

# Congressional Record

## SEVENTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

### SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 1932

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who art from everlasting to everlasting and whose mercies are new every morning; we thank Thee for the renewed springs of love, joy, peace, aspiration, and hope with which Thou hast but recently refreshed us. As we stand at the threshold of another year, give us the power to be more patient, more just in judgment, more useful and helpful in action, more apt in learning the lessons of life. May our work be better done and may our hearts respond more quickly to the touch of all that is good and true, that by our counsels and deliberations we may speed the Nation's welfare with blessings of peace and tranquillity within our borders and rise to the passion of the larger claim of the hopes of mankind. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, December 21, 1931, when, on request of Mr. FESS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Couzens	Hull	Robinson, Ind.
Austin	Dale	Johnson	Sheppard
Bailey	Davis	Jones	Shipstead
Barbour	Dickinson	Kean	Shortridge
Barkley	Dill	Kendrick	Smith
Bingham	Fess	Keyes	Smoot
Black	Fletcher	King	Steiner
Blaine	Frazier	La Follette	Swanson
Borah	George	Logan	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Glass	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Glenn	McKellar	Townsend
Broussard	Goldsborough	McNary	Trammell
Bulkeley	Gore	Metcalf	Tydings
Bulow	Hale	Morrison	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harris	Moses	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Neely	Walcott
Caraway	Hastings	Norbeck	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Hatfield	Norris	Waterman
Coolidge	Hayden	Nye	Watson
Copeland	Hebert	Patterson	Wheeler
Costigan	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	White

Mr. KENDRICK. I wish to announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY], is necessarily absent on official business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. BLACK. I desire to announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], is absent on official business.

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

#### RELIEF OF ECONOMIC SITUATION (S. DOC. NO. 32)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

#### To the Senate and House of Representatives:

At the convening of the Congress on December 7 I laid proposals before it designed to check the further degeneration in prices and values, to fortify us against continued shocks from world instability, and to unshackle the forces of recovery. The need is manifestly even more evident than at the date of my message a month ago. I should be derelict in my duty if I did not at this time emphasize the paramount importance to the Nation of constructive action upon these questions at the earliest possible moment. These recommendations have been largely developed in consultation with leading men of both parties, of agriculture, of labor, of banking, and of industry. They furnish the bases for full collaboration to effect these purposes. They have no partisan character. We can and must replace the unjustifiable fear in the country by confidence.

The principal subjects requiring immediate action are:

1. The strengthening of the Federal land bank system to aid the farmer and to maintain at the highest level the credit of these institutions which furnish agriculture with much-needed capital. This measure has passed the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate.

2. The creation of a reconstruction finance corporation to furnish during the period of the depression credits otherwise unobtainable under existing circumstances in order to give confidence to agriculture, industry, and labor against further paralyzing influences. By such prompt assurance we can reopen many credit channels and reestablish the normal working of our commercial organization and thus contribute greatly to reestablish the resumption of employment and stability in prices and values.

3. The creation of a system of home loan discount banks in order to revive employment by new construction and to mitigate the difficulties of many of our citizens in securing renewals of mortgages on their homes and farms. It has the further purpose of permanent encouragement of home ownership. To accomplish these purposes we must so liberate the resources of the country banks, the savings banks, and the building and loan associations as to restore these institutions to normal functioning. Under the proposal before the Congress the most of the capital of these discount banks would be subscribed by the institutions participating in their use, and such residue as might be necessary for the Federal Government to supply temporarily would be repaid in time by such institutions as in the case of the farm-loan banks when they were first organized.

4. The discount facilities of our Federal reserve banks are restricted by law more than that of the central banks in other countries. This restriction in times such as these limits the liquidity of the banks and tends to increase the forces of deflation, cripples the smaller businesses, stifles new enterprise, and thus limits employment. I recommend an enlargement of these discount privileges to take care of emergencies. To meet the needs of our situation it will not be necessary to go even as far as the current practice of foreign institutions of similar character. Such a measure has

the support of most of the governors of the Federal reserve banks.

5. The development of a plan to assure early distribution to depositors in closed banks is necessary to relieve distress among millions of small depositors and small businesses and to release vast sums of money now frozen.

6. Revision of the laws relating to transportation in the direction recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission would strengthen our principal transportation systems and restore confidence in the bonds of our railways. These bonds are held largely by our insurance companies, our savings banks and benevolent trusts, and are therefore the property of nearly every family in the United States. The railways are the largest employers of labor and purchasers of goods.

7. Revision of banking laws in order to better safeguard depositors.

8. The country must have confidence that the credit and stability of the Federal Government will be maintained by drastic economy in expenditure, by adequate increase of taxes, and by restriction of issues of Federal securities. The recent depreciation in prices of Government securities is a serious warning which reflects the fear of further large and unnecessary issues of such securities. Promptness in adopting an adequate budget relief to taxpayers by resolute economy and restriction in security issues is essential to remove this uncertainty.

Combating a depression is indeed like a great war in that it is not a battle upon a single front but upon many fronts. These measures are all a necessary addition to the efficient and courageous efforts of our citizens throughout the Nation. Our people through voluntary measures and through State and local action are providing for distress. Through the organized action of employers they are securing distribution of employment and thus mitigating the hardships of the depression. Through the mobilization of national credit associations they are aiding the country greatly. Our duty is so to supplement these steps as to make their efforts more fruitful.

The United States has the resources and resilience to make a large measure of recovery independent of the rest of the world. Our internal economy is our primary concern, and we must fortify our economic structure in order to meet any situation that may arise and by so doing lay the foundations for recovery.

This does not mean that we are insensible to the welfare of other nations or that our own self-interest is not involved in economic rehabilitation abroad, which would restore the markets for our agricultural and other commodities. But it is our duty to devote ourselves to the problems of our own internal economy, not only as the first necessity to domestic welfare but as our best contribution to the stability of the world as a whole.

Action in these matters by the Congress will go far to reestablish confidence, to restore the functioning of our economic system, and to rebuilding of prices and values and to quickening employment. Our justified hope and confidence for the future rests upon unity of our people and of the Government in prompt and courageous action.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 4, 1932.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message will be printed and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND THEIR NATIONALS  
(S. DOC. NO. 34)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending the enactment of legislation for the purposes described therein.

The recommendations of the Secretary of State have my approval, and I request the enactment of legislation for the purposes indicated in order that this Government may carry out the projects and meet the obligations outlined in the report.

HERBERT HOOVER.

(Inclosure: Report of the Secretary of State.)

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 4, 1932.

EXPENSES OF INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF AERIAL  
LEGAL EXPERTS (S. DOC. NO. 33)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing an annual appropriation in the sum of \$5,750, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of participation by the Government of the United States in the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and/or of the commissions established by that committee.

HERBERT HOOVER.

(Inclosure: Report.)

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 4, 1932.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of papers and documents on the files of the department which are not needed in the transaction of business and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. ODDIE and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of publications and documents on the files of the department which are not needed in the conduct of business and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. NYE and Mr. PITTMAN members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of documents and papers on the files of the department which are not needed in the conduct of business and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

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

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his recommendation for the enactment of legislation excepting Federal civilian employees continuously employed in a department or establishment from the taking of a renewal oath on change of status, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, submitting a report showing—

One hundred and ninety-six officers of the Government who on June 30, 1931, were delinquent in rendering or transmitting their

accounts to the proper offices in Washington, the names thereof, and, in each instance, whether the delinquency was waived.

One thousand one hundred and eighty-five officers of the Government who, upon final settlement of their accounts, were found to be indebted to the Government and who on June 30, 1931, had failed to pay the same into the Treasury of the United States, together with the amount of the indebtedness of each and the aggregate of said indebtedness, viz, \$1,980,496.60—

which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate two communications from the Comptroller General of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Claims, as follows:

Report and recommendation to Congress concerning the claim of Joseph E. Bourrie Co. against the United States; and

Report and recommendation to Congress concerning the claim of Lewis O. Wick against the United States.

#### REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the National Academy of Sciences, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1931, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Library.

#### USE OF SILVER IN THE MONETARY SYSTEM

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, considerable agitation has occurred with regard to the use of silver as a part of our monetary system. I want to say that the people of my section of the country are very strongly in favor of that, and they do not look upon it as a change or a departure from the policy of the Republican Party in the past. As Senators know, much of the agitation for the restoration of silver in our monetary system is free from any partisan consideration. In this connection, I think it is well to read a line from the Republican platform of 1896 as follows:

We are unalterably opposed to every measure calculated to debase our currency or impair the credit of our country. We are, therefore, opposed to the free coinage of silver—

And note this—

except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world—

And note this—

which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such agreement can be obtained, the existing gold standard must be preserved.

That declaration was substantially reaffirmed in 1900. I do not know of any subsequent platform that has abrogated that declaration. As I say, I have heard of no special urgency for the rehabilitation of silver except through international agreement. I believe that if the administration would do everything possible along those lines, it would be acting, not only in accord with the Republican policy but I think it would be meeting the general opinion of the people, at least of the western and central portions of the country. I ask that the entire plank of the Republican platform of 1896, from which I have read, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The plank referred to is as follows:

[From Republican Party platform, 1896]

#### FINANCE

The Republican Party is unreservedly for sound money. It caused the enactment of the law providing for the resumption of specie payments in 1879; since then every dollar has been as good as gold.

We are unalterably opposed to every measure calculated to debase our currency or impair the credit of our country. We are, therefore, opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved. All our silver and paper currency must be maintained at parity with gold, and we favor all measures designed to maintain inviolably the obligations of the United States of all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard, the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth.

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

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

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator recalls that this body adopted a resolution at its last session requesting the President to call a conference on this subject?

Mr. JONES. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Can the Senator inform the Senate whether the President has acted upon or has the intention of acting upon that suggestion?

Mr. JONES. The Senator knows as much about that as I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator, I understood, was speaking for the Republican Party?

Mr. JONES. Oh, no.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And I was asking him if he could tell us a little more about what the President thought.

Mr. JONES. I was just reminding our people or bringing to their minds the declaration in the platform of 1896, which, I repeat, was reaffirmed in 1900, and I do not know that it has ever been abrogated since.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. JONES presented resolutions adopted by the chambers of commerce of Everett and Port Townsend, Wash., favoring the passage of legislation amending the antidumping law so as to make it more promptly enforceable, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARBOUR presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Montclair (N. J.) Real Estate Board indorsing the plan of President Hoover for the passage of home loan bank legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Minnesota praying for the passage of legislation known as "The farmers' farm relief act," which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the passage of legislation providing for more adequate safety of life at sea, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BROUSSARD presented resolutions adopted by the board of governors of the New Orleans Stock Exchange, the Louisiana Sugar and Rice Exchange, the directors of the New Orleans Board of Trade (Ltd.), the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans, the board of directors of the New Orleans Real Estate Board, and the board of directors of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, indorsing a resolution adopted by the American Legion at its national convention held in Detroit, Mich., appealing to Congress for a referendum in connection with the proposed amendment of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by Howard Burnett Post, No. 1520, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Fort Dodge, Kans., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the immediate cash payment of World War adjusted certificates (bonus), which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Ellis Community Club, of Ellis, Kans., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the Federal regulation of motor trucks and other instrumentalities of transportation competing with the railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BROOKHART presented a petition of sundry citizens of Prairie City, Iowa, praying for the limitation of armaments on land, sea, and air, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of Iowa, praying for the imposition of a tariff duty on oil, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Malvern, Iowa, praying for the passage of legislation providing payment of the balance of adjusted-service certificates which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BLAINE presented resolutions adopted by the Glenwood National Farm Loan Association, of Glenwood City, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation to grant the members of the national farm loan associations a 3-year moratorium on mortgaged indebtedness, said moratorium to apply only to bona fide farmers having lived on and operated farms for one year or more, and such suspended payments to be added to the end of the amortization period, and also the passage of legislation to amend the Federal farm loan law so as to permit the sale of Federal Government bonds, proceeds of such sale to retire the present bonds and to re-finance Federal land banks, thus assuring the borrower a lower rate of interest; which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine

Whereas oleomargarine is a product manufactured mainly from vegetable oils not produced in the United States; and

Whereas oleomargarine is capable of being used as, and is being used as a substitute for butter; and

Whereas the most eminent scientists and food experts have proved and recognized the superiority of butter over oleomargarine as a food product, and have repeatedly pointed out the vital importance of the vitamin content of butter, absent from oleomargarines and other butter substitutes, to the health, growth, and welfare of the children of the United States; and

Whereas the economic condition of the American farmer has never been so acute as at the present time; and

Whereas the economic welfare of the farmer is of basic significance in the economic welfare of the State and Nation; and

Whereas one of the principal causes of the deplorable condition of the American farmer is the depression of the market for his dairy products by the presence of dairy substitutes; and

Whereas butter is one of the principal products and sources of income to the American farmer and the price of butterfat is reflected in all other dairy products; and

Whereas the market for butter has been steadily depressed as the manufacture and consumption of oleomargarine in the United States has increased; and

Whereas the manufacture and consumption of oleomargarine in the United States has now reached the figure of 347,482,000 pounds annually, or a per capita consumption of 2.84 pounds per year; and

Whereas the Dominion of Canada in Parliament assembled has recognized the foregoing and has absolutely prohibited the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine or any other butter substitute within its territory: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States, before the adjournment of the present session, to enact legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine or any other butter substitute in the United States: be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

HENRY A. HUBER,  
President of the Senate.  
R. A. COBBAN,  
Chief Clerk of the Senate.  
CHAS. B. PERRY,  
Speaker of the Assembly.  
C. E. SHAFFER,  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. BLAINE also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Joint resolution relating to the conclusion of a treaty with Canada for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway

Whereas there is absolute unanimity in this State, as often expressed by the legislature, that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway is a vital need not only to Wisconsin but to the entire Middle West, as it would result in a large reduction in freight rates upon agricultural and manufactured products, to the benefit of all farmers and industries of this section of the country; and

Whereas this project would give employment to many thousands of the unemployed workmen of the country and thereby aid very materially in economic recovery; and

Whereas this important project now appears to be very near realization, as it has been announced that the United States Government has begun negotiations with the Government of Canada for a treaty governing the construction of this waterway: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin respectfully memorializes the President of the United States to expedite the arrangements with Canada for the conclusion of a treaty under which the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway may become a reality; and also memorializes the Congress of the United States and especially the Wisconsin Senators and Members of Congress to promptly ratify any treaty which may be submitted for this purpose and to enact the necessary legislation for the beginning of actual construction; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

HENRY A. HUBER,  
President of the Senate.  
R. A. COBBAN,  
Chief Clerk of the Senate.  
CHAS. B. PERRY,  
Speaker of the Assembly.  
C. E. SHAFFER,  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

PROPOSED CANCELLATION OF FOREIGN INDEBTEDNESS

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance a set of resolutions adopted by the United Irish-American Societies, of New York, on December 20, 1931, opposing the cancellation of debts owed to the United States by foreign governments.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is a movement on foot favored by prominent officials of the United States Government, and by propagandists, native and foreign, to cancel part at least of the debts due by foreign nations to this country; and

Whereas, in preparation for this proposed cancellation, the Congress is asked to declare a moratorium stopping the payment of these foreign debts for a period of a year and arranging that the payment of the year's debt be made in installments for several years to follow: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, exercising our right as citizens, call the attention of the Members of both Houses of Congress to the serious injustice which this proposed moratorium, and particularly the suggested debt cancellation, would do to the American taxpayers. If such laws were passed by the Congress, taxpayers in this country would be saddled with the financial burdens taken off the backs of the peoples of several foreign nations. In order to keep faith with holders of United States bonds, the Government in Washington would have to increase direct and indirect taxation, thus placing hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of already overburdened citizens in the position of paying themselves, through taxes collected from them, the interest due to them on the war bonds which they and others hold and the principal also when the bonds become due. This would be little better than repudiation by the United States Government of its financial obligations to its own people.

