORRIS. It tells right here on the face of it that "this manual supersedes Manual of Citizenship Training, prepared under direction of the Chief of Staff." We pay for it.

I presume the holding of these training camps is provided for in the bill that is now before us out of public funds, and I think there is a lot of good in it. I would not have any objection to these training camps, so far as I am concerned, if they would confine themselves to what is legitimately theirs; but when, under the guise of making good citizens, they take up the functions partially of the public schools and partially of the public press, and try to teach these young men what their duty as citizens may be on various public questions that may arise, they are questions with which the War Department has no business on earth to interfere, and they ought to keep their hands out of them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. COSTIGAN. Will the Senator also tell us whether there is any indication in the pamphlet that the present administration disapproves such indefensible propaganda?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; nothing that I have found. I have not read all of it, because, as I said, we are all too busy; but I am going to read you a few extracts.

I started to say, when I was interrupted, that my understanding is that in all these training camps, including colleges and others, there are 260,000 of our young men between 16 and 25 years trained, and the expense of that training is paid out of public funds. This is their textbook, and they have an examination like they do in schools. They have questions submitted to them in the form of questionnaires, and their answers will convey whether they have read and remembered the doctrine that has been promulgated here.

On page 99 of this official document, paragraph 134, I find this:

Dangers to representative government: Whenever the republican form of government has not achieved success the difficulty has not been with the system but with its faulty application.

Several dangerous experiments have been proposed, such as the initiative, referendum, recall, and the election of judges.

Take that to your homes. Do you elect your judges? Do you have the initiative in your constitution? Do you have the recall? I remember not so very many years ago when that was a new step, when the progressive-minded people of practically all the States were denounced and laughed at for advocating such a thing; but now we have in nearly all our State constitutions, I think, provisions for things of this kind. Our War Department, with money that they take from the taxpayers of the country, are running schools all over the country and teaching our young men that such doctrines are dangerous and injurious to a republic; and the item for the payment of that kind of teaching is included in the appropriation bill which is now before us.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, the language just read by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] impresses me as nothing less than an attack on popular government in this country.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator that I agree with him. I do not believe we can put any other construction on it. Whether we ought to have the recall and the initiative, or whether we ought to elect our judges or appoint them, are questions which have two sides. Within the lives of those who are now living the recall of judges, the initiative and referendum, have grown from nothing until now, as I said, those things are provided in the constitution of practically every State in the Union. Whether they ought to be in those constitutions or whether they ought to be out, whether we ought to appoint our judges for life, whether we ought to elect them, whether we ought to elect them for life, whether we ought to elect them for only a term, or whether they ought to be appointed for specific terms, are all debatable questions. What business is it of the War Department to teach the young men of this country that those are false doctrines, and line them up on one side or the other of economic, domestic, and political questions which arise to confront the citizen of every State in the Union? But we are asked to pay for it in this bill, at a time when millions of men are unemployed. When we are bending every energy, when we are sitting up nights, when we are trying from day to day to devise the best means to meet the unemployment situation, when we are trying to devise the best means by which the expenditures and the income of our Government may be equalized, we are confronted with one of the great departments of the Government, under the guise of teaching citizenship, trying to explain to the young men who go to training camps that public ownership, that the initiative, that the election of judges, are injurious things to a republic. Remember, that is in this paragraph headed "Dangers to Representative Government," a beautiful introduction.

> Whenever the republican form of government has not achieved success the difficulty has not been with the system but with its faulty application.

A beautiful sentiment.

> Several dangerous experiments have been proposed, such as the initiative, referendum, recall, and the election of judges. Departures from constitutional principles threaten to impair the efficiency of our representative form of government, and if continued will ultimately destroy it.

That is what those young men are taught, that if the things I have just mentioned are not stopped they will destroy this Government.

If I took the other side, and advocated that a lack of Government ownership by municipalities of public utilities would bring destruction to our country, what would happen? I would be denounced as a Bolshevik, as a "red," as an enemy to the country. Yet, under the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, these young men are told that the initiative, the referendum, the recall, the election of judges, are dangers in a republic. Let me quote the words:

> And, if continued, will ultimately destroy it.

Will destroy the Government, that means.

Now, at a time when we are trying to save every penny, when we are trying to balance the Budget, our great War Department comes here with an appropriation bill and asks us to appropriate money so that they may carry on that propaganda.

Mr. President, the people who advocate that kind of a thing in a free government as coming from the War Department, paid for by public taxation, are in the same class with the communists, with the "reds," with the fellows they are denouncing, and such doctrine, if carried on, will deny the right of free speech, will deny the right of citizens who are in favor of a change in the form of government to advocate, for instance, the election of judges instead of their appointment. They will be classed as enemies to our country, we are told by the War Department.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In the judgment of the Senator from Nebraska, is there any sound reason why our people should not be permitted to initiate legislation when unfaithful public servants fail to represent them?

Mr. NORRIS. I know of no reason.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Is there any reason why an unfaithful public official should not be recalled by the voters who elect him to public office?

Mr. NORRIS. I know of no reason. I represent, in part, a State which has the referendum, which has the initiative, and we obtained those things after a bitter struggle. We obtained them after several years of agitation. But we obtained them legally, we obtained them honorably, we obtained them openly, in the open form of debate. If one went into that State now and sought to take away from the people those rights, he would not get a corporal's guard to follow him; and, in the name of people who believe in those safeguards of Republican form of government, I denounce this attempt to teach the young men of our country what are falsehoods, in my judgment, the things the War Department is trying to teach them, and asking us to pay the bill out of the Public Treasury of the United States.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Under the ancient law of agency an unfaithful agent may be discharged by his principal and the principal may resume control over his own business. The initiative, referendum, and recall in governmental affairs are in line with this established legal doctrine.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator entirely.

Here is another thing I want to read, on page 100 of this same official document.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. Observing this colloquy between these two eminent Senators, the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Nebraska, may I not advert to the conclusion that the remedies referred to by the Senators are brought about by ballots at special elections?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. Then do not the Senators both recognize that the time has come when this Government should enact a law compelling citizens to go to the ballot boxes and vote, and also to impose a liability, to fix some form of penalty on one who will not vote, even to the point of forfeiting his privilege for constant failure?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, of course, that brings into the debate a question which so far has been entirely out of it, and I do not care to enter into it. Personally I would not favor a law which would compel everybody to vote.

Mr. LEWIS. How would the Senator call the people to the ballot box and make them perform their duty, those who are favoring a measure that is good, or to make others disclose their activities in the Government if we did not do so by some law?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I realize the importance of his question, but I do not believe it is involved in this debate.

Mr. LEWIS. I will not divert the Senator from what he is discussing. The thought occurred to me as a result of the colloquy between the able Senator from Nebraska and the equally able Senator from Colorado.

Mr. NORRIS. I only pause to say that, in my own humble judgment, I do not believe it would be wise to pass a law which would compel citizens to vote. I recognize that is a question which has two sides, however. I might say to the Senator that if the Army finds that out, they may take one side or the other of it, and tell all these young men that if they do not favor that kind of a law they are enemies of their country.

Mr. LEWIS. The Government reports that only 33 per cent of those in the country entitled to vote went to the ballot boxes in a presidential election.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Does not the Senator from Illinois think that a ballot cast under compulsion would not be a very instructive or a very intelligent ballot?

Mr. LEWIS. No; my idea is that a man who is forced to serve on a jury, when he is called to his duty, begins to consider the duty, and that if compelled to vote a man would consider the obligation and give it attention. Otherwise those of a certain class who assume themselves, in the language of the Holy Scripture, "holier than thou," play golf or polo instead of voting, while others of less social eminence escape responsibility by simply using the election day as a holiday, and these never go to the ballot box.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator think that it would help the services of the Government very much to force such a man away from his polo game?

Mr. LEWIS. There is something to be said as to how far that gentleman is capable of measuring the value of government as between such and the pleasure of a polo game. But as these special scientists in social engagements of polo teas are a class to whom I have borne no intimate relation, and as they want none with me, I am unable to give the Senator any further information.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I realize the importance of the question, as I said before, but I do not want to be diverted into a discussion of it because, as I see it, it is not involved in this appropriation bill.

On page 100 of the same official textbook are some more beautiful things, with a little poison wedged in between.

> Socialism, communism, anarchy.

That is one of the ways these fellows who are 200 per cent patriotic always start out when they want to poison a youthful mind, and they wedge it in between a lot of beautiful sayings.

Some Senator near me asks who wrote this book. It is prepared under the direction of the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States. It is a textbook they use in training camps in the training of young men of the United States in proper ideas about citizenship and government. I will read this heading again:

> Socialism, communism, anarchy. The problem of capital and labor, employer and employee, can not be solved by unrepublican methods.

I suppose probably if the writer of that elucidated it and disclosed the hidden meaning that is in it, he would say that we must not interfere with the courts when they issue injunctions in labor disputes.

> The problems of capital and labor, employer and employee, can not be solved by unrepublican methods. The suggestion of special legislation is socialistic.

That is a slap at us. We passed the anti-injunction bill. That is socialistic.

Listen to this:

> The suggestion of special legislation is socialistic and communistic.

We are communists in the Senate if we voted for that bill, and practically every one of us did.

> The suggestion of special legislation is socialistic and communistic in its theory and wholly repugnant to the American character.
>
> Socialism or communism, which negates property rights; anarchy, which negates law; the substitution of "direct action" for representative government; a Government ownership—all should be avoided as perils that threaten the very foundation of this Republic.

That is our school of thought. I want to digress again to say that I find no fault with the man who honestly believes that statement is true, but if he is an honest man he must agree with me that there are thousands and millions of citizens, honest as we are, who believe that Government ownership of public utilities is a proper thing. In other words, it is a debatable question.

What business is it of the Army to try to teach the citizen that Government ownership "should be viewed as a peril that threatens the very foundation of this Republic"? That is what the Army is teaching our boys in these citizens' training camps. Before they go away from the training camps they have to take an examination on what they have learned. Let me read a little to show this is not forgotten when the examination is held. Here is one of the questions:

> Name and define several dangers to representative government.

I have read the answers. The young man who studies his manual rightly and listens to the instructors who elucidate it, when he comes to the examination and is asked the question, "Name and define several dangers to representative government," will say that one of them is the initiative, one of them is the recall, one of them is the election of judges, one of them is public ownership of utilities. That is what he will say if he answers the question according to the doctrine that has been taught him when he was studying his lessons, and we pay for it out of public funds.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On the other hand, if the student at this training camp should give any other answer to the question, I presume it logically follows that the instructor would mark him as having failed in his examination.

Mr. NORRIS. Why, certainly. He would not pass. He would fail. He would not get the certificate written on a beautiful parchment that comes to him if he answers the questions rightly. The word to him would be, "You have flunked, you have failed to pass." Then they would say to him, "Why, you yourself are an unworthy citizen."

Here is another place on page 111 of this official document. "Preservation of Philosophy of Government" is the heading of the paragraph, from which I read:

> Some interpret American liberty as the opportunity to exploit the Nation's resources and people by propaganda that aims to destroy American institutions. Under the guise of freedom of speech and press every possible effort is being made to undermine and destroy the blessings of liberty.

What conclusion must you draw from that—that you must not have freedom of speech, you must not have a freedom of press, because, as they say:

> Under the guise of freedom of speech and press every possible effort is being made to undermine and destroy the blessings of liberty. The problem of national defense deals not only with the question of elements but it is also the question of the preservation of that philosophy of government devised by the founders of this Republic.

Beautiful! In other words, these young men are told that the question of national defense deals with the elements that enter into the question of the preservation of the philosophy of government devised by our forefathers. They did not have the initiative. They had no public-ownership question, because they had no public utilities, and hence we can easily say that the Constitution of the United States made no provision for public ownership of public utilities, and therefore it is wrong, and we must not believe in it; we must fight it, not on the field of battle, but at home in the ballot box. In your own locality, in your own municipality, you must oppose these things; otherwise you are not following the training that you got at this Federal training camp.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CUTTING. I have never had the privilege of seeing one of those pamphlets. About how much of it is devoted to civic affairs of this sort?

Mr. NORRIS. I have not had the time to read it all, but it is entitled "Citizenship." I will give the Senator an outline of the first section. First is the introduction, divided into these subheads: National Defense, Citizenship Training, Individual Initiative, Foundation of Citizenship, Social Phases of Citizenship, Economic Phases of Citizenship, Philosophy of American Government.

Mr. CUTTING. In other words, there is nothing in the pamphlet about military training?

Mr. NORRIS. Nothing so far. I can give the Senator a little further information along that line, though I must say to the Senator that I have not had the time to read it all myself. Here is the examination. As I understand it, this is what happens. These young men go there and stay 30 days. They are taught these things. They are trained in military affairs by actual training as I understand it. Then they are taught these lessons and when they get through they have a questionnaire submitted to them. The questions will give the Senator some idea about it:

> Define "citizenship." Describe the development of the idea of "citizenship." What is the source of "American citizenship"? How is "American citizenship" acquired? What is the status of the children of domiciled aliens born in the United States? Who has power over immigration and naturalization? * * * Why should every citizen vote?

Here is another subdivision of section 2:

> Independent relationships. Development of civilization. Mutual relationships. Community of relationships. Coordinated action. National relationships. Articles of Confederation. Constitution. Interstate commerce. International relationships.

Mr. CUTTING. Of course, it seems to me, that questions of that sort are entirely outside of the scope of the War Department and that they should not form a part of the curriculum of the citizens' military training camp. I do not see how there could be any argument about that at all.

The Senator himself, on the other hand, has said that these camps do a great deal of good to the young men of the country, and I think most of us agree in that respect. I wonder if the Senator might not be able to prepare an amendment providing that no part of the appropriation for the training camps should be used for the promulgation of views on civics or the philosophy of government, or something of that sort, so that we could maintain the benefits of the camps without subjecting young men to that sort of teaching.

Mr. NORRIS. I see the point the Senator has in mind, and I think it is an excellent one, but at the same time I want to say to the Senator that we are stopping a great many things because of the necessity of the situation that we would like to keep going. My own idea is, not because I am opposed to the training camps if they are properly conducted, not because I am opposed to using public funds for carrying them on, but right now until we regain our foothold, until we can see the end of this depression, I think we could well afford to abolish them entirely and take them up again when prosperity returns to our country. In other words, I think this is one item of appropriation that is not a necessity. I say again that training camps such as we have all over the country, if properly conducted, it seems to me would be a good thing not from the military standpoint but from the physical and mental benefits that these young men get from the camps of that kind if they are properly conducted. I think they do a great deal of good. But there are a great many things we would like to carry on that we are now laying aside. It seems to me this might well be one of them. If we laid it aside now, it would be regarded as a sort of punishment partially of the people who have misused these funds.

I want to read another paragraph:

> Destructive idealism. The attempt to undermine the Nation from within is more serious than the threat of armed force from without.

That reminds me that I had a letter some time ago, referring to the Army appropriation bill, from a very eminent citizen in one of our States holding a State office. He made a very good argument, and from his standpoint a logical argument in favor of increasing the appropriations for the Army and the Navy and the National Guard. It was a very fine letter, but he wound up by saying just what is said here. Perhaps he had been there and learned these things at the training camp:

> The attempt to undermine the Nation from within is more serious than the threat of armed force from without.

He said:

> You must know from your position that the danger to our Government is from within. This awful depression that is going on, and in my judgment is going to get worse. Unemployment is going to increase, and we are going to need a bigger army at home to protect our property and our people against mob violence.

That is what he was looking forward to happening.

In order to protect ourselves from mob violence, in order to protect ourselves from communism, from any danger from within, the best remedy on earth is to give the people a good Government, an honest Government. Make our people satisfied with our Government, and the dangers of communism and all the other dangers from within will disappear overnight. A satisfied people are not going to make trouble from within. A dissatisfied, hungry people will ultimately lose their reason. We would lose ours. We would lose our power to differentiate even right from wrong. Hungry men are not reasonable; hungry children are not reasonable, never have been, never will be. It is contrary to human nature.

I read on:

> An impractical and destructive idealism called internationalism is being propagated by certain foreign agitators—

I wish all you people who believe in the League of Nations would listen to this—

> and is being echoed and reechoed by many of the Nation's "intellectuals." Its efforts are to combat the spirit of patriotism, to destroy that spirit of nationalism without which no people can long endure. History teaches that in proportion as nations lose their sense of nationalism they become decadent. Having lost their sense of pride in the traditions of the past, their respect for national standards, their love for country, their spirit of patriotism—the end is near.

I was not a follower of those who believed in the World Court; I am not one who is willing without some very stringent reservations to take our country into the World Court. However, I concede to those who do not agreed with me the same honesty of opinion, the same right to express it, the same right to agitate the question as I have to express my ideas; and I would defend them as quickly in that right, even though I did not agree with them, as I would ask that I be defended in my honest right. But the Army of the United States has no business to interfere with us in the controversy as to whether we will join the League of Nations; whether we will go into the World Court is no business of the officers of our Army. That is a civilian's business, and that question, upon which our people are divided, ought to be let alone by our Army. There should be no authority in the Army to use the funds paid by the taxpayers of the United States to try to teach the young men of our country the ideas of the Army on any side of any of these political questions. They ought to keep their hands off; and when they do not keep their hands off it is time that we draw the purse strings of the Government and see that this kind of propaganda, which would be enlightening even to those over in Russia, should be stopped; at least, that they should not have public money with which to carry it on.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Are not most of the young men who go to these camps high-school graduates?

Mr. NORRIS. As a rule, I think, they are.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Are they not assumed to have had the necessary course in citizenship and American history and political science?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Why supplement that course with these additional courses?

Mr. NORRIS. I myself am trying to prevent it. This kind of teaching is going into our colleges and into our high schools and training camps, and the Army is asking money from the Congress of the United States to continue it.

Mr. President, while it does not have a direct bearing upon the subject, I want to read a newspaper report showing the treatment which is accorded by the representatives of big interests when they speak before the people to men who oppose this propaganda. I am sorry the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] are not present. I should like to have them hear what I am about to read. I hold in my hand a clipping from the Pioneer Press, of St. Paul, dated April 8, 1932. It contains a report of a speech made by C. R. Gray, who is vice president and general manager of the Omaha Railway, which is a large railway system running from St. Paul and Minneapolis to Omaha, Sioux City, and other places in the West. Of course Mr. Gray is a leader in his line, and to what he says people pay a great deal of attention. He made a speech in St. Paul before the Lions Club and the Women's Club. Let me read from the press report:

United States Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD was charged with spreading communistic propaganda by Col. Carl R. Gray, jr., vice president and general manager of the Omaha Railway, in an address before the Business and Professional Women's and Lions Clubs in the Hotel St. Paul, Thursday.

Other prominent Americans who were accused by Mr. Gray of disseminating propaganda that emanated from the headquarters of the Third International in Russia included United States Senators WILLIAM E. BORAH, of Idaho, and GEORGE W. NORRIS, of Nebraska.

Now here is a quotation from his speech:

It has been proved—

Mark the words—

It has been proved—

I was not at the trial, but it seems I was tried and "it was proved"—

"It has been proved," Mr. Gray asserted, "that these persons, besides thousands of others, are connected with activities which in turn can be traced directly to the Third International. This organization was formed for the express purpose of spreading 'red' propaganda in foreign countries, especially the United States."

He is quoted further as saying:

There is a mass of evidence available to support a charge that communists are making a determined effort against the national defense act.

That is the act by virtue of which these training camps are held—

Americans should be on guard against propaganda tending to destroy the spirit of this act, which is being spread by pacifists who do not realize they are dupes of the Communist Party.

Mr. Gray asserted that the proposed elimination of the reserve—

Now we come right to this bill—

Mr. Gray asserted that the proposed elimination of the reserve officers' training and citizens' military training camps in a congressional bill now in the making, besides a reduction in the size of the Regular Army, will seriously affect the national defense of the United States.

"The world of to-day and to-morrow," he said, "is going to follow the principles of the past, and so long as there is selfishness in human nature, and therefore in nations, wars will continue. Unless we keep on with our program for national defense America will find herself sooner or later at the mercy of a strong nation that will trample us into the dust."

Support these training camps—that is the lesson—and send letters to your Senators and Representatives to continue appropriations from the public purse for these training camps, where the youth of our land are taught this poisonous doctrine, where the youth of our land are made to believe that the initiative, the referendum, the recall, the election of judges, and public ownership are all inimical to the interests of the Republic.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And free speech.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; free speech and a free press, all are contrary to the principles of the Republic in which we live and, if continued, will bring about its destruction. That is what they teach; and this man says to the women and to the Lions Club of St. Paul that men who advocate such things are dangerous, and he uses the names of three United States Senators and says, to use his exact language, "it has been proved" that these Senators and thousands of other people are connected with organizations that follow the Third International declaration.

I have an account from another paper of the speech delivered by Mr. Gray in which exactly the same language is quoted between quotation marks, so that I take it the report is correct of the speech which denounces, in effect, the Members of the United States Senate as being communists, and says it has been proved that they are.

I denounce the statement as a falsehood, not only for myself but on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and I defy Mr. Gray or anyone else to submit such proof. Of course, he has no proof; he knows and everyone else knows that the statement is a falsehood; and yet such falsehoods are carried to business and professional clubs of which honest men and honest women are members, and they are taught, in effect, that the salvation of this country depends upon a continuance of these activities of the War Department, and that if one is opposed to them he is not a patriot, but belongs to the Russian Government instead of to the American Government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Perhaps Mr. Gray has been to one of the citizens' training camps and has learned his lesson well from the manual issued by the War Department, and has since learned that the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Idaho voted for the bill of the Senator from Nebraska providing for the Government operation of the Muscle Shoals plant; and, therefore, he thinks he has "proved," in view of the teachings of the War Department, that the Senators referred to are advocating measures which are subversive of our institutions.

Mr. NORRIS. I suppose under his theory probably that would be true, but he does not even give the poor defendants an opportunity to be present when the trial takes place. He ought to be at least fair enough to let the poor devils whom he denounces and who are so helpless in his hands have an opportunity to face the witnesses who are going to testify against them.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will yield further, I have been following the manual of the War Department, which is used in teaching citizens attending the training camps, and I judge from some of the things which the Senator has read that the department would not be in favor of the Senator having the right of free speech or the privilege of being heard and that it would not be in favor of a free press, all of which, according to the teachings of the manual, are subversive of our institutions.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. I do not know how many States have the initiative and referendum; I do not know how many States elect their judges instead of appointing them, but most of the States do.

This doctrine is taught by our War Department to our young men under a beautiful guise, under beautiful descriptions that are circulated over the country with beautiful sentiments of patriotism, by which they are induced to come to these training camps; and then they are taught a lot of very good things, I think, that nobody would find fault with. They have to do that to disguise the real intent of the thing they are trying to do. Covered up under those beautiful things is the poison that is intended to go into the minds and the hearts of the coming generations of American citizens.

It is very much like the propaganda that the Power Trust spread over the country when they got into the schools, they got into the commercial clubs, they got into the Lions Clubs, they got into the women's clubs, and told them some beautiful things; but interspersed with them here and there was a sentence that dropped the poison that they wanted to plant in human minds. All of them had been deceived when

they were brought there, and some of them went away perhaps without knowing that their minds had been poisoned secretly, dishonestly, falsely, because 90 per cent of it was false, without any opportunity for anybody to refute it. Those things were taught the children in school, and that is what the Army is teaching in its school, and we are called upon to expend the money to do it.

Let me say before I finish that I should like to have Senators read this pamphlet. I am going to read more of it. I have picked out almost at random the extracts which I have read. I think it has between the lines, on nearly every page, some poison of the kind I have narrated. If Congress, representing the American people, is going to permit that kind of thing to go on, then I have an erroneous idea of Members of Congress. If we are going to permit that kind of doctrine to be taught by the War Department to our private citizens, then it seems to me that we are derelict in our duty.

I am not pleading that any of the things criticized in this pamphlet are right. I am not now advocating any of them; but I am saying that under our form of government I have a right and you have a right to advocate them, and that we can do that without being traitors. I think that the man who is so anxious to criticize the patriotism of some one who believes in a theory of government that he does not agree with is himself lacking either in patriotism or in sanity. When they undertake to put across some of these disreputable schemes, they always start out by prefacing what they say with some beautiful patriotic thought that pleases everybody; and when the hearer has been won over by an outburst of patriotism, they carefully put in the drops of poison that they hope to sink into the minds and into the hearts and into the souls of coming generations.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I announce the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Copeland	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Costigan	Jones	Robinson, Ind.
Bailey	Couzens	Kean	Sheppard
Bankhead	Cutting	Kendrick	Shipstead
Barbour	Davis	Keyes	Shortridge
Barkley	Dickinson	King	Smith
Bingham	Dill	La Follette	Smoot
Blaine	Fletcher	Lewis	Steiwer
Borah	Frazier	Logan	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	George	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Glenn	McKellar	Townsend
Broussard	Goldsborough	McNary	Trammell
Bulkley	Gore	Moses	Tydings
Bulow	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Norbeck	Wagner
Capper	Hatfield	Norris	Walcott
Caraway	Hawes	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hayden	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
Cohen	Hebert	Patterson	Watson
Connally	Howell	Pittman	White
Coolidge	Hull	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the committee amendment on line 22, page 9.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I wish to enter a motion to reconsider the committee amendments on pages 8 and 9 in regard to the reinstating of the 2,000 Army officers left out of the bill by the House. I will take that up now, if it is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. REED. I shall be very glad to have that done.

Mr. FRAZIER. I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the amendment on page 8, lines 24 and 25, and page 9, line 1, and also the amendment having to do with the same provision on page 9, line 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think the Senator had better move to reconsider, and let us have a vote on that motion. It comes to the same thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was adopted on page 8, lines 24 and 25, and page 9, line 1, and the amendment on page 9, line 11, having to do with the same matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment on line 22, page 9, is the pending question. The motion may be entered now; and, of course, without objection, the motion may now be placed before the Senate.

Mr. REED. I have no objection to the motion being made at this time and setting aside the committee amendment which is pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment will be set aside. The question is on the motion made by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a motion to reconsider can cover only one amendment. I suggest that the Senator take the first one of the three.

Mr. FRAZIER. They all concern exactly the same thing.

Mr. REED. That is true; but a motion to reconsider can cover only a single vote.

Mr. FRAZIER. I was just trying to save a little time; that is all.

Mr. REED. The question can be decided on the first one, and we will not have to have roll calls on the others if the Senator is successful on the first.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, the first amendment is on page 8, line 24. The committee inserts "not to exceed an average of 12,000," which makes the paragraph read:

> For the pay of not to exceed an average of 12,000 commissioned officers.

Then the amount of money was raised by $4,523,500.

In the House of Representatives, when this provision was up for discussion, there was quite a little debate in regard to it; and there has been a great deal of propaganda spread from various sources against reducing the number of Army officers by 2,000. I received a letter this morning from the national headquarters of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States here in Washington in regard to this matter. It states:

> With reference to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 11897) we respectfully request that you support the measure as passed by the House, and further that you support the amendment to reinstate the 2,000 officers of the Regular Army omitted from the bill by the House of Representatives. If these officers are lost to the Army, irreparable damage will be done to our national defense, and it can be conservatively stated that it will emasculate the national defense act.
>
> We base this on the fact that our military policy as enunciated in the national defense act places 75 per cent of the burden of our defense upon the civilian components. There are at the present time approximately 1,653 officers of the Regular Army on duty with the National Guard, the Organized Reserves, and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps serving as instructors in educating and giving both theoretical and practical training to the civilian components.

I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that the 1,653 officers are the ones who are training our youth and other citizens the military idea of things which may be dangerous to the Government, such as public ownership, the recall, the initiative, the election of judges, and things of that kind. I continue reading from the letter:

> It is obvious that if the Regular Army personnel is reduced officers will be taken from those now assigned to important duty with the civilian components. We view this situation with alarm, as we see in it the major thrust of organized pacifism. We bespeak your favorable consideration of these points and ask you to support the amendment to restore these officers to the Regular Army.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
>
> BENNETT A. MOLTER,
> *Major, Air Reserve, National Secretary.*

A few days ago I received a letter from the president general of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution along the same lines. The letter reads:

> As president general of the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, an organization of 170,000 members, we view with extreme anxiety the action of our House of Representatives in reducing by 2,000 the officer personnel of the Regular Army.
>
> We women view with approval the plans of our United States Congress for providing for the Nation's defense.

Mr. President, I am a little at a loss to know just what the president of the Daughters of the American Revolution means by that policy. I presume she refers to a policy laid down in the past, however. The letter continues:

We believe they are compatible with the history and ideals of our people. It is self-evident that were our Regular Army officer personnel reduced to this extent our present plans must fail.

We trust our Senators appreciate the seriousness of the proposal and that they will take the necessary action to prevent removal of these officers.

I am submitting to you copy of a letter to General Pershing from General Foch, who commanded our American boys in France. This letter appears to me to be so pertinent and applicable to the situation that I am inclosing this copy, asking you to read it carefully.

Trusting that each Senator is convinced of the advisability of retaining these 2,000 officers, I am

Very sincerely yours,

MRS. RUSSELL WILLIAM MAGNA,
President General,
National Society Daughters of the American Revolution.

The letter written by General Foch was dated January 18, 1922, and a copy of it is sent along to prove that we need these 2,000 Army officers retained in the bill at the present time.

I am in receipt of another letter from the Military Order of the World War, the headquarters located here in Washington. It reads:

The Military Order of the World War is an organization of officers, the larger part of whom left their civilian pursuits and entered the service during the World War and who have now returned to civil life—

And so forth. They wind up by saying:

We ask you to see that these officers be not reduced below the present 12,000 which is considered the irreducible minimum.

I have another letter from the Hennepin County Republican Club, of Minneapolis, Minn. Even the politicians are getting interested in this proposition. The letter reads:

DEAR SENATOR: The following expression of our stand on measures affecting national defense has been sent to the Senators from Minnesota.

Respectfully yours,

HENNEPIN COUNTY REPUBLICAN CLUB (INC.),
By HENRY C. MALCHOW, *Secretary.*

"MY DEAR SENATOR: The Hennepin County Republican Club has noted the vote by the House of Representatives to reduce the Regular Army by 2,000 officers. This organization has always supported national defense and wishes to urge that you vote and work against this measure when it comes before the Senate.

"The United States maintains a smaller standing Army in proportion to population and wealth than any other nation. A surplus of officers is provided for the purpose of training the reserve and civilian components. The reduction in Regular Army officer strength would result in a practical cessation of this training, and the saving of $4,000,000 a year is negligible in comparison to the loss of defense strength involved.

"We shall appreciate an expression of opinion from you on the matter and trust that you will use your influence in the maintenance of our present defense plan.

"Sincerely yours,

"HENNEPIN COUNTY REPUBLICAN CLUB (INC.),
"By HENRY C. MALCHOW, *Secretary.*"

That is what the surplus of Army officers is for. I want the Senator from Nebraska to understand that. The surplus of the Army officers is to train these boys in the training camps, to train our boys in the universities and colleges, to give them the military idea, the idea of the War Department. I want to call to the attention of the Senator from Nebraska that there is not a boy in his State, the son of a farmer there, who wants to go to the agricultural college of that great State to get a training in agriculture who can take the course there unless he takes two years' compulsory military training. No son of any merchant in that State, or of any professional man there, can get a university training in that great State without taking two years of compulsory military training, where they get the kind of information the Senator has been reading this morning. The letter continues:

The reduction in Regular Army officer strength would result in the practical cessation of this training, and the saving of $4,000,000 a year is negligible in comparison to the loss of defense strength involved.

We shall appreciate an expression of opinion from you on the matter and trust that you will use your influence in the maintenance of the present defense plan.

I apologize to the Senators from Minnesota for reading a copy of a letter that was sent to them, but it is pertinent to the question before the Senate. I have also had a number of other letters, some from people in my own State, from organizations, and from individuals. I will not take the time to read them at present.

Mr. President, there are a little over 12,000 Regular Army officers at the present time. According to the figures I have, just a little over 5,000 of them are on duty with the Army of the United States. Of the other 7,000 of them, according to the statement here, 1,600 plus are with the National Guard, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and other organizations of that kind. I do not know where the other five or six thousand are or what they do. I would like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, who has charge of this bill, what the duty of these others officers is? As I understand it, there are only a little over 5,000 in active service with the Army, and a little over 1,600 with the National Guard and the training camps, and so forth. What do the other five or six thousand do?

Mr. REED. The separation of the duties of the different officers is shown in the House hearings. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, I will look it up.

Mr. FRAZIER. I will be glad to have the Senator look that up.

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

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I venture to say that there is at Leavenworth a school for training officers, there is the War College in this city, there is a training school at Fort Benning, Ga., and I think there are some other training schools. Some of the officers to whom the Senator has referred are engaged in those schools, at Leavenworth, at Fort Benning, in the War College, and I think some other school. Down at Fort Monroe there is a post, and some officers are stationed there. They are included in the list not accounted for by reason of being assigned to duty with troops and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Mr. FRAZIER. I understand that, but according to this letter from the Reserve Officers' Association, it is said that—

One thousand six hundred and fifty-three officers of the Regular Army are on duty with the National Guard, the Organized Reserves, and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, serving as instructors in educating and giving both theoretical and practical training to the civilian components.

That would include those in the universities and colleges and the so-called military institutions.

Mr. FLETCHER. It does not include those at Leavenworth, Fort Benning, Fort Monroe, and the War College.

Mr. FRAZIER. I presume it would include them; I do not know. That is what I would like to find out. There are 1,653 of them, according to these figures.

Mr. President, if my figures are correct, with only between five and six thousand of the Army officers now with the Regular Army, and with less than 2,000 with the National Guard and on duty in schools, and so forth, I think we can well afford to reduce the appropriation and the number of Army officers by the 2,000 by which it was reduced in the House.

Last year our Army and Navy appropriations amounted, in round numbers, to $800,000,000. They were a little less than that, but in round numbers they amounted to $800,000,000. According to the best figures I have been able to find, that is one-sixth of all the money expended in the world last year for Army and Navy purposes. Yet we are admittedly mighty hard up, and have had a difficult time in trying to balance the Budget, and we do not know whether it is balanced yet or not. I am sure that the extra two or three million which might be saved by cutting out these 2,000 Army officers would be a welcome addition in the cutting down of our expenses and balancing the Budget.

Mr. President, it seems to me there are a great many other cuts which should be made in this bill. I went over the amendments hurriedly. There are 46 increases by the Senate committee in various items of appropriations in this bill. There are a few decreases. While it is true, as the Senator from Pennsylvania said, that the total is decreased a little, the decrease comes in what might be called the nonmilitary part of the appropriation in regard to rivers and

harbors. That does not really belong in this bill anyway, or should be separated from it, in my opinion.

Mr. President, I believe the retirement age for Army officers is 65.

Mr. REED. Sixty-four.

Mr. FRAZIER. In the discussion of the measure in the House, Congressman COLLINS commented upon the question on May 10, at page 9935 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may get this matter straightened out?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Secretary said in the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations:

> Of the 12,000 officers that we have who are absolutely essential for the operation of our defense system, only 5,031 are serving this moment actually with troops. The others are serving on rivers and harbors, on civilian work of a military nature, in training the citizen soldiery of the Nation, and on similar duties.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> There is the General Staff School at Leavenworth, Kans.; the Infantry School at Benning, Ga.; School of Field Artillery, Fort Sill, Okla.; the Tank School is at Meade, Md.; the Coast Defense School is at Fort Monroe, Va.; the War College, of course, is here in Washington.

Mr. FRAZIER. Does that give the number of officers engaged in the schools?

Mr. FLETCHER. All those not engaged on active duty are engaged either on river and harbor work or in schools.

Mr. FRAZIER. In active Army work there were 5,031. There are 12,100 officers altogether. That would leave 7,069 officers on some other duty than with the Regular Army. It seems to me they ought to be able to spare at least 2,000 out of that more than 7,000 in these hard times when we are making such a desperate attempt to balance the Budget and cut down the expenses of the Government.

A moment ago I started to quote from Congressman COLLINS's statement on page 9935 of the RECORD. He said:

> We have lieutenants 62 years old in our Army. We have captains 61 years old.

A little farther down he said:

> What are the proper ages for Army officers? West Point graduates should be first lieutenants in 3 years, captains in 10 years, majors in 17 years, lieutenant colonels in 22 years, and colonels in 28 years.

I judge from this statement that we have Army officers who are older than they should be for the positions they occupy. Congressman COLLINS also quoted from some Army officer, as he said, though he did not mention his name, who said, in reply to an inquiry of how the expenses of the Army appropriation bill could be reduced, that it could well be done by cutting out 2,000 of the Army officers and putting them on the retired list.

Of course, it would be no great hardship to those officers to be put on the retired list. I do not know how much they are doing in civilian work, the 7,000 or more, for the benefit of the country, and whether they are all earning their money or not. I am frank to say I am doubtful whether they are all earning their money. As to some of those who are spreading propaganda, such as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] read from an official booklet put out by the War Department would seem to indicate that it is doubtful whether or not men of that type are earning their money, whether they are carrying out the policy that should be carried out by the majority of the people of our country.

When they advocate militarism and preach against any progressive idea that they believe is against militarism, it is doubtful in my mind whether they are a benefit to the country and whether at least 2,000 of them should not be retired from the active service.

The amendment putting back those 2,000 Army officers would increase the appropriation of $27,709,927 as passed by the House to $31,833,427, or an increase of $4,523,500. It is true, as the Senator from Pennsylvania explained, that in the other amendment in line 11, pay of officers on the retired list, it is cut down by $3,467,625, but the saving would be, under those two or three amendments, $1,055,875. Even that amount of money is worth while in these hard times, when we are attempting to balance the Budget. We have argued and debated for days on items involving less than that amount of saving.

Mr. President, it seems to me this amendment should not be agreed to, but that the 2,000 Army officers who were put on the retired list by the vote of the House of Representatives should not be put back on the active list by the vote of the Senate. Only a little over 5,000 of them—to be exact, according to the Senator from Florida, 5,031—are in the Army service proper, and over 7,000 of them are in some other service. I would like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he has the figures?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have the figures showing the distribution of officers in the different branches of the Army, and I would be glad to put them in the RECORD, but the figures do not show exactly how many were on duty with troops. The Senator must understand that the figures for those on duty with troops of the 5,000 officers included only those with regular troops.

In addition to that there is a very large number of regular officers on duty with troops of the National Guard, another large number serving with the headquarters of the reserve division, and, as was said by the Senator from Florida, there is a very considerable number in training all the time in the various schools like the Artillery School at Fort Sill, the Infantry School at Benning, and the Tank School at Camp Meade. There are several hundred officers all the time on duty at the War College. It is the only way to keep the officer up to the utmost professional fitness. I can assure the Senator that we have not any more than we need. We ought to have 14,000.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Reserve Officers' Association here in Washington gives the figures for the National Guard and other similar organizations as 1,653. That number deducted from 7,069 leaves 5,416 Army officers.

Mr. REED. But remember that over a thousand of those are doctors. I can get the breakdown from the War Department if the Senator thinks it would be helpful. When we take out the doctors and veterinarians and the dentists, the number comes down very fast. Many of the doctors are at Walter Reed Hospital. They are not loafing. I can assure the Senator they are all working.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, it may be true the Army officers are gainfully employed. I hope they are. Many of them are so-called Army engineers, but I notice a provision in the bill on page 36 that the Secretary of War, if he deems it necessary, may hire expert engineers at rates of pay to be fixed by him not to exceed $50 per day and not exceeding 50 days each and necessary traveling expenses. I take it those are civilian engineers. I think probably the Army engineers do need some expert advice once in a while, and have to go to civilian engineers to get it. From my experience with Army engineers in the river and harbor work and flood-control work, I would judge that they have made a dismal failure of it and are still hanging on to these jobs and do not want to be retired because it would cut down their pay a little. That is why the fight is being put up to put back into the bill the appropriation for the 2,000 additional Army officers over and above the number provided by the House.

When the farmers of the Nation are going broke or have gone broke by the millions, when business men throughout the Nation have gone broke along with the farmers, when we have 8,000,000 and more unemployed in the various cities in the United States, when we have an army estimated at anywhere from 5,000 to 10,000 unemployed World War veterans here in the city of Washington, we must stop and think. According to the newspapers these men here in and around Washington are being fed at a cost of 6 cents a day. In the bill the provision for food for the Regular Army has been reduced from 37 to 36 cents a day. I suppose the reduction of the price of food products generally would warrant at least that reduction of 1 cent a day, but that is six times as much as these poor fellows out in the suburbs of Washington are getting, who volunteered or were drafted in the World War, many of whom were sent to

France and fought in the trenches, many of whom were gassed or crippled and maimed and are now back here asking for a little money that is due them from the United States Government, asking Congress to make a little appropriation to take care of them. It is generally conceded that something has to be done to take care of the unemployed by appropriations of money or sale of bonds or some such way. We have an army of men here and more on the way, some coming from the west coast, demanding the payment of their bonus.

Mr. President, instead of passing the bonus measure providing the money for the unemployed World War veterans, who, in many instances, are half starved and half clothed, who are sleeping out here on the ground with Congress denying an appropriation to furnish them proper food and proper shelter, it seems to me it is time that a more drastic cut be made in the Army bill than is now proposed.

Under this bill as reported to the Senate there will be a total appropriation of $389,578,513. Of course, some of that—a few million dollars—is to be used for river and harbor work and other items of that kind that really do not belong to the Army appropriation bill; but, Mr. President, even at that it is the highest amount appropriated by any government on the face of the earth in peace times for its army. Here in the United States, where we try to make people believe we are for disarmament, that we are for cutting down all war forces, and are for the Kellogg peace pact, and all that, we have been for several years past appropriating more money for war purposes for the Army and the Navy than has any other civilized nation on the face of the earth in peace times, and we are doing it again this year. While it is true that our standing Army is not so large, according to our population, as are the standing armies of some of the other nations, yet a great many troops are provided for in this bill when we include the Reserve Officers' Corps, the National Guard, and numerous other organizations, which bring what might be termed a standing army, and what amounts to a standing army, at least to a larger number than is commonly stated to be the military force of the United States.

Mr. President, I want to refer again to these poor fellows who are camped on vacant lots around the edge of the city, herded there by the police force of the District. Some of them have shelter and some of them have none. An extra policeman is put on on every floor of the Senate Office Building. We have not had them before, but additional policemen are now employed to guard against what? To guard Members of the United States Senate in their offices over here, I do not know against what?

I do not believe, Mr. President, that there are any in the group that have come here belonging to the army of unemployed war veterans who would harm any Member of the United States Senate or any other public official. All they want is a square deal, Mr. President; all they want is the payment of money that the Government has promised them, that is due them; and to which I believe they are entitled. Yet extra policemen are put on; the unemployed veterans are guarded and watched as if they were a bunch of highway robbers, and it is even thought necessary to protect Members of Congress from those ex-service men who went into the war, who offered their very lives for their country, who worked for $30 a month at a time when millions were made here by the war profiteers.

In talking with a friend of mine who was in the city of Washington during the war time, who is well informed and knew the situation and had something to do with some investigations that went on before the war closed, in regard to some of the reported graft that was going on, he said there were many men at that time who were supposed to be patriotic in serving the Government at a dollar a year or for nothing who made a great deal of money. He said, "I could name a number of those men who told me they were going to get all the money they could during the war time"; and they got it. Some of them are now in prominent positions, and undoubtedly they did make a great deal of money during the World War—blood money, if you please—at the expense of the poor fellows who are camping on vacant lots around the city of Washington asking the United States Congress to appropriate a little money to keep body and soul together.

One poor fellow, whose wife had died, according to the newspapers, brought his little child, about 2 years old, clear across the continent, carrying the child on his back.

Mr. President, it is time the United States Congress should wake up; it is time that we reduce appropriations, especially those for the Army and Navy, and keep down expenses. We can do more toward balancing the Budget by cutting down the appropriation bill that is now before us than by any other one measure that has been considered, the economy bill or almost any other bill, without any detriment to the welfare of the United States Government or the welfare of its people.

Mr. President, I hope the motion to reconsider will prevail, and that the amendment will be rejected. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATFIELD in the chair). The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Costigan	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Austin	Couzens	Jones	Schall
Bailey	Cutting	Kean	Sheppard
Bankhead	Dale	Kendrick	Shipstead
Barbour	Davis	Keyes	Shortridge
Barkley	Dickinson	King	Smith
Bingham	Dill	La Follette	Smoot
Blaine	Fletcher	Lewis	Steiwer
Borah	Frazier	Logan	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	George	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Glenn	McKellar	Townsend
Broussard	Goldsborough	McNary	Trammell
Bulkley	Gore	Moses	Tydings
Bulow	Hale	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Norris	Wagner
Capper	Hatfield	Nye	Walcott
Caraway	Hawes	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hayden	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Cohen	Hebert	Pittman	Watson
Connally	Howell	Reed	Wheeler
Coolidge	Hull	Robinson, Ark.	White

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am perfectly well aware that most of the Senators have not had a chance to consider the pros and cons of this matter of the reduction in the number of officers.

The question involved comes down to this—whether it is a real economy to give up the full-time service of 2,000 officers upon whose training we have spent a very large amount of Government money, whether it is wise to throw away the services of those men in order to save something less than one-quarter of their pay, because the House bill provides not that we shall save the salaries of these officers who are dropped from the Army, but that we shall retire them on three-quarters pay, and, consequently, we would be paying hereafter 75 per cent of what we are paying now, and getting nothing whatever in return for it.

That is the proposition in a nutshell. Not only is it as bad as that but it is worse, because of the $3,800,000 which we would save in their pay we would immediately lose $900,000 because of the extra travel required to bring them back to their homes and to send officers to replace them in their present stations, which would be necessary to a large extent. So that from the standpoint of economy it seemed to us that there was nothing whatsoever gained.

Furthermore, a large number of those who would be thus retired are very young men; and they would be on the retired list for the rest of their lives, and we would have to count on paying them three-quarters of their pay for many years more than the average expectancy of an officer on the retired list at present.

Not only is that true, but we would have no one at all to use in training the National Guard, in training the reserve components, in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and in the citizens' military training camps. All of those activities would cease to have the benefit of the training of regular officers; and they would be driven back upon the more dubious training that they might receive from reserve

officers, who themselves would not be under the supervision of regulars.

According to the forces that we now have in the Regular Army of the United States, it is estimated by the General Staff that 14,000 officers are needed properly to exercise the functions of that body of troops. We have only 12,000. We have made drastic cuts since the World War. After our war-time Army was disbanded in 1919, when we had got down to what we thought was a peace-time footing, we had nearly 20,000 officers. Then in 1922 Congress compelled a cut from 20,000 down to 12,000, and, in order to make that cut, put in the system which all of us remember who were here at that time, the Class B proceedings.

The corridors of the Capitol and of the Senate Office Building were filled with grief-stricken men and weeping women for months, trying to get relief from that enforced retirement from the Army. Men who had given up all prospect of success in civil life and had made the Army their career, were thrown out then ruthlessly. Now the House of Representatives and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] propose to do it again.

I saw a list of the officers of the Army according to efficiency. I am sorry that I have not the figures before me; but it shows that out of the 12,000 officers now in the Army, all but 28, as I recall the figures, were classed satisfactory, excellent, or superior. Only 28 were classed unsatisfactory or inferior. That was as of the end of the last fiscal year; and it is safe to say that by the regular processes of attrition all of those 28 have now been dropped. So that the proposal now made of cutting an additional 2,000 officers means that we are to take officers who are graded by their superiors with the utmost care as being wholly satisfactory or excellent or superior. It does not mean that we are getting rid of the unfit. They have been weeded out already. It is safe to say that practically every man in the 12,000 today is efficient professionally, is fitted for the position that he occupies, the career that he has taken unto himself, and has fitted himself for its able performance.

And how does the House propose to do it? By creating a body of five generals who, between now and the 30th of next September, are to pass on these 2,000 cases, and drop the 2,000 least efficient. Could any five human beings between June 9 and September 30, pass judgment not only upon the 2,000 who are to be dropped but upon all the others?—because naturally all the 12,000 have to be passed upon in order to pick out the 2,000 least efficient. It is a human impossibility to do it. They would have to pass on more than 100 officers a day in order to accomplish that result.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the event that it becomes necessary to effect some economies in the military bill over those now contemplated, may I ask the opinion of the Senator as to what provision in the bill could be taken out with the least possible damage to the national defense?

Mr. REED. Rivers and harbors.

Mr. TYDINGS. As between the citizens' military training camps and the reduction of 2,000 officers, would the Senator care to express an opinion?

Mr. REED. I think it would be an unmixed calamity if either were dropped.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I may transgress on the Senator's time, I have always voted for what I hoped would promote the national defense; but I do feel that if there is anything we could get along without now without serious impairment of our national defense, this is the time to adopt it, at least for a year.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Therefore my question had this thought in mind:

The 2,000 Army officers who would go out if this proposition were adopted could not be brought back again after a year. They would be gone for good; but if the citizens' military training camps were discontinued for a year, we could, of course, start those all over again without changing the general set-up of the Army. There will be separate votes on some of those things; and if the Senator cares to do so, I should appreciate it if he would point out, not that he favors it, but what things might be eliminated with the least damage to the whole picture, because some of us feel that if there is any real chance to vote for any economy in this bill without seriously handicapping the national defense we should do it.

Mr. REED. I quite understand the Senator's view. Let me say a word about that.

The bill as it stands to-day represents a cut of $80,000,000 under the estimates submitted by the department to the Director of the Budget. For military activities the amount now carried by the bill is only $290,000,000, which is 17 per cent less than the same item in this year's appropriations. The estimates of the Bureau of the Budget were reduced under the department's estimates by about $30,000,000. That is the saving the Budget made. When those estimates came to the House, the House reduced the Budget estimates $21,000,000 more. When the bill came to us, we reduced its aggregate $3,000,000 more. The total cuts, therefore, up to the present time under last year's appropriations are $51,000,000, and under the Budget estimates some twenty-odd million.

On top of that, last night in passing the economy bill we made a further reduction which will amount to between nine and ten million dollars. We have not had time to estimate it accurately. So, taking our action of last night on the economy bill, we have cut the Army appropriations about $65,000,000 under last year's appropriations. At every place where they have been acted on they have suffered a cut; and I do believe, in all sincerity, that we have them down to the bare bones of the proposal.

I know the country demands economy, and we have been trying to give it; but it is not an economy, and I am sure the Senator must agree with me, to give up 100 per cent of the value of the service of these officers and save only 25 per cent of their pay.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator that that does not seem to me to be wise. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. REED. Gladly.

Mr. TYDINGS. How much is the amount appropriated for rivers and harbors under the Senate bill?

Mr. REED. Fifty-four million dollars. That is a 10 per cent cut under last year.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the event there is a public-works program, which probably will be financed in some way, it is quite likely that if that item is taken out of the Army bill it will be reinserted in the public-works proposal.

Mr. REED. I should think it is likely; yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. That being so, if we could reduce the Army appropriation by taking that out, it strikes me that if there are to be public works this provision could very well be inserted in that bill as sound and constructive and meeting most of the criticism which has been offered to public-works propositions.

Mr. REED. In other words, to take it out of this bill as a running expense and put it into the other bill as a capital expense.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is it.

The thought I had in mind is that we know now, roughly, what the economy bill is going to save. We also know that the Budget is probably underbalanced over $400,000,000; but, assuming that it is only $200,000,000 underbalanced, with the depression increasing I have got to the point where I want to cut everything that can be cut, so that we can put as much money as possible into the relief program, because I am of the opinion that if we do not get the relief measure over very quickly it will not make any difference about a lot of these cuts, for they will be ancient history. Therefore I feel that now we ought to start to build up this relief program as much as we can, or else we will have a more serious situation than we have now.

Therefore I would much rather cut out the training camps for citizens, at least for the time being, and turn that money

over to feed the unemployed and the hungry, and provide some work for them, than to take care of these boys in this altogether splendid way, in view of the fact that I think the need for it now is not as great as in other years.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I have been very much interested in the colloquy which has been going on between the two Senators. I want to suggest to both of them that from an economy standpoint I do not see how anything can be gained by taking an appropriation out of one bill and putting it in another.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if I may interject, except that one would be financed over a longer period of time, and this would be financed in one year.

Mr. NORRIS. That would be along the line the Senator from Oklahoma suggested some time ago, and I agree with the suggestion, but that would mean the issuing of bonds very likely.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Mr. NORRIS. I can see the viewpoint of the Senator from Pennsylvania when he answers the Senator from Maryland, saying that appropriations for rivers and harbors could be cut out with less effect on the Military Establishment than any other thing. I have no doubt the Senator is right about that. At the same time, unless we do follow the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma and lift these things out and put them in some appropriation for which we are going to issue bonds, I do not see that there would be any benefit in doing it. On the other hand, the officers' training camp, or the citizens' training camp—I do not know which is the right term, or whether there are two——

Mr. REED. There are two—one the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the other the citizens' military training camps.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me this must appeal to the Senator from Pennsylvania, as the Senator from Maryland said it appealed to him, and it seems to me it must appeal to everybody, that if we are going to be short of money and can not do all the things we want to do now, we could stop these training camps for a year without any material injury to the set-up of the Army, as I understand it. It would be different from cutting out the officers. I can see that point quite easily, because if we wanted the officers back we probably could not get them, but taking out these training camps temporarily, the Army would go on just the same. In case of difficulty the organization of the Army would be unimpaired and there would not be anything lacking, except that the citizens who go to the training camps to be trained would not get the training. That, I think, we ought to be willing to surrender in these times of distress, when we need the money for other things.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I just want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I entertained exactly the same views he has expressed. I did not see how we would get very much by a suspension for one year, especially when we know that already for this year we are more than $2,600,000,000 in the hole. Therefore I made a motion in the committee considering the military appropriations to strike out this language for citizens' military training camps. I got one vote, and that was my own; that was all.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator was fortunate——

Mr. McKELLAR. To get my own vote?

Mr. NORRIS. To get his own vote, with such a terrible majority against him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suppose so.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the citizens' military training camps item is found on page 62. It is not involved in the question we are expected to act upon now.

I have from the staff a rough statement of the present duties of the 12,000 officers of the Regular Army, and that distribution is as follows:

With troops of the Regular Army, including overhead at camps and posts, 7,000.

At arsenals and depots, 500.

At general hospitals, 300.

At the service schools, including the War College, 1,500.

With civilian components; that is to say, the National Guard, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the reserve, 1,600.

General overhead, including on duty in the War Department here, corps area headquarters, and so on; on river and harbor work, on flood-control work, and so on, 1,100.

Total, 12,000.

Mr. President, there is one other matter which ought to be borne in mind in considering this proposed reduction in the number of officers, and that is the investment we already have in the 2,000 officers. About 35 per cent of the 2,000 in all likelihood will be West Pointers. We have spent on each one of them during the four years he was at West Point over $9,000, and there, it will be seen, we would suffer a loss of investment of $6,000,000, which we would have put into the education of those officers, in order to save about $3,000,000 on their pay.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Would it not be much more advantageous to the Government to reduce the number of appointees to the Military Academy, rather than drop these highly trained and experienced officers?

Mr. REED. I think so.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If we are going to make a saving in the number of officers, the Senator would prefer a saving by reducing the number of new officers, rather than by dropping the experienced and trained officers?

Mr. REED. Very much so. After all, a new officer just out of West Point is a pretty green specimen in many ways, necessarily. He has not had any experience in the command of men, which is the most important thing in the training of a rounded-out officer. A West Pointer necessarily has had practically no experience in that regard.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on that very point, is it not a fact that we have such a large number of officers in the Army now that, on the average, they get with troops only about once in six years?

Mr. REED. Oh, no, Mr. President. On the average they spend about seven months per officer per year with troops, and under the Manchu law they have to go back to troops after every four years of possibly staff duty. So that with practically no exception the officers on the promotion list are constantly having experience with troops.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, has not the Manchu law been repealed?

Mr. REED. No; in effect it has not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought in effect it had been. That is my construction of the act.

Mr. REED. My impression is that, whether it is due to the Manchu law or some successor provision, no officer is permitted to remain away from troops more than four years.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely wish to direct the attention of the Senator to the source of the information which I obtained, which was a statement made by Representative COLLINS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations in the House. On page 9936 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10, I find this:

> Now, then, do you not know that we do not need more than 2,500 officers for the troops we have? A man is lucky if he has an opportunity to serve with troops every six or seven years, and, therefore, every year he is away from them he is going backward rather than forward, and we are permitting the entire mass to become more inefficient day by day.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should say that whoever gave Mr. COLLINS that information did not know anything

at all about the facts. We could not possibly officer 118,750 enlisted men with 2,500 officers, as he suggests there. It could not possibly be done. As 7,000 out of 12,000 officers of the Army are constantly on duty with troops, it is obvious that at least seven-twelfths of the time—seven months out of each year, on the average—an officer is serving with troops.

When we exclude from the total number the 1,500 who are at the service schools acquiring professional fitness through intense study there, we can see that for the balance the proportion of the time spent with troops is that much greater.

I can not think of any less effective economy than this proposal to save $2,900,000, net, at the expense of the retirement of 2,000 perfectly competent officers of the Army. That is not economy; it is waste; waste of the most shocking kind; and if and when war comes again—and we have had a war in every generation of our history—we shall need those 2,000 officers, and we shall need them desperately, because a trained officer is the one thing that can not be improvised in war time in a hurry.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. Can not these retired officers be called back into service at any time?

Mr. REED. They can be.

Mr. FRAZIER. Why does the Senator say we would lose them? Are they going to die because they are retired?

Mr. REED. No; they are going to become rusty, just as all of us who served in the World War became rusty. We have lost about 10 per cent of our efficiency every year that has passed. The retired officer does not keep up with the march of events.

Mr. FRAZIER. If the Senator's theory is correct, that it is going to be the young men who are retired, it does not seem to me that it will affect the efficiency so fast.

Mr. REED. I do not mean that they will lose their physical health—not at all—but they will lose their professional knowledge. They will not keep abreast of the times, and things are changing faster now than they have ever changed in peace time. All the ordnance is improved. An officer who went out of the Army 10 years ago is almost an ignoramus about the weapons that are used to-day. I know, because I feel my own loss of efficiency in that respect.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I can not see much difference between this appropriation bill and other appropriation bills for the Army since I have been here. They all have had practically the same appropriations for buying more horses for the Cavalry, and very little for tanks, very little for the Air Service, very little for the Chemical Warfare Service. It is the same old "bunk," the militia two miles and a half an hour, and all that sort of thing, that we have always had.

Mr. REED. It may be "bunk," but the Senator would be paying his taxes to the Kaiser to-day if it had not been for men who thought differently.

Mr. FRAZIER. Of course, there is a difference of opinion about that. I do not agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania in that particular at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER].

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, we should have a quorum, it seems to me, if we are to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Byrnes	Fletcher	Kean
Austin	Capper	Frazier	Kendrick
Bailey	Caraway	George	Keyes
Bankhead	Carey	Glenn	King
Barbour	Cohen	Goldsborough	La Follette
Barkley	Connally	Hale	Logan
Bingham	Coolidge	Harrison	McGill
Blaine	Costigan	Hatfield	McKellar
Borah	Couzens	Hawes	McNary
Bratton	Cutting	Hebert	Moses
Brookhart	Dale	Hull	Norris
Bulkley	Davis	Johnson	Nye
Bulow	Dill	Jones	Oddie
Patterson	Sheppard	Thomas, Okla.	Walcott
Pittman	Shipstead	Townsend	Walsh, Mass.
Reed	Shortridge	Trammell	Walsh, Mont.
Robinson, Ark.	Smith	Tydings	Watson
Robinson, Ind.	Steiwer	Vandenberg	Wheeler
Schall	Thomas, Idaho	Wagner	White

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11267) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LUDLOW, and Mr. HARDY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

H. R. 79. An act to provide for conveyance of a portion of the Liston Range Rear Lighthouse Reservation, New Castle County, State of Delaware, for highway purposes;

H. R. 2238. An act for the relief of Edward Bodeck;

H. R. 3527. An act for the relief of Berta C. Hughes;

H. R. 3724. An act for the relief of Charles Thomas;

H. R. 3951. An act to provide a preliminary examination of the Edisto River and its branches, South and North Edisto, S. C., with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 4144. An act for the relief of H. H. Lee;

H. R. 5052. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Juneau, Alaska, to use the funds arising from the sale of bonds in pursuance to the act of Congress of February 11, 1925, for the purpose either of improving the sewerage system of said town or of constructing permanent streets in said town;

H. R. 5940. An act for the relief of Florian Ford;

H. R. 6487. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $100,000 for the purpose of improving and enlarging the capacity of the municipal light and power plant, and the improvement of the water and sewer systems, and for the purpose of retiring or purchasing bonds heretofore issued by the town of Petersburg;

H. R. 6713. An act for estimates necessary for the proper maintenance of the Government wharf at Juneau, Alaska;

H. R. 7123. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 983; U. S. C., title 25, sec. 242);

H. R. 7914. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River;

H. R. 8393. An act providing for payment of $25 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of the Red Lake Band of Minnesota from the timber funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 8907. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire land adjoining Lawrence, Mass., post-office site;

H. R. 9259. An act to amend section 106 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 187);

H. R. 10585. An act authorizing the Fort Hancock-Porvenir Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at Fort Hancock, Tex.;

H. R. 10598. An act to provide for the transportation of certain juvenile offenders to States under the law of which they have committed offenses or are delinquent, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10926. An act to authorize conveyance to the United States of certain lands in the State of Arizona for use of the

United States in maintaining air-navigation facilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11020. An act authorizing the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pearl River at or near Pearlington, Miss.;

H. R. 11081. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Sabine River where Louisiana Highway No. 21 meets Texas Highway No. 45;

H. R. 11085. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River where Louisiana Highway No. 6 meets Texas Highway No. 21;

H. R. 11120. An act to amend an act (ch. 300) entitled "An act authorizing the Coos (Kowes) Bay, Lower Umpqua (Kalawatset), and Siuslaw Tribes of Indians of the State of Oregon to present their claims to the Court of Claims," approved February 23, 1929 (45 Stat. 1256);

H. R. 11246. An act authorizing the Boca Chica Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at Boca Chica, Tex.;

H. R. 12045. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 to the members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution for the improvement of Meridian Hill Park.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11267) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. JONES, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. HALE, Mr. BROUSSARD, and Mr. BRATTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11897) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, the vote about to be taken is to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment on page 8, line 24, inserting "not to exceed an average of 12,000," was agreed to. That means an addition of 2,000 Army officers who have been stricken out by the House provision. I want to make just a brief comment on the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

The difference between the regular salary of these 2,000 officers and their retirement pay at three-quarters of their regular pay amounts to a saving of $1,055,875. That would mean a saving per man of $527.93. I call attention to the fact that that is more than the average net earning of the average farm family in the United States. It is $1.44 per day. The army of war veterans now gathered in Washington would be glad to take jobs right now, practically every one of them that is able-bodied would be willing to work, at $1.44 per day, which is the saving that will be made on these 2,000 Army officers per day.

More than that, of the retired pay—which I admit is too much and ought to be cut down—the average pay is $1,690.31. That is more than the gross income of the average farm family in the United States last year. These men would be taken out of active service and put on the retired list. That does not mean they are barred out of the Army. They can be called back at any time their services may be needed. That is why they are kept on the retired list. This would mean a saving of $1,055,875.

Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, as I understand it, through the economy program nothing has been taken from the Army officers at all.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes, Mr. President; the furlough plan we adopted last night will cut down their active pay and their retired pay.

Mr. WHEELER. It will furlough the Army officers as well as others?

Mr. REED. Yes; it affects them just the same as it affects us.

Let me say that a vote "yea" is in favor of a reconsideration and therefore in favor of reducing the number of Army officers. A vote "nay," which I shall cast, means the retention of the present number of 12,000 Army officers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to reconsider, upon which he has demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLENN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is necessarily absent. Being advised that if present he would vote as I shall vote, I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HATFIELD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. SCHALL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], who is unavoidably absent. In his absence I withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. TYDINGS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF]. I understand that if he were present he would vote the same as I shall vote, and therefore I am free to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am paired with him, and not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. BINGHAM (after having voting in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who is necessarily absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF], and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. KING. I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], and in his absence withhold my vote.

Mr. WAGNER. My colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] is unavoidably absent. Upon this vote he is paired with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I am paired with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and therefore, withdraw my vote.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] are detained on official business.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr.

BLACK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily out of the city.

I also announce that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is absent in attendance upon the disarmament conference at Geneva.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—16

Bankhead	Brookhart	Dill	Norris
Blaine	Capper	Frazier	Nye
Borah	Caraway	Harrison	Walsh, Mont.
Bratton	Costigan	La Follette	Wheeler

NAYS—51

Ashurst	Dale	Kendrick	Steiwer
Austin	Davis	Keyes	Thomas, Idaho
Bailey	Fletcher	Logan	Thomas, Okla.
Barbour	George	McGill	Townsend
Bingham	Glenn	McNary	Trammell
Bulkley	Goldsborough	Moses	Tydings
Byrnes	Hale	Oddie	Vandenberg
Carey	Hawes	Patterson	Wagner
Cohen	Hebert	Reed	Walcott
Connally	Hull	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mass.
Coolidge	Johnson	Sheppard	Watson
Couzens	Jones	Shortridge	White
Cutting	Kean	Smith	

NOT VOTING—29

Barkley	Gore	McKellar	Shipstead
Black	Hastings	Metcalf	Smoot
Broussard	Hatfield	Morrison	Stephens
Bulow	Hayden	Neely	Swanson
Copeland	Howell	Norbeck	Waterman
Dickinson	King	Pittman	
Fess	Lewis	Robinson, Ind.	
Glass	Long	Schall	

So Mr. FRAZIER's motion to reconsider was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 22, after the word "allowances," to strike out "$5,122,479" and insert "$5,928,389, and the rental and subsistence allowances for the fiscal year 1933 shall be the same as for the fiscal year 1932, subject to such reduction therein as may be necessary under the provisions of section 102, Part II, of the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1933," so as to read:

Subsistence allowances, $5,928,389, and the rental and subsistence allowances for the fiscal year 1933 shall be the same as for the fiscal year 1932, subject to such reduction therein as may be necessary under the provisions of section 102, Part II, of the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1933.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the report on this bill which states the net reduction reported by the Senate committee as being $3,007,633. I want also to call attention to the fact that substantially none of the saving is made in the appropriations for the military activities of the Army; but practically the entire saving is made by reducing the appropriation for river and harbor improvements by more than $5,000,000; in other words, only the appropriations for nonmilitary activities are reduced, while some of the appropriations for military activities are increased very considerably, over $2,000,000, as I read the report.

At such a time as this, it seems to me we ought not to increase the appropriations for military activities provided for in the bill; we ought to reduce them. I want to call attention to how these appropriations have increased for the Army.

In 1916 the Congress appropriated for the Army $164,546,866.95; in 1924, long after the war, we appropriated $348,629,778.55 for the Army; in 1925 we appropriated $361,887,888.84 for the Army; in 1926 we appropriated $355,072,225.92 for the Army; in 1927 we appropriated $318,909,096.28 for the Army; in 1928 we appropriated $298,999,534.09 for the Army; in 1929 the appropriation was increased by more than 25 per cent; it was increased to $416,901,546.42; in 1930 it was increased to $453,524,973.41; in 1931 to $478,418,974.73; and in 1932 to $445,773,235. Now in the pending bill it is proposed to appropriate $389,578,513, notwithstanding the fact that prices of practically all articles entering into the item of subsistence of the Army, indeed the prices of everything incident to the maintenance of the Army, are down something like 50 per cent. In this bill, however, the appropriations for military activities are substantially the same as in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to the figures; and if Senators will follow me a moment with the bill, they can see for themselves——

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

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KING. I ask the Senator if he will again state, if he has the figures separated, the appropriation for the military activities of the Army for 1932?

Mr. McKELLAR. That item is found in the report. As I say, the appropriations in this bill for military activities—that is, activities pertaining purely to the Army itself—are not reduced but are increased; but, in order to show an apparent decrease in the appropriation, $5,000,000 plus was cut off the river and harbor appropriation, and therefore, taking that into account, there is a reduction of $3,000,000. As a matter of fact, however, the appropriations for the military activities of the Army have been increased over those provided by the House rather than decreased.