Resolved, That besides drawing the attention of Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives to this matter we warn American citizens generally that their interests are in danger and that well-paid bands of propagandists, foreign and native, are using every device known to professional promoters of make-believe "public opinion" and to the agents of high finance to have a moratorium approved, foreign debts to the United States canceled, and this country entangled in the schemes and intrigues of foreign diplomacy in utter disregard of old-time American policy and of the sage advice of the first President of the United States.

Resolved, That we command and congratulate the Navy League on its patriotic and independent stand for United States security on the seas. We, as members of a race which has served this Nation well in peace and war, from colonial times to the present day, pledge our earnest support to other patriotic organizations which are devoted to the preservation of the old-time American policy of avoidance of entanglements in the affairs and intrigues of foreign powers. We, whether we are native-born citizens or citizens by adoption, pledge every service and sacrifice that men and women can give to a great cause in order to defend the independence and interests of the United States.

Resolved, That we warn our fellow citizens of all the racial groups that make up the composite population of the United States of the danger arising from our Government giving a large part of its attention to "saving the world" while so many of our own people are in dire need, and we urge citizens of all parties to protest to their United States Senators and Representatives against such a policy and to insist that as "charity begins at home," "America first" should be the slogan of the rulers and people of this Republic. We ask our fellow citizens to make their opinions

known to their United States Senators and Congressmen, not by stereotyped resolutions sent out ready for signatures, by paid propagandists, but by letters, petitions, and resolutions written by themselves, and advise them to make personal calls on their Senators and Congressmen.

PROPOSED RESUBMISSION OF EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT

Mr. FLETCHER. I present a communication in the nature of a petition signed by Mrs. Lenora H. Holcomb, president of the Miami (Fla.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to the electorate of the United States, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FLETCHER: Through the press it is reported that the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment will be voted on at this session of Congress.

Because our Woman's Christian Temperance Union is vitally interested in this question we are writing to ask that you vote against the proposition.

We know the history of prohibition in the various States—first township local option, then county. As the law provided for a resubmission every two years, one fight was not over until another was started. Under local option the liquor traffic was driven out of all but the larger cities, then, State by State, the saloon business was outlawed until we had 33 States dry by their own legislation. Then came the adoption of the eighteenth amendment, with ratification by 46 of the 48 States, the largest majority ever given any amendment.

Since its adoption, or ratification, we have had a noisy bunch, headed by the brewers and distillers, whose hopes of again reaping rich profits in the liquor business have never died. They are the ones who have kept up the agitation for repeal, resubmission, and nullification. They tell half truths, distort facts, and have no respect for law or authority. They say the law can not be enforced, then place every obstacle in the way of its enforcement. Our officers and citizens are being corrupted and intimidated, honest men vilified and persecuted. Our President, when at Detroit, discussing matters of grave importance to the people, was greeted with cries of "We want beer; we want beer." Surely a fine bunch to tie to!

Those who oppose prohibition are easily classified: First, brewers, distillers, ex-saloon keepers, et al.; second, gamblers and the whole immoral element who prey upon human weaknesses; third, those who have an inferiority complex and need liquor to make them forget their inferiority; fourth, those who have been deceived by the insidious propaganda put out by the wets into thinking that prohibition is to blame for our ills, financial and otherwise, and to just repeal the eighteenth amendment will bring the millennium, while the facts are that human ingenuity, through all the ages, has never been able to formulate a law that would properly control the liquor traffic.

After all other methods had been tried, the eighteenth amendment, outlawing the traffic, was placed in the Constitution, and its repeal would mean turning loose a bunch of human leeches who would suck the lifeblood out of the Nation.

With the Nation on fire financially, it is a poor time for Congress to go fiddling on the wet-and-dry question, arousing antagonism among the people.

When the wets have a definite plan for the control of the liquor traffic, when they put forth their best efforts to help enforce the law, and give it a fair trial, honestly and squarely, and it is proven a failure, then, and not until then, have they a right to ask for resubmission. They should not be allowed to go into court with unclean hands.

It is unfortunate that there is no financial profit on the moral side of a question. But it is fortunate that we have a class of citizens who do have a care for the welfare of humanity, without a thought of financial profit.

This is the class who by great labor and self-denial and prayer placed the eighteenth amendment in the Constitution, and they will fight to the very end to keep it there. They will not compromise nor support those who do, and it would be absolutely unfair to put them on the defense.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a largely attended meeting of the Miami Woman's Christian Temperance Union at the White Temple Monday, December 14, 1931, and we are sending a copy to each of our Members of Congress:

"Whereas it is reported that the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment will be voted on at this session of Congress; and

"Whereas those asking for resubmission have not advocated any definite plan for the control of the liquor traffic, asking only for the repeal of the existing laws; and

"Whereas prohibition was adopted after all other methods had been tried and failed; and

"Whereas under our present financial crisis we need all our energies to work out a plan for the return of prosperity, we feel it is a very poor time for Congress to advocate a resubmission of

the question that would arouse intense antagonism among the people: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we call upon our Representatives in Congress to do their moral and patriotic duty by voting against the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment at this time."

Very respectfully yours,

Mrs. LENORA H. HOLCOMB,  
President Miami W. C. T. U.

THE PALMS,  
242 N. E. Third Street, Miami, Fla., December 15, 1931.

THE WORLD COURT

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations certain resolutions adopted and indorsements given by various Kentucky organizations on the subject of the World Court.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDORSEMENT OF THE WORLD COURT PROTOCOLS BY KENTUCKY ORGANIZATIONS

THE KENTUCKY FEDERATION OF LABOR, 1931

Whereas an official representative of the American Federation of Labor, appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1924, said, in presenting the resolution which the American Federation had unanimously passed urging the entrance of the United States into the World Court:

"The American worker recognizes that the position of isolation for the United States is an impossibility—a great exporting and importing nation. Whatever occurs in the farthest part of the world that affects the political and economic conditions of the people also affects the people of the United States. \* \* \* We realize that the chaotic conditions that now obtain in Europe affect us materially, and we recognize that those conditions are superinduced by fear, mutual fear, based upon lack of mutual understanding"; and

Whereas these words of 1924 are perhaps even truer to-day, when the industrial and political leaders of the world are bending every energy to achieve closer international understanding which will benefit the economic condition of the world; and

Whereas in our judgment, nothing will more significantly allay fear and suspicion among the nations than a cooperative agreement to apply to international disputes the principles of international law when it is practicable to do so; and

Whereas the World Court has proved its value as a stabilizing influence by applying the principles of international law to 34 international disputes that have been presented to it in the nine years of its existence: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Kentucky Federation of Labor, being in accord with the position of the American Federation of Labor with reference to the entry of the United States into the court, respectfully and earnestly urges the Senate to give its consent to the ratification of the three World Court protocols or treaties which will make the United States a member of the World Court, in accordance with the conditions which the Senate set forth in 1928, which conditions, according to Secretary Stimson, are "fully met" by these protocols; and be it further

*Resolved*, To instruct the Secretary to send a copy of this resolution to:

(1) President Hoover, now.

(2) The Kentucky Senators, with a request for it to be printed in the RECORD.

(3) A copy in December to every member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

(4) Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor, with the hope that similar views be incorporated in any further expression of opinion on this important question by the American Federation of Labor.

THE KENTUCKY PRESS ASSOCIATION

(Editorial quoted from the Louisville Times)

The Kentucky Press Association passed unanimously a resolution in behalf of the Senate's ratification of the World Court protocols and at the same time declared its purpose to avoid discussion of controversial subjects.

In other words, there is no controversy between the political parties as to the suitability of the entrance of the United States into the World Court in the circumstances which now present themselves.

A few recalcitrants in the Senate oppose ratification. But the two political parties, representing the sentiment of the people of the United States, favor going in.

OWENSBORO BAR ASSOCIATION

*Be it resolved* by the Owensboro Bar Association of Owensboro, Ky., That we favor the adherence of the United States of America to the World Court and urge the ratification of the protocols providing therefor at the next session of the Senate.

LOUISVILLE COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Inasmuch as the thought of the whole world is being centered upon international peace and amity, and inasmuch as President Hoover has instructed the proper authorities to sign the necessary documents looking to the adherence of the United States

to the World Court, which instructions have been already carried out, subject to ratification of the United States Senate, we respectfully request the Senate to ratify the action thus far perfected in order to make it finally binding upon the United States. Especially do we request the United States Senators from Kentucky that they use their influence and their vote in behalf of this measure.

POLL OF DAILY NEWSPAPERS IN KENTUCKY

A direct inquiry to the editor of every daily newspaper in Kentucky, asking its considered editorial position toward ratification of the World Court protocols, resulted as follows:

Favorable	24
	(Includes the 4 largest papers in the State.)
Opposed	1
No stand	0
Impossible to classify	0
No reply	4

REFERENDUM AMONG THE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC LEAGUE

A referendum among the members of the National Economic League in Kentucky on whether the United States Senate should ratify the pending protocols resulted in the following vote:

Favorable to ratification	34
Opposed to ratification	2

In addition to the central World Court committee in Louisville, there are representative community groups interested in completing the adherence of the United States to the World Court in Lexington, Covington, and Paducah.

In addition to the resolutions and referenda reported upon in the preceding pages, the following organizations have formally expressed their desire to see the United States a member of the World Court: The Unitarian Laymen's League of Louisville, Board of Governors of the Kentucky League of Women Voters, International Relations Committee of the Woman's Club of Louisville.

SIGNIFICANT PUBLIC MEETINGS ON THE WORLD COURT

There has been consistent and long-standing interest in the World Court in Kentucky over a period of years. This is readily indicated by the number of public meetings held in Louisville, at which public interest in our adherence to the World Court was conclusively demonstrated. The first of these meetings, held at the end of 1925, just before the Senate took up the World Court resolution, which it later passed, was called by the mayor of the city of Louisville and was attended by official representatives of the following organizations, which all urged the entrance of the United States into the World Court:

Board of Trade of Louisville, Retail Merchants Association of Louisville, Rotary Club of Louisville, Optimist Club of Louisville, Lions Club of Louisville, Exchange Club of Louisville, Woman's Club of Louisville, League of Women Voters, Louisville Women's City Club, Council of Jewish Women, Young Women's Christian Association, Louisville Parent-Teachers League, Bar Association of Louisville, Jefferson County Medical Association, Republican State Committee, Democratic State and County Executive Committee, Louisville Ministerial Association, Herald-Post Co., Louisville Courier-Journal Co., The Louisville Times.

Shortly after this meeting a mass meeting urging the entrance of the United States into the World Court was arranged by the Louisville World Court Committee and the Legion.

At a public meeting of the leaders of Louisville on January 2, 1930, the interest of the city in seeing the entry of the United States into the World Court was again reiterated.

PROPOSED TARIFF ON COPPER

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the nature of a petition I present resolutions in behalf of a copper tariff adopted at a recent conference of the governors of 11 Western States. Michigan shares this necessity for relief and joins in this prayer for emergency action in behalf of domestic copper. It makes itself a party to this prayer. The recent report of the United States Tariff Commission lays the warrantable foundation for this plea. What the protective rates should be may be a matter of legitimate argument. That the differential in costs should be covered does not admit of argument when the Tariff Commission reports some African copper labor running down to 5 and 6 cents a day. I ask that this petition may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Finance Committee.

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

Resolution adopted by delegates at the western governors' conference in Portland, Oreg., October 29, 1931, petitioning Congress to levy a tariff on copper

Whereas the domestic copper-mining industry is threatened with destruction through excessive importation of duty-free foreign-produced copper from cheap-labor areas throughout the world; and

Whereas foreign-produced electrolytic copper can be laid down at our domestic ports at a cost of 6 cents as against an average domestic cost several cents per pound greater; and

Whereas a domestic commodity price for copper within our highly protected market can only be obtained through adequate tariff protection; and

Whereas the domestic copper-mining industry, which is now utterly without tariff protection, is now merely seeking an equitable degree thereof; and

Whereas the 11 Western States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming produce 90 per cent of our domestic copper; and

Whereas about 1,400,000 citizens within said 11 Western States are directly or indirectly dependent on the domestic copper-mining industry; and

Whereas the value of copper produced is not only greater than any other metal product, but is greater than the combined value of all other metals mined within said 11 Western States; and

Whereas a commodity price should be received for every pound of copper mined within and depleting the industrial resources of said 11 Western States; and

Whereas a fair commodity price for copper will salvage untold quantities of copper which under free-trade conditions would be termed "industrial waste"; and

Whereas none of the 206 copper-producing districts within said 11 Western States have ever been explored with copper stabilized at a commodity price and utilizing modern mining and metallurgical efficiencies; and

Whereas a maximum and efficient operating domestic copper-mining industry from ore to ingot stage is a national requisite during war as well as peace: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the conference of western governors assembled here to-day*, That they petition Congress to forthwith levy a duty of at least 6 cents per pound as against copper imported in refined ingot forms; at least 5 cents per pound as against copper imported in the form of blisters, regulus, scrap, old, composition, or in concentrates containing more than 30 per cent of copper; at least 4 cents per pound as against copper imported in the form of ores or in concentrates containing less than 30 per cent of copper; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by the western governors' conference at Portland, Oreg., October 29, 1931.

GEORGE C. SUTHERLAND,

Secretary Western Governors' Conference.

REPORTS OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. NORRIS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 26) thereon.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) authorizing and directing the Comptroller General of the United States to reopen, adjust, and settle the accounts of the city of Baltimore for advances made by the city in 1863 for the construction of works of defense, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 27) thereon.

As in executive session,

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the following nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar:

John Knight, of New York, to be United States district judge, western district of New York, to succeed John R. Hazel, resigned; and

James M. Morton, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be United States circuit judge, first circuit, to succeed George W. Anderson, retired.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. WATERMAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 23, 1931, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 930) limiting the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code with respect to counsel in the case of the Appalachian Electric Power Co. against George Otis Smith and others.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL

A message from the President of the United States by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that on December 24, 1931, the President had approved and signed the above entitled and numbered (S. 930) enrolled bill.