On page 20 of the bill, under the head of Quartermaster Corps, there is an appropriation for the purchase of subsistence supplies. There is not a Member of the Senate who does not know that subsistence supplies can be purchased all the way from 25 to 50 per cent less than they could a year or two ago. I think, by all means, there ought to be a reduction of at least 25 per cent in that item; and if it shall be necessary, I am going to propose an amendment reducing that item to $9,172,242.

I turn to page 23, to the item for clothing and equipage of the Army. There is no reason in the world why that appropriation may not be reduced 25 per cent and the Army get along just as well.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. REED. That appropriation has been reduced 25 per cent. It was eight and a half million for the present fiscal year.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not been reduced 25 per cent below the appropriation made by the House, and I am talking now about the House bill. The House provides for an appropriation of $6,776,519. There is no reason in the world why subsistence supplies can not be bought for 25 per cent under that sum, in my judgment, and I expect to propose an amendment to that effect.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, does the Senator think that the cost of clothing has gone down 25 per cent since the 20th of May, when the House passed this bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; but I think that the House did not reduce the appropriations sufficiently, and I think that, as compared with a year or so ago, the cost of many kinds of clothing has gone down 50 per cent. I think Senators will realize when they recall the cost of their own clothes, except in the case of very unusual clothes, that the price has gone down at least 50 per cent. As to the particular item to which I was referring, prices have gone down at least 25 per cent, and, in my opinion, the appropriation carried by the bill as it passed the House should be reduced that much.

I turn next to the item on page 23, "Incidental expenses of the Army." In that item I think a reduction of 10 per cent ought to be made.

On page 28, under the item "Military posts," including the improvement of military posts and building construction, in view of the extraordinary expenditures of last year, surely we ought to cut the appropriation down. We ought to slow down on those expenditures.

I turn next to page 30.

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

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. REED. The item the Senator has just spoken of, expenses of military posts, for which two and a quarter million dollars are proposed to be appropriated, has been reduced from $15,864,000, carried in the appropriation bill for the current year.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly why we ought to reduce the amount below that provided by the House. In 1931, as I stated a few moments ago, we spent for the Army the enormous sum of $478,000,000, and a very considerable amount of that appropriation was used for the purpose of building posts, and for the fiscal year 1932, $445,000,000 was appropriated, and now it is undertaken to appropriate $2,250,000 for construction at military posts. I am going to move to strike that out and insert in lieu thereof $1,687,500.

I turn next to the item for "barracks and quarters, and other buildings and utilities," which is found on page 28, and for which $13,595,017 is appropriated. In a period of distress such as that now existing we are proposing to appropriate this enormous sum for "barracks and quarters and other buildings and utilities." I say that appropriation ought to be cut at least 10 per cent, and it would be perfectly proper if it were cut 25 per cent, or even 50 per cent, and the work slowed down on these utilities.

As a matter of fact the Army itself has recommended, as I understand, the discontinuance of a number of military posts. Yet we are building barracks and quarters at a proposed cost this year of $13,000,000 plus. The testimony before our committee the other day——

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in just a moment. The testimony before our committee the other day was that a post in North Dakota, Wyoming, or some other State in the West—I have forgotten the exact location—a splendid post, with excellent permanent brick buildings, had been recommended by the War Department to be discontinued entirely. Senators representing that particular State came before the committee and testified that it was a perfectly splendid post, a permanent post, needing practically no repairs; and yet we are abandoning posts of that kind and proposing to spend this year on other posts for quarters, and so forth, $13,000,000; and much more than that, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, was spent last year. It is a profligate waste of the people's money.

Let me call attention to the fact that the year before the war—and, by the way, it was in anticipation of the war, and I was serving on the Military Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives at the time and know the facts to be as I state them—we appropriated $164,000,000 for the Army, under a reorganization act then but lately passed, but in preparation of war; and yet now, when there is not a sign of war anywhere, in this bill it is proposed to appropriate the enormous sum of $389,000,000 plus. It seems to me it is inexcusable. Millions of our people are out of employment, and yet we are recklessly and extravagantly spending the people's money for war purposes.

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

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REED. The item for barracks and quarters does not include one single cent for the building of barracks or the building of quarters. It includes such items as fuel and repairs, and that sort of thing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Heaven only knows what it includes, but we all know that it includes a $13,000,000 appropriation from a bankrupt Treasury.

Mr. REED. Very good, Mr. President. But, if Heaven wants to know exactly what it includes, it will find the information on page 462 of the House hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. All right. Well, I will let Heaven examine into it.

On page 34 there is the appropriation for the Signal Service of the Army. That ought to be reduced at least 10 per cent under the House appropriation. Instead of that, the amount was increased slightly over that appropriated by the House. There is not any necessity for these enormous appropriations.

Again, on page 37 is the appropriation for the Air Corps of the Army, $25,439,131. We ought not to expend that vast sum upon the Air Corps of the Army. It ought to be reduced. I am going to offer an amendment to reduce it 10 per cent, and it ought to be reduced even more.

I come next to page 44, ordnance service and supplies of the Army, under the Ordnance Department, where the bill carries $9,832,715 for building new guns and supplies, including necessary traveling expenses. By all means that should be reduced 25 per cent. It is useless to build guns that will be obsolete when we get into a war. No country in the world is now able to go to war, for lack of finances; and if we spend all this money now for ordnance, it will be out of date when the next war comes on. I am going to ask that that be reduced.

I come next to page 46, Chemical Warfare Service. We have agents in Europe right now trying to abolish chemical warfare as being inhuman; and yet we are appropriating this year for Chemical Warfare Service $1,222,000. That ought to be reduced, and I shall offer an amendment to reduce that 10 per cent.

Again, on page 49 is an item of $2,338,136 for seacoast defenses. Those are very proper. We ought to have them; but surely we ought not to be expending to the very limit out of a Treasury that is empty.

Again, on page 50, there is an authorization of interchange of appropriations. Some time ago the Senator from Pennsylvania offered a resolution, to apply to all appropriation bills, providing that 15 per cent of any appropriation could be used interchangeably by the head of the department and transferred from one function to another. I was against it; but we agreed in the Interior Department bill and four other bills that were passed that 12 per cent could be so used interchangeably this year, when we were cutting down appropriations. I thought probably that would be the better way. Now the Senator brings in a 15 per cent provision of the kind in this bill. In other words, instead of bringing about a reduction in the military activities of this bill, there was an increase in the military activities of this bill. It ought not to have been agreed to; and I am going to move to change that from 15 per cent to 12 per cent.

On page 53 is an item for arms, uniforms, equipment, and so forth, for field service of the National Guard, $5,886,849. We just continued to appropriate and reappropriate, year by year, that item. It ought to be reduced at least 10 per cent, and I am going to offer an amendment to that effect.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator tell me why we should appropriate anything for the National Guard during these times?

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me it could be suspended. I think it ought to be suspended. There is not a sign or a threat of war anywhere. No other nation could afford to go to war with us, and in the present state of our Treasury we could not afford to go to war with any other nation. We have a deficit, the first 11 months of this year, of $2,700,000,000. We have a deficit of over $4,000,000,000 in the last two years, and we are putting additional taxes on the people now to the extent of a billion dollars. We are not in a position to go to war, and no other nation is in a position to go to war. Why keep up such a tremendous pressure of military preparedness?

It seems to me it is wholly out of place. It seems to me that we ought to cut these appropriations. We ought to reduce them. We have reduced them in other departments. We reduced them in the Interior Department, in the State Department, in the Labor Department, in the Commerce Department, in the Department of Justice. Why should we treat the military part of our Government better than we have treated these other departments? Why make fish of one and fowl of another? There is no good reason for it. The only reason in the world is the pomp and show of a great standing Army.

We have 118,000 men in the Army, or had that many last year. I believe we have 119,000 this year, besides the officers. Why is it necessary to keep up such a great army in times of profound peace, when nations are not able to go to war even if they were disposed to do so?

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] stated that in this bill there is $290,000,000 for the Army. Great Britain's appropriations for the British Army this year are $127,525,560, less than half of our appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. It is absolutely indefensible to be appropriating $339,000,000 of the people's money out of a Treasury where there is no money, when we are borrowing day by day, when we are leading a hand-to-mouth existence with our Government, when we are raising taxes enormously on the American people. There is no reason for making these great increases—and they are increases of at least two million, and maybe more, in the military activities of this Government over what the House provided. There is no reason in the world to build up a great army of 119,000 men and keep it in the pink of perfection, spending more than double what our neighbor, Great Britain, is spending. There is no reason in the world for our keeping up such an army. It is a willful, woeful waste of the people's money.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I notice here an item of $1,178,238 for procurement of forage, bedding, and so forth, for animals used by the National Guard. That is on page 51, line 10. Then I find that the next item is one of $2,428,553 for compensation of help for care of materials, animals, and equipment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Those items have just been recurring in every bill, and they are not considered by the committees of either House. The department sends them in, and we just agree to them. We do not go over them. We deal only with amendments before the committee. We do not deal with the perennial appropriations; and this, as I understand, is a perennial appropriation that has been made ever since the National Guard has been aided by the Federal Government.

Of course, I see that while we are providing bedding for the animals of the Army we are doing nothing for men who have not beds and have not the food with which to live. I think it is little short of outrageous so to legislate.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the next item, which is the item of Reserve Officers' Training Corps, under the heading of "Citizens' military training." If we were about to get into a war, if there were any threat of war, it would be very well to train our citizens in this way. It is a good thing, anyhow, for the citizens who take part in it. It is a very excellent thing. There is no reason why it should not be done in normal times. It is a very excellent thing; but with our Treasury in its present condition to spend $4,079,484 for this purpose is inexcusable. The item ought to be stricken out entirely for one year.

Surely if we are going to reduce the salaries of the clerks of the Government—and I am in favor of it; I believe it is a necessity—in the same way I believe it is a necessity to suspend this item for one year. It is not necessary. It is a willful waste of the people's money, and I do not understand how the taxpayers will stand for it. I think if they knew how it was, they would rise up almost as one man and not stand for this willful waste, this woeful waste of the people's money.

The next item I come to is citizens' military training camps, $2,603,624. That ought to be stricken out. It ought to be suspended for a year. I would rather suspend it than abolish it entirely. I think probably that would be the proper way to do—to suspend it—and it ought to be done.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the statement made by General Summerall, when he retired as Chief of Staff, concerning the citizens' military training camps. He said:

> It is apparent that the camps do not directly serve to promote any military objective. The chief benefit to the Army lies in the increased confidence in its personnel on the part of the civilian population which has followed from the many contacts incident to the conduct of the camps.

I should also like to direct the Senator's attention to the fact that it has been stated from an authoritative source that 39,061 boys in the citizens' military training camps provided only 10 reserve officers as a result of their training.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, 10 officers for $4,079,000 carried over a period of a number of years is doing pretty well, is it not? Does not the Senator think it is?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think it is a pretty high price to pay.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a pretty high price; but as the Senator knows, the Government loves to pay high prices. It would rather pay a high price than to pay a low price for anything it buys or anything that it creates.

Mr. President, I want to say that I think this is very excellent physical training. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin in thinking that it does not do the country any good as a means of national defense. I think it is a very delightful vacation in the summer time for men with a military trend of mind. I think if we had ample money in the Treasury there could be not very much objection to giving these men this sum of money; but with the present depleted condition of our Treasury we ought not thus to spend the people's money, and I am going to move to strike out that provision entirely.

I next come to ordnance equipment for rifle ranges for civilian instruction, where $100,000 is appropriated for arms, ammunition, and targets for our rifle-range practice. That is wholly unnecessary at this time. The senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] would disagree with me, of course, because he is a crack shot, and, of course, the crack shots in the country like to go to these places. It is a very popular thing for them to do at Government expense. At a time when the Government is well equipped with money and the Treasury is full, it may be that we ought to agree to it, but it ought not to be agreed to now.

I believe that is the last provision. In these provisions there are 14 items, which aggregate a little over $20,000,000. I think the bill ought to go back to the committee with instructions to reduce the appropriations 10 per cent.

If the furlough plan produces anything like the amount that has been claimed for it, the furlough reductions, with this $23,000,000, would reduce this bill about 10 per cent, in accordance with the others.

I do not believe the furlough plan is going to reduce the expenditures of the Government by $40,000,000. I doubt it very seriously. But, assuming that it will reduce the expenditures, as its advocates claim it will, some $80,000,000, it would then be about 10 per cent, with these various reductions which I have indicated.

Under these circumstances, I move now to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to reduce the appropriations 10 per cent below those made by the House.

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

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

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

Ashurst	Couzens	Keyes	Shortridge
Austin	Cutting	King	Smith
Bailey	Davis	La Follette	Steiwer
Bankhead	Dill	Logan	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Fletcher	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Frazier	McKellar	Townsend
Bingham	George	McNary	Trammell
Blaine	Goldsborough	Moses	Tydings
Borah	Gore	Norris	Vandenberg
Bratton	Hale	Nye	Wagner
Bulkley	Harrison	Oddie	Walcott
Byrnes	Hatfield	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Capper	Hawes	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Caraway	Hebert	Reed	Watson
Carey	Hull	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Cohen	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	White
Connally	Jones	Schall	
Coolidge	Kean	Sheppard	
Costigan	Kendrick	Shipstead	

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we are about to vote on the motion of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to reduce it 10 per cent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Below the House appropriations.

Mr. REED. Below the House appropriations. I am not going to take up time in discussing it; I want only to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that that reduction has already been more than made by the House itself. The appropriation for this year was $445,000,000. The House has cut under that some $53,000,000. The bill, as it is reported now to the Senate, cuts under that $56,000,000. The furlough plan reduces that further by another nine or ten million. So the total cut under last year's bill of $445,000,000 is already $65,000,000, or about 15 per cent, and the cuts in the military items are 17 per cent. We have cut it to the bone in every direction.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that the House in like manner reduced the appropriations for the other departments. I do not remember the exact percentage, but they reduced the appropriations very largely under last year and under the present recommendations for the Interior Department, the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Treasury Department, the Post Office Department, and the Department of Justice. They reduced all the appropriations under the estimates of last year and under the estimates of the Budget. So we would just be applying the same rule we applied to other departments if we took the action I have suggested.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. Earlier in the day I was called from the Chamber to attend a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency about the time when the Senator from Pennsylvania was discussing the increases and decreases in the pending appropriation bill. The information I desire may have been given to the Senate, but I do not have it because of my necessary absence.

I note from the committee report that the appropriation as reported by the Senate committee is $56,194,722 below the appropriation for 1932.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. BLAINE. Will the Senator advise me the amount of reduction in the appropriation for military activities?

Mr. REED. The amount carried in the bill for military activities is $290,000,000, which is 17 per cent under the same item for last year.

Mr. BLAINE. It is 17 per cent less than the appropriation of last year?

Mr. REED. Yes. I do not carry in my head the exact figure for last year, but it is easy enough to calculate.

Mr. BLAINE. The calculation would be made upon the basis of 17 per cent of $56,000,000, the total reduction, I assume?

Mr. REED. I have the exact figures now and can give them to the Senator. The amount of $290,000,000 this year is a reduction of $46,000,000 in the military items. The amount for military items last year was $336,000,000. In 1931 it was $347,000,000, so it has been cut down from $347,000,000 for 1931, to $336,000,000 for the present year, and is $290,000,000 for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. BLAINE. Will the Senator also give me the information as to the total amount of the decrease for nonmilitary activities?

Mr. REED. For nonmilitary activities, in 1931 the appropriation was $197,000,000; in the fiscal year 1932 it was $123,000,000, and in the present bill it is $99,000,000.

Mr. BLAINE. There is a reduction of about $25,000,000 for nonmilitary activities?

Mr. REED. About twenty-three to twenty-four million.

Mr. BLAINE. I notice in the report, under decrease, the item, "Total decrease, military activities." I assume that is under the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. BLAINE. A little over $656,000, and the total decrease for nonmilitary activities under the bill as it passed the House in round figures is $6,272,000, leaving a net increase for military activities over the bill as it passed the House of $3,129,145, and a net decrease in nonmilitary activities as compared with the House bill of $6,136,778.

Mr. REED. That is correct. The reason for the increase over the bill as it passed the House for military activities is due entirely to the restoration of the 2,000 officers, the provision for whom the House struck from the bill.

Mr. BLAINE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin, if he will permit, may be interested in knowing, however, that in 1923—and I have the figures from the office of the Chief of Finance of this date—the appropriations for military purposes were $274,802,000, in 1924 they were $260,867,000, in 1925 they were $268,974,000, in 1926 they were $271,092,000, in 1927 they were $274,000,000, in 1928 they were $297,000,000, in 1930 they were $329,000,000. So it is apparent that from the years to which I first challenged attention there has been a very large increase in the military expenses of our Government.

Mr. REED. Very largely accounted for by the expenditures in carrying out the Air Corps program, which is now about completed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understand the bill as reported to the Senate by the committee reduces the aggregate amount carried in the bill by $21,785,249 below the estimate.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There has been added to that amount what the Senator from Pennsylvania stated to be $9,000,000 on account of furloughs, which makes the total reduction below the estimate about $30,000,000.

Mr. REED. That is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. REED. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I hope the motion of the Senator from Tennessee will be adopted. It is not a question of how much we have reduced in the past. It is a question of being able to reduce the bill to the very minimum now. We have been told from the very inception of this session of Congress that we must balance the Budget, that we must reduce our expenditures. I am not one of those who want to cut down the Army under ordinary circumstances to the very minimum. I think in many instances we have not been very generous in our treatment of the Army, but I do think at this particular time there are items in the bill that could be dispensed with. I have particular reference to the citizens' training camps and the National Guard items.

The bill contains a provision for procurement of forage, bedding, and so forth, for the National Guard, $1,178,238; compensation of help for care of materials, animals, and equipment, $2,428,553; expenses camps of instruction, field and supplemental training, including medical and hospital treatment authorized by law, $8,078,000; expenses selected officers and enlisted men, military-service schools, including medical and hospital treatment authorized by law, $319,000; for pay of property and disbursing officers of the United States, $79,800; for general expenses, equipment and instruction, National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment authorized by law, $674,984; for expenses of enlisted men of the Regular Army on duty with the National Guard, including the hiring of quarters in kind, $480,000; for pay of National Guard—armory drills—$11,584,868.

Who on the floor of the Senate would tell me, in times of depression, when the people of the country are going hungry and suffering and walking the streets, when they are flooding the Capital of the country at the present time,

that we could not dispense with these items, amounting in all, I should judge, to probably $20,000,000?

Then we have arms, uniforms, equipment, and so forth, for field service of the National Guard, $5,887,000. Then there is the matter of military training camps. Frankly, it seems to me that to set up these military training camps at this time, when we have so much suffering in the country, is the wrong thing to do.

Ordinarily I have no particular objection to them; but it is wrong to get a group of business men to go out and have a vacation and have it paid for by the Government of the United States when there are men in our galleries at this moment, men out here on the streets of our city who served in the war and are suffering because of the fact that they can not get food enough to eat, and yet a deaf ear will be turned to them and not anything done for them. We are not going to give them any work and we are not going to pay them anything of any kind or character. When it comes to cutting the wages of Government employees we talk about economy and balancing the Budget, and tears will roll down our cheeks as we plead for economy and to keep us upon the gold standard. But when these men come here knocking at our door a deaf ear is turned to them; but money will be spent and appropriated lavishly for a lot of nonessentials.

Mr. President, we ought to take out of the bill every single dollar that is not needed absolutely for the upkeep of the Army. We ought not to spend a dollar in these times for a citizens' training camp. We ought not to appropriate money lavishly as we are in this bill for the National Guard. There is no excuse for it whatever. If Senators are sincere about the reduction of Government expenses, then here is the opportunity to take out the nonessentials. If Senators are sincere about balancing the Budget, here is the opportunity to help balance the Budget by cutting down expenses. If Senators are sincere in the cries they have made upon the floor of the Senate heretofore about balancing the Budget and cutting down expenses and economizing, here is the opportunity.

I appreciate the fact that this body will probably not comply with the motion of the Senator from Tennessee. I have not any doubt but what the Republican orators will go to the country this fall and say they have economized in every possible way they could. I have not any doubt they will say that but for the Democrats in the House and in the Senate they would have cut down and economized still more. But somebody will ask them, "Why was it that you appropriated money for the citizens' training camps while men were sitting in your galleries hungry, without a place to sleep and without any food in their stomachs, men who went across the water and served their Nation, and yet you were turning them down? You were not even willing to appropriate money to furnish them a place to sleep, and yet you were appropriating money for citizens' training camps, so that a group of business men could go out and have a vacation and be fed and fêted and trained at the expense of the Government of the United States of America."

I say in all sincerity that I fear for what is going to happen in this country if we continue this sort of a policy. I fear for what is going to happen in this country unless we treat all classes of citizens of the United States of America in exactly the same way. It can not go on. Senators may think they can go on with it, but they can not do it, because of the fact that the people of the country, those suffering upon the farms of the country, those dependent upon the Red Cross in the Middle West and Southwest, those men who are seeing their wives and their children go without clothes, their schools being closed because of lack of funds, will not stand for it. These men who are walking the streets because they can not get any employment, men who came back from war with their arms off and their legs off, many of them, and others who served their country to the best of their ability and were willing to give up their lives, will have a deaf ear turned to them, and yet Congress will appropriate money for nonessentials. I say it is not fair, it is not just, and sooner or later if we continue in that policy some one will have to suffer for it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is perfectly evident we are not going to approach balancing the Budget. The economy bill would not have balanced the Budget if it had been passed in full. However, it was reduced considerably to a saving of about $121,000,000, leaving at least $300,000,000 to be provided. Because the Senate would not agree to a tax upon beer, which would have raised $300,000,000 or $400,000,000, we are now forced to curtail every essential operation of the Government.

We read in the papers every day where this Senator or that Representative, who would not come out against this farce we call national prohibition, has been defeated. In the strongholds of prohibition, one after another, they have gone down to defeat. In the face of that, we have the effrontery and, I say with no disrespect, the ignorance to put $1,200,000,000 of increased taxation on an impoverished people while crime goes unchecked and while the one thing which would yield a great deal of revenue contributes nothing to the welfare of the Government. We may need the Army before this situation is over, and our own action here will make the Army more needed than any condition now existing in the Government.

I am going to vote to eliminate some of the things from this bill, not because I would have done it had we balanced the Budget and furnished the money to run the Government but because, through our lack of courage in taking hold of the prohibition farce, which every man with good intelligence knows is a farce, there is no other alternative left but to walk into these services with a broadax and slash them right and left, regardless of the emergency in which we find ourselves.

I want to serve notice now that when the relief bill comes before the Senate I intend to offer the beer amendment again, because it is absolutely asinine to appropriate $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 when we have an unbalanced Budget and project those bonds on a falling market, with fear and chaos everywhere, and not provide the means to pay them, to furnish the interest and a sinking fund from some sound source of taxation which will stabilize what little is left of property and wealth and security and happiness in the country. I hope when that time comes we can rise above the silly organization which has dominated and brought fear into the hearts of Members of both branches of Congress and realize that we are in a great national emergency, that here is a matter which does not violate the tenets of the Constitution, and which will furnish the revenue to run the Government which we can not get from any other source.

Yesterday we read of 3,000 men in a mob in Detroit walking into a factory and demanding work. This is summer time, Mr. President. People are not cold now as they will be next fall and winter. Last fall and winter a mob in Detroit hunting employment brought on a serious condition, and four or five of them lost their lives and many were injured, some of them very seriously. And yet with crime unchecked, with graft permeating the whole prohibition structure from top to bottom, with liquor to be had at any crossroads in the country, with men like Al Capone bilking millions from the pockets of the people, with the Government getting no taxation because of the refusal of Congress to tax that product which would furnish enough revenue to run the Government, we have got to go to our poor little Army, already thirteenth in size among the nations of the world. We have to go to the Federal employees' salaries, already in many cases too low. We have to put $1,200,000,000 more taxes on the backs of the people, taxing their electric current, their entrance to the cheap moving-picture theaters, their chewing gum, their radios, their automobile tires, and all the rest because we are afraid of the Anti-Saloon League. That is the only reason. Of course, we may be defeated at the next election, and that is the only reason why we do it.

A great many of us are going to be defeated in the next election, in my judgment, because an aroused populace is not going to stand this intolerable condition of public affairs. There is not a dry in this body who can not vote to put a tax on beer without violating the Constitution under which we live. The legalization of beer containing 2.75 per cent

of alcohol by weight, according to the best testimony it is possible to obtain, would not transgress the Constitution, and yet we whittle here and whittle there, cut down charwomen's salaries, and cut down the salaries of employees who have large families and who are not getting $1,200 a year, simply because we will not tax this one thing that exists everywhere. Then, to make greater our hypocrisy, to add to this farce we tax wort, grape concentrates, and all the rest of the things that go into illegal beer. I say it is an outrage; and I am wondering how long those who are paying the bulk of the taxes in this country are going to rest under this large tax burden, shoulder this tremendous debt and deficit, endure our country's finances being unsettled, see commodity prices go down and chaos existing everywhere, while we sit here and refuse to face the issue.

In both political parties right at this moment there are men juggling with words in the effort to say something on prohibition that nobody on God's earth can understand. Instead of exhibiting some courage and honesty and telling the people they are for it or against it, one hears vague words like referendum and resubmission, which in the last analysis may mean any one of a thousand different things.

I say, if the action which I have proposed were taken it would not be necessary to cut some of these appropriations in the ruthless manner in which we are proposing to reduce them. We cut them without any regard to relative merits, simply to reach a certain sum, and perpetuate injustices multiplied by other injustices and without any regard for the needs or the fitness of the situation and conditions.

Let those who will not vote to tax beer realize that they have put $400,000,000 a year in taxes upon an oppressed people which they could have avoided; let those who vote to slash salaries realize that this one great big industry—the industry of crime—is above the law and contributes nothing to the Government, while every decent farmer and business man is forced to pay his meed of tribute to our Government in order that its institutions may endure. The way the economy issue is being projected in this Congress is an outrage. Simply because we have not got the money which we could have gotten, we look every place in the whole Federal structure, and wherever we find a large appropriation we cut it down even though it might be a short-sighted business policy so to do.

I am going to vote for a few of the proposed economies in the Army appropriation bill, but very few, because we have now reached the point where we have got to have an Army, whether it costs money or not, in order to keep law and order in this country. There is no use evading the facts.

We have evidence piled on evidence from North Carolina, Florida, Alabama, from the West, everywhere in the country, that the people are in rebellion against this farce, that they are sick of this hypocrisy, that they do not want extra taxes, that they need relief. We have not the money adequately to provide it, and here is the one thing which would raise at least a third of all the revenue which we have proposed to raise in the new tax bill, but, because we are afraid of a few little organizations, we back away from it, more in fear, I venture to say, that we may be defeated in the next election than because of the merits or the demerits of the case.

How long will it be tolerated? How long will the people bear these new taxes? How long will we see this illegal industry go untaxed, corrupting the entire Government, State governments, city governments, county governments, the Federal Government? Every Senator here knows that not later than next December or next March we shall vote to resubmit the eighteenth amendment. Who challenges the statement that within one year from this hour some measure of repeal or modification will pass both branches of Congress? It may not pass, but the prophecies all are that it will pass. Why can we not accept the inevitable now, when the need is great, when the emergency is great, and when there is great demand that we shall raise the money to help maintain the Government under which we live and exist?

One State after another goes wet; one congressional district after another goes wet; even last fall in every special election, in Vermont and in Michigan—not in the big industrial centers but in the rural districts—men who were opposed to prohibition were invariably returned to Congress and those who were in favor of prohibition went down. What more evidence do we need that the people are sick of this farce, worn out by this hypocrisy, and overburdened with the expense incident to it?

We come to the consideration of the Army appropriation bill, and we are actually in a few moments going to vote upon the question whether or not we will recommit this bill to the committee not with an idea of making any balanced adjustment but on the sheer formula that it must be cut 10 per cent. Whether the service can stand it or not, we must take off $40,000,000; it does not make any difference whether it cuts the Army 3 per cent or 10 per cent or whether it eliminates so many officers; get the money. That is the kind of economy that is going on here. There is no sense to it; there is no logic to it; and there is no need for it. If we would tap this vast source of revenue, we could extract ten times as much money as is proposed to be saved by this motion.

I simply want to serve notice now, Mr. President, that when the relief bill comes before the Senate I shall again offer a combination of the bill offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] and myself for 2.75 per cent beer by weight, and I hope that by that time an aroused public opinion will force us to obtain in that way the money which we can so easily get, and not make necessary the taxation of an already distressed and overburdened people.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, in the early stages of this session of Congress I voted consistently for the motions offered, one by one, by the Senator from Tennessee to instruct the Committee on Appropriations to reduce each appropriation bill 10 per cent below the sum total carried in the bill sent to us by the House. I cast those votes, Mr. President, because I believed that there are but few bureaus of the Government which could not exist efficiently, perhaps even more efficiently, with a 10 per cent reduction in their total appropriation. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I had every intention of voting for the motion made by the Senator from Tennessee to recommit this bill with similar instructions, and I would cast such a vote but for the fact that I regard as nothing less than a direct incentive to revolution in this country the remarks of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], to the effect that he wishes the national defense cut down in order that money may be provided for others who have no right to it whatever.

Mr. President, neither the galleries nor any armed camp which may encircle the Capitol can have the slightest effect upon my convictions or upon my vote. I believe that lobbyists, no matter in what guise they come here, should not be fed and sheltered and supported from the Federal Treasury; that they should take care of themselves; that they should let their cause stand upon its own merits. If we have now come to a time when the Senate of the United States, like the Roman Senate of old, is to be encircled with legionnaires, intent to overthrow the Republic and set up a military dictatorship, now is the time to resist it. I therefore give notice to the Senator from Tennessee that I can not go forward with him and vote for this motion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator says that he voted for the other reductions as a matter of principle, and I know he did, and I know he believes they were right.

Now, simply because another Senator makes a statement with which he does not agree, it does not seem to me that that would justify my splendid friend from New Hampshire in changing his convictions, though, of course, he is the judge of that and I am not. At the same time, however, just looking at it as one man to another, it seems to me that that would hardly be a fair reason for the Senator to change his vote in a matter of conviction, and I hope he will not do so; but, of course, the Senator himself will decide as to that.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I must be the judge of my own conduct, and I intend to be. I think that if we could have gone forward in an orderly fashion, and if this bill could have been dealt with in subcommittee and in full committee as other measures have been, if the chiefs of the

departments could have come before us and have set up a reallocation of funds, as the Senator from Tennessee knows has been done in connection with several of the appropriation bills, undoubtedly we could have worked out the proportionate reduction in military expenses which we have worked out in connection with civil expenses; but, Mr. President, I have never yet surrendered to a threat, and I do not intend to begin now.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I do not propose to stand idly by and let the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] put words in my mouth. I say to him now that he knows very well that there was no threat made by me, and all the Senator is attempting to do by his statement is to stir up antipathy toward the ex-service men who are here.

Mr. President, I am not sure that there are any of them in the galleries, although I assume that there may be some in the galleries; but regardless of the views of the Senator from New Hampshire with reference to his feelings toward these men who have come to the city of Washington, and regardless of whether they are right or whether they are wrong, there is one thing about them, and that is they are not asking that we give them something any more than others in this country are appealing to the Congress and asking for special favors.

Ever since this Congress has been in session different groups of people have come here knocking at the doors of Congress, seeking and asking for special favors; and I make the statement without fear of contradiction that never before on the floor of the Senate have I heard the Senator from New Hampshire raise his voice in protest against special favors being granted to different classes of the citizens of this country, particularly, if you please, if those citizens happened to come from the State of New Hampshire or from New England.

I do not for one moment intend to stand here and let the statement of the Senator go by that I was making an inflammatory speech. What I was appealing for was for simple justice on the part of the people of this country, to protect them from being mulcted in taxes because of things that were unnecessary and unessential at a time when the Government of the United States, and particularly those on the other side of the Chamber, were crying with tears in their eyes, talking about the balancing of the Budget in one breath, and then, if you please on the other hand trying to put into this bill and into other bills appropriations that in my judgment and in the judgment of some of us were unessential in times of crisis like these.

Far be it from me, let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire, to appeal and try to bring on a revolution in this country. It is the last thing in the world that I want to bring on; but I do say that what I am seeking to do is to stop that sort of thing from being brought on in this country by seeing to it that the masses of the people, that the average citizens of this country, fare as well at the hands of the Congress of this Nation as do some of the Wall Street interests and bankers and insurance companies who have come into this Congress, getting special favors at the hands of Congress.

Let the farmers come here and knock for legislation and see what a deaf ear is turned toward them. Let the workers of this Nation come here and see what a deaf ear is turned toward them. But, if you please, when the Wall Street bankers come here, when the Wall Street brokers come here, when the representatives, if you please, of the stock exchange come here, do you find the Senator from New Hampshire standing upon his feet talking against special privilege?

No, Mr. President; the Senator from New Hampshire can not choke those words down my throat, here or at any other place, either upon the floor of the Senate or elsewhere. I resent the statement made by him to the effect that I or anybody else was trying to threaten the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire to make him vote for some piece of legislation that he did not want to vote for. I know him too well to think that any threat that might be made by me or by anybody else would influence him in arriving at a decision that he did not want to make.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, thanking the Senator from Montana for the implied compliment which he paid to my courage, let me say that the usual contradiction of terms with which he generally presents his cause here has accompanied, if you please, what he has now said. Inveighing against special privilege, if you please, for those who have not come from my section of the country, he now pleads for special privilege, if you please, for those for whom he has pleaded this afternoon.

While I do not wish to put words in the eloquent mouth of the Senator from Montana, I am entirely content that the country shall rest its judgment upon the printed words of what he has said when they appear in the RECORD to-morrow morning.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee having charge of this bill one or two questions.

The first question is, How many officers have we now in the United States Army?

Mr. REED. Approximately 12,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. How many enlisted men in the regular armed forces of the Nation?

Mr. REED. One hundred and eighteen thousand seven hundred and fifty.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. What is the number of the National Guard of the several States and Territories?

Mr. REED. My recollection is that it is about 140,000, but I should have to look it up.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. What is the number of the Reserve officers?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am only a 2-legged Senator, not a 12-volume encyclopedia. If the Senator would give me some notice that he was going to ask these questions, I would have the replies ready.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The distinguished Senator is the chairman of the subcommittee handling this appropriation bill. He is likewise the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. He is likewise one of if not the best-posted men in the Senate; and upon military affairs I give him credit for being the best-informed man in Congress.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I was trying to get the figures in the RECORD as to the number of the forces of the country that this bill is making provision for. If it is simply making provision for 12,000 officers and 125,000 men, the total amount would seem large; but when it is spread over 12,000 officers, 125,000 regular soldiers, 140,000 National Guardsmen, and probably that many, if not more, reserve officers, and a very large number of civilian troops in the summer camps, perhaps it is not such a large sum after all.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator. Now I have found the figures for which he was asking.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am very glad to revert to the question just submitted.

Mr. REED. According to Congressman COLLINS in the House, the estimates for the National Guard provide for the armory drill pay of 136,548 enlisted men, and for the drill pay or allowance of 14,300 officers. So, as the Senator says, the number of individuals affected by these appropriations is much greater than the mere Regular Army figures.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the record shows that this year, 1932, we are spending something like $445,000,000 in the support of this branch of the Federal service. The Budget requests of Congress for 1933 were less than we are spending this year. They were less by $34,000,000. Hence, the Budget estimate is only for $411,000,000. This estimate was transmitted to the House of Representatives, and the House committee recommended and the House itself passed a bill carrying the sum of $392,000,000. That is the amount in the bill when it reached this body—a reduction of $53,000,000 less than we are spending this year. That is less by $19,000,000 than the Budget estimated for. So the House made a substantial reduction under the Budget estimates submitted by the President in the sum of $19,000,000.

The Senate committee reduced the amount to $389,000,000. That is $56,000,000 less than we are spending this year. It

is $22,000,000 less than the Budget requested, and it is $3,000,000 less than the House actually passed in its bill. So to-day the bill stands before the Senate at a total figure of $81,000,000 less than we are spending on the Army forces for the year 1932.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Gladly.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator has summarized the facts very well and very effectively.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, we have two Armies in this country to-day. We have an active army and an ex-army. I had a chance to see the ex-army on parade a night or two ago. So far as I can learn, this ex-army, now camped in this city, has had no attention at the hands of the House or the Senate.

I have in my hand a paper that is just off the press. The top headline is as follows:

Vets won't leave—call 150,000 men.

Mr. President, I am unofficially advised that the Presiding Officer has on his desk a petition. I hold in my hand what purports to be a copy of that petition. I submit to the Presiding Officer the parliamentary inquiry if it is true that he does have such a petition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A petition has been presented by a committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the petition delivered to the Vice President during the last few minutes be laid down and read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the petition will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

DEMANDS OF OUR "BUDDIES"

Whereas in the year of our Lord, 1918, the flower of our country, young and strong, at the call of their Government, and with the cry of "Hero" still echoing in their ears, went forth upon the blood-soaked battlefields of France to sacrifice their all, their time, their fortunes and opportunities, their health, and even their lives, in the service of our country, determined to liberate the nations of the world from oppressive militarism and to forever guarantee democratic governments upon earth; and

Whereas in part performance of promises, solemnly given by the people and by the Government of these United States, the representatives of the people, in Congress assembled, enacted a law providing for soldiers' compensation certificates, varying in amount according to duration and place of service, calculated upon the lowest wage rate paid to unskilled laborers who had remained at home; and

Whereas in a country overflowing and abundant with the riches of the earth a colossal disaster has now befallen these veterans and all other workmen, rendering them jobless, evicting them from their homes, and subjecting them and their wives to hunger and to starvation and their children to the blighting diseases of malnutrition; and

Whereas the bankers and moneyed interests, through wild speculations, have caused nearly 4,000 banks to fail, depriving the workingmen of this country of $3,000,000,000, and hurling this country to the very brink of economic disaster; and

Whereas the Government of this Nation, although deaf to the entreaties of the jobless, has lent a ready and willing ear to the wishes of these same bankers and moneyed interests, and has provided for their use a fund of $2,000,000,000 to relieve them of the fruits of their own folly; and

Whereas the soldiers' compensation certificates are the only thing of value still remaining in the possession of the jobless veterans and are valid obligations of our Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the army of jobless veterans, representing the millions of jobless veterans of every section of this country:

First. That Congress provide for the immediate payment in cash of the unpaid balance of the adjusted-compensation certificates; or

Second. That Congress provide jobs for the jobless veterans and the other jobless of the Nation by the appropriation of $5,000,000,000, to be raised by the issue of currency or by the issue and sale of bonds, and to be expended for the creation of work in public construction, including highways, public buildings, hospitals in rural districts, reforestation, flood control, and water-power conservation. Work is the solution of all industrial and farm problems; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be delivered by the Rev. Father James R. Cox and a delegation of veterans to the President of the United States, to the Vice President, as presiding officer of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as one Member of the Senate, I wish to commend the authors of this petition for the manner in which it has been handled and for the text of the petition itself. I have had occasion to visit the camp in which these men are located. It is a misnomer to call it a camp, however. It is simply a vacant space of land over on the Anacostia River. When I was there two days ago I found several thousand ex-soldiers camped upon the open spaces. I found good order and the strictest discipline. The men have come from every State in the Nation. They have come in every way that men can travel. Some had their own cars, some had their own trucks, great numbers have come without regular means of conveyance. They are living out there on that barren plain, sleeping on the grass. Some have improvised beds of a little straw; others, more fortunate, have sacks, furnished by the War Department, filled with grass or straw or leaves; but they are the ones who are living de luxe. The average ex-service man in that camp is forced to sleep upon the ground.

The only friends those men have found in Washington are the police, the newspaper boys, and the people of this city. They have made their appeals to the War Department and to the Congress and to date they have been turned down. They asked the War Department for tents and same were not furnished; however, the department did furnish some 2,000 empty canvas sacks, which can be filled with straw or hay or grass and used for sleeping purposes. There are some 10,000 of those ex-service men in this so-called camp.

Few of the boys have sacks, however. Most of them are forced to sleep on the ground. They have no blankets whatever. All the covering they have is the stars. The police department spent $350 in buying some secondhand lumber and sent it down to the camp, and the men have gotten together some nails and some hammers and have put up some shelters, just roofs, no sides; but only a few are so accommodated.

In addition to some straw, the police department has found some old rusty tins, evidently from roofs, and some secondhand roofing paper, building paper, and delivered this junk and rubbish to the camp; and there these men, one-time soldiers of this Nation, all having honorable discharges, most of them having seen service abroad, are forced to sleep in the Capital of the Nation covered with tin and tar paper and straw.

Mr. President, those men have had no assistance except $500 given them by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. A few nights ago the police arranged for the use of the Gayety Theater, and they got some of the boys who were able to entertain to go down to the theater and make fools of themselves for the entertainment of the public, and through that source they got $540 more.

Last night at the baseball park there was a donation benefit. Some 30 or 40 of the boys put on boxing exhibitions. There was no admission charge, and 15,000 of the Washington people went out there to see those exhibitions. During the bouts put on by the soldier boys the management took up a collection and received as a voluntary donation between $2,500 and $3,000.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that the only friends the boys have in Washington are the police force—and the police force have been their real friends; the newspaper boys, who are writing the news stories; and the people of the city of Washington. The War Department was appealed to, and some 2,000 of the canvas sacks were secured for beds. If they have appealed to Members of the Senate, it has not been mentioned on this floor.

Mr. President, who is responsible for this condition? I am not going into that phase of the question now, because it is a long story and perhaps a debatable matter. But we are facing to-day a fact and not a theory. Ten thousand veterans are here. They are not communists, they are not "reds," they are not "bums," they are not tramps, but are American citizens and entitled to all the rights and privileges as such. What are we to do in this emergency?

I realize that the police can not feed these veterans. I realize that the city of Washington can not feed them, and perhaps there is no department of the Government that can speak for the Government. Perhaps no department is charged with such responsibility. But there is one body in the capital that is charged with such responsibility, and that is the policy-making body of this Government—the Congress of the United States.

If we should receive information that a cyclone had struck in some part of this Nation rendering 10,000 people homeless and clotheless and foodless, no doubt resolutions would be introduced immediately for appropriations to buy food and clothing and housing facilities for the stricken community.

Perhaps some will say, "We are not responsible for these men being in Washington." That may be true, and on behalf of my State I am able to say that but very few Oklahomans are here. That may be a criticism of the men of my State. It may be that they are not so good at riding the rods as the men from some other States. It may be that the distance has kept them away. Still, men from States farther away than Oklahoma are here. I do see in the public press that down in Tennessee, I think it is, there are some Texans and Oklahomans on the way to Washington, but they are not coming here at my invitation. I am in rather close touch with the ex-service men of Oklahoma. I have been importuned to advise them as to whether or not to come, and I want to place in the RECORD my advice in the form of messages I have uniformly sent out. That advice has been as follows:

Replying to message, advise Washington rapidly filling with veterans. No accommodations, short rations, and fear suffering and trouble. While do not criticize soldiers for coming, yet realizing hardship awaiting them would hesitate to invite them here. Am doing all possible to advance immediate payment full balance due veterans.

Mr. President, the Senate now having this petition from this group, the press being filled with news stories written by friendly reporters and published by the friendly press, the Congress can not longer ignore the presence of 10,000 of these men, homeless and foodless, in Washington, and I now pause to ask those in responsible places of leadership whether any consideration is being given to this problem now hanging like a pall over this Capital City. I address myself to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs first.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there is nothing in the pending bill that provides for persons outside the military service.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. My question is, Is anything being done or is any consideration being given to this problem of these men who are here, who are former soldiers, and perhaps other thousands on the way?

Mr. REED. In this bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; I do not mean in this bill.

Mr. REED. Leaving this bill out of it, I know of no provision that is being made for them.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I address the same inquiry to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, no matter has been presented to the Committee on Appropriations with reference to this subject. I do not know what action the Committee on the District of Columbia has taken. I think nothing has been presented to them in reference to it. No proposition of any kind has been presented to the Committee on Appropriations touching the matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the same papers that carried the headlines to which I have alluded carry another news story this afternoon, and it is this kind of news story to which I now direct attention:

NEW YORK CENTRAL ASKS UNITED STATES FOR $13,600,000

The New York Central Railroad to-day asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve its application for a $13,600,000 loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The money is needed to pay interest on fixed debts, rents for leased roads, and taxes, the application states. Of these fixed charges $11,100,000 falls due July 1 and $2,500,000 August 1.

On March 23 the commission approved the road's application for $4,399,000.

Mr. President, many people in this country can not understand why it is that this Government, under the orders of the Congress, can make it so easy for the railroads and the banks and the life insurance companies to come to Washington and, for the mere asking, receive money by the millions to pay interest and pay rents and pay taxes, but when these ex-soldiers come here, they are carted out to the edge of town and sleep on the barren ground, and when their petitions are presented, they are told by some, "You are not here at our invitation, and the place for you to be is at home."

Mr. President, for five or six months now Congress has devoted its time to making safe for their owners bonds, dollars, and property. When men, women, and children come before the Congress and ask for consideration we know what the answer has always been and what the answer is to-day.

Mr. President, I want to place in the RECORD copies of some news articles, so that the people of the country who may have a chance to read the RECORD may have some idea of what the press of the country is saying about the proposal to pay the soldier boys the amount due them on the certificates which they hold.

I know the Congress has said they can not get their money until 1945, but the railroads were not held up until 1945 waiting for their adjustments. Contractors that had business with the Government during the war and had business unfinished when the war was over were not held off until 1945 to secure their adjustments. They have their adjustments and secured their money promptly.

Just because the Congress placed a limitation of 1945 upon the adjustments to be made with these veterans, when times like these come they feel that they are entitled to come to Washington, justified in coming to Washington, and asking that the Government consider their petition. Their petition is on file. Some months ago a delegation came to the Capital and delivered a petition signed by 2,500,000 of the veterans asking that compensation due them on an admitted obligation be made available at once. They are demanding what they have a right to demand, and that is that Congress consider their petition and give them a vote upon the matter.

I understand that in the other branch of Congress on Monday next a vote will be taken. If the bill should pass that body, it will come to the Senate very shortly thereafter. These ex-service men are demanding of the Senate that in the event that bill does pass the other body and come here, we shall give it consideration and give them a vote upon the bill. If the bill reaches this body, then, so far as I am concerned, the Senate will not adjourn until it has voted upon the so-called bonus bill.

I find this headline in a late issue of one of the leading papers:

Bonus army camp looks like Congo. Inspection reveals typical American atmosphere, however.

This is an article signed by Thomas R. Henry. I quote the following paragraph:

There is a squalid colorfulness to this sprawling Camp Camden, down by the Anacostia River.

It is a sort of cross between the military and the gypsy—this spot where more than 2,000 World War veterans from the four quarters of the United States to-day were drowsily waiting for something to happen.

The shelterless ex-service men are showing considerable native ingenuity in meeting the elements—the showers and the burning sun.

In this connection, if we should have here in Washington a rainstorm as we had in my State only a few days ago, it is difficult to conceive the results. In Oklahoma it was not a rainstorm; it was a waterspout. The rain fell in such torrents that the rivers and streams were unable to take it away. A portion of the capital city of my State was covered with water. Several lost their lives. Thousands were made homeless. I am advised that during that storm hailstones as large as baseballs fell in great profusion. If that should happen here, as I hope it shall not, falling on 10,000 American citizens camped in the open, without shelter and within

the shadow of the Capitol, what would be the reaction of the people of America?

The immediate effect would be that many would be killed. The hospitals of the city would be filled to overflowing. An aroused public sentiment would condemn every official in a responsible position in the service of the Government.

I read further from the news article to which I have just referred:

They have evolved a curious sort of shelter—the straw tent. This is a structure about the size and shape of an Army "pup tent," with a framework of odd-sized sticks, pieces of rusty iron garnered from a neighboring junk pile, and any other material which will fit. This is all closely thatched over, top and sides, with closely interwoven straw.

LIKE A CONGO VILLAGE

The nearest comparison to the part of the camp where these structures are most abundant is that of a Congo village.

And this in the Capital of the richest and the most powerful Nation on the face of the globe.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a news story containing a picture of one of the ex-service men. This picture shows the veteran wearing a distinguished-service cross. The name of this young man is Joe T. Angelo. I read one paragraph from this news story:

The War Department records tell of Joseph T. Angelo, Headquarters Company, First Tank Brigade, who was awarded the distinguished-service cross for carrying his commanding officer, now Maj. George S. Patten, jr., Thirty-second Street and Woodland Drive NW., to the safety of a shell hole under continuous shell fire from the German lines, 40 meters away, and remaining with him until help arrived. That was September 26, 1918.

A few nights ago when the parade marched down historic Pennsylvania Avenue I saw many of these boys who were proudly wearing distinguished decorations for heroic service in the service of their country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the news story from which I have just quoted one paragraph may be inserted at this point in connection with my remarks.

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

The news story is as follows:

ONE OF THE FIERIEST BONUS ARMY LEADERS WEARS DISTINGUISHED-SERVICE CROSS

By Richard Hollander

He's a few inches over 5 feet tall and weighs about 115 pounds. But when he stands on the running board of a truck and harrangues the army of bonus marchers quartered in the Anacostia Park section there's something about him that makes his less excitable comrades listen to him.

He is Joseph T. Angelo, of Pennsgrove, N. J., and that medal pinned to his tattered undershirt is the United States distinguished-service cross.

HE LOBBIES

Angelo is one of the representatives appointed to go out each day to the Capitol and lobby for passage of the bonus. But in the mornings before he puts on his shirt and combs his hair he is the firebrand that keeps the "We want our bonus" flame burning.

Yesterday morning he had his chance to put into words just how he feels about this business of coming to Washington. A group of some 125 veterans rolled in from Atlantic City. They said they could only stay for the day. They were going right back.

"Why, you don't know what this is all about," he yelled, his hoarse voice threatening to give way any minute. This isn't a vacation or a sight-seeing trip. It's not a big joke. It may be a question of life and death before we're finished.

PEP TALK

"And you come here thinking you can do the job in one day. We couldn't do it that way in France, and we can't do it here. We'll have to keep going in at the doors of the Capitol until we wear them off the hinges—and then we'll only be starting."

The men from Atlantic City looked sheepish. Angelo continued, his voice getting more husky and his hair wilder. The veins of his neck swelled. He clapped his hand to his chest where that medal hung.

"You see this? Two hundred men were killed and I stayed to save a man's life."

ON THE RECORDS

The War Department records tell of Joseph T. Angelo, Headquarters Company, First Tank Brigade, who was awarded the distinguished-service cross for carrying his commanding officer, now Maj. George S. Patton, jr., Thirty-second Street and Woodland Drive NW., to the safety of a shell hole under continuous shell fire from the German lines 40 meters away, and remained with him until help arrived. That was September 26, 1918.

And now Angelo is here with the bonus army to get his $762.50. He is not the actual commander of the camp in Anacostia. He isn't even a platoon sergeant or a corporal. But when he wants to speak, the leaders give way to him.

"We'll stay here," he says, "until we drop. Then they can get rid of us. But while we've anything left to eat, we'll stay on. We're too big to be laughed at. That's the reason we don't want any of our own gang to make us look like fools.

MUST BE SERVICE MEN

"If they come to Washington without jobs, without anything to eat and can show that they're ex-service men—O. K. Otherwise we don't want them. They've got to live as we do.

"A man here wanted me to go to a hotel and sleep between nice, clean sheets and have swell food. But I told him where to go. While we're here we're all buddies. We all want the same thing."

The rest of the camp doesn't quite know how to take Angelo. He's a bit overpowering and they urge him not to "get excited."

But when Angie speaks they listen. And Angie intends to keep on speaking for a long time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, we have in this country a very distinguished Army correspondent. His name is Floyd Gibbons. Mr. Gibbons perhaps has seen more active service in more wars than any other correspondent that ever lived. He has contributed some news articles recently, one headlined "Bonus vets here to find out what ails the Government, says Gibbons." I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the article, but ask unanimous consent that the story, under the signature of Mr. Gibbons, may be printed at this point in connection with my remarks.

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

The article is as follows:

BONUS VETS HERE TO FIND OUT WHAT AILS THE GOVERNMENT, SAYS GIBBONS

By Floyd Gibbons

Hello everybody! This blast comes from the Washington zoo. I don't mean the one in Rock Creek Park. I am referring to the one on Capitol Hill.

The animals are all disturbed. The congressional dog Rover has suddenly found himself full of fleas. And is he beginning to scratch?

Old congressional Rover had fleas before, but never anything like this set. The old unorganized taxpayer fleas got on his back occasionally, but he just walked out from under 'em.

EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

But, jumping dog biscuits! Those bonus fleas stick closer than a dog collar and bite deeper than a chigger. They just won't let the old dog alone. Rover is having flea trouble like nobody's business.

Funny part of it all is that it is everybody's business—especially everybody who has been having his own flea trouble for the last three years. Boys and girls who have been scratching like the very dickens to exterminate the depression fleas and get rid of the unemployment chiggers and feed the tax collector locusts—well, it has never made any of us any happier to see old Rover on Capitol Hill, without a single worry.

That's why Rover's present antics to shake off the bonus fleas are sending a suppressed snicker right across the country. Misery likes company. There's lots of people pulling for the fleas.

A REAL ARMY

There's an army here—a real army. They call it a bonus army. But it's more than that—much more.

These 4,000 men camped along the Potomac are here to get an answer to a mighty serious question. They want to know why they're starving in the midst of plenty.

They want their bonus money. But the main thing they want is work. They're hungry and these bonus certificates which don't mature for another 10 or 12 years are the only things that even look like meal tickets—much less money.

First of all, they are not bums. Second, they are not agitators.

CITIZENS AND VOTERS

And these men are shaven and clean. They pass safety razors and bits of soap back and forth. There's the Potomac River for a private bath and laundry and plenty of hot sun to dry out the wash.

These men are citizens. They are veteran American soldiers. Some of them are disabled soldiers. We call them heroes when they sailed for France. Called them that again when they limped back with the bacon after the armistice and found the country dry and some other fellow with their girl and somebody else in their old job.

They are also voters.

They are also workmen—steel workers, coal miners, structural-iron workers, cowboys, stenographers, newspaper reporters, dairymen, shopkeepers without shops, clerks, farmers—well, they are just American people like you and me.

SOMETHING'S WRONG

And, by golly, they are just as puzzled as we are about what has happened to the United States of America.

They don't know any more about it than our big statesmen who denied the depression. No more than our big financiers and

bankers and Wall Street operators who used to be considered the prosperity brains of the country. And no more, apparently, than our Government.

They tell me, they tell everybody, that they think the country is all right. Nature has been good to us. We can produce all the food and coal and fruit and beef and clothing that we need. We can build all the houses and beds and furniture that we need. The banks are full of money. The grain elevators are full of wheat.

And the people are all right. They are all hard-working people, only too anxious to take care of themselves. But, by golly, something has gone wrong with the management.

The fault just lies with the people who are running the show. That's what this hungry army on the Potomac believes.

That management is here in Washington. As the veterans see it, it is centered in Congress. They are here to find out who's supposed to be running this show and whyinell it ain't running.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I likewise ask permission to insert a second story by Mr. Gibbons, entitled "Heroes in '17; Outcasts Now."

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

The story is as follows:

HEROES IN '17; OUTCASTS NOW

By Floyd Gibbons

I saw them march last night.

They were the men who won the war in '17 and '18 and were thrown into the discard in the battle of '29, '30, and '31.

In the old days—young and strong, well shod and equipped, well fed and received with open arms—they marched the length of Pennsylvania Avenue, past the Capitol, and past the White House, where Woodrow Wilson reviewed them.

In the light of day and the glory of youth and with prayers and hopes of the Nation pinned above their khaki-clad breasts, they marched that same route between thousands of proud and admiring public officials and civilians.

FORGOTTEN GHOSTS

Last night they marched in the dark, like ghosts out of the forgotten past. Four abreast they marched—5,000 strong.

Few uniforms were shown, and those ragged and wear worn.

The grease-stained overalls of jobless factory workers.

The frayed straw hats of unemployed farm hands.

The shoddy elbow-patched garments of idle clerks.

All were down at the heel. All were slim and gaunt, and their eyes had a light in them. There were empty sleeves and limping men with canes.

They were 5,000 hungry ghosts of the heroes of 1917. Not so young now. They came back triumphant from the smoke of battle in distant wars, only to go down in the battle of life with their own kind. Their own people. Their own Government. The Government they fought for.

MARCH IN DARK

They did not march in the light of day. They marched in darkness. The moving-picture record of the march of the 5,000 guests will be dim and obscure, if any at all.

That's why they marched at night with their shoes worn thin and their boots run down at the heel. They marched without hats, many of them, because they have no hats. Many were without coats.

But they were clean shaven, every man of them. And the shirts they wore, though patched and torn and thin and cheap, were clean from their own washing.

And they marched proud and unashamed, carrying the flag they fought for. The flags were not carried on regular staffs. They were on makeshift pieces of patched wood. Some of the flags were carried proudly aloft on fresh-cut saplings from the river bottoms where these ghosts live.

You know how pitiful and abandoned a garment looks when it is nailed on an oar and floats above a raft as a signal of distress at sea.

That is how their flags looked last night.

That's how their clothing looked—and their gaunt, clean faces. Distress and abandonment.

They carried no flagrant banners. They marched silently, as ghosts should.

WHITE HOUSE BAN

They were men of the old fighting First. They were the ragged remnants of Pershing's own. They were survivors from the glorious Second Division, from the Twenty-sixth, and the Thirty-sixth, and Forty-second, and the Eighty-sixth, and the Ninety-first—they were the ghosts of the American Expeditionary Forces, the largest and greatest Army that ever marched under the American flag.

They marched in darkness last night.

They were not allowed to march past the Capitol this time. Nor the Office Buildings of Congress. It would bring distress to the Congressmen.

They did not march past the White House last night. They were not allowed to. They would bring distress to the President of the richest nation in the world.

They were allowed to march just around and past one corner of the great United States Treasury, at the corner of Fifteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue.

It also was dark.

Some said that President Hoover could, if so inclined, have seen the march of the 5,000 hungry ghosts from either the south portico or the upper windows of the White House. From those positions he could have seen them.

I hope he saw them march last night.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, so that the people of the country may know what is going on in Washington as reported through the local press, an article entitled "Bonus Brigade Called Soul of Decency." The article is under the signature of Elsie Robinson. I ask that it may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

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

The article is as follows:

BONUS BRIGADE CALLED SOUL OF DECENCY—ELSIE ROBINSON DECLARES VETS ARE NOT TRAMPS BUT SOLID CITIZENS

By Elsie Robinson

Five thousand veterans camping on the Washington wastes—7,000 more ex-soldiers hurrying by foot, in trucks, box cars, flivvers, along every road that leads to Washington. The army that saved the country now marching on the Capital.

That's news. Perhaps it's also history. Whichever it is, you're listening in and forming your opinion. All right—for it. But before you do, there are certain facts you should have straight.

Whether we approve of them or don't, these men are not tramps. They are not communists. They are not hoodlums nor restless unemployed. They are representative American citizens—conservative, respectable, patriotic men—merchants, real-estate dealers, lawyers, ex-bankers, union men in good standing. And they are here with a purpose.

SOLID, DECENT MEN

Of course, there are some bums and radicals amongst them—bound to be. But in the main they're solid citizens like you and me—living by the same ideals—heading for the same goals.

Regular folks—that's the thing that hits you so hard when you first see them. You go down to the dumps "for a thrill," expecting to find a crowd of bums as you used to see in the hobo "jungles" across the railroad tracks. And with one glimpse that thrill is knocked out of you and you feel as cheap as a phoney nickel. For there facing you are your own people!

Men like your own father or husband, brother, sweetheart, or son, without shelter, rags on their backs, hunger in their eyes, but their jaws grim.

ORDERLY, BUT GRIM

The orderliness of it all—there's the one thing you mustn't forget. The orderliness of the bonus expeditionary force is the finest and the most hopeful—yet at the same time the most dangerous and ominous thing—about the whole performance.

Riots ravel out on themselves. But these men are not rioters. There's an almost solemn quietness about them—a conscious, steely-eyed precision. The look of men getting ready—waiting.

They have formed a military organization—live as nearly as they can by military rule. They permit absolutely no radical talk, no panhandling, disorderly conduct, or drinking.

They have established an intelligence service along army lines to ferret out any reds or riot talk.

They are here to get the bonus and—they tell you quietly, without any boasts or blusters—that they'll stay until they get it; until 1945 if necessary.

"But suppose Congress adjourns?"

"We won't adjourn," they answer with a smile.

Work? They have an attitude about work that startles you a little until you realize how logical it is. They don't want a dole of work just as they don't want a dole of money or food, and they don't see why they should have to have it. They consider themselves the Nation's ex-creditors, and they don't see why they shouldn't be treated with as much respect as Morgan, Mitchell, or the Missouri Pacific.

HEARTLESS TREATMENT

Well, maybe that idea is cockeyed and again maybe it isn't. But the point is, it's their idea and they're sticking to it.

They won't work for less than union wages. If a man can't afford to pay that, they work for nothing at all—or just grub. There's a lot of criticism of this. But the bonus expeditionary forces say they are not scabs or moochers.

How are they faring? Rotten. Regardless of the merits of their case. This is a mighty heartless—and perhaps a mighty dangerous—way for a big company to treat 10,000 human beings.

Over in Anacostia field—which is nothing more than a smelly, dirty flat down by the river bank—there a few shelters stuck up on poles—no floors, no sides, no tents, no cots, no mess table. A few hundred are sleeping on bags filled with straw in a big garage, and a few hundred more in some other old building. Outside of that, they are just lying around on any strip or dirt they can find.

SKIMPY RATIONS

As for rations—here's what they had to eat Sunday: Two meals. For breakfast, black coffee and mush with a little milk stirred into it. At 4, one weenie and some sauerkraut. After Thursday morning there won't be anything. They say they expect starvation before they're through.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask further permission to have printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks an editorial appearing in the Washington Times of June 8. The editorial is under the title of "The Bonus, or a Job."

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

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Washington Times of June 8, 1932]

THE BONUS OR A JOB—MILLIONS OF MEN UPROOTED IN THE WAR, TAKEN FROM THEIR PLACES, THEIR OPPORTUNITY, SENT ABROAD WHILE OTHERS WERE MAKING WAR-TIME WAGES AND WAR-TIME PROFITS, ARE NOW WITHOUT JOBS AND IN WANT—THEY TOOK CARE OF THEIR GOVERNMENT, THEIR GOVERNMENT SHOULD TAKE CARE OF THEM

The Washington Times, on behalf of its readers, demands for every veteran his bonus or a job.

It is time for the Government of the United States, richest in the world, to stop its shilly-shallying methods concerning American soldiers.

It is not necessary at this late date to dilate on the service rendered to their country by the soldiers. Heaven knows how presidents, governors, editors, politicians, and clergymen have talked enough about it.

What these men did for the United States, the sacrifices that they were forced to make, are well known.

The question now is, What is the United States going to do for the men that it sent to Europe with promises of never-dying gratitude?

Thousands of men, formerly in the Army, now out of work and in absolute want, are marching on Washington to learn whether their Government's promises will hold water, and whether the word "gratitude" is to be found only in the dictionary, now that the war is over.

These men do not want anybody's charity, not even that of the Government served by them. They do want and are entitled to a chance to make a living by work. If the Government can not find work for them to do, they are entitled at least to payment of the bonus, which the Government owes them and must pay eventually, and which represents no charity but recognition of the fact that these men are entitled to payment for lost opportunity and sacrifices in the war.

This newspaper demands on behalf of the veterans that the Government supply them with jobs or pay them the bonus now.

It ought not to be necessary for any veteran to walk or ride on a freight car hundreds or thousands of miles from home to the Capitol at Washington to get simple justice from the Government.

The men ask only a chance to live, and they are entitled to it. Many of them already in Washington have offered to work for $1 a day, if no better job could be found, but even $1-a-day jobs are not forthcoming.

There has been much talk about "inflation," failure to balance the Budget, "danger to the gold standard," lack of confidence in Europe, and Heaven knows what besides, if the soldiers' bonus should be paid.

There was no such talk when this country plunged into a war, started by other nations and sent into the Army the men that now ask for just treatment.

As it is unnecessary to recall the services rendered by the soldiers, so it should be unnecessary to recall the Government attitude toward money expenditures when the war was on.

We talk now of "balancing the Budget" or "inflation of the dollar," or of "what Europe will think."

We did not bother about those things when we were shipping to Europe 3,000,000 men that now demand just treatment.

Our Government spent money at the rate of $10,000,000,000 a year. We had billions to lend to every country in Europe; we ran the Nation into debt by more than twenty thousand million dollars without a moment's hesitation in order to help foreign governments with a war that was not ours, one for which we were not responsible, a war which was in no way a menace to us.

The recent history of this country proves that the United States can spend the money when it wants to spend the money, while veterans of that war in which Uncle Sam poured out his billions so freely are neglected. If the Government refuses to pay to the soldiers the bonus that is due them, that will be because the Government does not want to pay.

What a disgrace that men that gave their time, sacrificed their opportunities, risked their lives, should now be sleeping on straw in sheds here, eating thin, poorly made cabbage soup, and told repeatedly in the newspapers on official authority:

"We are very hard up; we can not feed you 5,000 men much longer. We expect you to get out of here as soon as possible."

We were able to feed 3,000,000 of the same soldiers in Europe for the benefit of other countries.

We were able to ship 3,000,000 of them across the ocean, paying British shipowners gigantic sums for carrying our men to defend them.

We were able to lend ten thousand million dollars to foreign countries to help them in their fighting, billions that we shall not get back.

What a disgrace to say that a Nation that could afford ten billions for foreigners and forty-five billions for war can not now find two billions to save from want the veterans for whom work can not be found. The Government should and it must pay these men their bonus to enable them to live or find jobs that will support them.

What sort of men are they, gathered here and warned by this rich Government that they must "get out as soon as possible because it is difficult to feed them and their presence is a menace of some kind of violence"?

Are they not worthy men; do they deserve the misfortunes that have fallen upon them and compel them against their will to demand at least decent consideration from a Government that promised so much?

They are not unworthy men that lie on the straw here and eat that thin cabbage soup, supplied in such niggardly fashion.

Take one at random, Joseph T. Angelo, from Camden, N. J. He wears a whistle around his neck and blows it when he wants others to help him get the straw together and fix up the beds.

When he blows his whistle they come, for they respect him, even though his Government seems not to respect him.

Joseph Angelo does not look spick and span, as when he went to the war at his country's request. His clothes are old and worn, his shoes not in good condition. But you notice two medals on his breast, souvenirs presented to him by a generous Government. If you ask how he got them, he is not enthusiastic, but he says, smiling: "They don't get my family any food."

One "medal" that he wears is the distinguished-service cross. The department records show that he got it, as a private in the Army, for rescuing his commanding officer under fire within 40 meters of the German machine guns. He has a wife and child, has been three years without work, and if the Government doesn't pay his bonus or give him a chance to work the tax gatherer will soon gather in his home.

A man from New York came to Washington to see if the Government really meant it when it talked about gratitude. He has had no work since last September, his wife and children are "camping with relatives." The home in which he lived has been taken from them, and he says "the $800 I would get as a bonus would come in plenty handy."

Another man, from Illinois, a graduate of Northwestern University, a certified public accountant, walks around helping to pile up the straw and do odd jobs about the veterans' camp, wearing shoes with holes in the soles that allow the stockings to touch the ground.

Elmer Jensen, leader of 553 men from Salt Lake City, says that all his men are out of work, 65 per cent are married, one has eight children. The Government might tell him:

"In these hard times a man ought not to have eight children."

But it did not hesitate about taking him over to Europe, without asking whether he ought to go or not.