## 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. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2420) for the relief of Edward F. Weiskopf; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2421) for the relief of Martin Aloysius Mahon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2422) for the relief of the owners of the coal hulk *Callitene*;

A bill (S. 2423) for the relief of Norman Beier;

A bill (S. 2424) for the relief of Grace K. Barber; and

A bill (S. 2425) for the relief of Elizabeth Bolger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A bill (S. 2426) to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the use of a portion of a National Guard target range near Phoenix, Ariz., as a burial plot; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2427) granting a pension to Herbert L. Sanders; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2428) to provide for the confirmation of a selection of certain lands by the State of Arizona for the benefit of the University of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2429) authorizing the investigation of waste products by the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2430) for the relief of Arthur N. Knofft; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2431) for the relief of Timothy Jones Powers; and

A bill (S. 2432) to give advanced rank to certain retired officers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2433) authorizing refund of 50 per cent of the duties collected upon certain carillons and parts thereof; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2434) for the relief of Edgar H. Taber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2435) granting a pension to Michael Ludwig; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2436) for the relief of Alfred G. Simmons, Jr.; and

A bill (S. 2437) for the relief of Robert E. Edgecumbe; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2438) for the relief of Homer V. Milton; and

A bill (S. 2439) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with certain public works at the United States naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MCGILL:

A bill (S. 2440) to amend section 19 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (relating to suits on insurance claims); to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2441) for the relief of Walter Alonzo Ford; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2442) for the relief of William Duckett; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2443) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Boyd; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2444) for the relief of Frederick Bischoff; and

A bill (S. 2445) for the relief of Allie Fisher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES:

A bill (S. 2446) to provide that indictments and information shall not be held insufficient for failure to lay the venue;

A bill (S. 2447) to provide for references in law cases by consent of the parties and declaring the effect of such submission; and

A bill (S. 2448) to dispense with the necessity of setting out copies of instruments in indictments and informations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 2449) to create a bureau of welfare of the blind in the Federal Board of Vocational Education, to provide for the issuing of licenses to blind persons operating cigar stands in Federal buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 2450) to provide for the acceptance of a donation of land on the campus of the University of Oklahoma, and the construction thereon of suitable buildings and appurtenances for an institution for higher education of American Indians and their descendants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2451) granting to the State of Oklahoma 210,000 acres of unappropriated nonmineral land for the benefit of its agricultural and mechanical colleges, according to the provisions of the acts of July 2, 1862, and July 23, 1866, and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the Secretary of the Interior certifying the number of acres available and that there are not sufficient lands in the State of Oklahoma to comply with the provisions of this act, to pay to the State of Oklahoma in lieu thereof the sum of \$1.25 per acre for the number of acres due said State; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 2452) granting a pension to Laura E. Todd;

A bill (S. 2453) granting a pension to Mary M. Kibe (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2454) granting a pension to Thomas Otterby (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2455) granting a pension to Arthur W. Mace (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2456) for the relief of Benjamin F. Hazlett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2457) granting a pension to the regularly commissioned United States deputy marshals of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, including the Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma, and to their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2458) for the relief of Ralph E. Williamson for loss suffered on account of the Lawton, Okla., fire, 1917; and

A bill (S. 2459) for the relief of Lettie Leverett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAINE:

A bill (S. 2460) for the relief of Theodore K. Birkhaeuser (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2461) granting a pension to Thomas Sullivan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 2463) for the relief of James W. Walters; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2464) to amend section 122 of the Judicial Code;

A bill (S. 2465) to fix the date when a sentence shall commence to run; and

A bill (S. 2466) to amend the act providing for the annual conference of senior circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUZENS:

A bill (S. 2467) granting a pension to Morris Glickstone (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2468) for the relief of Trifune Korac; and

A bill (S. 2469) for the relief of Nellie E. Treuthart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A bill (S. 2470) to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the east coast of Maui, in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2471) to provide that the provisions of the act requiring the payment of the prevailing rate of wages to laborers and mechanics on public-building projects shall apply to public-building projects in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 2472) to amend section 100 of the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 2473) to provide for increasing the permissible alcoholic content of beer, ale, or porter to 3.2 per cent by weight, and to provide means by which all such beer, ale, or porter shall be made of products of American farms; to the Committee on Manufactures.

A bill (S. 2474) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1916; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2475) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 2476) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A bill (S. 2477) to authorize the appointment of reporters in the court of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii and to fix their duties and compensation; and

A bill (S. 2478) to fix the alcoholic content of liquors included within the Webb-Kenyon Act so that liquors may not be brought into a State in violation of the State policy on prohibition even though Congress has not prohibited the manufacture, sale, or transportation of such liquors elsewhere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2479) to establish a branch home of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers in the Territory of Hawaii; and

A bill (S. 2480) authorizing the Secretary of War to set apart as a national cemetery certain lands of the United States military reservation of Schofield Barracks, Leilehua, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 2481) for the relief of Kenneth G. Gould; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2482) granting an increase of pension to Carrie F. Bloom (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2483) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Owens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 2484) to regulate interstate and foreign air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 2485) for the relief of Anna Hathaway; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2486) granting a pension to Nancy Cornwall Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 2488) to abolish the Bureau of Efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 2489) to amend the laws relating to the immigration and naturalization of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 2490) placing the Rural Delivery Service on a contract basis; and

A bill (S. 2491) to prohibit the use of the mails in furtherance of bucket-shop transactions and short sales of securities; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A bill (S. 2492) to authorize the erection of a 362-bed addition to the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Camp Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 2493) to amend section 2 of an act known as the agricultural marketing act, passed and approved June 15, 1929, relating to salaries of members and employees; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2494) to amend section 4 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, passed and approved March 4, 1925, relating to the compensation of Members of and Delegates to Congress; and

A bill (S. 2495) to repeal section 17 of the act passed and approved July 28, 1866, relating to mileage of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2496) to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 2497) to amend an act approved May 1, 1906, entitled "An act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; and

A bill (S. 2498) to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over public land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2499) for the relief of George A. Gundelfinger; and

A bill (S. 2500) to amend an act to increase the efficiency of the Veterinary Corps of the Regular Army, approved June 28, 1930 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2501) granting a pension to Eliza Ellis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2502) granting a pension to Charles O. Puckett (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2503) granting an increase of pension to Mattie F. Colebaugh (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2504) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Walker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2505) for the relief of William Duckett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2506) to provide for the reforesting of watersheds in and adjacent to national forests; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 2507) for the relief of Ralph E. Woolley; and

A bill (S. 2508) for the relief of Maj. O. S. McCleary, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 2509) to authorize an appropriation for combating grasshopper infestation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2510) for the relief of Genevieve M. Heberle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL:

A bill (S. 2511) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain a tobacco experiment and demonstration station for the South at or near Carthage, Tenn.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2512) for the relief of Kate Hatton; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2513) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 2514) to amend section 5 of the suits in admiralty act, approved March 9, 1920; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2515) for the relief of Martin De Vries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2516) amending section 1 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, and for other purposes," which became a law June 2, 1930, by including male as well as female nurses within its provisions and benefits; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 2517) to authorize the erection of a 300-bed addition to the United States Veterans' hospital at American Lake, Wash.; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2518) to provide for the establishment of the Yakima Indian Forest; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2519) granting an honorable discharge to Frank I. Otis, first lieutenant, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2520) for the relief of Lucy B. Hertz and J. W. Hertz; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2521) granting a pension to William A. Baker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2522) for the erection of a public building at Kelso, Wash.; and

A bill (S. 2523) for the erection of a public building at Camas, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 2524) for the relief of Ike F. Kearney; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2525) granting a pension to Mary Alice Maum; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 2526) to provide for the admission to the mails as second-class matter of publications of charitable societies; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 2527) for the relief of Edwin P. Hulsberger;

A bill (S. 2528) to extend the benefits of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to John Melville; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2529) to amend section 118 of the Judicial Code to provide for the appointment of law clerks to United States circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2530) for the relief of John J. Gillick;

A bill (S. 2531) for the relief of the Union Shipping & Trading Co. (Ltd.);

A bill (S. 2532) for the relief of George B. Marx;

A bill (S. 2533) for the relief of Ludwig Baer;

A bill (S. 2534) for the relief of Grace Emmons;

A bill (S. 2535) for the relief of Amos D. Carver, S. E. Turner, Clifford N. Carver, Scott Blanchard, P. B. Blanchard, James B. Parse, A. N. Blanchard, and W. A. Blanchard; and

A bill (S. 2536) for the relief of Regina Schoor; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2537) granting a pension to John H. Fleming;

A bill (S. 2538) granting a pension to Edward A. McGuire;

A bill (S. 2539) granting a pension to William P. A. Fitzjohn;

A bill (S. 2540) granting a pension to William H. Bruns;

A bill (S. 2541) granting an increase of pension to Julia Mackintosh;

A bill (S. 2542) granting a pension to Alice Clyde Stafford; and

A bill (S. 2543) granting an increase of pension to John T. Powers; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2544) to provide for the appointment of Maurice D. Loewenthal as a warrant officer, United States Army.

A bill (S. 2545) to authorize the presentation of a distinguished-service cross to T. K. Jones;

A bill (S. 2546) for the relief of Dr. Fred Barney;

A bill (S. 2547) providing for the retirement of certain Medical Reserve officers of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps;

A bill (S. 2548) for the relief of Thomas E. Carlin;

A bill (S. 2549) for the relief of William D. Grush;

A bill (S. 2550) for the relief of Thomas F. Nicholas; and

A bill (S. 2551) for the relief of Harry Stanbrough Monell, formerly chairman War Department Claims Board Transportation Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 2552) authorizing an appropriation for the construction of roads and bridges in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2553) to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Skull Valley Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2554) for the relief of Charles F. Poitra; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 2555) granting a pension to Charles E. Conner;

A bill (S. 2556) granting a pension to Jennie Tewksbury;

A bill (S. 2557) granting a pension to John T. Wilson; A bill (S. 2558) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Haddix;

A bill (S. 2559) granting an increase of pension to Earl W. Newlon; and

A bill (S. 2560) for the relief of Samuel Pelfrey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 2561) for the relief of Robert G. Hunnicutt; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2562) granting a pension to James C. Howard; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2563) to authorize the appointment of Technical Sgt. Tom Bowen as a warrant officer, United States Army;

A bill (S. 2564) to establish a national military park to commemorate the battles fought around Atlanta, in the State of Georgia; and

A bill (S. 2565) to provide for the commemoration of the Battles of Dalton, Cassville, New Hope Church, Resaca, and Ringgold, in the State of Georgia, and for the erection of markers along the Johnston-Sherman line of march in Georgia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2566) for the relief of Newdigate Moreland Owensby;

A bill (S. 2567) for the relief of Angus M. Whatley; and

A bill (S. 2568) for the relief of John B. McLamb; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 2569) authorizing adjustment of the claim of Lewis O. Wick; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2570) authorizing adjustment of the claim of Joseph E. Bourrie Co.;

A bill (S. 2571) authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2572) for the relief of Ransome Cooyate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 2573) to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Albert D. Drury; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2574) for the relief of Edmund L. Moore; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 2575) for the relief of George W. Brothers;

A bill (S. 2576) for the relief of John Donnelly; and

A bill (S. 2577) for the relief of Thomas Duffy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2578) for the relief of Edward Flanagan;

A bill (S. 2579) to restore to the active list of the Marine Corps the name of Albert Hamilton;

A bill (S. 2580) for the relief of John Francis Henneberry;

A bill (S. 2581) for the relief of Carl John Johnson;

A bill (S. 2582) for the relief of Leo James McCoy;

A bill (S. 2583) for the relief of Albert Lawrence Sliney; and

A bill (S. 2584) for the relief of John Henry Smith; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

A bill (S. 2585) to provide for the commemoration of the siege of Lexington, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2586) granting a pension to George H. Miller;

A bill (S. 2587) granting a pension to Lucy Brown (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2588) granting a pension to Sarah J. Parker (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2589) granting a pension to Alice Paver (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2590) for the relief of John Evans (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2591) for the relief of Minnie D. Hines (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROUSSARD:

A bill (S. 2592) for the relief of the Amite Bank & Trust Co., of Amite, La.; and

A bill (S. 2593) for the relief of the Canal Bank & Trust Co., formerly Canal-Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, suc-

cessors to United States Safe Deposit & Savings Bank, of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2594) to authorize the erection of a 250-bed addition to the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2595) for the relief of Charles G. Keiser, to the Committee on Civil Service.

A bill (S. 2596) granting a pension to Effie Howard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2597) for the relief of the Peoples Trust & Savings Co., of Fort Wayne, Ind.; and

A bill (S. 2598) for the relief of the Security Trust Co., of Indianapolis, Ind.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 2599) for the relief of Louis E. LeBrun; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2600) for the relief of Earl L. Kelly; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2601) granting a pension to Annie J. Maddox (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2602) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Merritt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2603) for the relief of Mary A. Cox;

A bill (S. 2604) for the relief of the Union Trust Co. of Baltimore, Md.;

A bill (S. 2605) for the relief of Philip F. Hamsch (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2606) for the relief of Moreau M. Casler;

A bill (S. 2607) for the relief of Mary E. Roney;

A bill (S. 2608) to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Lillian Stecher Waldecker, formerly Lillian A. Stecher;

A bill (S. 2609) for the relief of Hattie E. Barber, executrix of Lloyd H. Barber;

A bill (S. 2610) for the relief of the Maryland Trust Co., successors to Continental Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md.;

A bill (S. 2611) for the relief of the Fidelity Trust Co. of Baltimore, Md.; and

A bill (S. 2612) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Anna S. Matthews (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Idaho:

A bill (S. 2613) for the relief of Lynn Bros.' Benevolent Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2614) for the inclusion of certain lands in the national forests in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2615) for the relief of Henry Stanley Wood; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2616) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Mahler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 2617) to restore to the active list of the Marine Corps the name of Albert Hamilton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2618) to correct the military record of Richard T. Butler;

A bill (S. 2619) for the relief of Vito Basile; and

A bill (S. 2620) to correct the military record of Thomas W. H. Ball; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A bill (S. 2621) to provide for the appointment of an acting secretary of the Territory of Hawaii during the absence or illness of the secretary; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEIWER:

A bill (S. 2622) to provide an examination and survey of Seaside Harbor, Oreg.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GLENN:

A bill (S. 2623) for the relief of Howard Donovan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 2624) for the relief of Caesar F. Simmons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH:

A bill (S. 2625) to provide for preliminary examination and survey of the channel from Rhodes River to Cadle Creek, Anne Arundel County, Md., with a view to providing a navigable channel across Cherry Stone Bar; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 68) relative to the naturalization of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. KING:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) establishing an inter-departmental committee on conservation of natural resources, providing for cooperation with the States in the conservation of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McNARY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) to correct section 2 of the act of March 4, 1931, to coordinate the agricultural experiment-station work and to extend the benefits of certain acts of Congress to the Territory of Porto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 71) requesting the President to proclaim October 12 as Columbus Day for the observance of the anniversary of the discovery of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) directing the Comptroller General to adjust the account between the United States and the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### LIBERALIZATION OF PROHIBITION LAWS

Mr. BLAINE. I desire to introduce a bill, but before doing so I ask the privilege of making a statement of two or three minutes with respect to the objects of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, the bill which I am about to introduce authorizes, first, the States to define intoxicating liquors in which case the Volstead Act shall not apply in its administration by the Federal Government, thus permitting a State to authorize light wines and beer, though the Federal Government is given concurrent jurisdiction to enforce the Volstead Act within the limits fixed by the State as to alcoholic content.

Second. A State may do one of two things, namely:

(1) Set up a system of State regulation and control through its agents; or

(2) Set up a system of liquor control under the Swedish system or any of the Canadian Province systems, or any similar system of direct State control.

Under this part of the bill the Volstead Act will not apply to any State that adopts either of the systems.

It is recognized that it will take some time before the eighteenth amendment is modified or repealed. This bill, in the meantime, permits of a flexibility, so that each State may solve its local problems, and permits the States to undertake experiments, and out of the experiences of the several States will grow a sane and sensible control of intoxicating liquors.

I now introduce the bill and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2462) to amend the national prohibition act, as amended and supplemented, in respect of the definition of intoxicating liquor, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 1 of Title II of the national prohibition act, as amended and supplemented, is hereby further amended by inserting immediately after the first paragraph thereof the following:

"The foregoing definition of the term 'liquor' and 'intoxicating liquor' shall not apply in the administration of this act or

any act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto within the territorial limits of any State which has or may have in effect a prohibition enforcement law defining intoxicating liquor otherwise than as defined by this act. In the case of any such State the definition of 'liquor' and 'intoxicating liquor' to be applied in the administration of this act or any act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto within the territorial limits of such State shall be the definition of intoxicating liquor provided in the prohibition enforcement law of such State."