While the proudest and richest country in the world fixes up its tax bills, votes one billion or two billions to be sent to the banks in order to "relieve them," manages through its gigantic "reconstruction fund" money to be used to reconstruct the mistakes of high financiers, the men that fought in the war sleep out of doors on straw when it is not raining, crowd into empty, cheerless buildings when it rains, wash themselves in the Potomac River or in barrels, commit no acts of violence, respect the flag that flies above their camp.

They hope that the Government that can give a thousand millions to a reconstruction committee to help disabled banks and hundreds of millions to help railroads in difficulties will decide that it can afford at least to pay the soldiers their bonus or else give them work.

Not to provide jobs for these soldiers in a gigantic public construction program, or not to pay these soldiers the money to which they are entitled, not to relieve their distress and that of their wives and children, is a brutal disgrace, and the country should not endure it.

To this subject this and other newspapers owned by William Randolph Hearst will return, continuing to discuss it until the matter is settled with justice to the soldiers and honor to the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the Washington Post this morning carries a leading editorial under the title "Send Veterans Home." I have read the editorial very carefully. I think the editorial contains some good advice to the Congress of the United States. I ask permission to insert the editorial at this point in my remarks.

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

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Thursday, June 9, 1932]

SEND VETERANS HOME

The demagogues who encouraged the march of veterans upon Washington are now trying to exculpate themselves. They can not succeed. They are responsible for the present dangerous situation, and will be morally responsible for any disorders that may occur.

The parade of veterans on Tuesday evening made a very favorable impression upon all beholders. Those who marched are true Americans. They are not trying to stir up mischief. Many of them are pitifully misinformed. Others have learned much since their arrival and would be glad to dissuade veterans from coming if they could.

More veterans are on the way. Their presence will make matters worse. With all the good will in the world, these men will not remain peaceable if they do not have food.

Congress is now grappling with the national problem of emergency relief. If that problem can be quickly solved, the problem of feeding and demobilizing the bonus army can be solved also. It is proposed that money shall be lent to the States for relief of the unemployed. Congress can provide that a sufficient sum to feed the veterans and to transport them to their home States shall be charged against the allotment to each State in proportion to the number of veterans from each State. The States, and not the United States, should be made to pay the cost of the veterans' expedition to Washington.

The veterans should be advised that unemployment relief must be sought at their homes, where they are known, and where the only fund for the purpose will be available. They should be provided with transportation back to their home States as soon as possible.

Unless the cost of feeding and dispersing the veterans' army is made a charge against the unemployment loan to the States the country will be confronted with the beginning of the Federal dole system. Once begun, the dole will expand until the total cost will exceed the $1,000,000,000 now paid annually to veterans.

Congress need not wait until the emergency relief legislation is completed. Both Houses and the administration have virtually agreed that there shall be an unemployment relief fund to be distributed through the States. Therefore the comparatively small sum required for feeding the veterans in Washington and sending them home can be appropriated at once, and charged against the loans to be made to the States.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as I said a while ago, we are confronted by a state of facts, not a theory. These men are in Washington. They are here to stay, so they say, until they get their bonus. I construe that to mean until the Congress votes upon their pending bill. If the House passes the bill, the measure will reach the Senate immediately thereafter. These men, as I interpret their attitude, will remain here until the Senate likewise votes upon their measure. If Congress will act upon their petition and give them a vote and give them an answer, that is what they ask. If we could get a unanimous-consent agreement that a vote is to be had before adjournment, then, instead of these veterans sending for their friends and sending to their homes for supplies, they would commence immediately to make their plans for evacuation of this so-called camp.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that these veterans may be assured that, in the event the other branch of the Congress passes the bill, the Senate will agree to consider the bill promptly and give them a prompt reply in the form of a vote. If that can be done, these men will soon begin their plans for getting away from Washington. While they are here they should be taken care of. They should be treated like human beings. At the present time there is not an animal on a farm in this section of the country that does not have better treatment than these men are having. Animals at least are provided with food, but these men have nothing.

Inasmuch as the bill is not before the Senate I can not ask unanimous consent that a vote be arranged for it, but I serve notice that the moment the bill reaches this body, if it does, I shall be active in trying to arrange to give these men the consideration to which they are entitled, and that consideration is an early vote upon their so-called bonus bill.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator has referred during the course of his remarks to a very practical proposition. I wish the Senator might give his attention particularly as I offer a suggestion.

The Senator referred to the possibility of terrific rainstorms in the District, the possibility of continuous rains, in which event, if this large number of men who are now encamped in Washington remain here, we are threatening and menacing everyone in the District of Columbia. Even without the weather conditions to which the Senator refers, there is a really serious problem confronting the people of the District of Columbia. As I understand, there are several thousand of those men here to-day. I think the Senator mentioned some 10,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes, sir; there are approximately 10,000.

Mr. BLAINE. There are approximately 10,000. They are billeted in places that have inadequate sanitary facilities, inadequate housing facilities, under any circumstances that might prevail. Clearly it is going to be impossible to get a vote upon the bonus bill in the Senate until the House acts; and it is very apparent that the House will not act, and, perhaps, can not act under its rules, until next Monday. That will mean that the bill could not have committee consideration and reach the Senate, unless there were unanimous consent for its consideration, until next Wednesday or Thursday.

I understand that the funds of the local charitable organizations have been exhausted. These men come from all over the Union. I presume nearly every State is represented among the former-service men now in the District of Columbia. The responsibility for this situation should not rest upon the people of the District of Columbia; they have no voice in the Government; and yet, if the situation continues, as in all probability it is going to continue, with this large number of men who are here now and larger aggregations of men who will be here within the next few days, we shall be subjecting the people of the District to the possibility of an outbreak of disease and to a condition that will be a menace to the people who reside in the District, and will be particularly a menace to the former-service men who are here. So there are two classes of people to be considered in this situation.

It does not make any difference what our views may be upon the bonus; it does not make any difference what our views may be upon the subject that was discussed in the colloquy between the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]; but here is a practical proposition; it is a very serious one, in my opinion, and I do not believe the Congress is justified in permitting the situation to go on without immediate attention.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at this point let me make this suggestion: These men are here because they are veterans of the World War, because at one time they were inducted into the service of the United States, wore the American uniform, and marched and fought under the American flag. The Congress sent them to that duty by declaring war in 1917. The Congress faces a serious responsibility. Those here now who voted for war face a double responsibility.

Mr. President, war is expensive, and the only way to avoid the expense, suffering, and misery of war is to find a plan to prevent war.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I am in full accord with what the Senator from Oklahoma has said regarding these former-service men. They have a right to be here. There is not any power in the Government of the United States or of the District of Columbia to load those men upon trucks and forcibly send them out of the District of Columbia. No such power exists in any jurisdiction.

How long those men are going to remain, I do not know, but they are here; they have a right to be here; they are human beings. We ought not to menace or jeopardize the lives of those men or their health and the lives of the people and the health of the people of the District of Columbia. The Congress of the United States has a double liability, a double obligation, a twofold obligation, which ought to be discharged immediately. These men must eat; they must be fed, as the Senator has said. I am not going into a long discussion of that proposition, but it is obvious to everyone that the demands of humanity would require the feeding of these men.

Taking into consideration the lack of sanitary facilities that are afforded these men, the possibility of weather conditions that may come, or even though the most delightful weather may continue, under any circumstances if we shall delay the consideration of the question of feeding those men for many more days, we do not know what situation we shall face here in the District of Columbia.

So I have presented this matter from the practical standpoint, from the standpoint of the welfare of the men who

have a right to be here, and from the standpoint of the men, women, and children who reside in this District. I think, Mr. President, the obligation is such a heavy one that some action ought to be taken. I am a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. Before that committee there is a bill, which was introduced by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN]. I am perfectly willing and anxious to vote that bill out with a favorable report. I am quite certain that the committee, if it were convened, would vote the bill out with a favorable report; and if some Senator should ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from the further consideration of that bill, so that it could be brought before the Senate immediately, I rather assume there would be no Senator who would offer an objection.

That bill may not carry the necessary appropriation; it may be necessary to call the chief of police, General Glassford, before the committee in order to ascertain what may be the minimum or maximum needs to take care of these men; but, at any rate, it ought to be done quickly. We ought to have some measure before this body when we convene on to-morrow upon which we may act, in order that we may take care of and protect these men and protect the people of the District of Columbia under circumstances which are due to no fault of the men who are visiting Washington and demanding of the Government the passage of the soldiers' bonus bill.

I do not want to make the request respecting the bill which is before the committee of which I am a member; but when the chairman of the committee shall appear in the Chamber, I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will ask him whether or not he would take any offense or have any objection if a motion were made to discharge the Committee on the District of Columbia from the further consideration of the bill, so that the Senate may consider and pass it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, citizens of this country have a right to come to Washington at any time they see fit and proper. When the present session of Congress convened in December citizens came here and asked for aid and assistance; they asked for the passage of a bill creating a superbank in order that such bank might lend them money. The Congress responded very promptly. I well remember that in the early days of the session we worked here until something like 11 o'clock one night to pass their bill.

Mr. President, when so large a group of citizens submits a petition, signed by millions, they have a right to expect consideration of such petition; and they have a right to expect a vote upon their bill.

If the Congress could assure these representatives of the millions of veterans that they are to receive consideration, and a speedy vote, the newspapers would carry such information throughout the country and the men from every angle of the compass now moving toward Washington would stop their journey and many of them would turn back toward home; and the veterans who are here would have a different attitude toward the future, and would plan to make their exit from Washington at a very early date.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. Does the Senator realize that if the vote shall be delayed for any considerable length of time, as it may be, the days intervening may jeopardize the health of these men and the health of the people of the District of Columbia? During the interim it would seem to me that some provision ought to be made by the National Government to feed those men, and to provide them adequate sanitation, so that both the men who are here as visitors, and who have a right to be here, and the people of the District together will be protected against any untoward situation that may arise out of conditions that are very apt to obtain under the circumstances.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The suggestion, let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin, was made in the hope that something might be done to stop this march on Washington. If the men who are now coming here could be assured that there is to be a vote upon their bill, in my judgment, many of them, if not all of them, would cease their journey toward this city and return to their former homes. I think such assurance should be given the veterans at the earliest possible date.

Mr. BLAINE. I heartily concur in that suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, we have wandered very far afield, which is not an unusual practice in the Senate, from the particular motion which is before the Senate. The question of beer is not before us; the question of a bonus is not before us. Questions have been discussed here for hours that have no relation whatever to the pending motion. I must call the attention of the Senate to what the motion is. The motion of the Senator from Tennessee is that this bill be recommitted to the committee with instructions to cut the appropriations it contains 10 per cent.

Mr. President, I have followed the Senator from Tennessee quite uniformly in his efforts to bring about economies. I think I have voted for all the motions that have been made with reference to reductions in appropriations; but there is a limit to such reductions. A 10 per cent reduction as applied to one bill might be all right; it might be justified; but a 10 per cent reduction applied to another bill might be all wrong; it might not be economy at all. This bill had been reduced to the limit before it came to the Senate. We reduced it before the Senate committee. I happen to know something about the facts in this connection.

I am very much opposed to the Senator's motion to recommit the bill with instructions to cut it 10 per cent. Having served on the subcommittee dealing with the bill, I became acquainted with these facts; and I want to state to the Senate that I think it would be a great mistake, and an unwise and unwarranted procedure, to agree to a motion like this.

I am opposed to destroying the fabric of our national defense. I am opposed to paralyzing the peace-time operations of the Army; and that is what we would do if we cut this bill any more than it already has been cut.

I desire to call attention to what the Secretary of War said before our committee:

> The total of the War Department appropriation bill now before you is $392,586,146. This is a reduction of more than $84,000,000 under the current appropriation, and nearly $19,000,000 under the Budget. Sixty-two per cent of this drastic curtailment is assessed against the military activities, which are decreased by $52,000,000.

Why talk about another 10 per cent? Why discuss any more reductions with these facts before us, undisputed and unquestioned?

If we are going to have any Army, if we are going to have any means of national defense, if we are going to go on with the peace-time activities of the Army, or the civilian activities, if you please, such as the river and harbor improvements, flood control, and those things that we have already provided for, we must give them the appropriations that are carried in this bill. If we reduce them, we cut down all these activities, we cripple the Army, and we paralyze these operations that have been provided for and which we think are essential. That is not economy at all. That is destruction. That is waste.

I hope the motion will be defeated.

Mr. REED. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement, and then a request of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

As we all know, the Panama Canal Zone is not a military government; and the provisions in the bill relating to the Panama Canal have nothing to do with military activities, but rather with nonmilitary activities.

There are two projects in the Panama Canal Zone which are very important. One is the Panama Railroad, operated by a corporation which is owned by the Government of the United States; the other is the Panama Canal Zone proper,

which has under its jurisdiction, through a civil governor, the operation of the locks in the Panama Canal.

I call attention to the fact that there are three items in the appropriation. One is for maintenance and operation. That item relates primarily to the locks and the upkeep and the operation of the locks. Another item is sanitation. All sanitation in the Canal Zone is under the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States. The other item is the civil government.

The Panama Canal Zone is the most perfected socialistic state in the world. The Government of the United States owns the fee title to the land. It does not convey any title to the land. No one can construct a building in the zone without a permit from the civil authority, and it is only a permission. No one can conduct a business in the Canal Zone without a permit from the Government of the United States. No one can remain in the Canal Zone without the consent of the Government of the United States. The Panama Railroad is a Government railroad, operated by a corporation organized and owned by the Government. All the machine shops that are necessary to take care of the civilian machine work are owned and operated by the Government. In fact, everywhere in the Panama Canal Zone—outside, of course, of the cities of Panama and Colon, where the Republic of Panama has jurisdiction—the Government of the United States has a perfect socialized state, and it is purely a business proposition. It has nothing to do with the military affairs of our Government.

There are peculiar situations obtaining in the Canal Zone. It is in the Tropics. The Government conducts the necessary hospitals. It has installed and operates all of the water system and the sanitary system, the health service, all of the essential services; and the whole operation of the government of the Panama Canal, so far as the appropriation is concerned, relates to a business organization which turns into the Public Treasury, as I recall, about $16,000,000 a year in profits.

I am sorry that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is not present, because I intended to call to his attention the fact that when the economy bill goes into conference certain exceptions ought to be made. The Panama police should be exempted from the act. There should be some modification of the act with regard to the workers on the Panama Railroad, because those workers labor six days a week—not five and a half days, as in civil employment in continental United States. So that unless some provision is made in the economy bill to protect the men who work upon the railroad owned and operated by the Government, they will lose double the amount of time without pay that the civilian employees in the continental United States will lose; and I hope the committee of conference will take those two items into consideration.

Let me say that the salary reduction, whether the provision made by the House or the amendment adopted in the Senate is finally adopted, is effective against the employees of the Government of the Panama Canal Zone and also the employees of the Panama Railroad. Therefore, in view of that situation, to cut off 10 per cent on the operation and maintenance of the locks might, to a very large extent, and no doubt would, interfere with international trade and jeopardize the successful operation of the canal. It would also, no doubt, interfere with the sanitary conditions, which must be kept perfect in the Panama Canal Zone on account of the zone being near the Equator. I see no undertaking for which appropriations are made under the subject of the Panama Canal that can be reduced without jeopardizing the business interests of the Government as well as other interests in which the United States has a vital concern in the Canal Zone.

I had hoped, therefore, that the Senator from Tennessee would except from his motion the provisions relating to the Panama Canal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in answer to what the Senator says, I desire to say that this morning I outlined 14 cuts in appropriations in this bill that I felt ought to be made. I did not include the Panama Canal Zone. It is not my purpose to include it if the bill goes back to the committee, because I am familiar with the facts as stated by the Senator from Wisconsin; and I had made up my mind, before the Senator brought the matter to the attention of the Senate, that there could not very well be a cut in the Panama Canal Zone.

I say that for the reason that if the Senator will look at the report of the Secretary of War for 1931, he will find the following statement on page 268:

> Tolls levied during the year on commercial seagoing vessels amounted to $24,645,456.57, as compared with $27,076,890.01 for 1930, a decrease of $2,431,433.44, or 9 per cent. Cargo carried through the canal during the year amounted to 25,082,000 long tons, as compared with 30,030,232 tons for 1930, a decrease of 16.5 per cent.
>
> The net income from tolls and other miscellaneous receipts known as "canal revenue" was $14,847,227.21. This was less than the net revenues for the fiscal year 1930 by $3,235,224.57, or approximately 18 per cent.

Now I read from page 11 of the same report.

> Total net revenue for the year from all sources (Panama Canal and Panama Railroad, exclusive of the Panama Railroad Steamship Line) was $16,401,375.10, as compared with $20,367,297.72 for 1930. The aggregate net revenue from all sources was less than that for any year since 1925. This shortage was due primarily to decreased shipping activities for the year as compared with the preceding five years.

It will be seen that the present bill on page 80 carries an appropriation of $11,146,661. That is somewhat less than the revenue. During the good years of 1925, 1926, 1927, and 1928, and even in 1929, my recollection is—I have not the figures before me, but my recollection is—that the income from the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad aggregated about $25,000,000. We were making a very excellent profit on our investment down there at that time. But since that time, during the depression, the same thing has occurred there that has occurred here, and the revenues have dropped considerably.

But, for the reason the Senator has stated, and for the additional reasons I have stated, it is not my purpose to interfere in any way; and if the bill goes back, there will be no action on my part to reduce in any way those items. I hope the Senator will remember that under the terms of the motion the committee is merely to reduce the aggregate, not any specific item, and I have already mentioned the items which I think ought to be reduced. I do not think the Panama Canal appropriation is one of those items.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator perfect his motion?

Mr. McKELLAR. I could not very well do that.

Mr. BLAINE. Will he not add "except as to the Panama Canal appropriation"?

Mr. McKELLAR. There will be no necessity of that, because I assure the Senator that item will not be reduced, so far as I am able to prevent it. I do not think a reduction ought to be made in that activity of the Government.

Mr. BLAINE. I know the assurance of the Senator from Tennessee is a valuable assurance——

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it is just my own vote. I could not assure anything more; but I think the Senator is entirely right in his contention.

Mr. BLAINE. There would be no harm, then, in amending the motion to except the Panama Canal appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator desires that, I have no objection to that being contained in the motion.

Mr. BLAINE. I ask that that be done.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will modify my motion to say, "with the exception of the Panama Canal."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator so modifies his motion. The question is on the motion as modified.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I listened with some amazement, some concern, and considerable disappointment, to the controversy between the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. I heard all that was said by the Senator from Montana and I confess I was not impressed that he had made any threat or used any language that meant a threat.

It did seem to me that the Senator from New Hampshire was going far afield to find a reason for voting against the motion.

He said that he had voted for each one of the other motions by which the various appropriation bills had been sent back to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to cut them 10 per cent, and that because of what the Senator from Montana said he was going to vote the other way on this motion. Mr. President, I want to have a pair with the Senator from New Hampshire. I voted against every one of the motions to return the appropriation bills to the committee with directions to bring in a bill reduced by 10 per cent, and I will now vote for this motion to send the pending bill back with instructions to bring in a report cutting the aggregate 10 per cent. If the Senator from New Hampshire is moved to vote the other way because of the speech of the Senator from Montana, I will say that I was so impressed with the speech of the Senator from Montana that I have decided to vote for the motion.

Mr. President, we have all been acting in the very best of faith, trying to reduce appropriations, and to cut down expenses. I confess that I was somewhat disappointed when I found the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Pennsylvania both advocating various items of taxation in the tax bill which grated very hard on me, which it was very difficult for me to support. But I followed them. In the main, I went through with them. We all united with the chairman of the Committee on Finance when he asked us to stay late at night and to start early in the morning. We discommoded ourselves, we neglected all our work, in order to help the committee dispose of and finally pass the tax bill, which everybody hoped would balance the Budget.

After all that teamwork, and those good-faith actions, we have seen the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Pennsylvania in the lead, in the main, in destroying the good work of that bill, which balanced the Budget, and opposing appropriations which would cut down the expenses of the Government, opposing items in the economy bill which would cut down expenses, so that by their own work they have been instrumental to quite a degree in unbalancing the Budget which they worked so hard to balance

Only yesterday they helped to cut out $40,000,000 of savings. Now, in the pending bill, they proposed to use public funds to carry on an appropriation by which schools are held all over the United States, and 260,000 of the younger citizens are taught that, for instance, the election of judges is something that will go far to destroy our Government, that the initiative is entirely and fundamentally wrong, that the referendum is wrong, that the public ownership of public utilities anywhere is wrong, and that if these things are carried on, our Government is going to fail, our Government is going eventually to be destroyed by these various things. That kind of doctrine is being taught to our people and the spreading of it being paid for by the Federal Government through appropriations made in this particular bill.

It seems to me, therefore, that if there has been an appropriation bill which we are justified in sending back to the committee, as the pending motion will do with the War Department bill, with instructions to reduce the aggregate 10 per cent, if there has been such a case, it is before us now, and I do not hesitate to vote in favor of the motion.

Something was said by the Senator from New Hampshire about threats, indicating that threats had been made. Something was said about the large so-called bonus army now encamped within sight of the Capitol. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that no threat should move us; but I have not heard of any threat. Nobody so far has threatened me. I have not felt that it is necessary for me to carry weapons in order to defend myself at night upon the streets. I do not believe any of us have been frightened or scared by any threat. That does not mean that I approve of the action of these ex-soldiers who have come here by the thousands in order to get what they call the bonus. I think it was a mistake. I do not believe they ought to have come. I do not believe they have accomplished anything by coming. But that is their business, and not mine. If they want to come, it is a free country, and they can come.

I have not heard of those men threatening anybody. I do not expect they will threaten anybody. The person who is trying to excite somebody to fright and saying that we are going to be threatened, that we are going to be mobbed, is running away from his own shadow. No danger has yet appeared.

Mr. President, suppose it were true; is that any reason why we should carry large appropriations for a large Army? Are we going to build up an army now to fight the soldier boys who just a few years ago were carrying our flag in foreign lands? Are we going now to build up an army to fight the veterans of the great World War? I do not believe we ought to do that. I am not afraid to intrust the reins of this Government in the hands of those veterans. I do not believe we would run any risk if we did that. I do not believe we are justified in now saying to the country and to the world that our soldier boys, who went through hell fighting our battles in a war that was going to make the world safe for democracy, and which only tumbled everything upside down and made the world a thousand times worse than it ever was before—I do not believe those boys who made the fight under our flag are dangerous now to the perpetuity of our Government.

I have talked with many people who saw the parade the other night, and who have gone through the camps, and they have not seen anything "red," they have not found communists, and, as I said this morning, communists are made by bad government. Communists avoid good government. If we want to save our country from the danger of communism, we ought to see that our people are happy and contented.

If there is a danger of rebellion coming, we can not throw it off by having our Army use public funds to try to inculcate in the minds of our people the idea that things which many of the States have regarded as fundamental principles of democracy are in fact dangerous to free government.

Why was the initiative adopted? Why was the recall adopted? Why have judges been elected? Why has there been a demand in many places for the Government ownership of public utilities? It is because of the injustice that has confronted the country and the communities from the exactions of the great utility companies. Every municipal plant distributing energy to the citizens of a locality has come into existence because of injustice, because of wrong, because Government officials have not fully complied with the law, because big business, big organized monopoly has insisted on bearing down and getting unholy profits from the men and the women of this country who toil and who make up the backbone and the sinew of our citizenship. They have all come on that account. There is not an exception.

Why has the initiative been put in force? It has been because experience has shown that some instrument of that kind is necessary in order to safeguard the rights of the common people against the inroads and the merciless and unholy things which have been done by legislatures and other officials controlled by selfish monopoly.

Why has the recall been brought about? For the same reason. Why are people electing judges; why are they resisting the cry that our Army is now trying to inculcate in the minds of the young men that an elected judge is a dangerous sign in a democracy? It is because judges selected for life, with salaries larger than the ordinary person in the community receives, being given for life a power over their fellow men that is given to nobody else, have abused that power, have in many cases been merciless and tyrannical in the use of it.

The people have said, therefore, "We will elect our judges." The cry that goes up against Federal judges now is that they abuse the power in many cases. I do not believe they all do. I think that as a whole we have a remarkably fine judiciary. But this cry which comes from the common people who have suffered injustice on account of the tyranny of men who hold office for life can not be drowned, that cry can not be squelched, by a lot of Army officials, paid for from the taxpayers' money, going out in

the country through all our communities trying to make people believe that an elected judiciary has no place in a democracy, that the initiative has no place in a free government, that public ownership ought to be driven out and our public utilities turned over to the tender mercies of an organized oligarchy, of an organized trust that reaches from ocean to ocean and from the Gulf to the Lakes in every community, going into the churches, into the school districts, into the municipalities, into the lodges, sowing their seeds of dissension, trying to build up a sentiment in the country opposed to government ownership, paying for it all out of the pennies that the washerwoman and the laboring man pay for the electric current they use, paying for it all from the money obtained from the very men and very women whom they are trying to deceive and to fool.

Mr. President, it seems to me time now that we should call a halt. We can do it by cutting this item out of the appropriation bill. Will it hurt anybody in this time of distress, when we are in the greatest depression we have ever had in the history of our country? Will it hurt anything to suspend for a year or two these instrumentalities which, as a matter of fact, have nothing to do with the efficiency of the Army or the Navy? We got along a great many years, more than a hundred years, without any of them, and we will continue to get along if we should abolish them for a year or two.

I say again, there are a good many things about the training camps that I think are good. I think the physical training given to the young men of the country is a good thing, but it is not necessary to get that training in a military camp. It is not necessary, in order to get that training, to listen to a lot of doctrine that I think is unpatriotic, that goes to the very foundation of our liberty and our Government, trying to teach the young men of the country, with money that we pay them from our taxes, that these things which millions of our people regard as necessary in a democracy are as a matter of fact treasonable and will ultimately bring about destruction of government.

I have no hesitancy in voting to send the bill back to the committee and I hope, if it comes back with some of these items left as they are now, that the Senate of the United States will strike them out when the time comes.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I am sorry that the eloquence of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] has been so powerful as to cause both the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] and the Senator from Nebraska to vote otherwise than they had intended to vote before that speech.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not have any feeling in regard to my vote, because that only emphasizes what I had already concluded to do.

Mr. CUTTING. I have been voting, as the Senator from Nebraska has voted, against every one of these motions to recommit bills for a 10 per cent cut. It seems to me a very foolish and futile policy. That has been proven by the cuts we have made on previous appropriation bills. It may be that in some cases the House has sent appropriation bills which could be cut and should be cut, not only 10 per cent but perhaps 20 per cent or more, but to assume offhand that any bill which comes from the House ought to be cut the exact sum of 10 per cent, no matter what the merits of the issue may be, seems to me a very poor compliment to the coordinate body at the other end of the Capitol.

I want to say with regard to the speech of the Senator from Montana that I do not consider it revolutionary, subversive, or in any other way offensive. I think it was a perfectly proper thing to call attention to the facts to which the Senator did call attention. The only criticism I would make of the speech is that it seems to brand all who vote against the motion to recommit as being Budget balancers at all costs, as being opposed to relief for the suffering, as being opposed to a public-works program, or to the demands of the army of visitors which has come to us at the present time.

I think the Senator from Montana knows that I have consistently preached that the balancing of the Budget was infinitely less important at the present time than the giving of direct relief to the suffering and the providing of employment to every man for whom the Government is able to find a job.

So far as the question of the bonus is concerned, since 1924, when I was commander of the American Legion for the Department of New Mexico, I have believed and stated that a cash option should have been included in the bill at that time, on less favorable terms, of course, than would have been provided for the ex-service men who chose to wait for the final maturity of their certificates. There has been no time since then that I personally would not have voted to amend the original adjusted compensation act to include a cash option, and I should so vote now if I had the opportunity. I do not think that the arrival of the ex-service men will promote that cause in any respect. It will probably lead a great many who would otherwise have voted for their cause into voting the other way. Nevertheless I do not think anyone could have watched that parade two days ago without being profoundly moved at the idea that a whole generation of men, whom the Congress of the United States took out of private life and put into the war, is now at our doors pleading for the elementary right of citizens to be allowed to work or, if that is not given them, for the payment of a debt which they feel to be just.

Possibly these men would receive less permanent relief through an immediate cash payment at the present time than they would receive in employment through the enactment of some substantial measure providing for public works. I myself have proposed a bond issue of $5,000,000,000 for that purpose. I am doubtful in my own mind whether even that vast sum is adequate to deal with the situation.

But, Mr. President, we are not voting on any of these questions at the present time. This is a vote on a motion to send back to the committee a bill which has already cut down the present Army appropriations by 17 per cent. That motion would instruct the committee to take out another 10 per cent, or rather to make a 10 per cent reduction under the figures proposed by the House. I served on the subcommittee which reported the bill now before the Senate, and I do not believe that any such cut is possible within the bounds of rational legislation. We have already taken $80,000,000 off the department estimates. While I have not figured out the cut which would be required, I suppose it would amount to something like $40,000,000 more.

Mr. REED. It would be $39,000,000.

Mr. CUTTING. That seems to be a cut quite out of proportion with what any other department of the Government has been forced to take at the present time. I very much hope that the motion of the Senator from Tennessee will not prevail.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, may I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the present amount proposed to be appropriated for the Army alone is $290,000,000, which is more than twice as much as the Army appropriation for the British Army at the present time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that statement has been made several times, but I am perfectly certain it is incorrect. The latest exact figures that I have are for the fiscal year 1930. At that time the British budget for their Army was more than the United States Budget, and that was our high year in our Budget for the Army. In that year Great Britain, with an army twice the size of ours—and she pays them very much less I might say—was spending $334,937,000.

Mr. FRAZIER. Did not that include their navy and their air force, too?

Mr. REED. Oh, no. Our Army appropriation for that year was $332,405,000. The British military appropriation does not include their air forces. The American appropriation includes that part of our air force which is attached to the Army.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, may I call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the fact that, according to my understanding, the British Army is not employed on any of the public-works programs which in this country we employ our Army to perform.

Mr. REED. The Senator is exactly right. At the present time the British Army is 100,000 men larger than ours.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, according to the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania, $290,000,000 of this bill is for the Army itself. That is not for the river and harbor provisions of the bill at all. The $290,000,000 is for the Army itself. According to Congressman COLLINS's statement appearing on page 10249 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10, the British budget provided for the army, navy, and air force an appropriation of $364,753,228. The British Army budget alone is but $127,525,560.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have not voted for any of the motions previously made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to return appropriation bills to the committee with instructions to reduce the total amount by 10 per cent. I have not voted for those motions because I did not believe that the civil arm of the Government should be required to bear the entire brunt of the economies to be achieved at this session of Congress. The total expenditure of this Government for past wars and preparation for future wars, 20 years after the World War, amounts, according to a statement made recently by the President of the United States, to about 70 per cent of this year's Budget.

Therefore, Mr. President, the economies attained by the motions of the Senator from Tennessee and by the Senate up until this time have been taken from appropriation bills carrying the funds for the 30 per cent of the Budget which goes to maintain the entire civil arm of the Government. I suggested to the Senator from Tennessee on yesterday that while he had been very successful in cutting the appropriation bills that deal with the civil branches of the Government, and which render daily service to the citizens, when he came to offer similar motions to apply to the Army and Navy appropriation bills he would find a very different attitude on the part of Members of this body.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that while there is an apparent reduction in the bill of $3,000,000 from appropriations for the Army, it does not come from the appropriations for military activities of the Army at all, but it comes from deductions made from appropriations for civil activities of the Army, $5,000,000 plus being deducted from the appropriations for rivers and harbors alone, so that the bill really provides for an increase over the House appropriations of $2,000,000 plus.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. It merely emphasizes the point I am making.

Mr. President, I have not been one of those who participated in creating the panic in the public mind concerning the balancing of the Budget; I have not been a party to it either on the floor of the Senate or in anything I have said outside of this Chamber. The fact remains, however, that Members of this body, members of the administration, men in positions of leadership in our economic and financial life, and the press have created a panic in the country concerning the balancing of the Budget. Yet when those same gentlemen are confronted with a proposal to apply to the appropriations for the Army the same rule of economy they have applied to all the civil functions of the Government, they balk; they find excuses not to apply that rule to the one branch of the Federal Government expenditures which, taken with those for the Navy, account for the greater share of the outgo of the money that is gathered in through taxation.

Our expenditures, Mr. President, for this purpose following the "war to end war" have been continuously mounting through the years. In 1916, after we had launched a preparedness program, we spent for military activities $122,392,363; in 1922, after the war, we spent $329,000,050; in 1923 we expended $284,112,900; in 1924 the expenditure was $250,714,592; in 1925 the expenditure was $262,087,036; in 1926 it was $267,260,488; in 1927 it was slightly reduced to $267,124,000; in 1928 it rose to $294,957,000; in 1929 it jumped to $313,093,000; in 1930, the first year of the depression, it jumped again to $325,400,742; and even in 1931 it mounted to $339,604,259. The expenditures of the United States Government for national defense have increased from 1913 to 1930 by 197 per cent, the largest increase in such expenditures of any of the great powers of the world. Our total expenditures for armament in 1931 were $707,425,000.

A majority of the Senate has been willing, in order to achieve economies, to take 10 per cent out of the pay of the lower-salaried employees of the Federal Government; but, Mr. President, according to Doctor Lubin, a noted economist connected with the Brookings Institute, if the 732,460 civil employees of the Federal Government who are to-day threatened with a cut in wages were to relinquish all their wages and salaries during the coming fiscal year, the savings to the United States Government would hardly be equal to two-thirds of the annual Federal expenditures for past and prospective wars.

One of the items which has been under discussion in this bill is the item for the citizens' military training camps. I wish again to direct the attention of those who hesitate to take the same action in connection with this bill that they have taken regarding all the other appropriation bills which have been considered by this body to the fact that Major General Summerall, when he retired as Chief of Staff, had this to say about the citizens' military training camps:

> It is apparent that the camps do not directly serve to promote any military objective. The chief benefit to the Army lies in the increased confidence in its personnel on the part of the civilian population which has followed from the many contacts incident to the conduct of the camps.