SEC. 2. Title II of such act, as amended and supplemented, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 40. The provisions of this act or any act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto shall not apply to any liquor purchased or manufactured by any State or political subdivision thereof acting in the exercise of its proprietary functions, or by any officer, agent, or employee of any State or its political subdivisions when such officer, agent, or employee is engaged in the performance of any duty or the exercise of any power specifically provided by the laws of any such State governing the exercise of its proprietary functions or the proprietary functions of any political subdivision thereof, except in so far as such liquor may be shipped out of such State or manufactured, sold, or transported for such shipment."

SEC. 3. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

#### PROPOSED BIMETALLIC CURRENCY SYSTEM

MR. WHEELER. I introduce a bill to establish a bimetallic system of currency, employing gold and silver, to fix the relative value of gold and silver, and to provide for the free coinage of silver, and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2487) to establish a bimetallic system of currency, employing gold and silver, to fix the relative value of gold and silver, to provide for the free coinage of silver as well as gold, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the proportional value of silver to gold in all coins which are by law current as money within the United States, shall be as 16 to 1, according to quantity in weight, of pure silver or pure gold; that is to say, every 16 pounds weight of pure silver shall be of equal value in all payments with 1 pound weight of pure gold, and so in proportion as to any greater or less quantities of the respective metals.

SEC. 2. There shall be free coinage of both gold and silver, at the ratio fixed in this act, subject to the conditions and limitations now provided by law with respect to the coinage of gold; and all the laws of the United States relating to such coinage, or to recoinage, exchange, or conversion of coin, bars, or bullion, of gold, shall apply equally, so far as practicable, to silver.

SEC. 3. The dollar consisting of 25 $\frac{1}{2}$  grains of gold 0.9 fine, or of 41 $\frac{1}{2}$  grains of silver 0.9 fine, shall be the standard unit of value, and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard, and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain such parity.

#### METHODS OF AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION

MR. BINGHAM. I introduce a joint resolution, and, in view of the interest in the subject of changing the method of amending the Constitution, I ask that the joint resolution may be read at the desk.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 73) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein),* That the following is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States, which conventions shall be composed in each State of delegates elected by a majority vote of the electors of the State voting at such election:

Article V of the United States Constitution is hereby amended by adding thereto the following: "Provided, however, That no amendment conferring on the Government of the United States any added powers over the people of the United States or their individual rights, or any of them, and no amendment relating to any powers now granted to the Government of the United States over the people of the United States shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution except when ratified by the vote of the qualified electors in three-fourths of the several States.

#### CHANGES OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. HALE, the Committee on Naval Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the following bills, and they were referred to the Committee on Commerce:

S. 787. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a marine hospital at Portland, Oreg.; and

S. 891. A bill for the relief of A. B. Thomas.

#### RELIEF OF INDIANS IN ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO

MR. ASHURST. Mr. President, I submit two amendments to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill and ask that they may be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MR. ASHURST. I ask the privilege of speaking a minute on the amendments.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arizona will proceed.

MR. ASHURST. Mr. President, snowstorms and blizzards of Siberian ferocity and Arctic fury have fallen upon the Indian reservations in northern Arizona and northern New Mexico, where dwell over 50,000 pure-blood Indians. The storms came at intervals beginning November 21 last, and the whole of that Indian country, 20,000 square miles in area, is as a marble ocean; Indians have perished in the snowdrifts, have starved in the storms, and have frozen in the frosts. Their mainstays are sheep and goats, and the cavalry of these winds and the artillery of these snows, with the thermometer ranging from 10 to 30 degrees below, have decimated their herds and flocks of sheep and goats.

The Indian Bureau and the superintendents of the various reservations have put forth valiant efforts at relief, but have exhausted their resources, and this appropriation of \$75,000 is necessary to purchase food for the Indian and his flocks and herds.

MR. KING. Mr. President, does the amendment call for the payment of this amount from the tribal funds or out of the Treasury?

MR. ASHURST. It is a gratuity out of the Treasury.

MR. PRESIDENT, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from Mr. John Collier, who is the executive secretary of the American Indian Defense Association and who gives a description of this storm.

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

The letter is as follows:

THE AMERICAN INDIAN DEFENSE ASSOCIATION (INC.),

Washington, D. C., December 31, 1931.

DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: A disaster quite unprecedented has fallen upon the great Indian reservation area of northern Arizona and northern New Mexico. Here dwell the 45,000 Navajos and the 3,000 Hopi Pueblo Indians, the 2,000 Zuni Pueblo Indians, the 600 Jicarilla Apaches, and 500 Utes whose reservation adjoins the Navajo.

The disaster is still in progress. A series of blizzards and snowstorms have fallen and continue to fall, with intervals of a fortnight between. Before last Christmas day the Jicarilla Apaches had lost half of all their sheep, the Zunis had lost heavily, and the Navajos had lost more than 150,000 head. The worst, as events have proved, was yet to come.

To realize the major disaster which has befallen these pure-blood Indians, self-supporting, and living in their tribal integrity, it is necessary to go back earlier in time than the first of the blizzards, which came November 24 last.

These Indians rely principally on sheep and on blankets woven from the wool of sheep and goats. The wool market for many months has been profoundly depressed. A season of droughts had weakened their stock before November. The Indian Bureau forester for the Navajo and Zuni areas, in charge of grazing matters, wrote October 22:

"On account of lack of rains in certain areas of the Navajo Reservation as a whole we find a serious shortage of winter feed. It appears to me that we are facing a rather serious condition on the Navajo Reservation as a whole and that much of the stock will suffer this winter and undoubtedly perish in large numbers due to the lack of feed. \* \* \* Inasmuch as the sheep industry is the mainstay of the Navajo people, it will be

necessary to do something in order that these people will not lose everything and seriously suffer in the future."

Nature would appear deliberately to have lured the Indians to their destruction. There came in middle November last a time of delicious Indian summer warmth, clear soft air, and cloudless skies. The long-awaited piñon crop, which comes once in five or seven years, was heavy on the trees, and the Indians relied on this crop to compensate them in part for their losses through the collapse of their wool market. Thousands of the Indians went out from their pueblos and hogans thinly clad, leaving perhaps a single young boy in charge of the sheep. They traveled to the highest areas—Zuni Mountain was the most fertile bearing of the piñon areas. Hardly had their piñon gathering begun when on November 21 the sky darkened without any warning which they could read and there fell a snow exceeding 5 feet in depth in many of the areas. This snow covered the whole southern Navajo area, the eastern Navajo, the Zuni and Jicarilla Apache areas, and most of the northwestern and western Navajo areas. It blocked all traffic; it made even horse passage out of the question. It completely buried the sagebrush and other feed of the sheep and it marooned more than 1,500 Indians in and around the Zuni Mountain area. Their food supply was practically nothing and their clothing was a blanket or a light coat.

With the snow came the cold. It was an Arctic cold. Night after night the thermometer registered 25° below zero and sometimes 35° below and even 40° below. Bitter winds piled the snow into huge drifts and intensified the effect of the cold.

The picture is best drawn in telegrams from the reservation superintendents. Superintendent Hunter, of the Fort Defiance Navajo jurisdiction, telegraphed to Commissioner Rhoads on November 25:

"Storm condition continues. Superintendent Trotter advises that approximately 1,000 Navajos are marooned on the mountains south of Zuni. Party now organized to break trails that section. Food supplies being sent. Distress calls elsewhere will no doubt be received as storm subsides. No applicable funds available for distress calls of this nature. Estimated at least three thousand required for immediate emergency needs of this jurisdiction. Snow ranges from 1 to 5 feet."

Superintendent Hunter telegraphed again on November 26:

"Hundreds of Navajo piñon pickers still marooned in mountain regions south of Zuni. Eight deaths reported. Temperature has been ranging from 10 to 40 below zero. Conditions are extremely serious. Trails are being broken and medical supplies being rushed to these regions. Everything possible being done to relieve distress."

The Indian and white communities alike met the disaster in a resourceful, even heroic, way. Rescue parties, working night and day in deep snow and 30-below-zero weather, found and brought to safety more than a thousand of the marooned Indians. There might have been hundreds of deaths, and there were only two. Thousands of the sheep were saved a gradual death from starvation by being frozen to death in the first days. Before December 6 all the rescue parties were back to the lower levels, chiefly through the activity and generalship of Superintendent Stacher, of the Crown Point jurisdiction; Superintendent Trotter, of Zuni; and Superintendent Hunter, of Fort Defiance, helped by all of the Indian traders and all able-bodied Indians. But the country looked like northern Siberia and was as deep in snow and as cold as if it had been a Siberian tundra. Even the transcontinental highway remained only partially cleared. Many of the reservation roads are still, at the beginning of January, impassable.

Then, on December 8, came a second blizzard with a new and heavy snow and a renewed intense cold.

And now, December 31, a third blizzard has come.

The situation over an area of 20,000 miles square is illustrated by a letter from Superintendent Hunter, of the Fort Defiance jurisdiction, dated December 24 last.

"A few days ago I came upon a sight I shall never forget. A Navajo woman and three little children were loading a few sheep and goats into a wagon with the intention of taking them a few miles where brush could be found. These animals had been subsisting on thistle and coarse brush, which had been dug out of the snow near the hogan. As a result, the sheep's mouths were chopped and bleeding and in addition had been frozen. With what hope this family could further undertake the task of saving these animals I am at a loss to understand. The only answer could be that these few sheep and goats represented all their possessions, and naturally they were putting forth every effort to save them. The pitiful situation, which I have very inadequately described, is only representative of nearly every other case on the reservation. Under these circumstances it is certainly obligatory that everything be done that can reasonably be done."

"Without being on the ground, it is very difficult to realize how serious conditions are, but when we consider that the whole country, including 16,000 Navajos and 500,000 sheep, are entirely snowed-bound, with no food in many camps and no stock feed at all, it can be understood what we are up against."

Superintendent Hunter's letter refers to the Fort Defiance jurisdiction only. Conditions equally severe exist through the whole eastern Navajo jurisdiction, and the conditions at the Jicarilla Apache are still more terrifying and the actual destruction has been greater.

Superintendent Hunter states in his letter of December 24 to Commissioner Rhoads:

"I can not close this letter without expressing my appreciation, and that of the Navajos, for the splendid attention you have

given our situation. I wish to also take the opportunity to express appreciation to the Navajos themselves for the wonderful qualities which they have shown during these very trying times. I have never known people to withstand dire adversity as these people have done. They are resourceful to an extraordinary degree in managing livestock and keeping them alive when there seemed no chance to do so. In many sections of the country the sheep have been subsisting entirely upon piñon and juniper brush, which has been cut and hauled to the sheep as soon as it was possible for the Navajo to break the trails in order to do the hauling. They have also carried their sheep in their arms and on horses to places where brush might be found."

The whole country should know the way in which the Zunis met the disaster. Their own sheep were stricken; the snow on their whole reservation was more than 2 feet deep. The thousand Navajos, gathering piñons on and near the Zuni Reservation, became a charge on the hospitable Zunis. Superintendent Trotter writes:

"Some of the Zunis fed all of their hay to the Navajo's teams, while all gave freely of their supplies. One of the horses of the rescue teams of the Zunis died from overexertion, as did one of the draft mares belonging to the agency."

He adds that the Zunis used up all their firewood in caring for the refugees. There was one refugee for every two Zunis, and Superintendent Trotter concludes his letter: "The Zunis are not asking anything (for themselves), but it is known that there are many homes where suffering will result later because of this hospitality unless relief is given."

After the first blizzard a superintendents' conference was held at Gallup and estimates were telegraphed to the Indian Office calling for an immediate allowance of \$38,500, of which \$18,500 is to be used for food and clothing for the Indians and \$20,000 for feed for the sheep. This request was immediately granted by Commissioner Rhoads although the allowance in the pending urgent deficiency bill is only \$25,000 for relief for the whole storm area. In addition, the Indian Office secured from the Army 50 carloads of Army clothing for distressed Indians in all parts of the country, and of these 50 carloads 3 have already gone to this storm area and 2 more will go.

It quickly became apparent that the allotment of \$38,500 was totally insufficient unless a half million or more of Navajo sheep were to be abandoned to starvation. Mr. Roman Hubbell, of Ganado, an Indian trader, one of a famous and noble family of Indian traders, wired December 23 as follows:

"Just returned from reservation. Visited many Navajo camps. Only since thawing of last two days have sheep been able to get feed on ground. Still snow covered. Sheep are weak, conditions very serious. Understand Government appropriated \$25,000 emergency to get feed to sheep to isolated points and Government employees already delivering feed. This is help but only drop in bucket for the number of sheep in real need. Long time until spring grass. Lots of feed required to save 50 per cent of sheep. Needs immediate action before thaw makes roads impassable."

Mr. Chee Dodge, probably the best known Navajo leader, telegraphed on December 24:

"My people suffering from cold and storm. Sheep are dying by the thousands from lack of feed. Ground covered with snow from 1 to 2½ feet. To save sheep they must be fed. Urgent that Government helps now. Already have 15 per cent loss, and will probably be 50 per cent, especially in southern Navajo and Crown-point (Eastern Navajo jurisdiction)."

Mr. Hubbell's telegram was followed December 25 by a telegram from Superintendent Hunter, of the Fort Defiance jurisdiction. The following is Hunter's long telegram in part: (Note that it relates only to the Fort Defiance jurisdiction, one of the six areas overwhelmed by the storm.)

"Hubbell telegrams regarding Navajo situation called my attention. Navajo people making extraordinary effort in helping themselves, but implore your office for further aid. Past allotment \$5,000 undoubtedly saved numerous sheep. Urge immediate allotment additional \$5,000 and more as soon as possible. Another \$5,000 will also be required to care for human distress."

As stated above, Mr. Hubbell's anticipation of a thaw was not realized. Instead there has come another blizzard and a renewed intense cold.

From far in the northern Navajo area, at Kayenta, on December 18, Doctor Perkins, of the Kayenta Indian Bureau hospital, wired:

"Roads blocked; frozen snow. No mail for two weeks. Road to coal mine blocked. Supplies insufficient. Present equipment poor and torn up."

He wired again December 29: "Coal supply diminishing rapidly. Roads so bad trucks can deliver only small quantities. May be worse in January and February. Another bad snowstorm would isolate us with short coal supply."

The following is from Superintendent Walker of the western Navajo jurisdiction, the least hard hit of the entire Navajo area:

"Because of the extremely cold weather we have experienced for almost a month now, which is very extraordinary for this section of the country so early in the year, I am much more uneasy regarding the welfare of the Indians than I have ever been. With from 4 to 18 inches of snow over the reservation, very cold weather, and at least two months more ahead of us in which to expect like conditions, or worse, the situation looks bad. On top of this, our Indians have pawned practically everything available, and some of the traders are unable to take anything more, even if the Indians had it. They (Indians and traders) have not been able

to sell anything, and we have no more building or other funds for employment. Consequently we must depend on funds from the office."

And now, on top of the situation as it existed around Christmas time, comes the situation described in a wire dated December 30 from Superintendent Stacher, of the Crown Point or Eastern Navajo Agency:

"Snowstorm of yesterday completely blocked roads Thoreau, Crown Point, Star Lake, and Kinebeto. Will be several days before roads can be opened, which will delay further delivery of feed and subsistence to Indians. However, have some supplies distributed at several points for Indians. Have delivered supplies Blanco Canyon Indians on pack horses. Absolutely impossible to reach by car or trucks."

Few Members of Congress are in a position to realize what the destruction of half, or more, of the Navajo, Zuni, and Apache livestock means. These Indians in numbers are more than a third of the pure-blood Indians in the whole country. Their tradition of self-support is an unbroken one. They live on and utilize vast stretches of country which are outstanding for scenic beauty but are barren, harsh, and waterless through great areas. Year by year these Indians have struggled upward, raising their standard of living, meeting their obligations, and asking favors of none. They live at peace with their white neighbors and are an indispensable element in the economy of the Southwest, particularly in Arizona and New Mexico. Sheep are their livelihood, their capital, and even their very life. Unless the present crisis be met, the Government may have cast upon it within the year 1932 a burden of hundreds of thousands of dollars of charitable relief and of appropriations to enable these Indians once more to get on their feet in the sheep and stock business. Congress may well be reminded that the Pueblo and Navajo sheep are not even bought with money loaned by the Government. These tribes created their own capital by their own labor, and it is this capital which is now, day by day, in the amount of thousands of sheep every day, being annihilated.

The paramount need, of course, is feed for the sheep. In many areas the forage will be out of reach for weeks, probably months, to come. One who traversed the reservation after the first storm thus describes the situation:

"The sheep and cattle were huddled or standing helpless, freezing or frozen, on the snow. Here and there a cedar or piñon tree stood out above the snow, but through great areas there are no cedar or piñon trees. The frozen breath of the cattle hung in long icicles from the ice-sealed lips of the creatures in agony. The Indians were carrying on their backs, often long distances through deep snow, brush and branches, which, of course, were scarcely food at all, but which the cattle and sheep tried to eat. Here and there, with enormous effort, an Indian had pushed away snow from the sagebrush; but even in summer time, and in a season of good rains, it requires more than 5 acres of this scattered sagebrush to feed one sheep. The situation meant inevitable and dreadful starvation, and the Indians were at the edge of starvation themselves."

The costs are twofold. Hay and cottonseed cake must be bought. Then these must be distributed by wagon, on the backs of burros, on the backs of men, to hundreds, even thousands, of hogans and sheep camps through this immense wilderness of snow and frost. The increased emergency appropriation of \$75,000 is a pitiful amount, but it will probably save the lives of a quarter million sheep and directly and indirectly the lives of hundreds of Indians.

Most cordially,

JOHN COLLIER.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6172) to amend the Federal farm loan act, as amended, to provide for additional capital for Federal land banks, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

#### ADDRESS BY DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER ON "THE REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT"

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler in the Hall of Parliament, Vienna, Austria, on June 22, 1931, the subject of the address being "The Republican Form of Government."

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

The text of the address which I have the honor to make in this distinguished presence is to be found in the opening sentences of the constitution of Austria, adopted October 1, 1920:

I. Oesterreich ist eine demokratische Republik. Ihr Recht geht vom Volk aus.

II (1). Oesterreich ist ein Bundesstaat.

Article I. Austria is a democratic republic. The will of the people is the foundation of its laws.

Article II (1). Austria is a Federal state.

It is most interesting and most significant that, because of the wholly changed conditions which have come upon Europe during the past quarter century, the great experiment in government which the people of the United States have been carrying on for more than a century and a half should now appear to have useful lessons to teach to many of the older nations. It is startling but true to record the fact that the republican form of government set up when the Constitution of the United States was ratified in 1789 is, if the Empire of Japan be excepted, the very oldest form of government of a great nation which now exists in the world. During the eighteenth century, the British ministries with two exceptions, came and went at the pleasure of the Crown, but the British Government was revolutionized by the reform act of 1832, by the representation of the people act of 1867, and very radically by the parliament act of 1911. The present Government of France dates only from the fall of the Second Empire and the rise of the Third Republic in 1870-71. The ancient peoples of China became a republic in 1912. The German State is governed under the terms of the constitution of Weimar, which was written in 1919. The constitution under which Austria became a republican federation of eight Provinces was adopted in 1920, and in the same year Hungary established the existing form of government in that country. The revolution in government in Italy, of which Signor Mussolini is the representative and spokesman, took place in 1922. The Union of Socialist Soviet Republics came into existence in Russia in 1923. Spain has just now passed from monarchy toward a republic. Every other European or Asiatic State of any considerable importance has found its government made over as a result either of the Napoleonic wars or of the revolutions of 1848 or of the Great War which seized the whole world in its grasp from 1914 to 1918. These changes and revolutions in government have been sometimes quiet and orderly, sometimes violent and accompanied with the shedding of blood. They have had various origins, but they have always tended toward one goal. Their origin has been now in difficult economic conditions, now in changed modes of political thinking, and now in personal and group ambition. The common result of them all has been to make increasingly unstable any form of government or social order which does not rest upon an enlightened and instructed public opinion. For 300 years, government has everywhere tended to become less and less the function and privilege of the few, whether competent or incompetent, and to become more and more the accepted prerogative of the great mass of the governed. It is time, then, to look about and inquire with an open mind and the broadest human sympathy what lessons the experience of recent generations may have to teach. When this question is asked, the United States becomes of importance to the whole world, not because of the extent of its territory, not because of the size of its population, not because of its vast natural resources, and not because of its accumulated wealth, but rather because of its attempt to make the republican form of government work under those rapidly changing conditions of philosophic thought, of economic interest and of political practice which have marked the nineteenth century and the twentieth.

That the republican form of government was consciously adopted for the United States admits of no doubt. That question is settled forever by the debates in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and by the classic discussions of *The Federalist*, particularly by chapter 10 of that famous work, which came from the pen of James Madison. These are Madison's words: "A republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place. \* \* \* \* (Lodge, *Henry Cabot—The Works of Alexander Hamilton* (New York: 1904), Vol. XI, pp. 74-75.) He then proceeds to examine the points in which it differs from pure democracy. He describes the two great points of difference between a democracy and a republic as, first, the delegation of the government in the latter to a small number of citizens elected by the rest; and, second, the greater numbers of citizens and the greater sphere of country over which the republic may be extended. This is the republican form of government which by the Constitution of the United States is guaranteed by the United States to every State in the Union. There is now at hand the experience of a century and a half to give answer to the question: How has this republican form of government worked?

The English philosopher, Herbert Spencer, in writing of the Americans, used these words:

"The republican form of government is the highest form of government; but because of this it requires the highest type of human nature—a type nowhere at present existing." (Spencer, *Herbert—Essays, Scientific, Political, and Speculative* (New York: 1891), *The Americans*, Vol. III, pp. 478-479.)

It would not be easy to controvert that judgment. The republican form of government certainly puts the heaviest sort of burden upon the whole adult population, since if their government is to be really effective they must first of all clearly understand the issues to be met by those chosen to exercise the powers of government and then show skill and wisdom in selecting these public officers. Whatever may be the theoretical soundness of the republican form of government, in practice it must meet these two tests if it is to attain success on a high plane.

It is worth while before pursuing this inquiry further to come to terms as to the meaning of words which are commonly used concerning forms of government but in different and often in illusive senses. If democracy be taken to mean pure democracy, in which the people as a whole themselves exercise the powers of government directly, then it must be said at once that no such thing is possible in modern times or under modern conditions.

Indeed, it never has been possible save for a very homogeneous group, small in number and occupying a very restricted area of the earth's surface. From the time of Plato and Aristotle the meaning of this word and its antithesis has been studied and debated and expounded until surely there is nothing more to be said.

It would appear to be more helpful to clear thinking, however, not to use the word democracy to connote a form of government which can not and does not exist; but rather to apply it to any government, whatever its external form, which rests upon the authority and expresses the will of all the people. In this sense it is quite possible to have a democratic monarchy, as in Great Britain, or a democratic republic, as in the United States. This democracy, whatever its external form, would become oligarchy or monarchy if the authority and the will of the whole people were displaced by the authority and the will of a small and privileged group or by the authority and will of one, whether he came to his high place by hereditary advantage or by personal seizure of the right to rule. In this sense, then, it would appear that the prevailing tendency throughout the world is toward a democratic government, usually republican, but sometimes monarchical, in its form of expression. The two chief outstanding exceptions are the Communist Government in Russia and the Fascist Government in Italy, each of which rests upon a distinct philosophic, economic, and political foundation of its own. At the moment communism and fascism are competing vigorously with democracy in the experimental laboratory of political practice and they are competing with that democracy wherever it exists, either in Europe or in America, no matter whether it find expression in monarchical or in republican institutions.

There are some aspects, important ones, of the Government of the United States which are not of necessity a part of the republican form but as to which American experience is distinctly enlightening. Chief among these is that separation of powers, executive, legislative, and judicial, which Aristotle planned, which Montesquieu taught, and which the framers of the Constitution of the United States thought most important. Through the acceptance of this principle of separation there has been set up an independent judiciary which is one of the most characteristic and strongest elements of the republican form of government in the United States. That government would not to-day be what it is, nor would the people of the United States be where they are had not their highest courts, particularly the United States Supreme Court under the long leadership of Chief Justice John Marshall, had the power and the courage to interpret in practice the great phrases of the Constitution and to build barriers against the oft-attempted invasion of private and personal rights by the legislative branch of Government. There is no contradiction in the possession or exercise of this authority by the Supreme Court of the United States. It speaks for the whole people in its sphere as the Congress speaks for the whole people in the sphere allotted to it.

The notion widely held and often expressed that in some mysterious way the legislative branch of government is more fully representative of the people than the executive or the judicial branch finds no basis whatever in history or reason. The same people authorized at the same time all three of these branches of government and set them their several tasks. That these agencies of government should strive to work together in harmony goes without saying, but that occasion might arise when grave difference would manifest itself between them is almost certain. Should this difference arise between the executive and legislative branches the legislative branch may prevail, provided two-thirds of its Members present and voting are ready and willing to record their difference with the Executive. From the finding of the highest tribunal in the judicial branch of the Government there is, however, no further appeal. Its judgment stands. Surely a people's ripe and reflective judgment is as much entitled to weight in government as are a people's violent and passing emotions.

Of course, it would have been perfectly possible to build a republican form of government in the United States wherein the judicial branch was made subordinate to the executive or wherein the executive branch was made subordinate to the legislative, as in Great Britain or in France, but, doubtless fortunately, that was not done. On the whole, the experience of the United States teaches that the separation of powers in its republican form of government, particularly as regards the independent judiciary, has worked well. It has made for consideration, for sober reflection, for emphasis upon underlying principles, and for opportunity to interest vast numbers of people in difficult and disputed questions of public policy.

There are at least two respects in which existing arrangements in the Government of the United States could be improved without in any way altering its form.

There might be instituted by the Congress itself some restriction upon the introduction of bills and resolutions for consideration. It is now the privilege of any 1 of the 96 Senators or of any 1 of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives to introduce any bill or resolution he may see fit, dealing with any conceivable matter, germane or not germane to the public interest. In theory, at least, each one of these legislative proposals stands on an equal footing; but, of course, the vast majority of them are doomed to what may be described as legislative asphyxiation. They are introduced and heard of no more. Nevertheless, there is no orderly responsibility such as exists in the British House of Commons in respect to the introduction and discussion of bills and resolutions of a public character. Since this same tendency and this same habit prevail in the legislatures of each of the 48 con-

stituent States, it follows that the people of the United States live under an overwhelming and constantly increasing flood of legislation, most of which is inconsequential, much of which is unnecessary, and not a little of which is distinctly mischievous. If it were possible to place responsibility for the introduction and report of public bills and resolutions upon a responsible majority group, much might be gained; but as matters now stand there is no Senator or Representative so poor or so inconsequential that he may not on his own behalf and of his own right present for the consideration of the Congress any proposal that may suit his fancy, however revolutionary, even if it attack the very foundations upon which the Government rests. All this points to a weakness, not of principle but of method, in the practical working of the republican form of government as it exists in the United States.

The second improvement which might be effected almost by the stroke of a pen has been proposed on high authority, but nothing whatever has been done to bring it to pass. This is to require members of the Cabinet, who are the administrative heads of the several executive departments, to attend the sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives at stated times. The executive branch of the Government may have been at work anxiously and carefully upon some important problem and may have suggested the introduction of a bill or resolution relating to it either in the Senate or House of Representatives. Present practice makes no provision whatever for the appearance on the floor of either House of Congress of that Cabinet officer who, representing the executive branch of the Government in any particular case, would be best qualified to discuss the proposal, to give information concerning it, and to answer objections to it. Such Cabinet officer would of course have no vote in either house, but it would be a distinct gain in the transaction of the public business if he were not only permitted, but required, to attend upon the sessions of the Senate and of the House of Representatives at definite times in order publicly to give information regarding the work of his department of government and to answer questions regarding any detail of its administration. This is now provided for in limited fashion at hearings before committees of either House of Congress. These hearings are sometimes private and sometimes public. They are, however, no substitute for the important proposition which was formally made to the Senate on December 8, 1881, by a committee of most responsible and representative Senators of both political parties. No action has been taken upon that vitally important proposal from that day to this, despite the fact that such names as Blaine, of Maine; Platt, of Connecticut; Allison, of Iowa; Ingalls, of Kansas; Pendleton, of Ohio; Long, of Massachusetts; and Presidents Garfield and Taft are to be cited in its support.

That the republican form of Government in the United States would work more expeditiously, more effectively, and more wisely if these two improvements in its administration were made without in anywise changing its form, is, I believe, quite certain.

The major questions, however, in respect to the effectiveness of the republican form of government must always be: First, are the people upon whose will the Government rests and to whose will it is to respond really enlightened and competent; and, second, have ways and means been found to make it reasonably certain that the republican form of government when established will become and remain genuinely representative of the interests and ideals of the whole people?

The answer to the former question indicates the fundamental part which the process of education is to play in the modern republican state. There must be not merely effective instruction, first, of youth in the schools followed by that of the adult through the many new and powerful agencies which are coming into existence for that purpose, but this instruction must be part and parcel of genuine education. The underlying moral, social, and political principles upon which the republican form of government rests are not of themselves beyond the reach of injury or even of ruin. They must be respected, cared for, supported, and emphasized in and through every aspect of social and political life, and in and through every act of government, unless that government is to degenerate into a mere grasping for power by selfish and competing groups whose dominating interest is not principle but privilege. The people upon whose authority and will the republican form of government rests must be taught to think, must be able to think, and must be willing to think.

In the republican form of government the substitution of any private interest for the public interest is perversion. This is the path by which the republican form of government degenerates into some superficial imitation of democracy for which we have as yet found no adequate name. Aristotle understood all this perfectly. He saw and accepted as basic the varieties of social condition, of occupation, of personal interest, and of economic status. He was too wise to put forward any notion of false or compulsory equality. He understood clearly that the poor should no more govern than the rich and that the best ends can be obtained only when all persons alike, whether high or low, rich or poor, share in the government to the utmost. If this be beyond the power of mankind, then a continuing and successful form of republican government is impossible.

Cynics and critics have at all times been quick to seize upon the weaknesses and abuses of democracy and to poke fun at them. So sagacious an historian as Froude wrote that "Popular governments have hitherto uniformly glided into democracies, and democracies as uniformly perish of their own excess" (Froude, James Anthony—*Short Studies on Great Subjects* (New York: 1890).

Party Politics, third series, p. 316), while Gibbon went so far as to point to corruption as the most infallible symptom of constitutional liberty (Gibbon, Edward—*The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (London: 1901), vol. 2, ch. 21, p. 372).

It must be borne in mind, however, that these cynics and critics measure the republican form of government in terms of its perfection and not by comparison with the evils and defects of monarchy or oligarchy or with such as may attach to any other nondemocratic form of government. If it is meant by these criticisms to point to the fact that the republican form of government, where it exists, does not of itself do absolute justice to all or assure perfection of policy, then it must quickly be admitted that the experience of the United States can not be cited in contravention of this judgment. On the whole, the American people justly feel that under their republican form of government they have weathered many storms, have dealt with many grave problems, and have demonstrated the principles of that form of government in a way reasonably to satisfy both the demands and the hopes of men. So long as human nature remains imperfect, just so long will any form of government which rests upon human nature be imperfect, too. The important question is not whether the republican form of government as hitherto practiced has reached perfection, but whether it is improving and can be further improved and how it compares, even from the standpoint of perfection, with monarchy, with oligarchy, with Fascism, or with Communism. An instructed and informed electorate is of vital importance, and no people who venture upon the republican form of government dare leave any stone unturned to offer to the whole population, youth and adult alike, every opportunity, every inducement, and every reward to obtain that training and that discipline, those habits of mind and of conduct which taken together are marks of a genuine education.