In other words, Mr. President, the same gentlemen who have been shouting that drastic economies were necessary in order to maintain the credit structure of the Federal Government now refuse to apply the 10 per cent reduction rule to this bill which they applied to the other appropriation bills. It is evident they will vote to give the Army the money necessary to run the citizens' military training camps for instance when a former chief of staff has indicated that they are of no service so far as a military objective is concerned and that all the money expended for them accomplishes is to help carry on a propaganda among the citizenship of the country for the Army and for larger appropriations for its enlargement and maintenance.

I pointed out early in the afternoon that 339,061 boys participating in the citizens' military training camps have provided only 10 reserve officers; that half of the graduates who accept commissions let them lapse by showing no further interest; and, so far as the Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit is concerned, of 179,000 boys taking drill in educational institutions last year, only 5,150 became reserve officers, there being 833 graduates too young to receive commissions.

The Senate should be more consistent in its attitude toward the appropriation bills. Upon what theory will it refuse to reduce military appropriations and at the same time justify drastically cutting the independent offices appropriation bill, thereby crippling the investigation of the power companies, stopping the investigation of the chain-store organizations, stopping the investigation of the Cement Trust? It is said it is necessary to cut these appropriations in order to maintain the credit structure of the Government; but when the test comes on the Army bill, which accounts for a large percentage of the Government expenditures, the Senate is generous and declines to cut 10 per cent. Senators find excuses for changing their positions, even going so far as to seize upon the remarks made by another Senator as a justification for their inconsistencies.

Much has been said heretofore, Mr. President, relative to the military expenditures of France. I hold in my hand a clipping from the New York Times dated at Paris, June 8, from which I read as follows:

> France's new radical socialist government intends to reduce armament appropriations this year by nearly 10 per cent, the figure currently given being 1,500,000,000 francs, or $60,000,000. The reduction will be distributed among three services—the army, the navy, and the air force.

The nation which has been most militaristic since the war now recognizes that it can no longer maintain the enormous

expenditure for the maintenance of its military establishment.

In January, 1929, the President of the United States had this to say:

In the matter of Army outlay, I am in agreement with the Secretary of War to set up within the General Staff a commission of leading Army officers to reconsider our whole Army program, to see what services and other outlays have become obsolete through advancement of science and war methods, and what development programs can be well spread over longer periods in view of the general world outlook.

In September in a radio address the President said:

To-day we are engaged in a most hopeful discussion with other governments leading to this end

Referring to disarmament.

These are proposals which would relieve the backs of those who toil from gigantic expenditures and the world from the hate and fear which flows from the rivalry in building armaments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. While we have that expression from the President, here is what actually happened:

In 1928 there was expended for the Army $298,000,000.

In 1929 there was expended for the Army $416,000,000.

In 1930 there was expended for the Army $453,000,000.

In 1931 there was expended for the Army $478,000,000.

In 1932 there was expended for the Army $445,000,000.

While the President may have taken the position that he was in favor of reduction, it will be found from the figures, from the actual facts, that during the time he has been President we have had the most extravagant and the costliest Army we have ever had in the history of time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I was about to point out, before the Senator interrupted me, that despite these statements made by the Chief Executive, the appropriations for the Army have been mounting and mounting, mind you, during this period of depression; mounting during the very time when people were talking, in this Chamber and out of it, about reducing Government expenditures. It seems to me that in view of this situation we are entirely justified in pursuing with regard to this bill the course which the Senate has followed with regard to the bills carrying appropriations for the civil activities of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, the mounting burden of armaments in the world is, no doubt, one of the causes for the prolongation of this depression.

I should like to point out that in Great Britain between 1913 and 1930, armaments rose from $375,000,000 to $535,000,000, an increase of 42 per cent.

In France they rose from $348,000,000 in 1913 to $455,000,000 in 1930, an increase of 30 per cent.

In Italy they rose from $179,000,000 in 1913 to $258,000,000 in 1930, an increase of 44 per cent.

In Japan they rose from $95,000,000 in 1913 to $232,000,000 in 1930, an increase of 142 per cent.

Mr. GORE. Is that for the army and navy, both?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Both.

In Russia they rose from $447,000,000 in 1913 to $579,000,000 in 1929, an increase of 30 per cent.

In the United States they rose from $244,000,000 in 1913 to $727,000,000 in 1930, an increase of 197 per cent; or, as I said a moment ago, the largest for any great power in the world.

In 1913 the six Governments I have named spent $1,690,000,000 for armaments. In 1930 they expended $2,788,000,000, or an increase for the group as a whole of 65 per cent.

Mr. President, I hope that the motion offered by the Senator from Tennessee will prevail. I believe that if this bill is sent back to the committee and if the Secretary of War comes before the subcommittee, as the heads of other departments have come before other subcommittees in connection with other appropriation bills, a material saving may be made in this appropriation. I trust that the same procedure will be followed with regard to the naval appropriation bill; for unless the Senate adopts the same rule of economy with the Army and the Navy appropriations that have been applied to all of the other appropriation bills, its efforts to bring about economy become a sham and a hypocrisy.

I, for one, can not see how Senators who have participated in directing public attention to the necessity of balancing the Budget, who have stated here on the floor of the United States Senate that if the Budget was not balanced it would create a run on the American dollar, can vote against this motion. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], in charge of this bill, made an impassioned speech, which I characterized as an unfortunate utterance and could but inevitably have the effect of increasing the panic already created in this country concerning the soundness of the credit structure of this Government. Yet, as the Senator in charge of this appropriation bill for the Army, he is unwilling to vote, as he has voted on other appropriation bills, to send it back to the committee in order to make a substantial reduction in that branch of the service. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] voted to reduce the civil branches of the Government but he declines to reduce the Army by the same percentage.

I shall vote for this motion because I believe it is a sham on the part of the Senate to cut the civil services of the Government 10 per cent and then to refuse to make the same cut in the Army and Navy upon which we shall expend nearly $700,000,000 this year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has moved to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to cut the appropriations 10 per cent below the amount contained in the bill as passed by the House, with the exception of the appropriations for the Panama Canal.

On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered, The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea," and if I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. SCHALL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK]. Were I at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. TYDINGS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF]. I understand that if he were present he would vote on this question the same way that I shall vote. I therefore ask to be recorded. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. BINGHAM. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BROOKHART. I have a pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], who is absent. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] with the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—23

Bankhead	Couzens	Hull	Nye
Blaine	Dill	King	Shipstead
Borah	Frazier	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Gore	Logan	Walsh, Mass.
Capper	Hebert	McKellar	Wheeler
Costigan	Howell	Norris	

NAYS—47

Ashurst	Cutting	Kendrick	Smoot
Austin	Dale	Keyes	Steiwer
Bailey	Davis	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Barbour	Fletcher	Moses	Townsend
Bingham	George	Oddie	Trammell
Broussard	Goldsborough	Patterson	Tydings
Bulkley	Hale	Pittman	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hawes	Reed	Wagner
Carey	Hayden	Robinson, Ark.	Walcott
Cohen	Johnson	Sheppard	Watson
Connally	Jones	Shortridge	White
Coolidge	Kean	Smith	

NOT VOTING—26

Barkley	Fess	Long	Schall
Black	Glass	McNary	Stephens
Bratton	Glenn	Metcalf	Swanson
Brookhart	Harrison	Morrison	Walsh, Mont.
Byrnes	Hastings	Neely	Waterman
Copeland	Hatfield	Norbeck	
Dickinson	Lewis	Robinson, Ind.	

So Mr. MCKELLAR's motion to recommit the bill, with instructions, was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at this time I desire to introduce a resolution which, if agreed to, would have an effect upon the pending bill and all other appropriation bills. I ask to have the resolution read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to introduce a resolution, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 224), as follows:

Resolved, That it be declared the policy of the Senate to eliminate from H. R. 11897 and all other appropriation bills, including bills already enacted, all items for permanent improvements, such as for highway construction, public buildings, public works, flood control, river and harbor improvements, and that such items be ordered considered in connection with the bill for unemployment relief and that the cost of such permanent improvements be met with funds secured from the issuance and sale of bonds.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution may lie over under the rule.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I did not ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a matter of fact, may the Chair state to the Senator from Oklahoma, the resolution may not be introduced except by unanimous consent, because the Senate is already working under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I realize that the resolution would not be in order as an amendment to the pending bill. The resolution, if agreed to, would affect a bill which has already been passed, the Interior Department appropriation bill, but that is not in such shape that it could not be reached. That bill contains items which can be taken from it and placed in what might be termed an unemployment relief bill.

This resolution, of course, is subject to a point of order. I could only get it up by unanimous consent, and I serve notice that at the earliest possible time I shall ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair suggest that the Senator ask unanimous consent to introduce the resolution, have it printed, and lie on the table?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 21, strike out "$4,648,006" and insert "$6,281,824," so as to read:

Rental allowances, including allowances for quarters for enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available, $6,281,824.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 22, to strike out "$5,122,479" and to insert "$5,928,389," so as to read:

Subsistence allowances, $5,928,389, and the rental and subsistence allowances for the fiscal year 1933 shall be the same as for the fiscal year 1932, subject to such reduction therein as may be necessary under the provisions of section 102, Part II, of the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1933.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 9, to change the appropriation for pay, etc., of the Army from "$133,257,790" to "$137,042,204," and in line 12, after the word "discharges," to strike out "$132,457,790" and insert "$136,242,204," so as to read:

In all, $137,042,204, less $800,000 to be supplied by the Secretary of War for this purpose from funds received during the fiscal year 1933 from the purchase by enlisted men of the Army of their discharges, $136,242,204; and the money herein appropriated for "Pay, etc., of the Army" shall be accounted for as one fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 15, after the word "*Provided*," to strike out:

That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay any officer detailed as a military aide to any civil officer of the United States outside of the War Department except the President.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, commencing in line 18, to strike out:

Provided further, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for or on account of the maintenance of more than 50 military attachés.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, commencing in line 21, to strike out:

Provided further, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for or on account of the maintenance of more than 83 bands: *Provided further*.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 2, after "sec. 803)," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That after September 30, 1932, the sum herein appropriated for the pay of officers shall not be used for the pay of more than 10,000 commissioned officers on the active list of the Regular Army.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 6, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That after September 30, 1932, the number of officers of the line and promotion list officers on the active list of the Regular Army shall not exceed 8,930, to be distributed among the following grades in the proportion now authorized by law, namely: 17 in the grade of major general, 37 in the grade of brigadier general, 384 in the grade of colonel, 473 in the grade of lieutenant colonel, 1,411 in the grade of major, and 2,822 in the grade of captain, and in the grades of first and second lieutenant the total number shall not exceed 3,786.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, commencing in line 19, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That hereafter no promotion shall be made to fill a vacancy in any of the several grades designated unless such promotion be necessary within the number of such grade as herein prescribed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 22, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That upon the approval of this act, the President shall first select the general officers to be removed from the active list of the Army, and from the general officers remaining on the active list the President shall convene a board of five general officers, who shall select the officers to be removed from the active list in consequence hereof, and the action of such selection board as to the officers to be removed from the active list shall be final.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 5, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That any officer may be retired upon his own application if same be filed prior to September 1, 1932.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 8, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the selection by the board aforesaid of the officers to be removed from the active list shall be made solely on the basis of comparative ability, efficiency, and physical fitness, as disclosed by all now existing efficiency reports and other pertinent official War Department records, and that no removals hereunder shall be made of officers permanently commissioned in the Air Corps or the Judge Advocate General's Department, and that any person who, by any means whatsoever, shall attempt to influence or interfere with the action of said selection board in its work of reduction with respect to the retirement of any officer of the Army shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both, at the discretion of the court.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 23, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That all officers selected for removal from the active list in consequence hereof shall be placed on the unlimited retired list with pay at the rate of 75 per cent of active pay.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 3, to strike out:

Hereafter no person holding a civil office or position, appointive or elective, under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia or under any corporation, a majority of the capital stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States, shall be entitled, during the period of such incumbency, to retired pay from the United States for or on account of services as a commissioned officer in the military forces of the United States at a rate in excess of an amount which when combined with the annual rate of compensation from any such civil office or position, makes the total rate from both sources more than $3,000; and when the retired pay amounts to or exceeds the rate of $3,000 per annum such person shall be entitled to the pay of the civil office or position or the retired pay, whichever he may elect: *Provided*, That the term "retired pay" shall be construed to include credits for all military or naval service as lawfully may enter into the computation thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 22, to strike out:

TRAVEL, MILITARY AND CIVIL PERSONNEL

For mileage, reimbursement of actual traveling expenses, or per diem allowances in lieu thereof, as authorized by law for official travel on military and nonmilitary duty under the War Department, to commissioned officers (including discharged officers to their homes), warrant officers, contract surgeons, and expert accountant, Inspector General's Department; for transportation of troops, Philippine Scouts, nurses, flying cadets, enlisted men (including discharged enlisted men to their homes or places of enlistment); for transportation of recruits and recruiting parties and of applicants for enlistment between recruiting stations and recruiting depots; and rejected applicants for enlistment; for transportation of dependents of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men as provided by law; for transportation of general, paroled, escaped, and discharged prisoners and persons discharged from St. Elizabeths Hospital after transfer thereto from the military service to their homes or elsewhere as they may elect, the cost in each case not to be greater than to the place of last enlistment; transportation of cadets and accepted cadets from their homes to the Military Academy and discharged cadets, including reimbursement of traveling expenses; for traveling expenses of civilian witnesses before courts-martial; for traveling expenses of attendants accompanying remains of military personnel and civilian employees; for traveling expenses of civilian employees and other persons under the War Department authorized by law to travel on departmental, military, and nonmilitary duty; and for examination of estimates of appropriations and of military activities in the field, $4,126,865, of which sum $737,478 shall be available exclusively on account of travel in connection with river and harbor and flood control activities under the Corps of Engineers, and no other appropriation in this act shall be available for any expense for or incident to travel of personnel of the Regular Army or civilian employees under the War Department, except the appropriation "Contingencies of the Army," the appropriation "Air Corps, Army," for flying new aircraft from factory to first destination, and the appropriations for the National Guard, the Organized Reserves, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, citizens' military training camps, and the Panama Canal.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 14, to insert:

MILEAGE OF THE ARMY

For mileage, reimbursement of actual traveling expenses, or per diem allowances in lieu thereof, as authorized by law, to commissioned officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, and expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, $506,250.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I would like to have an explanation of that insertion in lines 15 to 20, page 16.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that is a part of the larger item, which, the Senator will see, was stricken out, ending on line 14, page 16. We have put back into a separate provision the appropriation for various items of travel; but we have not increased by a single cent the amount allowed by the House for travel. That is the explanation for many of these changes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Expenses of courts-martial," on page 17, line 2, to strike out "$55,700" and insert "$58,925," so as to read:

For expenses of courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, retiring boards, and compensation of reporters and witnesses attending same, contract stenographic reporting services, and expenses of taking depositions and securing other evidence for use before the same, $58,925.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Apprehension of deserters," and so forth, on page 17, line 13, after the word "discharge," to strike out "$110,000" and insert "$30,000," so as to read:

For the apprehension, securing, and delivering of soldiers absent without leave and of deserters, including escaped military prisoners, and the expenses incident to their pursuit; and no greater sum than $50 for each deserter or escaped military prisoner shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be paid to any civil officer or citizen for such services and expenses; for a donation of $10 to each prisoner discharged otherwise than honorably upon his release from confinement under court-martial sentence involving dishonorable discharge, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps," on page 20, line 3, after the words "in all," to increase the appropriation for subsistence of the Army from $11,714,792 to $11,815,498.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 23, after the figures "$3,904,926," to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no appropriation in this act shall be available for the purchase of electric ranges for buildings or quarters supplied with gas for cooking purposes or for buildings or quarters upon reservations to which such gas is supplied.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I can not understand why this proviso should be stricken out. I do not know what the amount of the expenditure would be if it were left in. The appropriation to which it refers is $3,904,926. The House has put in the proviso that no electric ranges shall be bought where gas is available. I can not see for the life of me why there should be; and I can not see why the committee struck the proviso out.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that was stricken out on the report of the War Department that there are some posts at which electricity is so cheap that they save money by using electricity instead of any other fuel. Of course, that is not true in most posts, but there are some of them where hydroelectric works are right near by, where they can do their cooking cheaper by electricity than by coal or gas. That is the only reason why the proviso was stricken out.

Mr. FRAZIER. It seems to me strange, Mr. President, that the House committee would not have the same information the Senate committee had.

Mr. REED. If the Senator will yield, I will say that that is one of several items which the House committee inserted apparently without any evidence one way or the other.

Mr. FRAZIER. I do not know that it makes any difference, but where gas is already piped into buildings, it looks rather strange that they would be allowed to spend Government money for electric ranges.

Mr. REED. The War Department assures us that in every case they will adopt that course which is the cheapest, which will save the most money.

Mr. FRAZIER. I am not so sure that the War Department always carries out that kind of a promise. It seems to me that they have been mighty extravagant in many instances in their expenditures. I am afraid this is one of them, and that the reason is that the wife of the Army officer feels that she would prefer an electric range instead of a gas range because it is cooler in the summer time to have an electric range.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 9, after the word "reasons," to strike out "$6,776,519" and insert "$6,300,000," so as to read:

Clothing and equipage: For cloth, woolens, materials, and for the purchase and manufacture of clothing for the Army, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for issue and for sale; for payment of commutation of clothing due to warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service and to enlisted men; for altering and fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary; for operation of laundries, including purchase and repair of laundry machinery; for the authorized issues of laundry materials for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and for applicants for enlistment while held under observation; for equipment and repair of equipment of dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting storehouses, hat-repairing shops, shoe-repair shops, clothing-repair shops, and garbage-reduction works; for equipage, including authorized issues of toilet articles, barbers' and tailors' materials, for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances and applicants for enlistment while held under observation; issue of toilet kits to recruits upon their first enlistment, and issue of housewives to the Army; for expenses of packing and handling and similar necessaries; for a suit of citizens' outer clothing and when necessary an overcoat, the cost of all not to exceed $30, to be issued to each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably, to each enlisted man convicted by civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary or other civil prison, and to each enlisted man ordered interned by reason of the fact that he is an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, discharged without internment; for indemnity to officers and men of the Army for clothing and bedding, and so forth, destroyed since April 22, 1898, by order of medical officers of the Army for sanitary reasons, $6,300,000, of which amount not exceeding $60,000 shall be available immediately for the procurement and transportation of fuel for the service of the fiscal year 1933.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 6, after the word "departments," to strike out "$3,809,251" and insert "$3,709,251," so as to read:

Incidental expenses of the Army: Postage; hire of laborers in the Quartermaster Corps, including the care of officers' mounts when the same are furnished by the Government; compensation of clerks and other employees of the Quartermaster Corps, including not to exceed $15,750 for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (46 Stat. p. 818), and clerks, foremen, watchmen, and organist for the United States Disciplinary Barracks, and incidental expenses of recruiting; for the operation of coffee-roasting plants; for tests and experimental and development work and scientific research to be performed by the Bureau of Standards for the Quartermaster Corps; for inspection service and instruction furnished by the Department of Agriculture which may be transferred in advance; for such additional expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the movements and operation of the Army and at military posts, and not expressly assigned to any other departments, $3,709,251.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for Army transportation, on page 24, line 15, after the word "transportation," to strike out "For transportation of Army supplies; of authorized baggage, including packing and crating" and to insert:

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty; of authorized baggage, including that of retired officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men when ordered to active duty and upon relief therefrom, and including packing and crating; of recruits and recruiting parties; of applicants for enlistment between recruiting stations and recruiting depots; of necessary agents and other employees, including their traveling expenses; of dependents of officers and enlisted men as provided by law; of discharged prisoners and persons discharged from St. Elizabeths Hospital after transfer thereto from the military service to their homes (or elsewhere as they may elect): *Provided*, That the cost in each case shall not be greater than to the place of last enlistment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment may be passed over for a moment. Apparently a line has been omitted by the printer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be temporarily passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 16, after the word "allowances," to insert "to officers and enlisted men on discharge," so as to read:

For travel allowances to officers and enlisted men on discharge, to officers of National Guard on discharge from Federal service as prescribed in the act of March 2, 1901 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 751), and to enlisted men of National Guard on discharge from Federal service, as prescribed in amendatory act of September 22, 1922 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 752), and to members of the National Guard who have been mustered into Federal service and discharged on account of physical disability.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for Army transportation, on page 25, line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "$9,555,854" and insert "$12,078,734," so as to read:

In all, $12,078,734, of which amount not exceeding $250,000 shall be available immediately for the procurement and transportation of fuel for the service of the fiscal year 1933.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 10, after the word "types," to insert "except those that are procured solely for experimental purposes," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the purchase or exchange of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles other than not exceeding $80,000 for the purchase or exchange of motor-propelled ambulances and motor cycles, and not exceeding $150,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the purchase or exchange of motor-propelled trucks, including station-wagon types, except those that are procured solely for experimental purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, commencing in line 11, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any expense for or incident to the transportation of privately owned automobiles except on account of the return to the United States of such privately owned automobiles as may be in transit to or from points outside of the continental limits of the United States or have been transported to such outside points at public expense on or by the date of the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, commencing in line 18, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any expense for or incident to the maintenance, operation, or repair of any motor-propelled vehicle procured out of appropriations for the Regular Army that may be transferred to the custody and maintenance of any of the civil components of the Regular Army or to any of the activities embraced by Title II of this act that is more than 2 years old from the date of purchase at the time of such transfer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under subhead "Signal Corps, Signal Service of the Army," on page 32, line 24, after the name "Signal Corps," to insert "mileage or other travel allowances of officers and traveling expenses of employees traveling on duty in connection with the Signal Service of the Army," so as to read:

Telegraph and telephone systems: Purchase, equipment, operation, and repair of military telegraph, telephone, radio, cable, and signaling systems; signal equipment and stores, heliographs, signal lanterns, flags, and other necessary instruments; wind vanes, barometers, anemometers, thermometers, and other meteorological instruments; photographic and cinematographic work performed for the Army by the Signal Corps; mileage or other travel allowances of officers, and traveling expenses of employees traveling on duty in connection with the Signal Service of the Army.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, would an amendment be in order making an addition to a part of the bill now under consideration?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An amendment to a committee amendment is in order. An amendment to the House text is not yet in order.

Mr. JOHNSON. My amendment is not to a committee amendment, so I shall have to offer it subsequently.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be in order when the stage of individual amendments is reached.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment on page 26, beginning with line 11?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that language was stricken out because it was completely covered by our action on the economy bill yesterday. We did not see any use in duplicating it.

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

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 17, to increase the appropriation for telegraph and telephone systems, Signal Service of the Army, from $2,525,634 to $2,544,275.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Air Corps—Air Corps, Army," on page 35, line 20, after the word "necessary" to insert a comma and "and payment of their traveling and other necessary expenses as authorized by existing law," so as to read:

For creating, maintaining, and operating, at established flying schools and balloon schools, courses of instruction for officers, students, and enlisted men, including cost of equipment and supplies necessary for instruction, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, instruments, and materials for theoretical and practical instruction; for maintenance, repair, storage, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, materials, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith and the establishment of landing and take-off runways; for purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs in connection with aerial photography; improvement, equipment, maintenance, and operation of plants for testing and experimental work, and procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, gas, and sewerage, including maintenance, operation, and repair of such utilities at such plants; for the procurement of helium gas; salaries and wages of civilian employees as may be necessary, and payment of their traveling and other necessary expenses as authorized by existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 4, to increase the appropriation for the Air Corps of the Army from $25,307,816 to $25,439,131.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 5, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$3,728,401" and insert "$3,758,401"; in line 6, after the word "pay," to insert "and expenses"; in line 11, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "$2,813,077" and insert "$2,821,567"; and in line 21, after the word "accessories," to strike out "not less than $5,924,010 shall be expended, other than for pay of civilian employees, for aviation fuel and oil, and for the repair and maintenance of airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That not to exceed $3,758,401 from this appropriation may be expended for pay and expenses of civilian employees other than those employed in experimental and research work; not exceeding $9,000 may be expended for the procurement of helium from the Bureau of Mines, of which sum such amounts as may be required may be transferred in advance to that bureau; not exceeding $2,821,567 may be expended for experimental and research work with airplanes or lighter-than-air craft and their equipment, including pay of necessary civilian employees; not exceeding $100 may be expended for the production of lighter-than-air equipment; not less than $11,525,728 shall be expended for the production or purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories, of which $9,017,152 shall be available exclusively for combat airplanes, their equipment, spare parts and accessories; and not more than $6,000 may be expended for settlement of claims (not exceeding $250 each) for damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post and approved by the Chief of Air Corps and the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Engineer School," on page 42, line 11, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$20,000" and insert "and for travel expenses of officers on journeys approved by the Secretary of War and made for the purpose of instruction, $20,900: *Provided*, That the traveling expenses herein provided for shall be in lieu of mileage and other allowances," so as to read:

For equipment and maintenance of the Engineer School, including purchase and repair of instruments, machinery, implements, models, boats, and materials for the use of the school and to provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction of Engineer officers and troops in their special duties as sappers and miners; for land mining, pontoniering, and signaling; for purchase and binding of scientific and professional works, papers, and periodicals treating on military engineering and scientific subjects; for textbooks and books of reference for the library of the United States Engineer School; for incidental expenses of the school, including chemicals, stationery, hardware, machinery, and boats; for pay of civilian clerks, draftsmen, electricians, mechanics, and laborers; for compensation of civilian lecturers; and for unforeseen expenses, and for travel expenses of officers on journeys approved by the Secretary of War and made for the purpose of instruction, $20,900: *Provided*, That the traveling expenses herein provided for shall be in lieu of mileage and other allowances.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Engineer operations in the field," on page 43, line 13, after the word "depots," to strike out "$175,000" and insert "$175,610," so as to read:

For expenses incident to military engineer operations in the field, including the purchase of material and a reserve of material for such operations, the rental of storehouses within and outside of the District of Columbia, the operation, maintenance, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; for the execution of topographic and other surveys and preparation and reproduction of maps for military purposes, and for research and development of surveying by means of aerial photography and in field reproduction methods; for services of surveyors, survey parties, draftsmen, photographers, master laborers, clerks, and other employees to Engineer officers on the staffs of division, corps area, and department commanders, and such expenses as are ordinarily provided for under the appropriation for "Engineer depots," $175,610.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department—Ordnance service and supplies, Army," on page 44, line 19, after the word "each," to strike out "$9,805,734" and insert "and necessary traveling expenses, $9,832,715," so as to read:

For manufacture, procurement, storage, and issue, including research, planning, design, development, inspection, test, alteration, maintenance, repair, and handling of ordnance material, together with the machinery, supplies, and services necessary thereto; for supplies and services in connection with the general work of the Ordnance Department, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water, advertising, stationery, typewriting, and computing machines, including their exchange, and furniture, tools, and instruments of service; to provide for training and other incidental expenses of the ordnance service; for instruction purposes, other than tuition; for maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn freight and passenger-carrying vehicles; for ammunition for military salutes at Government establishments, and institutions to which the issues of arms for salutes are authorized; for services, material, tools, and appliances for operation of the testing machines and chemical laboratory in connection therewith; for publications for libraries of the Ordnance Department, including the Ordnance Office, including subscriptions for periodicals; for services of not more than four consulting engineers as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, at rates of pay to be fixed by him not to exceed $50 per day for not exceeding 50 days each, and necessary traveling expenses, $9,832,715.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 21, after the word "available," to strike out "exclusively for the purchase of five convertible armored tanks" and insert "for the procurement of tank or combat cars," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That $200,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the procurement of tank or combat cars.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Repairs of arsenals," on page 45, line 9, after the word "available," to strike out "exclusively," so as to read:

For repairs and improvements of ordnance establishments, and to meet such unforeseen expenditures as accidents or other contingencies may require, $807,881, of which amount $20,000 shall be available for dredging in connection with the hydroelectric power plant, Rock Island Arsenal.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Gauges, dies, and jigs for manufacture," on page 45, at the end of line 17, to strike out "$74,200" and insert "$74,800," so as to read:

For the development and procurement of gauges, dies, jigs, and other special aids and appliances, including specifications and detailed drawings, to carry out the purpose of section 123 of the national defense act, approved June 3, 1916 (U. S. C., title 50, sec. 78), $74,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Seacoast defenses," on page 49, line 1, after the name "United States," to strike out "$996,249" and insert "$997,986," so as to read:

For all expenses incident to the preparation of plans and the construction, purchase, installation, equipment, maintenance, repair, and operation of fortifications and other works of defense, and their accessories, including personal services, maintenance of channels to submarine mine wharves, purchase of lands and rights of way as authorized by law, and experimental, test, and development work, as follows:

United States, $997,986.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 2, after the word "departments," to strike out "$668,365" and insert "$669,708," so as to read:

Insular departments, $669,708.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 3, after the name "Panama Canal," to strike out "$670,202" and insert "$670,442," so as to read:

Panama Canal, $670,442.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for seacoast defenses, on page 49, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "$2,334,816" and insert "$2,338,136," so as to read:

in all, $2,338,136.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance, United States Military Academy," on page 49, line 24, after the word "expressage," to insert "transportation of cadets and accepted cadets from their homes to the Military Academy, and discharged cadets, including reimbursement of traveling expenses," and on page 50, line 23, after the words "in all," to strike out "$1,123,354" and insert "$1,154,589," so as to read:

For text and reference books for instruction; increase and expense of library (not exceeding $6,000); office equipment and supplies; stationery, blank books, forms, printing and binding, and periodicals; diplomas for graduates (not exceeding $1,100); expense of lectures; apparatus, equipment, supplies, and materials for purpose of instruction and athletics, and maintenance and repair thereof; musical instruments and maintenance of band; care and maintenance of organ; equipment for cadet mess; postage, telephones, and telegrams; freight and expressage; transportation of cadets and accepted cadets from their homes to the Military Academy, and discharged cadets, including reimbursement of traveling expenses; for payment of commutation of rations for the cadets of the United States Military Academy in lieu of the regular establishment ration; maintenance of children's school (not exceeding $12,200); contingencies for superintendent of the academy, to be expended in his discretion (not to exceed $3,500); expenses of the members of the Board of Visitors (not exceeding $1,500); contingent fund, to be expended under the direction of the Academic Board (not exceeding $500); improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings and grounds (including roads, walls, and fences); shooting galleries and ranges; cooking, heating, and lighting apparatus and fixtures and operation and maintenance thereof; maintenance of water, sewer, and plumbing systems; maintenance of and repairs to cadet camp; fire-extinguishing apparatus; machinery and tools and repair of same; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled vehicles; policing buildings and grounds; furniture, refrigerators, and lockers for Government-owned buildings at the academy and repair and maintenance thereof; fuel for heat, light, and power; and other necessary incidental expenses in the discretion of the superintendent; in all, $1,154,589.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 23, to insert:

When approved by the President, not to exceed 15 per cent of each of the amounts hereinbefore appropriated under the subtitle "Military activities" shall be available interchangeably for expenditure on the objects named, but no one item shall be increased by more than 15 per cent: *Provided*, That any such transfers shall be reported to Congress in the annual Budget.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Arms, uniforms, equipment, etc., for field service, National Guard," on page 53, line 12, after the word "sums," to strike out "herein appropriated" and insert "appropriated for in this act," so as to read:

To procure by purchase or manufacture and issue from time to time to the National Guard, upon requisition of the governors of the several States and Territories, or the commanding general, National Guard of the District of Columbia, such military equipment and stores of all kinds and reserve supply thereof, including horses conforming to the Regular Army standards for use of the cavalry, field artillery, and mounted organizations of the National Guard, as are necessary to arm, uniform, and equip for field service the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and to repair such of the aforementioned articles of equipage and military stores as are or may become damaged when, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, such repair may be determined to be an economical measure and as necessary for their proper preservation and use, $5,886,849, of which not to exceed $908,745 shall be available for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts and accessories, and all of the sums appropriated for in this act on account of the National Guard shall be accounted for as one fund.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, apparently there is a misprint there. I move to amend the committee amendment by striking out the word "for," so it will read "sums appropriated in this act."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 15, after the word "hereby," to strike out "directed" and insert "authorized," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to issue from surplus or reserves stores and material on hand and purchased for the United States Army such articles of clothing and equipment and Field Artillery, Engineer, and Signal material and ammunition as may be needed by the National Guard organized under the provisions of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916 (U. S. C., title 32, sec. 21), as amended. This issue shall be made without charge against militia appropriations except for actual expenses incident to such issue.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Citizens' military training—Reserve Officers' Training Corps," on page 61, line 1, after the figures "1928," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be available for any expense on account of any student in Air Corps, Medical Corps, Dental Corps, or Veterinary units not a member of such units on May 5, 1932, but such stoppage of further enrollments shall not interfere with the maintenance of existing units:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 18, after the words "insignia," to insert "for the transportation of employees, instructors, and civilians to engage in practice," and in line 24, after the designation "Secretary of War," to strike out "$28,650" and insert "$33,650," so as to read:

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE, ARMY

QUARTERMASTER SUPPLIES AND SERVICES FOR RIFLE RANGES FOR CIVILIAN INSTRUCTION

To establish and maintain indoor and outdoor rifle ranges for the use of all able-bodied males capable of bearing arms, under reasonable regulations to be prescribed by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and approved by the Secretary of War; for the employment of labor in connection with the establishment of outdoor and indoor rifle ranges, including labor in operating targets; for the employment of instructors; for clerical services, including not exceeding $25,000 in the District of Columbia; for badges and other insignia; for the transportation of employees, instructors, and civilians to engage in practice; for the purchase of materials, supplies, and services, and for expenses incidental to instruction of citizens of the United States in marksmanship, and their participation in national and international matches, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, $33,650.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance equipment for rifle ranges for civilian instruction," on page 66, after line 2, to strike out:

No appropriation contained in this act shall be available for expenditures for or incidental to the manufacture and/or production of wearing apparel for enlisted men of the Regular Army in Government factories or establishments.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under Title II, "Nonmilitary activities of the War Department, Quartermaster Corps, cemeterial expenses," on page 67, line 19, after the name "Rock Island," to strike out "$830,237" and insert "$847,862," so as to read:

For maintaining and improving national cemeteries, including fuel for and pay of superintendents and the superintendent at Mexico City, laborers and other employees; purchase of tools and materials; purchase of six motor-propelled freight-carrying vehicles at a total cost not to exceed $5,750, and for the repair, maintenance, and operation of motor vehicles; care and maintenance of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, chapel, and grounds in the Arlington National Cemetery, and permanent American cemeteries abroad, including not to exceed $2,250 for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (46 Stat., p. 818); for repair to roadways, but not to more than a single approach road to any national cemetery constructed under special act of Congress; for headstones for unmarked graves of soldiers, sailors, and marines under the acts approved March 3, 1873 (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 279), February 3, 1879 (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 280), March 9, 1906 (34 Stat., p. 56), March 14, 1914 (38 Stat., p. 768), and February 26, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 24, sec. 280a), and civilians interred in post cemeteries; for recovery of bodies and the disposition of remains of military personnel and civilian employees of the Army under act approved March 9, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 10, sec. 916); for the care, protection, and maintenance of the Confederate Mound in Oakwood Cemetery at Chicago, the Confederate Stockade Cemetery at Johnstons Island, the Confederate burial plats owned by the United States in Confederate Cemetery at North Alton, the Confederate Cemetery, Camp Chase, at Columbus, the Confederate section in Greenlawn Cemetery at Indianapolis, the Confederate Cemetery at Point Lookout, and the Confederate Cemetery at Rock Island, $847,862.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 2, after the word "village," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of the appropriation "Pilgrimage of Gold Star Mothers and World War Widows, 1930–December 31, 1933," shall be available for the payment of steamship accommodations reserved and not used.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 20, after the word "duty," to strike out "$6,020" and insert "$6,057," so as to read:

For repair and preservation of monuments, tablets, observation tower, roads, fences, etc., made and constructed by the United States upon public lands within the limits of the Antietam battlefield, near Sharpsburg, Md.; for maintenance, repair, and operation of motor vehicles, and for pay of superintendent, said superintendent to perform his duties under the direction of the Quartermaster Corps and to be selected and appointed by the Secretary of War, at his discretion, the person selected for this position to have been either a commissioned officer or enlisted man who has been honorably mustered out or discharged from the military service of the United States and who may have been disabled for active field service in line of duty, $6,057.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 13, after the word "highways," to strike out "$59,728" and insert "$59,880," so as to read:

NATIONAL MILITARY PARKS

CHICKAMAUGA AND CHATTANOOGA NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

For continuing the establishment of the park; compensation and expenses of the superintendent, maps, surveys, clerical and other assistance; maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle; maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle; office and all other necessary expenses; foundations for State monuments; mowing; historical tablets, iron and bronze; iron gun carriages; roads and their maintenance, including posts and guard rails on highways, $59,880.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 22, to strike out "$7,299" and insert "$7,374," so as to read:

FORT DONELSON NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

For care and maintenance of the Fort Donelson National Military Park established on the battlefield of Fort Donelson, Tenn., in accordance with the provisions of the act approved March 26, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 16, secs. 428–428j), including personal services, procurement of supplies and equipment, and all other expenses incident to the care and maintenance of the park, $7,374.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 5, after the word "vehicle," to strike out "$14,700" and insert "$14,925," so as to read:

FREDERICKSBURG AND SPOTSYLVANIA COUNTY BATTLEFIELDS MEMORIAL

For continuing the establishment of a national military park to be known as the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved February 14, 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 16, secs. 425–425j), including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, $14,925.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 22, after the word "foregoing," to strike out "$60,064" and insert "$60,102," so as to read:

GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

For continuing the establishment of the park; acquisition of lands, surveys, and maps; constructing, improving, and maintaining avenues, roads, and bridges thereon; fences and gates; marking the lines of battle with tablets and guns, each tablet bearing a brief legend giving historic facts and compiled without censure and without praise; preserving the features of the battlefield and the monuments thereon; compensation of superintendent, clerical and other services, expenses, and labor; purchase and preparation of tablets and gun carriages and placing them in position; purchase of one motor-propelled freight-carrying vehicle at a cost not to exceed $3,000, including the value of a vehicle exchanged, and purchase of two motor cycles at a cost not to exceed $300 each; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled freight and passenger-carrying vehicles, and all other expenses incident to the foregoing, $60,102.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, at the end of line 3, to strike out "$7,930" and insert "$7,982," so as to read:

GUILFORD COURTHOUSE NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

For continuing the establishment of a national military park at the battlefield of Guilford Courthouse, in accordance with the act entitled "An act to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Guilford Courthouse," approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat., p. 996), $7,982.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, at the end of line 10, to strike out "$4,616" and insert "$4,725," so as to read:

MOORES CREEK NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

For continuing the establishment of a national military park at the battlefield of Moores Creek, N. C., in accordance with the act entitled "An act to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Moores Creek, N. C.," approved June 2, 1926 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 16, secs. 422 to 422d), $4,725.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 21, after the word "park," to strike out "$4,750" and insert "$4,937," so as to read:

PETERSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

For continuing the establishment of a national military park at the battlefields of the siege of Petersburg, Va., in accordance with the provisions of the act approved July 3, 1926 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 16, secs. 423–423i), including surveys, maps, and marking the boundaries of the park; pay and expenses of civilian commissioners, and pay for clerical and other services; supplies, equipment, and materials; maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, and all other expenses necessary in establishing that park, $4,937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 6, after the word "vehicle," to strike out "$39,873" and insert "$39,968," so as to read:

SHILOH NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

For continuing the establishment of the park; compensation of superintendent of the park; clerical and other services; labor; historical tablets; maps and surveys; roads; purchase and transportation of supplies, implements, and materials; foundations for monuments; office and other necessary expenses, including maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, $39,968.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 2, after the word "vehicle," to strike out "$26,777" and insert "$26,889," so as to read:

VICKSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

For continuing the establishment of the park; compensation of civilian commissioners; clerical and other services, labor, iron gun carriages, mounting of siege guns, memorials, monuments, markers, and historical tablets giving historical facts, compiled without praise and without censure; maps, surveys, roads, bridges, restoration of earthworks, purchase of lands, purchase and transportation of supplies and materials; and other necessary expenses, including maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, $26,889.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National monuments," on page 73, line 12, after the word "power," to strike out "$37,842" and insert "37,984," so as to read:

NATIONAL MONUMENTS

For maintaining and improving national monuments established by proclamation of the President under the act of June 8, 1906 (U. S. C., title 16, sec. 431), and administered by the Secretary of War, and such battlefield sites, monuments, grounds, and memorials as have been authorized from time to time by Congress, and not expressly provided for under other appropriations, including pay of the caretakers, laborers, and other employees, purchase of tools and materials, light, heat, and power, $37,984, of which not to exceed $300 may be paid to the superintendent of the Shiloh National Military Park, in addition to his salary as such superintendent, for performing the duties of superintendent of the Meriwether Lewis National Monument.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, at the end of line 25, to strike out "$5,782" and insert "$5,819," so as to read:

Lincoln Birthplace Memorial: For the preservation of the birthplace of Abraham Lincoln, near Hodgenville, Larue County, Ky., in accordance with the provisions of the act approved February 11, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 16, secs. 215–216), including the purchase of necessary supplies, and equipment, the salary of the caretaker and other necessary employees, and all other necessary expenses incident to the foregoing, $5,819.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 13, after the designation "Secretary of War," to strike out "$151,280" and insert "$161,285," so as to read:

SIGNAL CORPS

WASHINGTON-ALASKA MILITARY CABLE AND TELEGRAPH SYSTEM

For defraying the cost of such extensions, betterments, operation, and maintenance of the Washington-Alaska Military Cable and Telegraph System as may be approved by the Secretary of War, to be available until the close of the fiscal year 1934, from the receipts of the Washington-Alaska Military Cable and Telegraph System which have been covered into the Treasury of the United States, the extent of such extensions and betterments and the cost thereof to be reported to Congress by the Secretary of War, $161,285.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 2, after the word "amended," to strike out "$354,310" and insert "$494,310," so as to read:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, BRIDGES, AND TRAILS, ALASKA

For the construction, repair, and maintenance of roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, and trails, Territory of Alaska, to be expended under the direction of the board of road commissioners described in section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction and maintenance of roads, the establishment and maintenance of schools, and the care and support of insane persons in the District of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved January 27, 1905, as amended (U. S. C., title 48, secs. 321–337), and to be expended conformably to the provisions of said act as amended, $494,310, to be available immediately, and to include $1,000 compensation to the president of the Board of Road Commissioners for Alaska, in addition to his regular pay and allowances.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rivers and harbors," on page 76, line 1, after the word "law," to strike out "$59,277,095" and insert "$54,000,000," so as to read:

To be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers:

For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for survey of northern and northwestern lakes, and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City, for expenses of the California Débris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893 (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 661); and for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors: *Provided*, That no funds shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law, $54,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I want to call attention to these items in the river and harbor provisions of the bill. I invite attention to the prevailing method of financing river and harbor projects. I want to do that for the purpose of showing what a wasteful pork-barrel method of appropriating funds has been pursued all down through the years, an inexcusable method of wasting public funds.

I have had placed on the wall of the Senate Chamber a map which shows the Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, and Tennessee Rivers. In the last 40 years there has been $470,000,000 spent in developing those rivers—$470,000,000 spent to develop channels for transportation; and we have not a channel in any of those rivers now, with the exception of the Ohio.

The Ohio River project was adopted in 1910. It was estimated it would cost $60,000,000 if it was completed in 10 years. Under this piecemeal method of appropriations and piecemeal method of making contracts, and the delays incidental to this method of financing the project, it took 20 years to complete it. Because of the delays and because of the method pursued in letting the contracts it cost $103,000,000 instead of $60,000,000. The Ohio is the only project that has been completed. Last year the Ohio River, with its tributaries, carried 64,000,000 tons of freight. It carried 24,000,000 tons more of freight than passed through the Panama Canal last year.

To show what river transportation means to those who must pay for goods moved, we have here the Monongahela River carrying coal to the steel plants at Pittsburgh for 21 cents a ton. The rate by rail for the same coal 50 miles farther to Youngstown, Ohio, is $1.46 a ton, $1.22 extra to haul it an extra 50 miles by rail. I am informed that that difference in differential is worth $25,000,000 a year to the United States Steel Corporation for the plants at Pittsburgh over what the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., at Youngstown, enjoys, having to haul by rail. There is a distance on the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to Youngstown that has not yet been developed. I believe that stretch is called the Beaver River. That will give an illustration of what it means to develop the inland waterways of the United States.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate to discuss now the advantages of developing the rivers and harbors. I want to point out how wasteful of the taxpayers' money is the method now pursued in this bill and in every appropriation bill that has been passed for rivers and harbors, because it does not finish any channel, it does not give the taxpayer the advantage of the cheaper water transportation. We have here $470,000,000 invested in these inland waterways, but we do not have the use of them. The interest on the money thus invested, the interest on the idle capital tied up in inland waterways, would ensure the balancing of the Budget this year. The Chief of Engineers of the Army has testified before the Commerce Committee of the Senate that if this work were done as one job it could be completed in five years and he would save 20 to 25 per cent of the amount otherwise expended.

The method pursued in financing the inland rivers has been as expensive and wasteful as it would be when building a house to build one room each year and not put on any roof. We have dug in these rivers for 40 years and because the work was never finished, the work that was done this year was destroyed by the floods of next year, and it would have to be done over again. The only people who have had any benefit out of this wasteful pork-barrel method of financing the inland waterways have been the contractors who seem to have had a close corporation and have waxed fat upon these contracts without anyone else getting any benefit.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. KING. A number of years ago I made a very careful investigation in regard to these contractors and their close corporation or their close affiliation under the terms of which they obtained substantially all the contracts. I was wondering if that combination still exists and whether the War Department of the Government still nurses them as it has been doing to my way of thinking for many, many years? I think it is perfectly indefensible conduct on the part of the Government. I discovered these organizations carried on a powerful propaganda. Their organization went so far as to affect the purchase of materials and the necessary machinery that was employed. I was wondering if the Senator knew of the existence of the organization to-day and whether there has been any change in its policy and in the relation of the Government to it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have no personal knowledge of the conspiracy, but judging from results and methods pursued they are evidently very good lobbyists. I am led to believe that in view of the attitude that has been taken by the War Department in the administration ever since Hoover in 1928 and again in 1929 made it a part of his program to finish these inland waterways as one project and to develop inland water transportation, nothing has been done to carry out a comprehensive plan of developing the inland waterways and finishing them to save money and to give people the benefit of water transportation.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. Has the Senator suggested how he thinks this project could be financed?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. WAGNER. I think that would be interesting.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. These projects, in my opinion, being permanent improvements, that will mean a great saving to shippers of all kinds of goods in the 25 States affected, should be treated as capital investment. There is no reason for continuing appropriations under the present method unless we are going to handle this on a business basis and pursue a sound financial policy in financing and develop a sound economic policy in the construction of it; otherwise I think these appropriations should be abolished.

The capital investment should not be taken out of the taxpayer at the present time or at any time. The finances should be funded. It should not be funded in the Budget. No capital investment should be in a budget. The simplest housewife who has a budget at all will budget her current expenses, but extraordinary expenditures become capital investment and should not be taken out of current income.

The smallest business concern will not take capital expenditures out of current income. If the project is to be finished so that the people shall get the benefit of water transportation and so break the economic paralysis that has stricken this part of the country since Congress passed the transportation act, the whole financial project should be lifted out of appropriation bills; funds should be raised by the sale of bonds and retired over a long period of years. Future generations should help to pay for the benefits that are to accrue.

The benefits resulting would make it indirectly a self-liquidating project because the benefits that would come would so increase the income to the people, freight that can not now move would then move, and from the increased interchange of goods would come financial and economic benefit so that at least indirectly these projects would be self-liquidating.

To illustrate, from Shelby, Mont., to Duluth, 1,000 miles, it costs 21 cents to haul a bushel of wheat. From Duluth to Buffalo by water it costs 1.8 cents to haul the same bushel of wheat. It costs 7.5 cents to take a bushel of wheat across the Atlantic, 3,000 miles. It costs just one-third to take it 3,000 miles by water that it does to take it a thousand miles by land. Transportation rates are so high in this part of the country [indicating on map] that industry is drifting to the seaboard in order to get to the water. The traffic manager for the John Deere Co. at Moline, Ill., testified before the Commerce Committee that, because of deep channel in the lower Mississippi, instead of shipping farm machinery to the Pacific Coast by rail, they took it down the Mississippi River by barges, put the machinery on board a ship and took it through the Panama Canal, up the coast of Central America and to ports in California at a saving of $23 a ton. He said the saving amounts to as much as forty or fifty dollars on a farm tractor.

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

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

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. DILL. As illustrative of what water transportation compared to land transportation means, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that when the wheat farmers on the Pacific slope have a market in the Orient they get a higher price for their wheat than any other farmers in the United States; but when the market in the Orient is glutted or closed to them and they must ship their wheat east, they get 30 cents a bushel less than is paid in Chicago. That is the practical illustration of the benefit of water transportation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I thank the Senator from Washington for his contribution. I should like also to talk with the Senator from Washington about lumber because he is interested, I am interested, and we are all interested in it, because we buy it. Prices for it are very high. With the development of these waterways [indicating on map] lumber can be brought down from British Columbia and Washington to the Mississippi River and up the Ohio to Pittsburgh, or up the Mississippi to the Twin Cities, and up the Missouri River to Sioux City. Here [indicating on the map] is a development that seems to have been left in the hands of a very few people, who certainly have had a great deal of benefit out of it at the expense of the great mass of the taxpayers of the United States, though their number is very small, because the project has never been finished.

Later I shall call the attention of the Senate to a bill that would place all those projects into one project, which would save, according to the Chief of Engineers, from 20 to 25 per cent in construction costs and employ 160,000 for five years, working 120 days out of each year.

Mr. BLAINE. That is direct employment?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is direct employment of labor, and the indirect employment of labor we can not estimate.

Mr. BLAINE. It is three times the direct employment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Possibly it is three times.

I simply wanted to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to call attention to the miserable little appropriations being made for projects of this kind under the policy being pursued. It is a disgrace to any government; it is not businesslike at all; it is an example of business in government and not government in business.

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

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact, notwithstanding the expenditure of considerably more than $500,000,000 upon the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, to say nothing of the Ohio, that there is less traffic upon those rivers now than there was in the days of Mark Twain and for 20 years anterior to his trips up and down the Mississippi River?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think that is true of the Mississippi, because with the present channel it is uneconomic to move freight, the channel not being of sufficient depth. However, engineering plans have already been finished, and the Chief of Engineers said he could easily spend $100,000,000 this year on the program of completing these inland waters and river and harbor projects. Where there is a 9-foot dependable channel there can be operated a barge tow of 24,000 tons. The average tow on the Ohio is 10,000 tons, drawn by a little tugboat. Tows have been hauled on the

Ohio, I am told, of 35,000 tons. That would be nearly four times the tonnage carried by an ocean freighter. The average tow, however, is 10,000 tons.

Mr. President, I do not think I will at this late hour take up any more time. I will address the Senate later upon this subject; but because of the fact that there is an appropriation bill now before us to continue the present uneconomic method of developing rivers and harbors, I wanted to call the Senate's attention to the policy which has been pursued for 40 years and which should be stopped at once.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator's proposal involve taking the expenditure of the funds for rivers and harbors out of the hands of the War Department? I agree with the Senator, I will say, that that ought to be done, because of the experience of the past. We have expended now more than $1,260,000,000 upon river and harbor projects; I have examined every project from the days of Washington down to the present time, and I have reached the conclusion that 95 per cent of them have been wasteful and extravagantly managed. It seems to me now, as the Senator has pending a very important proposition treating the question sort of de novo, we ought to take it out of the hands of the War Department and evolve a different system for handling these appropriations.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I believe that the Congress is to a great extent to blame, because Congress has sponsored and tolerated the kind of policy which has been pursued.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Congress should establish the policy, and I believe the engineers of the War Department will carry out whatever policy Congress may adopt. I have a great deal of regard for the ability and integrity of the Chief of Engineers, General Brown. I think he is a man who could complete this work as efficiently as General Goethals completed the Panama Canal. If there were adopted such a method of financing these projects as was adopted in the case of the Panama Canal, they could be brought to completion, and the people who are now suffering from exhorbitant freight rates and economic stagnation in that great inland empire, around which Congress built an economic wall when it constructed the Panama Canal, would be greatly benefited, as would the taxpayers; but under the methods pursued in the past, I can not see where anyone gets any benefit unless it be the contractors and those who furnish the material.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Muscle Shoals," on page 76, line 6, after the word "development," to strike out "$244,809" and insert "$245,184," so as to read:

For operating, maintaining, and keeping in repair the works at Dam No. 2, Tennessee River, including the hydroelectric development, $245,184, to remain available until June 30, 1933, and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, at the end of line 13, to strike out "$31,773,775" and insert "$31,500,000," so as to read:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries: For prosecuting work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the flood control act, approved May 15, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 33, sec. 702a), $31,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 21, to strike out "$390,307" and insert "$400,000," so as to read:

Emergency fund for flood control on tributaries of Mississippi River: For rescue work and for repair or maintenance of any flood-control work on any tributaries of the Mississippi River threatened or destroyed by flood, in accordance with section 7 of flood control act, approved May 15, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 33, sec. 702g), $400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, at the end of line 2, to strike out "$993,855" and insert "$1,000,000," so as to read:

Flood control, Sacramento River, Calif.: For prosecuting work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the flood control act approved March 1, 1917 (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 703), as modified by the flood control act approved May 15, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 33, sec. 704), $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 2, to insert:

Mileage, traveling expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof, transportation of dependents, including packing and crating, and transportation of baggage, as authorized by law, for officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and civilian employees, traveling on duty pertaining to or on detail to or relief from nonmilitary activities provided for in this act under appropriations for the Quartermaster Department, Signal Corps, and Engineer Department, shall be paid from the appropriation in connection with which such travel is performed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). That completes the committee amendments with the exception of an amendment, on page 24, which the Chair is informed was passed over at the request of the chairman of the committee. Without objection, that amendment will be recurred to, and will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 24, line 15, after the word "transportation," the committee proposes to strike out—

For transportation of Army supplies; of authorized baggage, including packing and crating.

And to insert:

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty; of authorized baggage, including that of retired officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men when ordered to active duty and upon relief therefrom, and including packing and crating; of recruits and recruiting parties; of applicants for enlistment between recruiting stations and recruiting depots; of necessary agents and other employees, including their traveling expenses; of dependents of officers and enlisted men as provided by law; of discharged prisoners, and persons discharged from Saint Elizabeths Hospital after transfer thereto from the military service, to their homes (or elsewhere as they may elect): *Provided*, That the cost in each case shall not be greater than to the place of last enlistment.

Mr. REED. I move to amend the committee amendment by inserting the word "transportation," after the semicolon at the end of line 5, page 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, in line 6, before the words "of horse," it is proposed to insert the word "transportation."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am authorized by the committee to submit an amendment, to come in on page 76, after the figures "$54,000,000," in line 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 76, line 2, after the figures "$54,000,000," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the existing project for the improvement of the Miami River, Fla., authorized by the rivers and harbors act approved July 3, 1930, is hereby modified to include the improvement recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the report submitted in Senate Document No. 95, Seventy-second Congress, first session, provided that the authorization of $800,000 for the existing project shall not be increased but is hereby continued as the total authorization for the project as herein modified.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this amendment does not involve an increase of appropriation; it does not involve an increase of authorization, but is merely a modification of the project which has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers so as to permit the dredging of a place in Miami Harbor where airplanes en route to Panama may come to rest. It requires a 6-foot depth of water, and there is only 2 or 3 feet at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. I am authorized by the committee to offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 76, after the additional proviso just inserted, to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the existing river and harbor project at Monroe Harbor, Mich., as authorized by the act approved July 3, 1930, and in accordance with House Document No. 22, Seventy-first Congress, second session, is hereby modified in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 12, Seventy-second Congress, first session.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that amendment involves an actual reduction in the appropriation at Monroe Harbor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. I am requested by the Quartermaster General to offer the amendment which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68, line 2, after the word "village," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That hereafter Arlington National Cemetery shall be administered by an officer of the Army retired from active service under the provisions of section 1251, Revised Statutes, detailed on active duty for that purpose.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of that amendment.

Mr. REED. The amendment merely authorizes the continuance in Arlington Cemetery of the retired officer who is now on duty there. The Quartermaster General has asked that the amendment be adopted in order to clear up any doubt that may exist.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. I have one more amendment to come in on page 11, line 2, after the parenthesis. I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 2, after the parenthesis, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, That notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary contained in Part II of the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1933, members of the military service shall be entitled to automatic increases in pay and allowances by reason of length of service or promotion during the fiscal year 1933.

Mr. REED. The purpose of that amendment, Mr. President, is to take care of those enlisted men and officers—but principally enlisted men—who may be promoted during the coming year. If a private is promoted to a corporal or a corporal is promoted to a sergeant, the promotion carries a very few dollars additional pay, but it is something that touches the pride of the man himself.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, is this amendment not in defiance of the provisions of the economy bill which passed yesterday?

Mr. REED. It is the amendment which I tried to offer last night and which was ruled out of order because the bill had already been read the third time.

Mr. DILL. It permits promotions and increases of salary, which are forbidden in every other department, does it not?

Mr. REED. Promotion goes on just the same in the Army, but does not carry an increase of salary. In the case of the enlisted men in the Army, promotions result in an additional cost of approximately $150,000 a year. If we are going to say to a newly made corporal that he is to be denied all increase of pay that should accrue from his promotion, we have just about destroyed his morale, and I hope the Senate will not insist upon doing that.

Furthermore, as to the officers, I have had a statement prepared to show who will bear the brunt of the change; and I find that it falls almost entirely upon the first lieutenants and the captains. Three hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars out of the $500,000 saving on officers will fall on first lieutenants and captains. I am sure the Senate did not realize that when it included military officers in section 201 of the economy bill.

I should like very much to have this amendment adopted and go to conference in the hope that we can do something for those young men.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not think that amendment should go in this bill. We should not start out in this bill to make exceptions in the other one before we get it through conference. I can realize that it will work some little hardship in the way of the expectations of these men, but we must deal with the situation as it is. What the economy bill may bring out I do not know; but I do not believe we should provide in this bill that exceptions shall be made.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I feel perfectly certain that the Senate would have done this last night if we had not had snap judgment taken on us by the action of the Chair in announcing the third reading of the bill. It gave us no chance to offer the amendment or to thresh it out on its merits.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I have just read the amendment. It was impossible for anyone to keep up with the amendment when the clerk was reading it, he read it so rapidly.

This amendment distinctly says that nothwithstanding the provision in regard to promotions, members of the military service shall be entitled to automatic increases in pay and allowances by reason of length of service or promotion during the fiscal year 1933.

Mr. REED. That is right; and they ought to have them.

Mr. TRAMMELL. That is directly in contradistinction to the policy applied to everybody else in the Government service.

I see no reason why we should make any exceptions. I have a very high regard for the Army officers. I have a very high regard for the administration of the War Department in general, as far as the Army officers are concerned. I might not extend that to the Secretary of War, although I think perhaps he is all right; but, while the Army officers are all right, there is no reason or justice in making exceptions in their case and giving them a privilege that we do not give anyone else.

I do not blame the Senator in charge of the bill for his zeal in trying to hold the War Department intact in every respect and have practically no reductions in the appropriations. He is now manifesting the same zeal in that respect that he did a day or two ago in regard to cutting the salary of everybody in civil employment.

Mr. REED. Frankly, I am concerned for the enlisted men.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not care for any exceptions. If the Senator is concerned about the enlisted men, why not apply it only to the enlisted men?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think this amendment is subject to a point of order. I think it is legislation on an appropriation bill; and I make the point of order.

Mr. REED. I have to admit that, in my opinion, it is subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there is one other amendment which is requested by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. It merely continues an authorization on which contracts are now being let. There is some apprehension in the War Department that they will not be able to get the contracts technically completed by the 1st of July. This will take care of that by continuing the authorization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, line 17, in the appropriation for military posts, add the following:

The unexpended balances on June 30, 1932, under the following appropriations are hereby continued and made available until expended for the same respective purposes, namely: Barracks, officers' quarters, and noncommissioned officers' quarters, $518,000, War Department appropriation act, fiscal year 1929, approved

March 23, 1928, and subsequently made available for the same purpose at Marin County, Calif., by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1931, approved March 4, 1931; technical construction for the Air Corps of the Army, $285,000, War Department appropriation act, fiscal year 1930, approved February 28, 1929, and subsequently made available for the same purpose at Marin County, Calif., by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1931, approved March 4, 1931.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania on behalf of the Senator from California.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask the chairman of the committee whether any effort has been made—and if so, whether it is being realized in this bill—to close a large number of the unnecessary posts throughout the United States?

Mr. REED. That is a matter for Executive discretion, Mr. President. It is a fact that a list of 58 posts—I think that is the number—has been prepared at the War Department. Many of them have already been abandoned. The property of many of them has been advertised for sale. They are making a conscientious effort to reduce the number as fast as it reasonably can be done.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that the maintenance of this large number of Army posts adds materially to the expenses of the Government, and the same thing is true of the Navy. We are maintaining a large number of naval stations that are unnecessary; and, notwithstanding frequent recommendations for their abolishment, are still maintained. We are also maintaining many Army posts that ought to have been abandoned years ago.

Mr. REED. I think that is true; but every time we try to abandon one, Senators and Congressmen interested rush up to the War Department and to the President and make it difficult. I think, however, more have been abandoned in the last 12 months than in any similar period in the last 25 years.

Of course, it is for the good of the Army. Men can not be trained satisfactorily when only a platoon is stationed at a post.

Mr. KING. Army maneuvers can not be conducted properly, as our troops have been scattered throughout the United States, a few hundred or, at the most, a very few thousand in posts, instead of having them concentrated in such a way that effective Army maneuvers can be conducted.

Mr. REED. The Senator is exactly right; but, of course, he sees as well as the rest of us that to bring that about by legislation is next to impossible. We would not get this bill through by Christmas if we undertook to put in a list of posts to be abandoned.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator one other question? I notice in the reports of the expenditures for a number of years that the civil employees in the Army have ranged all the way from 25,000 to 45,000. A large number have been clerks and officials doing civilian work. I am wondering if any effort had been made to reduce the number of civilian employees in the Army.

Mr. REED. Oh, I think so.

Mr. KING. I have not seen any evidence of it.

Mr. REED. Of course, the Senator must remember that a very large number of civilian employees are employed in nonmilitary activities. The flood control and river and harbor work calls for the employment of many civilians. They are not all clerks here in Washington, by any means.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I express deep regret over the failure of the committee reporting this bill to bring it within proper bounds. In my judgment it contains a number of provisions that ought to have been eliminated and it carries a total appropriation of at least $50,000,000 in excess of what the situation requires. There has been deep concern upon the part of Congress because of the fear that revenues would not be provided for the purpose of meeting the expenditures for the next fiscal year. That fear was shared by the business interests of our country as well as by thoughtful persons and those who were cognizant of the condition of the Treasury of the United States.

Congress was conjured to apply drastic reductions to the appropriation bills that were being formulated, and to enact a revenue measure that would produce considerably more than $1,000,000,000 of additional revenue. It was recognized that the increasing deficit was a menace to the credit of the Federal Government and an obstacle to business revival. If the Federal Government failed to provide revenues to meet its expenditures, it was obvious that the day would soon come when the credit of the country would be impaired and its securities would fall below par. Such a situation would be calamitous. Securities of States and their political subdivisions, as well as those offered by corporations and individuals, would be seriously affected and the reactions in every business and industrial activity would be highly disadvantageous.

The Finance Committee, of which I am a member, struggled for weeks to agree upon a measure that would yield sufficient revenue, if appropriation bills were materially reduced, to cover the contemplated expenditures of the Federal Government for the coming fiscal year. Because of the continued depression and the rather dubious prospects of anticipated revival in business, it is a question whether the revenues anticipated by the committee and by Congress, will be realized, in which event a deficit undoubtedly will result, unless reductions made by Congress are hundreds of millions of dollars below the President's Budget submitted by him to Congress in December.

Mr. President, if Congress were to follow the recommendations of the President as contained in his budget, there would be, I feel certain, a deficit of hundreds of millions of dollars. Congress must disregard the President's recommendations and subject every appropriation bill to important, and indeed radical, reductions. Thus far Congress has made some progress and has cut appropriation bills considerably below the recommendations of the executive departments. But the cuts have not been sufficient. It has been my view that when the two military bills, the Army appropriation bill and the Navy appropriation bill, were before Congress, there would be an opportunity to achieve important results in the way of reductions in Federal expenditures. I believed that we could reduce the budget estimates covering the Army and Navy for the current year, between $150,000,000 and $200,000,000. But I am doomed to grievous disappointment. My expectations will not be realized. The Senate a few moments ago, refused to recommit the pending measure for the purpose of reducing the total amount carried by the bill, 10 per cent. With a decisive vote in opposition to the motion to recommit, the Senate served notice that it would not accept any amendments reducing the items carried in the bill.

The measure before us provides approximately $400,000,000 for the next fiscal year. It is true only about three hundred millions are for strictly military purposes, the remainder being for improving rivers and harbors, and for flood-control work on the Mississippi River. With respect to the appropriations for rivers and harbors, may I say that in my opinion at least fifteen or twenty million dollars should be taken from the amounts allocated for that purpose. Three or four years ago I made a searching investigation of the appropriations made by the Government for improving rivers and harbors and so-called inland waterways. I examined every appropriation from the days of President Washington, and every project upon which money had been expended, together with the hundreds of reports and thousands of pages of testimony relating to such projects, and after such examination I was convinced that hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated by the Government had been wasted. There has been appropriated to date considerably more than one and a quarter billion dollars for such projects.

The Senator from Minnesota has just stated in substance that hundreds of millions of dollars expended during the past 40 years upon the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers have largely been wasted. In my opinion the inefficiency of the Government when it undertakes business activities has been exhibited in the waste and extravagance which have characterized its work in connection with rivers and harbors and so-called inland waterways. For years I contended for a different plan for dealing with rivers and harbors and inland waterways, and suggested a plan calling for a scientific and proper engineering organization to handle these public

projects, but we have kept on in the old inefficient and wasteful course with unsatisfactory results and with indefensible demands upon the Public Treasury.

Mr. President, this bill should carry no more than $250,000,000 for the military activities of the Government for the next fiscal year. For a number of years, such as 1924, 1925, and 1926, the total appropriations by the Government for purely—Army—military purposes did not exceed $250,000,000 per annum. There is no justification for a larger appropriation at the present time. Indeed, taking into account the nation-wide depression, the enormous burdens of taxation, the possibility and perhaps the probability of a deficit for the coming year, the appropriation should be less than it was in either of the years referred to.

The Senator from Tennessee a short time ago referred to a large number of items carried in the bill which should be reduced; and, as I recall, his suggestions would have reduced the military appropriations in the bill between thirty and forty million dollars. There are a number of other items that should be reduced so that the military appropriations carried in the bill would have been brought within the limits of $250,000,000.

Mr. President, we will have before us within a few days a naval bill which will demand more than $300,000,000 to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government for the next fiscal year. Senators will recall that only a few days ago there was forced through the Senate a bill authorizing nearly a billion dollars for new naval construction, the war vessels to be completed before the end of the year 1936. The appropriations demanded by the executive department for military and naval purposes for the next fiscal year will be greater by nearly $200,000,000 than any country on earth. I have heretofore stated that there is no justification for this Republic, with its advantageous position—geographically, materially, and otherwise—devoting so large a sum for military purposes. During the past two or three years we have expended nearly $800,000,000 each year for the ordinary expenses of the Army and the Navy. That stupendous sum has been nearly one-fifth of all of the expenses of all nations for military purposes.