Then there is the vitally important matter of the choice of those persons who shall from time to time and for fixed periods exercise the power and authority of government. Theoretically the people in making these choices speak by the voice of a majority. In important elections this occurs but rarely, however, particularly in the United States. There it has been found most difficult to induce the millions who enjoy the right and the privilege of suffrage to exercise that right and that privilege. This fact taken in connection with the institution in recent years of a very complicated and involved system of preelections for the purpose of choosing competing candidates from whom choice must be made at a final election has built very high barriers to the possibility of majority rule and has elevated to high consequences and power well-organized and active pluralities of voting minorities. These facts, together with the vast area of the United States and the great diversity of immediate local interests and problems, unite to make it extremely difficult, as matters now stand, effectively and accurately to record the judgment of the American people upon any single question, however important. Those who participate in the elections may be in part chiefly influenced by personal allegiance to a particular individual candidate, in part by their judgment as to the relative significance of some issue which is to all intents and purposes purely local, and in part by deep conviction as to some great question of both national and world-wide importance. It would defy human power to analyze precisely and accurately how the voting public in the United States at any particular time intended to register its preferences as to any such dominant issue.

Nevertheless, experience shows that in some extraordinary fashion the prevailing temper of the American people finds expression at the polls with the result that, if the choice declared be not logically or mathematically accurate, it is nevertheless on the whole reflective of preponderant public opinion. This was certainly true in the presidential election of 1860, when Abraham Lincoln was chosen President, although his popular vote was nearly a million less than the combined vote of the three candidates who contended against him. It was certainly true also in 1896, when William McKinley was chosen to the Presidency, although his popular vote was but little greater than the combined vote cast for the six other candidates. In the former case, the people were speaking for a policy that would preserve the Union and deal firmly with all proposals for the extension of slavery into new territory. In the latter case, they were speaking against that extreme form of bimetallism in public finance which was earnestly advocated by President McKinley's vigorous competitor, William Jennings Bryan. American experience would appear then to indicate that the people have found a rough and ready way of expressing their will and of getting it translated into official action, even if logic and mathematics will not always give full support either to their methods or to their forms of expression.

Simplification of the electoral process is greatly needed in the United States, and, if American experience is to be weighed, no other people accepting the republican form of government should attempt to imitate either the extent, the variety, or the complication of the electoral procedure which now exists throughout the United States.

In the first place, far too many public officers are chosen by popular election. In village, town, city, and county government, hosts of public officials are chosen annually or biennially who should really be appointed by a competent executive for long terms, since their duties are in no wise primarily political but almost exclusively administrative. The fact that these minor offices are so largely elective conceals from the voting public the great importance of the choices which they must make for legis-

lative office and for such high administrative posts as those of mayor and governor and president. If the many officials in the field of local government were appointed under proper terms and conditions, not only would their posts and their duties cease to be objects of partisan clamor and partisan pressure, and the public be thereby much better served, but the way would be cleared to focus public attention on the choice of those public officers who directly represent the public will in the discharge of their duties and who when elected have it within their power quickly to affect and to shape public policy. The notion that the election of local administrative officials is more democratic than their appointment would be, is a vexatious illusion. It is democratic properly to serve the democracy, and it is undemocratic to install those processes and to do those things which make it difficult or impossible to serve the democracy.

There are not wanting evidences that an increasing body of opinion in the United States is awake to the improvements which might well be effected in the electoral system now prevailing. Time, probably considerable time, will be needed to bring such improvements to pass, but there is no reason to doubt that as public opinion becomes more alert, better instructed, and ready to accept a higher degree of responsibility for public policy, it will bring about improvement in the conditions which have just now been mentioned for the purpose of indicating that they are not aspects of American experience which should uncritically be adopted elsewhere.

It remains to point out how difficult is the effective participation of the Government of the United States in the new and cooperative life of the world by reason of the relations of its various instruments of government to the formulation and execution of foreign policy. That field of responsibility and opportunity is directly committed by the Constitution to the chief executive officer of the Government, the President of the United States, but whenever this involves agreement or arrangement with another government—as it almost always does—then the resultant treaty can only be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. In other words, if the Government of Great Britain or of France or of Germany or of Austria or of almost any other nation signs a treaty with a foreign power, that treaty is an accomplished fact and both governments may proceed accordingly. In the case of the United States, however, agreement with a foreign power upon a treaty is only the beginning of what may be, and usually is, a long and involved process of discussion and debate in the Senate, where the whole question, very simple originally, may be vastly complicated and its difficulties multiplied by injudicious, irrelevant, and unwise things which may there be said. The established procedure of the Senate of the United States is such that a very small group of Senators, insignificant in number, may delay almost indefinitely important action in respect to international relationship, action to which the public opinion of the people is overwhelmingly favorable. This constantly creates difficult and even painful situations which gravely affect the highest interests of the people of the United States, as well as the peace and good order of the world at large.

The cooperation of the Senate in respect of foreign policy through its power to advise and consent in the process of treaty making is not of itself harmful or unwise. Quite the contrary; still greater difficulties would arise in connection with the foreign policy of the United States if the President were to have unlimited and unhampered power to make treaties on his own single official responsibility. The insertion in the Constitution of the provision that two-thirds of the Senators present must consent before a treaty can be ratified, was intended to raise the whole process of treaty making above the level of partisan politics and to invite and to secure the cooperation of men of various parties and from different parts of the country in formulating those important measures which have to do with international relations. What is of vital consequence, however, is that the Senate itself should by change of its procedure make it impossible for a few Senators indefinitely to delay action upon a treaty, and by such delay not only to injure the reputation of the United States but to complicate the international life of the world. There are few cases in which the outright rejection of a treaty by the Senate would not cause less international disturbance and do less harm to the people of the United States than the long and inexplicable delays which are now permitted because of existing rules of procedure.

Fundamental and controlling in the form of government established by the people of the United States are the Bill of Rights and the principle of federal union. The Bill of Rights, which sets out with definiteness and in detail the limitations which the people put upon the government which they established and the rights and liberties which they reserved for themselves or for the constituent States, is the foundation upon which the whole structure of American life and government is built. In Great Britain the Bill of Rights has for centuries existed in the form of custom, convention, and tradition, but it is nowhere expressly formulated in definite terms that represent its power and its place under the conditions of contemporary life. Apart from the *Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen* adopted by the National Assembly at Versailles on August 26, 1789, which was placed at the forefront of the Constitution presented to the King of France on September 3, 1791, and accepted by him on September 14, a Bill of Rights first made its appearance in the written constitutions of nations of continental Europe when the German Empire was organized in 1871. Recent constitutions adopted by continental European nations have incorporated a Bill of Rights

In more or less specific and complete form. The people of the United States are everywhere and always insistent that the limitations which their Bill of Rights puts upon government shall be strictly adhered to and maintained. They look upon government as their servant, not their master, and they require it as best they can to keep strictly within the limits which they have marked out for it. Without a Bill of Rights, a republican form of government might readily become a tyranny, and there is no essential difference between the tyranny of the many and the tyranny of the one or of the few. Tyranny is tyranny, however manifested and exercised.

The principle of federal union is next in importance to the Bill of Rights. Had the vast area of the United States been brought under a single, a rigid, and a uniform system of executive and legislative control, it would have broken to pieces long ago. Local self-governments so organized and conducted as to reflect the wishes and to meet the needs of different sections, different climates, different economic conditions, and different social conditions are essential to the republican form of government as it exists in the United States. Uniformity of legislation and singleness of executive oversight are found only in the narrow field prescribed and limited by the Constitution, and in respect to all which has to do with foreign policy and international relations. A smaller, a more compact, and a more homogeneous area than that of the United States might perhaps dispense with the federal form, but so far as American experience can teach it is an essential element in the success of a republican form of government over a wide territory and a numerous people in these modern days.

It may then be said that the experience of the people of the United States over more than a century and a half gives evidence that the republican form of government can be operated wisely, justly, and successfully, and that such incidental weaknesses and defects as are revealed from time to time in its practical conduct and administration may easily be remedied when instructed public opinion is directed to that end. It would be unbecoming to suggest or to imply that any modern people, particularly one with long historic background and fine traditions of its own, should adopt, much less imitate, the form of government which any other people has found adequate and successful. On the other hand, it is becoming, when the problems of government are being studied more intensively than ever before and with larger knowledge, that every form and kind of experience should be turned to for assistance and for light. The open-minded, the fair-minded citizen of any twentieth-century nation will be constantly asking how the government, for which he himself is in part responsible, can be improved and strengthened and what lessons have other nations to teach out of their own experiences. If the people of the United States be asked this question, their answer can be that, on the whole and with due regard to weaknesses and limitations in practical operation, they may say, without appearing to boast, that they have demonstrated that the republican form of government can be made to work with essential justice to all men and for the protection and widening expression of human liberty.

#### MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF MALT AND SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS

Mr. BINGHAM. I offer a Senate resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It merely asks for information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 123) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Commerce is requested to furnish to the Senate as soon as practicable information covering each annual period from the year 1909 to the year 1917, both inclusive, with respect to (1) the number of persons employed in the United States in the manufacture and sale of malt and spirituous liquors, (2) the number of gallons of malt and spirituous liquors manufactured in the United States, and (3) the number of freight cars employed and the amount of coal used on railroads in the United States in the transportation of coal and grain to breweries and distilleries.

Mr. BINGHAM. I offer another Senate resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It merely requests information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 124) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is requested to furnish to the Senate as soon as practicable information with respect to the number of bushels of grain used in the manufacture of malt and spirituous liquors in the United States during each annual period from the year 1909 to the year 1917, both inclusive.

#### COMMITTEE TO AUDIT AND CONTROL THE CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Mr. FESS. I desire to submit a Senate resolution and should like to have a minute or so in which to explain it before presenting it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator will proceed.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the resolution I am about to submit has to do with the procedure of the Senate with reference to measures that under the statute must be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It is a matter of law rather than a matter of rule. Not infrequently a resolution is presented that goes to substantive matters involving policy over which the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has absolutely no authority by way of suggesting amendments or holding hearings or anything of that sort. We have tried to establish the practice here that when such a resolution is submitted it shall be referred to the standing committee which would have jurisdiction of it before its reference to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, so that in case the standing committee recommends it, then the other committee will be free to report it favorably. I am submitting a resolution, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Rules, looking to that change in our procedure.

The resolution (S. Res. 125) was read and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the fourth paragraph of clause 1 of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, be amended by adding before the semicolon at the end thereof a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That any such resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee."

#### ARTICLE BY GOVERNOR PINCHOT ON "THE CASE FOR FEDERAL RELIEF"

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article in the Survey Graphic, published in New York City, for January, 1932, entitled, "The Case for Federal Relief," by Governor Pinchot, of Pennsylvania.

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

The article is as follows:

#### THE CASE FOR FEDERAL RELIEF

By Gifford Pinchot

Is this Nation, as a Nation, to reach out a hand to help those of its people who through no fault of their own are in desperation and distress? Shall Federal aid be granted in this great national crisis? It is not a question of ability to help. We are the richest nation on earth. If Federal aid is needed, it can be granted. Congress has only to say the word. Shall the answer be yes or no?

My answer is yes. To my mind it is the only possible answer. Prolonged study and profound conviction support my belief that Federal aid in this depression is our clear duty and our best hope for prompt and permanent recovery. Two solid years of bad times have taught us that we can no longer consider our condition as an unfortunate accident which will automatically right itself if left alone. Gentle bedside language can do nothing for us.

Our methods so far have been restricted substantially to local relief. Those in high places have continually insisted that a national emergency be met with local aid alone. They have left it all, with the exception of a bit of benevolent advertising, to the States and communities themselves. To requests and plans for Federal aid they have cried "dole, dole." Why aid given by the Nation should be a dole, and precisely the same aid given by a State or a city should not be a dole, I have never been able to understand.

Of course, none of us wants the dole. None of us is in favor of establishing any system which will give the unemployed money or even food when work can be given instead. But that choice is not before us. Industry and business are not giving men the chance to work. Nor are they feeding the unemployed. We must feed them if they are to live. We must feed them if they are to retain any confidence in the Government under which they live.

Crying "dole" has not helped the unemployed, but it has served a very definite purpose, that of restricting relief to local sources. Then what about local relief? In what direction has it headed us?

A nation-wide community-chest campaign was backed to the hilt by the most persuasive and efficient forces that charitable leaders could muster. We can all rejoice that in many cases the quotas were subscribed. The quality of neighborliness, the virtue of sympathy have not died out. We never feared they had. But if the full quotas aimed at were everywhere collected would they be sufficient to cover the needs of the winter? They would not. Responsible social workers tell me the quotas were fixed on the basis of what the chest managers believed that the communities could be made to subscribe. They were often small in proportion to the real needs. The people who think they can wash their hands, now that the chest drives are over, and go away on trips to Florida should think again.

Where does the bulk of local relief come from? Who carries the load? It comes from and is carried by those who pay taxes to the municipal and county and sometimes to State governments. The Russell Sage Foundation, reporting for 81 cities, found that in past years private funds supplied only 28 per cent of the relief. Tax funds supplied the other 72 per cent. In some cities over 90 per cent came from tax funds.

How are these taxes raised? The answer is that municipalities raise their funds mainly through real estate and other property taxes. Local relief of this kind means an increase in property taxes. This increase in property taxes and the sort of enforced charity by which industry takes a day's pay out of every twenty or so in the month from workers, even from scrubwomen in offices, to help swell relief funds—that is how the program of local relief works out. Yet it is substantially true that every cent a man of small means contributes to relief either directly or indirectly through increased taxes is taken out of consumption. His buying power is immediately slowed down by exactly that much. And the slowing down of buying power means the slowing down of the wheels of industry. Here, then, is the heart of the local-relief plan. By cutting down consuming power, it can only serve to further our economic maladjustment and to sink us deeper in the hole.

Now in considering what plan we are to advance in addition to, or as a total or partial substitute for, local relief, it might be well for us to investigate the flaws in our economic structure which brought our present troubles upon us. There ought to be very little doubt that the largest single cause was production beyond the power of the people to consume. Through the years called prosperous, no stone was left unturned which would help perfect or increase our national productive power. Technological improvements, financial devices such as mergers, high-pressure sales campaigns, installment buying and other credit schemes, all tended to the same end. All helped to raise production to new and dangerous heights and to leave normal consuming power farther and farther behind.

Instead of sharing with labor the profits of increased production, industry shunted the wealth back to itself. Wage earners were encouraged, persuaded, cajoled to spend their money buying goods. If they couldn't pay for them now, they should buy on the installment plan. They should borrow money, if necessary. But they should buy. No real American, they were told, could be without his radio and his automobile.

And what happened to the money spent in buying? Did a reasonable part of it go back in increased wages to the working-man's pocket so that the circle of producing and consuming could go on? It did not. It went in staggering disproportion to dividends and capital. It went back to industry so that production might be increased, even at the expense of consuming power.

This is no wild guess. This is fact with figures to support it. Julius Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, tells us that in the decade ending in 1929 real wages increased only 13 per cent while the returns to all industry increased 72 per cent. Where did the 72 per cent come from but out of the spent wages of the millions and millions of workingmen? Doctor Klein tells us the dividends in industrial and rail stocks increased by 285 per cent, twenty-two times as fast as wages. Is it any wonder that the crash of depression came? Increased production served only to turn the national wealth into two tremendously unequal channels. By far the bulk of that wealth went back in a torrent to capital and production. A tiny stream returned to purchasing power through wages.

Was overproduction and the disregard of consuming power entirely accidental? I think not. To me it is inconceivable that the great experts in business and economics who have taken over the banking, industrial, and political control of the country could have been blind to what was going on. As early as 1921 the Federated American Engineering Societies reported that many of our large industries were overdeveloped: Clothing, 45 per cent; printing, 50 per cent; shoes, 50 per cent; coal, 50 per cent. Yet throughout the whole decade the Department of Commerce used every power of persuasion to bring industry to the highest point of mass production.

If the drive for superproduction had been coupled with a drive for an increased return to labor and consumers, the result might have been very different. If it had been combined with an arrangement for providing men discharged because of labor-saving machinery and mergers with a dismissal wage, it might have been helpful. It was coupled with nothing of the sort.

What it was coupled with was a campaign on the part of the Treasury Department to reduce taxation on great wealth. That campaign was not only successful but oversuccessful. Not only was the excess-profits tax repealed but the income tax on the higher brackets was reduced.

Meanwhile, what was happening to consuming power? What about maintaining the buying ability of those millions of wage-earners who would have to use the extra goods turned out by glorified production? Take bituminous coal. In 1923 the people paid \$900,000 for a coal commission to direct stabilization of that industry, already in bad shape. Its report and its recommendations were killed in cold blood while the administration looked calmly on. Take agriculture. For years the farm organizations have battled in vain for the stabilization measures which were so badly needed. Take the stock market. Some years ago when speculation was getting out of hand and the Senate had begun to study the situation, the then President concisely announced

that the amount of brokers' loans was not too high. Never before had a President undertaken to support the stock market.

In all this record not a plan was made—let alone carried out—for stabilizing purchasing power. Not a prop was put beneath consuming ability while producing ability was being reared to such dizzy heights. Our national leaders, those same leaders who have been insisting on local relief, lent willing hands in the development of a prosperity so one-sided that it could not stand.

Before going further let us see what sort of an economic structure these men have been building—these men who have consistently opposed the idea of Federal relief. By the steady drying up of the springs of purchasing power and the overstimulation of production, there has been developed in this country the most astounding concentration of wealth in the hands of a few men that the world has ever known. Here is the basic evil which has brought on the depression, and which we must guard against in planning relief for the future. Here is the evil which is protected and fostered by local-relief plans.

In 1926 the Federal Trade Commission made a report to the Senate on national wealth and income. They had studied the county court records of over 40,000 estates. The records came from 12 States and stretched over a 12-year period. The counties studied had been chosen to represent not only every section of the country from coast to coast, but also every sort of district from the farms to the congested cities. They found that in this sampling, 1 per cent of the people owned about 60 per cent of the wealth, that sixty dollars out of every hundred were owned by one person out of every hundred. They found that 40 per cent of the wealth, forty dollars out of every hundred, were left for the other 99 per cent of the people. In other words, one person out of every hundred was considerably richer than the other 99 put together. They found further that 13 per cent of the people owned more than 90 per cent of the wealth. And at the other end, 77 per cent of the people owned only 5 per cent of the wealth. Three-quarters of the people could have added up all their fortunes and it would come to a bare twentieth of the total. In 1929 the National Bureau of Economic Research made a careful study of all the incomes in this country for 1926. They found that four and a half thousand people received that year an average of almost \$240,000 apiece. And at the bottom of the heap, 44,000,000 people had incomes of about \$1,000 each, or less than one-half of 1 per cent of the separate incomes of those at the top.

Most recent figures are yet more amazing. In 1929 the per capita income in this country was \$700 for every man, woman, and child. But according to the Treasury Department's preliminary estimate over 500 persons had in that year incomes of over a million dollars apiece. Their total income was \$1,185,000,000. They received these five hundred and odd, the average shares of 1,692,000 people.

The facts of concentration alone are impressive enough. But even more so are the indications of how tremendously that concentration increased in the years during which it received governmental encouragement. The figures for these years tell all too vividly the story of a nation building toward disaster by unbalancing its economic equilibrium. On March 20, 1931, the National Industrial Conference Board published in its bulletin figures representing the total income of the Nation for several years back. In 1920 we made over \$74,000,000,000. In 1928 we made \$81,000,000. In eight years we had increased our income by a little less than 0.1.

But the Treasury Department's latest annual statistics of income reveal some particularly interesting things to compare with that one-tenth. In 1920 there were 3,649 people who had incomes of over \$100,000. In 1928 that number had jumped to 15,977. It had doubled and then doubled again and was still going up. In 1920 those people made a total of over \$727,000,000. But in 1928, those who had the \$100,000 incomes and up received about four and a half billion dollars—more than six times as much money. And all this, remember, while the incomes of all our people increased one lone tenth of its previous figure.

Then how about the men who receive a million a year? In 1920 there were 33 of them and they got \$77,000,000. In 1928 there were 511 of them, fifteen times as many, and they got over a billion dollars, or fourteen times as much. The national income had meanwhile increased by one-tenth. Finally look at our fellow-citizens who get a paltry five million a year. In 1920 there were four of them and they collected not quite \$30,000,000. But by 1928 they had added 22 new members to their exclusive circle, and the 26 of them were forced to get along with an income of a little over \$250,000 among them.

In other words, in the 8-year period between 1920 and 1928, while the total national income increased less than 10 per cent, the number of men with incomes of over a million dollars increased over 1,400 per cent, or one hundred and forty times as fast. And the amount of money these men made in one year increased 1,300 per cent, or one hundred and thirty times as fast as the total amount of money made by everybody in the whole of the United States. They certainly got their share.

The same astounding concentration of wealth and power is seen in the industrial world. A study of corporate wealth and of the influence of large corporations was published this year in the American Economic Review. The conclusions reached are eye-openers. In 1927, there were over 300,000 industrial corporations in this country. Two hundred of the 300,000, less than seven-hundredths of 1 per cent, controlled 45 per cent of the total wealth of all these corporations. The same 200 received over 40

per cent of all corporate income, and controlled over 35 per cent of all business wealth. Furthermore, about 20 per cent of the wealth of this entire Nation was in the hands of those 200 corporations.

Truly the growth of these 200 giant corporations has been almost beyond belief. In the 10 years up to 1929 their assets grew from under \$44,000,000,000 to \$78,000,000,000, an increase of 78 per cent. The author of the study, Prof. Gardiner C. Means, asserts that if their indicated rate of growth continues in the future they will own within 20 years virtually half of our national wealth. Professor Means then emphasizes an extremely important fact. He says that in 1927, less than 2,000 men were directors of these 200 corporations. Since many of them were inactive, the ultimate control of more than one-third of industry was actually in the hands of a few hundred men. And, according to present indications, it will still be only a few hundred men by 1950 will control half of the wealth of this entire Nation.

It is this almost unbelievable concentration of wealth which has killed the consuming power of the average millions and has brought our misfortunes upon us. It is this same incredible concentration which is the chief obstacle in our path to permanent prosperity. And it is the Senegambian in the local-relief woodpile. For if we examine statements and actions of the proponents of local relief, we find that they weave together into a surprisingly harmonious pattern. That pattern does not spell relief for the unemployed. What it spells is persistent shielding of concentrated wealth—not relief for the needy but release for the millionaire.

The local-relief advocates are prolific in denials of any excessive distress. Yet I know that there are almost a million men unemployed in the State of Pennsylvania alone. If my State were typical of the rest of the Nation, there would be not far from 10,000,000 unemployed in the country.

Next we have statements to the effect that wage earners are not so badly off because prices have been dropping along with wages. That argument is answered by the Government's figures. Commissioner of Labor Statistics Stewart of the United States Department of Labor announced on October 1, 1931, that from June, 1929, to June, 1931, the cost of living went down less than 12 per cent. In the same period, he stated, the total wage decrease was about 40 per cent. Wages actually paid dropped more than three times as far as prices.

The local-relief advocates have also laid unwarranted emphasis on Federal public works. Their construction program, they say, has greatly relieved distress and they point out that the number of men employed in the Federal construction program last month was 50,000. We have had the past summer half that number employed on State highways alone in Pennsylvania. And 50,000 is no large percentage of the millions unemployed, after two years of depression. Is it any wonder that President William Green of the American Federation of Labor calls this "only a drop in the bucket" toward relieving unemployment?

Finally, there are the plans now under way to make up the Federal deficit the depression has caused.

Treasury proposals to increase the income taxes recommend that the exemptions be lowered and the base of the tax be spread. In other words, much or most of the increase is to come from the little fellows. Certain leaders, among them Senator Reed, advocate a sales tax. A sales tax is simply another way of putting the burden on small business. They do far and away the largest part of the Nation's buying, and a sales tax would fall mainly on them. Does a sales tax reach the hoarded millions of the overrich? Does it take money from the coffers of the large manufacturing corporations? It does not. It is another way of seeing to it that concentrated wealth shall remain concentrated.

There is only one conclusion to be drawn from all this: The safeguarding of money in the hands of an incredibly small number of incredibly rich men. The force behind the stubborn opposition to Federal relief is fear lest the taxation to provide that relief be levied on concentrated wealth—fear lest the policy of years, the policy of shielding the big fortunes at the expense of the little ones, should at long last be tossed into the discard.

In the name of those who are overburdened now, I demand that the tax rates on the upper-bracket incomes be increased. In their name I demand that the graduation of the inheritance tax be steepened. And in their name I demand that the exemptions and the lower-bracket tax rates be left untouched. To meddle with them is to trifle with disaster and to invite the depression to stay. When I ask that the top rates of the income and estate taxes be raised enough to pay for Federal relief for the unemployed, I am speaking as a man directly affected. I pay an income tax in the high brackets myself. In time, a goodly share of my estate will go to the Government.

I believe in levying taxes according to ability to pay. Our Government recognizes that principle in its dealings with foreign nations. Why should it not do so at home? The burden of an income tax or an inheritance tax can not be shifted. It lies where it falls. The burden of a heavily graduated tax falls on the man who is best able to bear it, who will feel the loss the least. I am strong for it. I am strong for its use to help defeat that shameful situation by which millions suffer from want in the richest country in the world.

You may ask how Federal relief funds can be used. In two ways. First, by supplementing the efforts of the States, cities, and other municipal organizations for feeding and otherwise helping people who can not get work. Second, to give work. There is scarcely any limit to the number of men who could

be employed by the Federal Government in great public works of many kinds in every part of the country. Flood control on the Mississippi and other rivers; the development of inland waterways; reforestation and fire prevention; the use of rivers for water supply, irrigation, and power; the checking of erosion; the construction of airports and the lighting of airways; the drainage of swamp land; the building of highways—all these and many others can be undertaken, and will pay for themselves over and over again in the recreated efficiency of national life. More than 2,400 years before the Christian era the rulers of Egypt were faced with the question of employing idle labor. It was answered by the most widespread and effective public construction program the world up to that time had known. The Nile was harnessed. Irrigation lakes and canals, public buildings and monuments, entire cities were built on a nation-wide scale. Are we lacking in the vision and the courage that set a nation at work 43 centuries ago?

The picture is now complete. Local relief means making the poor man pay. Local relief serves to weaken further our national consuming power and block any hope of permanent recovery. Local relief is part of a vicious policy to shield concentrated wealth—a policy which brought on the depression and has kept it with us for two long years. Local relief means release for the rich, not relief for the poor.

Federal relief is demanded by every principle of justice, of humanity, and of sound economics. Federal relief can be raised from the wealthy, so that the purchasing power of the millions of average citizens will not suffer. Federal relief can be spent in such a way that unemployment and distress will be defeated and the entire Nation started well along the path to a permanent and balanced prosperity.

Best of all, it should be remembered that plans for a very considerable part of these developments are already in existence and that work upon many of them could be undertaken with comparatively little delay.

There is no local crisis, no State crisis; it is nation-wide. I can not believe that a National Government will stand by while its citizens freeze and starve without lifting a hand to help. I do not see how it can refuse to grant that relief which it is in honor, in duty, and in its own interest bound to employ.

#### THE AVIATION INDUSTRY

MR. BINGHAM. Mr. President, in the nature of a petition from the airplane industry, which, like many other industries, is suffering greatly, I ask that there may be printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Charles L. Lawrence, president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America (Inc.), entitled "Where the Industry Stands," and an editorial from Aviation entitled "The Federal Budget and Aviation."

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

#### WHERE THE INDUSTRY STANDS

By Charles L. Lawrence, President Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America (Inc.)

The condition of an industry may be gauged by what it produces—and sells.

In 1931, we estimate that the aircraft industry will produce 2,520 airplanes valued at \$19,289,445 and 3,566 engines valued at \$13,424,290—a total value of \$32,713,735. And most of this equipment has been sold.

In 1927 there were produced 2,186 airplanes, and 1,397 engines, valued at \$21,055,532.

In 1928 the production was 4,761 airplanes and 3,252 engines, with a value of \$49,648,197.

In 1929 the production was 6,034 airplanes and 7,378 engines, having a value of \$70,053,130. Most of this very large production remained unsold at the end of the year.

In these figures is embraced the story of the expansion and contraction of the aircraft industry. From the standpoint of productive activity we are to-day back to about where we were in the first quarter of 1928, as shown in Table I. We have undergone some disillusionment. We have acquired much experience. And we have obtained and still retain certain tangible advantages, which, granted there is no serious deviation from our national aviation policy, hold forth to me the promise of distinctly better times.

But first let us examine further into the record of 1931. Of the 2,520 airplanes, which we estimate will be produced this year, 875, or 34.8 per cent, are military, valued at \$12,847,625. Of the 3,566 engines, 1,866, or 52.3 per cent, are military, valued at \$10,197,690.

Of 2,520 planes built in 1931, 1,645, or 65.2 per cent, valued at \$6,441,820, are commercial. Of the 3,566 engines, 1,700, or 47.6 per cent, valued at \$3,226,600, are commercial.

In other words, out of a total estimated production of \$32,713,735 in 1931, \$23,045,315, or 70.4 per cent, represent sales to the War and Navy Departments, and \$9,668,420, or 29.6 per cent, represent sales to private and business owners, aerial service operators, and operators of scheduled transport lines.

Our military sales in 1931 represent practically the final shipments under the procurement authorized by the Army and Navy 5-year programs—the Navy's quota having been completed and the Army's quota standing now at four and one-half yearly in-

crements complete, with the last half of the fifth and final increment postponed.

Having learned in 1929 the extravagance of building in anticipation of a commercial market which failed to appear we spent most of 1930 in working off inventories, and in 1931 were generally disposed to build only on order.

TABLE I.—*Airplane and engine production*

Airplanes	Military			Commercial		
	Units	Value	Unit value	Units	Value	Unit value
1925	447	\$5,174,025	\$11,575	268	\$1,499,634	\$5,595
1926	532	6,154,703	11,569	604	2,716,319	4,497
1927	621	7,528,333	12,123	1,565	6,976,616	4,457
1928	1,219	19,066,379	15,641	3,542	17,194,298	4,854
1929	677	10,832,544	16,221	5,357	33,624,756	6,276
1930	747	10,723,720	14,355	1,937	10,746,042	5,547
1931 (7 months)	542	7,958,567	14,683	1,158	4,534,875	3,916
1931 total (estimated)	875	12,847,625	-----	1,645	6,441,820	-----

  

Engines	Military			Commercial		
	Units	Value	Unit value	Units	Value	Unit value
1925	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1926	842	\$4,080,571	\$4,846	(1)	(1)	(1)
1927	1,397	6,550,533	4,689	(1)	(1)	(1)
1928	2,620	12,407,920	4,735	632	\$979,600	\$1,550
1929	1,861	8,600,530	4,621	5,517	17,895,300	3,243
1930	1,841	10,823,423	5,879	1,925	6,255,493	3,249
1931 (7 months)	1,166	6,372,555	5,465	1,570	2,980,046	1,988
1931 total (estimated)	1,866	10,197,690	-----	1,700	3,226,600	-----

<sup>1</sup> The war supply of OX-5 and Liberty engines were in use almost exclusively at this time, and were used on commercial planes to some extent in 1928.