This Nation professes to be a devotee of peace, to desire disarmament and the abolition of war, and the establishment of international tribunals to which appeals may be made to settle all controversies which might arise between nations. It is inexplicable to some, why, with the professions which we make, this Nation should expend more for military purposes than any of the so-called militaristic nations of the world. Many of our citizens with remarkable vocal powers and loud affirmations of patriotism, are constantly talking of preparedness, of national security, and indulge in bitter criticism and indeed denunciation of those who do not accept their view and who merely suggest that this Nation might be more influential in the world and might become a greater moral leader if it did not devote so large a portion of its revenues for military purposes. Within this latter category are many people in the United States who, if the occasion required, would gladly lay down their lives for their country and make every sacrifice possible to defend its honor and preserve its integrity. There are those who believe that this great Republic was brought into being under divine cognizance to serve a beneficent purpose, in promoting the cause of liberty and justice in all the world; that it is to be not only a powerful moral and spiritual force, but an effective instrumentality in securing world unity, peace, and good will.

Mr. President, I submit that there is no foe that menaces our country. This Republic is impregnable from any attack from without. If it ever falls it will be the result of domestic causes, and internal betrayal. But I have confidence in the enduring qualities of this Republic—the integrity and character, and the love of liberty and freedom of the American people. Social and political disturbances that shock the foundations of other nations will pass us by, and this Nation under God will indefinitely guard the liberties of the American people and contribute to the progress and welfare of all peoples.

Mr. President, this is not the time to spend hundreds of millions of dollars, as is proposed, for military and naval purposes. It will be a great mistake to pass this bill in its present form. It will provoke criticism from many American citizens; it will arouse the fears, or, at least, provoke questionings upon the part of other nations. They will be unable to comprehend how or why in this period of depression, with millions out of employment, this Government would be willing to heavily tax its people and appropriate between seven and eight hundred million dollars for its Army and Navy for the next fiscal year.

Many Americans have been critical of the policies of other countries, charging them with ambitions for territorial gain and militaristic enterprises. May we not expect criticisms of other nations if we pass measures such as the one before us? It seems to me that we should be more interested in rescuing our country from the frightful depression into which it has been plunged. We should be interested in reversing unwise and unsound policies by which our country has been guided for a number of years. We should abandon any narrow or partisan view, and formulate and carry into execution those policies that will unify the people, dissipate the difficulties that now exist, revivify stricken business, quicken moribund and stagnant enterprises, and contribute to the return of prosperity. We should attempt to instill confidence by adopting measures that have within them moral and humane qualities—if such may be attributed to social and economic policies—as well as sound business and financial measures that will bring assurance to the people that the shadows are passing and prosperity is within our reach.

I express my profound regret that the Senate has set its face resolutely against modifying this bill or reducing the appropriations beyond the limits prescribed therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] in behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Individual amendments are in order.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I move to strike out all of pages 62 and 63, the provision for the citizens' military training camps.

I do not care to detain the Senate at this late hour in discussing the proposition, because I have already discussed it in considerable detail on the motion to send the bill back to the committee with instructions, which motion was defeated.

I believe that the Senate, if it wants to carry out what we have been professing we were trying to do—to bring about economy and to cut appropriations to the bone—can not vote against this amendment. I am not arguing, and I have not to-day argued, against these military training camps if they are properly administered, if they are properly handled, but I have called attention to the fact that in these military training camps the money that is to be used, or part of it at least, is used for the purpose of inculcating into the minds of the young men who attend those training camps ideas of government which are directly detrimental to the constitutions and laws of nearly all the States of the Union.

Can we not wait one year, can we not, for the sake of helping out the economy program, suspend the operation of these camps for one year? They have nothing to do with the military efficiency of the Army. They have nothing to do with any Army emergency of any kind. But over the country there are military training camps established, where for 30 days, I believe it is, young men from all walks of life come to get instruction. Some of the instruction they get is beneficial, although it is doubtful whether the expense should be paid by the Federal Government.

The young men are taught, as I have shown to-day, not military affairs so much but ideas of citizenship, which are absolutely contradictory to the theory of citizenship in 90 per cent of the States of the Union. They are taught there, as I have shown, that an elective judiciary, if carried out

to its logical end, would mean the destruction of our Republic. They are taught there that all the initiative provisions in the various State constitutions are in that class. They are taught that if a municipality wants to own its own electric-light plant, its waterworks, its street-car system, such a thing will ultimately lead to the ruin and the destruction of our Government.

Do we want such things taught? We have no objection to anybody having those theories of government if he wants to, but I submit that it is not right to ask the taxpayers of the United States to pay for them.

Are we not willing in this great emergency, as great as war itself, to forego for one year even the things in those training camps which are beneficial to the young men, physical training, and so forth? From every walk of life from whence these young men come there is human suffering on account of unemployment. A few are selected to go to these training camps. They have a vacation; they have a good time; they receive some instruction that is valuable, some instruction that is absolutely wrong, fundamentally wrong—all of it at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States—when in every community from which they come, on all sides, their own neighbors, their own acquaintances, are suffering for the necessaries of life, and we are here now trying to meet the emergency, we are here now trying to cut down the unnecessary expenses of the Government, many which under ordinary circumstances it is conceded are unnecessary.

Why, then, should we insist on paying from public funds under these conditions the expenses of these training camps, even if this evil were taken out?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY], and vote "nay."

Mr. HATFIELD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN], and vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). Again announcing my general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], I withhold my vote, being unable to find a transfer. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. TYDINGS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON]. I am not informed how that Senator would vote if he were present. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

I also desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] is unavoidably absent. On this vote he is paired with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KING. Upon this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. I am advised that if present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] with the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND];

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. COSTIGAN. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is unavoidably absent. His pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] has been announced.

Mr. HAYDEN. My colleague the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. REED (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BROOKHART. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I understand that he would vote as I am going to vote, and therefore I am permitted to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. Has that Senator voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and vote "nay."

Mr. BULKLEY (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY], but I understand that he would vote as I have voted, and therefore I allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—11			
Blaine	Costigan	La Follette	Shipstead
Brookhart	Frazier	Logan	Wheeler
Connally	Gore	Norris	
NAYS—45			
Austin	Coolidge	Jones	Smoot
Bailey	Cutting	Kean	Steiwer
Bankhead	Davis	Keyes	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Dill	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Bingham	Fletcher	McNary	Townsend
Bratton	George	Moses	Trammell
Broussard	Hale	Oddie	Vandenberg
Bulkley	Hatfield	Pittman	Walcott
Byrnes	Hawes	Reed	Watson
Capper	Hayden	Sheppard	
Caraway	Hebert	Shortridge	
Cohen	Hull	Smith	
NOT VOTING—40			
Ashurst	Fess	Lewis	Robinson, Ind.
Barkley	Glass	Long	Schall
Black	Glenn	McKellar	Stephens
Borah	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Swanson
Bulow	Harrison	Morrison	Tydings
Carey	Hastings	Neely	Wagner
Copeland	Howell	Norbeck	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Johnson	Nye	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Kendrick	Patterson	Waterman
Dickinson	King	Robinson, Ark.	White

So the amendment proposed by Mr. NORRIS was rejected.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, on page 14 of the bill there is a provision, beginning in line 12, that—

No appropriation for the pay of the Army shall be available for the pay of any officer or enlisted man on active list of the Army who is engaged in any manner with any publication which is or may be issued by or for any branch or organization of the Army or military association in which officers or enlisted men have membership and which carry paid advertising of firms doing business with the Government.

Then follows a proviso to the effect that this shall not prohibit officers from writing articles not in violation of the regulations of the War Department.

This has been interpreted so that officers are afraid to permit the publication of special booklets or special publications for their posts for athletic contests and recreation purposes. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], who was instrumental in having this passed, said it had not been the intention to interfere with those special publications. I have prepared a short amendment to be inserted at the end of the provision in line 24, page 14, which I offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, line 22, at the end of the provision after the word "war," strike out the period and and insert a comma and add the following:

Nor from giving approval to the issuance of special publications in the interest of athletic contests or recreations at a local post or fort.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have looked at the amendment and I am quite clear that it does not conflict with the original purpose of Congress in adopting the general policy. This would relate only to athletic programs and things of that sort.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit an amendment in the nature of a limitation and ask that the same be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 82, after line 20, add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. No part of any appropriation made by this act shall be used in any way to pay any expense in connection with the conduct, operation, or management of any post exchange, branch exchange, or subexchange within any State, save and except for real assistance and convenience to enlisted men and troops in supplying them with articles of ordinary use, wear, and consumption not furnished by the Government: *Provided*, That excess and surplus stocks of merchandise now on hand at any exchange, branch exchange, or subexchange may be disposed of, and all goods on consignment shall be returned immediately: *Provided further*, That all branch exchanges and subexchanges located off of Government lands and outside of Government reservations, and operated by private contract or agreement on a commission basis, shall be closed and terminated as to such contract or agreement immediately: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall make a report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate at the beginning of the next session of the Congress, covering the several exchanges, branch exchanges, and subexchanges operated by or under the supervision of the War Department.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in support of the amendment I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at this point a radio address delivered by Merle Thorpe, editor of Nation's Business, entitled "On Behalf of the Delinquent Taxpayer."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

The article is as follows:

ON BEHALF OF THE DELINQUENT TAXPAYER

(Transcript of the thirty-second radio talk of the Popular Business Fallacies series conducted by Merle Thorpe, editor of Nation's Business)

I have been discussing with you, ladies and gentlemen, the increasing activities of government and its inevitable increase of taxes. Many of these activities are in direct competition with the business enterprises of its citizens. We have the spectacle of the Government laying taxes on the people and at the same time undermining the income of the individual by destroying his opportunity of earning a livelihood. Such a spectacle needs no eloquence to argue its complete impropriety.

I wish I could say that this encroachment on individual enterprise is something new, that it had only now been brought into the light of public opinion, and that this publicity offered a dependable protection from future trespass. Let us not be deluded. Business men have long been alive to the insidious curtailment of their markets for goods and services through the paternalistic and welfare innovations of government. Unfortunately, nothing is done except pass resolutions. But now the public is thoroughly aroused because the related tax burden has become oppressive, and at the same time it sees with its own eyes the ruin of an individual business or industry through Government competition.

As a result of this aroused public opinion a significant thing occurred in the Congress this week. The House agreed to the appointment of a committee of five Members to investigate Government competition with private enterprise.

The proposed inquiry had its inception in a personal investigation made by Representative SHANNON, of Missouri. He had been hearing from some of his constituents who have been forced to divide their business with Uncle Sam, as well as hand over a sizable share of their earnings in taxes. The discussion of the resolution on the floor of the House helps to define the breadth and depth of the Federal Government's aggressive curtailment of the money-making possibilities of the American people.

He sent a young clerk, John Cronkite, to an Army supply store. He returned outfitted from head to foot in apparel that cost him $27.55. The same outfit purchased elsewhere would have cost from $38 to $50.

Mr. Shannon's experience caused Representative RALPH HORR, of Washington State, to go shopping. At the Army canteen he bought a straw hat for $1.85 and four bottles of cordial at 50 cents each.

"The cordial is labeled rum, Scotch, rye, and gin," said Mr. HORR. "Directions explain it should be mixed with one gallon of alcohol and the result will be the required flavor as well as color."

Cronkite's tour of Government agencies was started at the post store at Bolling Field, Army airport. There he bought for $4.85 a pair of shoes. To his surprise they were stamped "Made in England." At another Government store he acquired a light-gray 3-piece suit for $16; pocket handkerchief, 25 cents; underwear, 75 cents; white shirt, $1.60; belt, $1. At the Army post exchange he bought a necktie, 85 cents; straw hat, $1.85; socks, 40 cents.

The young man also had luncheon, a shoe shine, hair cut, and shave at Government establishments and, determined to take advantage of all possible bargains, bought cigars, camera film, witch hazel, soap, and vaseline at Federal agencies.

The office of the Missouri Representative contains large packages of goods bought in this manner and innumerable letters from business men complaining of this competition. One of his exhibits is a letter sent out under Government frank by a Government store to local citizens of Leavenworth, Kans. The letter announces "special sales for Friday and Saturday; fresh country eggs, 15 cents a dozen; bananas, 15 cents a dozen; ketchup, 3 bottles for 57 cents," and so on.

Mr. SHANNON said merchants of that city were in distress because they could not meet the lower prices of the Government competition.

As he read a letter from one of them he opened a large cardboard box containing a string of beads, brilliant yellow necktie, a bottle of cologne, and a pair of women's pink pajamas (price, 89 cents) that his secretary had bought at the Army post store.

Well, what of these exhibits in the case? Are they to be dismissed with a few paragraphs in the editorial and news columns of the press? My friends, the situation revealed through Representative SHANNON's enterprise defines a problem of national dimensions. I think I can suggest to you the magnitude of the malady by indicating the nature of the protests registered by businesses which are struggling against this Government competition.

From one city came this letter to Congressman SHANNON: "There is a serious condition existing in our little community. Our merchants are being ruined by the Government stores, with which they are unable to compete."

One of his constituents wrote him to see if something could not be done to save his business from this unfair competition. He has a little jewelry store, which is his sole support. A customer gets his price on, say, a Seth Thomas clock. He takes the number, then walks across the street to the Government store and buys the same clock for much less.

A woman clerk sent shopping by the Congressman was able to purchase at a Government store a bottle of cologne, a handkerchief, and a pajama suit, and two packages of cigarettes—the cigarettes minus the 2 cents for the State tax which the private store across the street had to charge. And here's another angle, a St. Louis shoe factory petitioned its Representative in these words: "Can not something be done to stop the Government from making shoes at Leavenworth * * *."

It takes no personal exposure to this sort of competition to understand the feeling of merchants in trying to get their plight before the Members of Congress. Why not consider us as well as the personnel of the Army, they ask, in pointing out that the Government pays its officers and men, and then, after they have served a specified time, they are retired on part pay, "but we still have to fight for a living."

Then there's the difficulty faced by private laundries in competition with the Government-operated establishments. It seems that a Government employee's cousins, sisters, and his uncles and his aunts may send their soiled linen to a Government laundry if they send it in his name. Representative SHANNON says he has received protests from privately operated laundries in 20 cities. The situation in Washington is illuminating. I give it in his words. "Fort Myer sends Government wagons over to gather up the Army officer's clothes, and incidentally the clothes of all his neighbors and friends, and later they whisper, 'We get our work

done 30 per cent cheaper by sending it to the Government laundry!'"

To that the laundrymen of Washington say, "Of course you do. We have to pay rent. We have to pay labor. We have to equip our plants and pay for everything that is necessary for our privately conducted business, including higher and higher taxes."

Years ago Professor Downing, of Harvard University, showed that—

"It is this pernicious practice of obscuring the actual costs of Government business enterprises of all kinds—by diverting interest, depreciation, and some measure of the overhead expenses into the general tax levy—which makes possible the appearance of an apparent profit to the taxpayer, when in reality he suffers an actual deficit. That deficit the uncritical taxpayer never recognizes, because it comes to him only as increased taxes. A private business enterprise can not resort to a shifty system of accounting and throw its burdens on the patient and sinewy shoulders of the taxpayer."

The restaurant and delicatessen men also have a case, and Representative SHANNON has been looking into it.

In Kansas City a restaurant is operated in the Federal Reserve Building, and the installation of another in the new post-office building is contemplated. Space in Government office buildings is also leased, I am told, in competition with local real-estate owners.

Representative STOKES, of Pennsylvania, reports that a varnish factory at Scranton is being ruined by the competition of a Government plant at Norfolk. Representative BACON is authority for the statement that the Navy Department maintains a factory for the manufacture of clothing, whereas it previously called for bids from private contractors on a competitive basis. Now, he says, the Navy is spending a good deal more for its clothing than it paid under the old system.

So much for the mere item and detail of the competitive encroachment of Government on the domain of private business. The examples carry a significance far beyond the localities which provide them. In a very real sense they are symptomatic of a comprehensive trend toward a paralyzing restriction of the area of individual endeavor.

Possibly it is something of a novelty that public opinion as reflected by the Congress thinks it worth while to hear what the small business man has to say about Government in business. As long as I can remember, it has been a popular fashion to regard "big business" as the only objector to a commercial rivalry with a public administration, such as banking, insurance, the grain trade, the railroads, water-power developments, fertilizer, and the operation of ships.

But the fact is, my friends, that Government has set up shop in about 250 separate lines of business, and the complications in which Government competition involves the local laundry owner, merchant, real-estate man, or tailor are only the localized vibrations from a profound disturbance felt throughout the length and breadth of the entire structure of finance, trade, and industry.

In the main, our attitude has been "Let 'em take it on the chin. They're big enough to stand the punishment." But if in the past we have noted only the opposition of corporations to Government competition, we are now impressed with the rising tide of protest from individuals, men who might be your neighbors or mine. It is this per capita expression of public opinion that comes home to us, for it awakens our sense of fellow feeling. When we hear that a friend or acquaintance, some familiar figure in our town, is on the financial rocks because he had to give odds to his Government in carrying on his business, we do more than say, "Poor old So-and-so." We resent this unfair treatment of a fellow citizen.

Every business community has a stake in this inquiry. An actual interest will do much to revitalize the guarantees written into the Constitution. And it is no carping or mischievous spirit that business men throughout the country are seriously questioning whether the roots and trunk of government can sustain the luxuriant foliage to which it has been unduly stimulated by the zealous advocates of growth for growth's sake.

Where there is voluntary acceptance of the idea of self-government, there must also be an active ideal of the authority, functions, and services of government. And never was there greater occasion for the friends of this democratic form of government which is ours to ask themselves in all seriousness, "What is government?"

An agency to protect life and property, to establish justice, to provide for the national defense. As Charles R. Fowler, of Minneapolis, reported to the American Bar Association in New York, only a minor part of the present Federal Budget goes to pay for the essential constitutional functions of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government. In other words, a large percentage of our costs is due to those activities which we have wished upon our governments, that do not fall within the primary purpose of our social compact.

Because of this, our tax burden is increased in two ways: First, the activities now assumed by Government, which should be carried on by the individual, are not subject to taxation. Therefore, a growing number of business enterprises, including property, are taken off the tax base. In the second place, when Government attempts to carry on a business undertaking, it invariably runs at a deficit, which must be made up by the taxpayer. This may be due to no lack of ability on the part of those whom we intrust to operate a governmental business undertaking. It is due, as I have pointed out, to the political mechanism which we have set up to protect political liberty, with its checks and balances—red tape, we call it—necessary in handling matters involving our political rights, but which rules and regulations hinder the efficient operation of a business enterprise. We must have red tape in order to prevent a quick overturn of established political principles. Otherwise it is revolution. Quickness of decision is essential to the proper conduct of a business.

So, when we have a large percentage of governmental activities, we find the reduced taxpaying capacity of the country is aggravated because Government deprives citizens from earning money with which to pay taxes.

This gradual and subtle encroachment of Government into those activities which belong to the individual, and for which you and I as citizens are responsible through our indifference or our thoughtless encouragement, has been widespread.

Thus we have the anomaly of taxpayers providing the funds for their own competition, and it is one of the factors to-day affecting the delinquent taxpayer, present and prospective, in whose behalf these talks are given.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as I listened to the amendment being read, it occurred to me that it might possibly create some difficulties in places like Panama.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It applies only to the States, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. REED. It does not apply to the outlying possessions?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It does not apply to the Territories.

Mr. REED. I can not commit myself to it very definitely, but I am inclined to consent to its adoption at this time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment which I think will take care of the situation so ably and justly criticized by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] with regard to the use of citizens' training camps for the dissemination of various kinds of propaganda relating to economics, governmental theories, and so forth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 63, line 25, after the word "made," insert the following:

Provided further, That no money appropriated in this act shall be available for any citizens' military training camp or unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in which there is instruction in civics, economics, governmental theory, or any other nonmilitary subject.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, this subject has been discussed at such length to-day that I do not care to add anything more; but I should like to have the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if we are not going to have the yeas and nays, let us talk about it a while.

Mr. REED. O Mr. President, let us have the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand for the yeas and nays seconded?

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

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I again announce my general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] and withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and vote "nay."

Mr. TYDINGS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement with reference to my pair with the

senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF]. I understand that if my pair were present he would vote as I shall vote. Therefore I vote "nay."

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I am informed that if the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON], with whom I am paired, were present he would vote "nay." Therefore I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BULKLEY (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY]. I am advised that if present he would vote as I have voted, so I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY], I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I find that I can transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF], which I do, and vote "nay."

Mr. NYE. On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. Were I permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HATFIELD. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] and vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] with the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK];

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW].

Mr. COSTIGAN. I wish to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. His pair has been announced.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—18

Blaine	Cutting	Howell	Smith
Brookhart	Dill	La Follette	Trammell
Caraway	Fletcher	Logan	Wheeler
Connally	Frazier	McGill	
Costigan	George	Norris	

NAYS—36

Austin	Cohen	Keyes	Steiwer
Bailey	Coolidge	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Davis	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Bingham	Hale	Oddie	Townsend
Bratton	Hatfield	Reed	Tydings
Broussard	Hayden	Robinson, Ind.	Vandenberg
Bulkley	Hebert	Sheppard	Wagner
Byrnes	Jones	Shortridge	Walcott
Capper	Kean	Smoot	Watson

NOT VOTING—42

Ashurst	Fess	King	Robinson, Ark.
Bankhead	Glass	Lewis	Schall
Barkley	Glenn	Long	Shipstead
Black	Goldsborough	McKellar	Stephens
Borah	Gore	Metcalf	Swanson
Bulow	Harrison	Morrison	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hastings	Neely	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Hawes	Norbeck	Waterman
Couzens	Hull	Nye	White
Dale	Johnson	Patterson	
Dickinson	Kendrick	Pittman	

So the amendment proposed by Mr. CUTTING was rejected.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 82, line 8, after the word "department," strike out the remainder of line 8 and all of lines 9 to 13, inclusive, and insert:

This section shall not apply to medical officers on out-patient medical service to whom may be assigned a Government-owned motor vehicle for their exclusive use.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, the object of the amendment is to effect a very substantial economy when we apply the policy to the various departments here in Washington. This is the first appropriation bill that has been considered since I discovered a week or two ago that probably half a million dollars a year is expended for private automobiles for officials to use at Government expense. I do not know that there was ever any justification for this policy. I do not think the American people would quite approve of the idea of furnishing a Cadillac automobile for an Assistant Secretary of War in which to ride around on his private business. Of course, it is called "official business," but I do not know of any particular official business of any consequence that would require the Government to furnish an automobile for an Assistant Secretary of War. It happens that the other House requested data in regard to the use of Government automobiles, and the head of the Bureau of Efficiency reported, as best I am able to figure from the data furnished, that there are about 21 or 22 automobiles used in connection with the War Department.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I yield.

Mr. REED. I do not see why this amendment should not be agreed to and allowed to go to conference. Then we can look into it and ascertain the number of automobiles that are being used.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I should like to have that information. I thank the Senator. I am going to say only a few additional words to show some justification for the amendment. The report made by the Director of the Efficiency Bureau shows that the Secretary of War has a Packard automobile, purchased with Government money, and that $1,380 is provided for a chauffeur. I have great respect for the dignity of that office, but I submit, especially in view of depressed economic conditions, that there is no reason in the world why the Government should furnish the Secretary of War an automobile. Let him own his own automobile and provide his own chauffeur just as does the average official in this city or any other city does or as a Senator does. I do not know of any Senator who has an automobile furnished to him; I do not know of any Senator who even has the privilege of the use of what are called "group automobiles." In the War Department the Secretary has a Packard furnished him, with a chauffeur at $1,380 a year. One of the Assistant Secretaries has a LaSalle, with a chauffeur furnished at an expense to the Government of $1,380. The other Assistant Secretary of War has a LaSalle, purchased by the Government, furnished free of charge, with a chauffeur at $1,380. The Chief of Staff is furnished with a Cadillac, which is operated by an enlisted man. The chief deputy of the General Staff has a LaSalle, which is also operated by an enlisted man.

Then they have what they call the "reserve and replacement" LaSalle, operated by an enlisted man. The Adjutant General has furnished to him only a Dodge and an enlisted man to operate it for him. Then they have what is called the "messenger center," with a Dodge. Then they have six cars in a general pool. I suppose anybody may use those. Those cars are all operated by enlisted men and are directly connected with the department, as I understand. I have checked these data the best I can. There are about 21 cars, as stated here, purchased by the Government, furnished by the Government, operated by the Government, used by the War Department. I think some of these automobiles are also used by the district engineer, probably as many as 15 or 16; but the others are used entirely by the War Department.

This system has crept into all the departments. It has crept into the Agricultural Department. The Secretary, his assistant, and the heads of the different bureaus are all provided with Packards, LaSalles, Cadillacs, and so forth, at Government expense, and with chauffeurs. The Secretary of Agriculture tries to effectuate economy when it comes to the question of rendering some assistance to the poor, downstricken farmers of the country, but he did not ask Congress to cut off the appropriation for all those automobiles, for which he really has practically no use so far as official business is concerned.

I say he has "practically no use" for them. If the Secretary of Agriculture or one of his assistants has occasion to come to the Capitol, let him go out and get in his own car, just as a Senator does when he visits the department. I dare say that 90 per cent of the Senators spend more time visiting different departments on official business than do any of the department officials calling at different places on official business.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. We have no transportation accommodations furnished to us—none whatever. I do not make this criticism on account of what we have or do not have. I would not have such accommodations if they could be furnished; I think it would be wrong for transportation to be furnished to a Senator. I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. My recollection is that in the appropriation bills which we have heretofore passed there has been a general provision in regard to the use of automobiles by department officials.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not think so. I raised this question the other day.

Mr. JONES. I will ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if there is not such a provision in the pending bill?

Mr. REED. There are restrictions in this bill, but they do not go so far as the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TRAMMELL. No.

Mr. JONES. But they are similar to the provisions in the other appropriation bills?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. TRAMMELL. There is in this bill a restriction against the use of automobiles for any other than official purposes; then there is a definition of "official purposes," and then there is the provision which I seek to have stricken out which excepts the Secretary of War and his assistants and those connected with his department. That in itself shows it should be taken out. Why should they be made favorites? Why under any idea of the dignity of the office or placing a higher official upon a pedestal that should any of them except the Secretary be allowed to have free cars and chauffeurs? I think in these times that even he should not be permitted to have them. They have absolutely overdone the business of getting Government automobiles and using them practically for personal purposes. The abuse runs all through the Government service. I dare say that in the various appropriation bills there are at least half a million dollars or a million dollars carried this year for that purpose.

I never said anything about the Chief Executive. I have a great deal of sympathy for the man who occupies the high office of President of the United States, and particularly in these times when he has his trials and his tribulations and responsibilities. But as an illustration, what use is there for nine automobiles at the White House, purchased and paid for by the American people, and with chauffeurs provided by the American people?

If the Senator will accept this amendment, I will be glad to have him do so.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 61, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be expended for or on account of any educational institution not essentially a military school which makes military training compulsory to any student enrolled therein, and this appropriation shall be available in accordance with law to such institutions as maintain elective military training courses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, this amendment simply cuts out the compulsory feature of military training at public educational institutions. I should like a yea-and-nay vote on it, and if that is agreeable I will make no further remarks. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be again stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk again stated the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota on which the yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand seconded?

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

Mr. BINGHAM (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before regarding my pair and its transfer, I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BULKLEY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before with respect to my general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. HATFIELD (when his name was called). Repeating my previous announcement regarding my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Referring to my former announcement, I vote "nay."

Mr. NYE (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], I desire to announce that were I at liberty to vote I should vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I find that I can transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] to the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT]. I do so, and vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. NORBECK. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON] with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] with the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG];

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]; and

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

The result was announced—yeas 7, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—7

Blaine	Costigan	La Follette	Wheeler
Brookhart	Frazier	Norris	

NAYS—43

Austin	Cohen	Howell	Shortridge
Bailey	Connally	Jones	Smith
Bankhead	Cutting	Kean	Smoot
Barbour	Davis	Keyes	Steiwer
Bingham	Fletcher	Logan	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	George	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Hale	Moses	Townsend
Bulkley	Hatfield	Oddie	Trammell
Byrnes	Hawes	Reed	Vandenberg
Capper	Hayden	Robinson, Ind.	Watson
Caraway	Hebert	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—46

Ashurst	Fess	Long	Shipstead
Barkley	Glass	McGill	Stephens
Black	Glenn	McKellar	Swanson
Borah	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Tydings
Bulow	Gore	Morrison	Wagner
Carey	Harrison	Neely	Walcott
Coolidge	Hastings	Norbeck	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Hull	Nye	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Johnson	Patterson	Waterman
Dale	Kendrick	Pittman	White
Dickinson	King	Robinson, Ark.	
Dill	Lewis	Schall	

So Mr. FRAZIER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still on its second reading and open to amendment. No further amendments being proposed, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LOANS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF—ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4860) to provide for loans to States for the relief of distress arising from unemployment, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF THE POST OFFICE COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. ODDIE, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HEBERT, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nomination of Thomas D. Goldrick to be postmaster at Pascoag, R. I., in place of T. D. Goldrick.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

RADIO ADDRESS OF EDWARD A. O'NEAL

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a speech of Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, delivered on June 4 over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerks at the desk state to the Chair that this speech was inserted in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

Mr. BROOKHART. Very well; if that has been done, I withdraw the request. I will let my statement stand in the RECORD, however, with the further statement that this speech ought to be read by every Senator, including the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The RECORD will carry that statement, undoubtedly accurately.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to say that if that speech of Mr. O'Neal is not better than those I usually hear him make, I advise anybody who is thinking about reading it not to waste his time. [Laughter.]

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—LEGAL EXPENSES

Mr. TOWNSEND. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably a short resolution which will not entail any debate.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The legislative clerk read Senate Resolution 222, submitted by Mr. NORRIS on the 8th instant, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, authorized by Senate Resolution No. 415, agreed to February 5, 1931, to engage counsel for the purpose of instituting proceedings to secure a determination of the right of George Otis Smith to the position of member of the Federal Power Commission, and to pay the counsel fees and other expenses necessarily incident to such proceedings, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $395.40 in addition to the amount heretofore authorized for said purpose.

FEDERAL BUILDING SITE, DOVER, N. J.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Order of Business 729, House bill 11337, be taken up and passed at this time. I may say that the bill passed yesterday without discussion or debate; and I requested my colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] to let it go over through an inadvertence. I ask that it be passed again.

Mr. CONNALLY. Reserving the right to object, whose bill is it?

Mr. BARBOUR. My bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the action of the Senate to have been to have passed the bill yesterday, and, upon request, that action was reconsidered and the bill was replaced upon the calendar. The Senator from New Jersey now asks unanimous consent that it may be taken up for consideration. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I desire to make a request following a motion which I understand is about to be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair intends to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. WAGNER. What is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the bank bill, the so-called Glass bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is a privileged motion. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7912) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President——

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. I ask unanimous consent that as soon as the conference report just made the special order is disposed of, we take up for consideration Order of Business 836, Sen-

ate bill 4860, which is the so-called relief bill, providing for an appropriation of $300,000,000 for the relief of the destitute.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator couple with that request a further request that the Glass bill be temporarily laid aside?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; of course, that the Glass bill be only temporarily laid aside.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is my opinion that this morning, when the Army bill was made the unfinished business, it displaced the unfinished business. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not so understand, although the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair at the time. The Chair understood that it was temporarily laid aside.

Mr. McNARY. A motion was made to proceed to the consideration of the Army bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed at the desk that it was temporarily laid aside, in which case the Chair was perfectly correct in laying the unfinished business before the Senate; but, of course, a motion to take up a conference report is privileged. That motion has already been agreed to, and the conference report is now before the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] objected to unanimous consent to laying aside the unfinished business temporarily and the question came on the motion to proceed to the consideration of the Army bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair was not presiding at that moment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I suggest that the Chair inquire at the desk?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will ask the Journal clerk what occurred.

Mr. McNARY. That is precisely what occurred, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal clerk informs the Chair that that is correct, and the banking bill has been laid aside permanently.

Mr. McNARY. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The business before the Senate now is the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President——

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. I have submitted a unanimous-consent request which I ask to have put by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the consideration of the conference report now before the Senate Order of Business 836, Senate bill 4860, shall be taken up. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senate has had on its calendar for some time the bill providing for the independence of the Philippine people. That bill passed the House by almost a unanimous vote, and it is on our preferential calendar.

I desire to say that the friends of Philippine independence do not want to interfere with relief bills or these other important measures; but there must come a time when the Senate will take up that bill and dispose of it. It not only represents a very large sentiment in the House, but I am sure that that sentiment is equally strong in the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that that bill be taken up——

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the Senator from Oregon does not intend to proceed with the conference report to-night; and all this is unnecessary, because it all comes after the conference report, which is not going to be acted on to-night.

Mr. WAGNER. I understand that.

Mr. NORRIS. Why does not the Senator wait until to-morrow, then?

Mr. WAGNER. What I wanted to do was to have some definite time fixed when this bill, which is so important, shall be taken up.

Mr. NORRIS. The conference report may take all day. There will be plenty of time to make the request to-morrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. WAGNER. I understand that the Senator from Missouri does not intend to object to my request.

Mr. HAWES. No.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in view of the parliamentary situation, the possibility of some Senators objecting, and the fact that the Senator from New York will have an opportunity to submit his request in the morning, I move now that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock; and I suggest that the Senator from New York withhold his request until that time.

Mr. WAGNER. Of course, I will follow the suggestion; but the Senator from Missouri has just informed me that he does not intend to object to my request.

Mr. McNARY. Other Senators have informed me that they may do so this evening; so I move that we recess now, and suggest to the Senator that he proceed with the matter to-morrow.

RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon moves that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, June 10, 1932, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of June 8), 1932

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

David D. Ashworth, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney, southern district of West Virginia, to succeed James Damron, whose term expired January 4, 1932.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lieut. Wiley Thomas Moore, Field Artillery (detailed in Ordnance Department), with rank from October 1, 1930.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonel

Lieut. Col. Thomas Watson Brown, Infantry, from June 1, 1932.

To be lieutenant colonel

Major Arthur Earl Wilbourn, Cavalry, from June 1, 1932.

To be major

Capt. Henry Hutchings, jr., Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1932.

To be captain

First Lieut. William Jacob Kunzmann, Infantry, from June 1, 1932.

To be first lieutenant

Second Lieut. Harry Joseph Wheaton, Infantry, from June 1, 1932.

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

Capt. John Charles Burr, Dental Corps, from June 5, 1932.

To be captain

First Lieut. Eugene Edward Manning, Dental Corps, from June 2, 1932.