Our commercial airplane production in 1931 we estimate at 1,645 units. Classified as to general types, according to the user, we find 740 light airplanes, with a value, including engines, of \$1,256,984; 658 larger private planes and equipment for business and aerial service use, with a value, including engines, of \$3,310,976; 247 heavy transports, with a value, including engines, of \$5,100,550.

It is thus seen that the light types, while constituting 44.9 per cent of the total commercial production, represented but 12.9 per cent of the dollar value. The aerial service, business and private machines, constituted 40 per cent of the commercial total and represented 34.4 per cent of the dollar value. The transports, constituting but 15.1 per cent of the number of units, accounted for 52.7 per cent of the total value of our commercial sales.

No one knows how many millions of dollars were poured into the emergency aircraft industry, hastily created during the World War; but we do know that by 1920 not more than \$5,000,000 capital investment remained. In the next six years we estimate that this had grown to \$15,000,000. In 1929, when the boom was at its height, it is believed that \$500,000,000 was invested in our total aeronautical fixed establishment, including building sites, structures, machinery, tools, and airports. In 1930 perhaps \$100,000,000 had been liquidated. By 1931 the capital investment had been further reduced to an estimated total of from \$300,000,000 to \$350,000,000.

In 1925, 44 plants were listed as airplane factories and 4 as engine factories, as shown in Table II. In 1929 there were listed 101 plane factories and 32 engine factories. In 1931 the list declined to 82 plane factories and 31 engine factories, of which, however, only 46 of the former and only 19 of the latter plants were even nominally active.

TABLE II.—*Manufacturing facilities*

	Plants listed	Actually doing business	Employees
AIRPLANES			
1925	44	(1)	2,701
1926	62	(1)	(2)
1927	70	(1)	4,422
1928	78	(1)	(2)
1929	101	92	16,405
1930	100	67	12,000
1931	82	46	11,500
ENGINES			
1925	4	(1)	(2)
1926	5	(1)	(2)
1927	6	(1)	(2)
1928	17	(1)	(2)
1929	32	30	5,977
1930	34	28	3,500
1931	31	19	3,150

<sup>1</sup> No data available but probably corresponds closely to number listed, as business was expanding.

<sup>2</sup> No data available.

In 1925 the plane and engine plants employed a total of, perhaps, 3,500. In 1929 the personnel totaled 22,000. In 1931 the number had decreased to 14,650 operatives, of whom 75 per cent were engaged in military construction.

In November, 1918, when the war-time aircraft industry was approaching its maximum, our plants were producing planes at the rate of 21,000 per annum, while engine production was at even a higher peak. In 1925 the productive capacity of the industry was 1,200 planes, though only 715 were actually built. In 1929, when our commercial boom production facilities were approaching the zenith, we were turning out airplanes at the rate of 6,000 and engines at the rate of 7,000 a year. In 1931 we estimate that we will build a total of 2,520 planes and 3,506 engines. Yet our production facilities, in so far as structures, tools, and machinery are concerned, remain, in 1931, practically what they were in 1929.

From 1903 to 1914 there was virtually nothing but experimental flying. From 1914 to 1917, when we entered the World War, a few plants were producing aeronautical equipment for the Allies. The period 1917-18 marked the creation and 1919-20 the liquidation of our war-time aircraft establishment.

By 1922 aviation had sunk to what appeared to be the lowest point possible to reach without disappearing. We lacked a continuing military procurement policy. Disastrous attempts were made to operate transport lines with obsolete equipment. The country was full of barnstormers flying surplus military planes, doing stunts, and impressing the public further that flying was a trade suited only to daredevils, that an airplane was outrageously costly, and that even to ride in one was heroic. The popular idea of aviation was that it was a military adjunct. There was no financial incentive to encourage commercial aviation and no legal protection once operation was begun. There were virtually no airports, save a few military fields, and absolutely no airways or aids to aerial navigation. From an engineering standpoint we had progressed no further than two types of service planes and engines developed during the war.

From 1918 to 1923 the aircraft industry and our air defenses were made the subject of a number of investigations. Not all of these inquiries were friendly. Outstanding, however, among the constructive observations were those made in 1923 by the Lassiter Board of the War Department, and in 1924 by a special board of the Navy Department.

The Lassiter Board, which included representatives of the General Staff, stated: "The aircraft industry in the United States at present is entirely inadequate to meet peace and war-time requirements. It is rapidly diminishing, and under present conditions will soon practically disappear." It was the opinion of the Lassiter Board that a continuing procurement program extending over a period of 10 years would be most helpful.

The special board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, reporting in 1924, found that "the aviation industry is in a very unsatisfactory condition."

This board, which, like the Lassiter Board, did not include a single representative of the industry, listed as contributory causes, first, the letting of airplane contracts by competitive bidding; second, a lack of continuity of production; and third, the destruction of capital in the industry.

Congress next took a helpful step. The Select Committee of Inquiry into the Operation of the United States Air Service, otherwise known as the Lampert-Perkins committee, sitting in 1924 and 1925, recommended that "not less than \$10,000,000 should be spent annually for the War Department and a like sum for the Navy Department for the procurement of new flying equipment, constructed by the civilian industry." Purchases, the committee's report observed, should be based on a continuing program. Recognition by the Government of proprietary rights of design in the construction of planes, engines, and accessories also was urged.

Largely as a result of the congressional inquiry, President Coolidge appointed an Aircraft Board, headed by the late Senator Dwight W. Morrow. The Morrow Board, in its report, complemented the conclusions of Congressman RANDOLPH PERKINS and his colleagues, with respect to assistance to the aircraft industry, and stressed the necessity for the adoption of a policy of continuity in the purchase of aviation equipment. Out of the tangle of conflicting and controversial testimony, as given before the various preceding investigating boards or committees, the Morrow Board, late in 1925, evolved a national policy.

Our air transport system had its beginnings in the passage in February, 1925, and amendment June, 1926, of the Kelly contract air mail law, and the enactment in April, 1930, of the McNary-Watres Act, whereby air mail carriage is used to stimulate the carriage of passengers and express.

Our military policy, which in the main pursues the spirit of the recommendations of the Army, Navy, and Morrow Boards and the Perkins Committee, dates from the middle of 1926, when legislation was passed authorizing the 5-year procurement programs.

Our lawless flight became legal and our adventurous cross-country commercial operations more orderly and safe when, in 1926 also, the aeronautics branch was established in the Department of Commerce for the encouragement and regulation of civil aviation.

May 20-21, 1927, Lindbergh flew to Paris. Without in any way detracting from the significance of that immortal achievement, I believe it is truthful to say that the world, amazed that such a thing could be, emulated Lindbergh in fancy and saw the heavens filled with commerce. It was as if a meteor, flashing into our vision, had for a moment illuminated the vault of the sky, giving us a glimpse of what could be seen, understood, and utilized gen-

erally only after patient research, experiment, and practical education.

However that may have been, our industry was under way; the boom was on; all else was forgotten. If some of us had our doubts, these doubts were swept aside by popular enthusiasm. And it probably occurred to none of us, either in the industry or out, that while we thought aviation was booming business, what really was happening was that the general business boom, worldwide in its surge and scope, was carrying aviation with it.

Without this tremendous impetus, beyond our control and certainly at the time beyond our knowledge, it is now obvious to me that aviation would never have been promoted to such unsound heights, and likewise would never have suffered so severely when the general depression came.

Let me now revert to the four obvious markets for aircraft—private, aerial service, scheduled transport, and military.

The air "flier" has never appeared, except as an engineering experiment, but private flying is a fact. In 1928, 1,500 planes flew 12,000,000 miles in the hands of individual owners, 3,125 flew 25,000,000 miles in 1929, and 4,974 flew 40,000,000 miles in 1930. This year we estimate that 3,750 are in active use, and in 12 months will have carried their owners 30,000,000 miles.

How rapidly the 3,750 private planes will be increased in number depends largely upon advanced engineering and, probably, lower prices, together with uninterrupted development of our Federal airways and the maintenance of aids to navigation. The States must supplement the Federal program with airports, airways, lights, and weather data for flying within their boundaries. It seems clear to me also that private flying will increase only to the degree that patronage of the scheduled transport system increases. As the body of the public intelligently acquainted with the advantages of air travel is enlarged, so will be enlarged the prospective market for the sale of private planes.

From 1919 to 1924 the gypsy flyer had his day. By 1925 most of the reckless itinerants had disappeared and the more substantial ones had become fixed-base operators—the forerunner of specialized aerial service. From 1925 to 1928 there was substantial growth, so far as the carrying of passengers or the performance of salable service was concerned. In 1929 the public, which was seeing "big money" in aviation, as well as in almost everything else, raised the number of planes in aerial service (as compared with 1928) from 489 to 7,408, carried 2,995,530 passengers instead of 526,203, flew 104,336,560 miles instead of 8,411,889, and put 20,944 people instead of 1,988 on the pay rolls. The sky was the limit.

But aerial service, for all its imaginative expansion, has reluctantly relinquished its gains. Passing over 1930 to 1931, we find that we now have (in contrast with 1929) 349 operators instead of 800, that planes in commission number 4,824, that 1,917,540 passengers will have been carried 74,772,000 miles, and that 3,839 employees will be doing the jobs that 20,944 were being paid for in 1929, as shown in Table 3.

TABLE III.—*Miscellaneous aerial service operations in the United States*

	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931
Number of planes	676	969	768	489	7,408	5,324	4,824
Passengers	205,094	380,201	476,724	526,203	2,995,530	2,621,769	1,917,540
Miles flown	4,640,672	7,656,492	8,341,517	8,411,889	104,336,560	95,645,747	74,772,000
Employees	931	1,537	1,674	1,988	20,944	12,283	3,839
Operators	262	420	357	268	800	600	349

Development of the aerial service market for the industry depends on improved engineering, greater pay-load efficiency, lower initial and operating costs, and, most emphatically, not only on the maintenance of the Federal airway program but also upon the provision by the States of aids to navigation for intrastate flying.

On a certain day in December, 1903, only one man in the world had successfully flown in an airplane.

In 1926, the first full year of our contract air mail system, 5,782 passengers were carried. Year by year since then the number has progressively increased: 12,594 in 1927, 52,934 in 1928, 165,263 in 1929, 385,910 in 1930, and, it is estimated, 400,000 in 1931. From 433,649 pounds in 1926, air mail has increased to an estimated poundage of 8,965,000 in 1931 and air express from 6,467 pounds in 1926, to an estimated 675,000 pounds in 1931. In 1926, 19 operators employed 527 persons, utilized 95 planes, and flew 2,025,824 miles on schedule. This year we estimate that 42 operators employ 7,000 persons, utilize 753 airplanes, and fly an estimated total of 42,653,000 scheduled miles. Complete statistics, showing the growth of the air-transport branch of the industry, are given in Table IV.

I am convinced of two things:

First. That within a few years all of the first-class mail and the bulk of urgent express will have to move by air because the public will demand it.

Second. That the average growth of the last few years indicates it is only a matter of mathematics and time until most of the passenger travel, where speed is a factor, will be by air. The public will insist upon it.

How long? Certainly not in 1932 or 1933. Air transport is now in its most critical stage. Remove from it the contract air mail, deprive it of the Federal airway system and aids to navigation and it will collapse. Deviate severely from our present policy

and its growth will be retarded. Here, again, engineering is imperative. Here, again, experimentation, always costly, is inevitable. Granted undisturbed continuance of indispensable Federal assistance for a few more years and the system will establish itself upon a sound basis, performing an economic service to the public and aiding the production end of the industry by purchases of equipment and by creating an ever-widening circle of air transport patrons from among whom will come the aerial service customers and the private owners of the future.

TABLE IV.—*Scheduled air transport operations*

	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931 (7 months)	1931 (estimated)
Planes	95	144	294	619	637	753	753
Passengers	5,782	12,594	52,934	165,263	385,910	231,925	400,000
Air mail	433,649	1,101,404	3,632,059	7,096,930	8,005,201	5,325,188	8,965,000
Express	6,467	12,495	35,376	197,538	286,798	464,590	675,000
Scheduled miles flown	2,025,824	3,922,304	10,472,024	20,242,891	28,833,967	22,455,878	42,653,000
Employees	527	840	1,740	4,430	6,350	6,947	7,000
Number of operators	19	24	32	27	35	40	42

This brings us once again to the military. For all my optimism, I can not forget that in 1931, 70.4 per cent of the total value of our entire airplane and engine production is military and that 75 per cent of the individuals on our pay rolls are engaged in military work. I know that engineering is vital to our progress and that it is prohibitive in its cost unless it can be stimulated by military production. I know that without engineering, cheaper, safer, and more efficient aircraft can not be obtained. And I know that without such improved aircraft air defense falls short of its responsibility and commercial aviation can not be expected to become a great and profitable industry.

Early this year it was my privilege to present a statement to President Hoover in behalf of the aircraft industry. In this statement we said:

"It is our desire to develop aircraft primarily as vehicles of peace.

"Notwithstanding the possibilities which aviation offers for the good of humanity, we recognize that until peace is universally practicable aircraft will occupy an increasingly important place in national defense.

"The aircraft industry—manufacturing and operating—is essential as a source of supply to the air defenses of our country."

Aviation can not be dissociated from our national defense. Our national defense is now involved with the general problem of unproductive and excessive armaments, an answer to which is being sought by the world and by each of us individually as well. As an individual and also as the spokesman for the aircraft industry, I feel that it is proper for me to observe:

Any plan for the reduction of American air defenses in agreement with foreign powers must, out of justice to us, recognize the fact that the fundamental concept of aviation held in the United States is radically opposed to that which we believe is held in some other countries. We regard aircraft as servants of commerce; others regard them as weapons of destruction. We ask support from the military for the aircraft industry in order that it may be established upon a permanent commercial basis; others subsidize commercial operations to achieve a military end.

We know where the aircraft industry is to-day; where it will be to-morrow, and how long will be required before we can achieve our objective as a business primarily commercial, but ever at the service of our country in time of emergency. I will not even hazard a guess.

#### NEXT YEAR'S FINANCIAL OUTLOOK—THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND AVIATION

The Federal Budget, that formidable document which contains the record of the estimates of every penny of expenditure and income in prospect for the Government in Washington, has taken on a lean and hungry look in the last two years. It used to run almost 2,000 pages, but now it musters barely half that number. But shrunken as the volume is, some of the figures that it contains are more shrunken still. And particularly severe punishment has fallen upon aeronautical items.

Aviation, in fact, seems to have sunk into the stepchild rôle. For the first time in six years, there was no direct mention of the subject either in the President's general message to Congress or in the message accompanying the Budget. Last year, a review of the Federal Government's aeronautical activities occupied almost a page of the Budget message. Only three other subjects received as much space. This year, not a line. The President, in fact, accomplished what is probably an absolutely unique feat when he wrote the section of his message on national defense without letting aviation creep into it anywhere. On no other occasion in the last five years, we imagine, has anyone undertaken to summarize the whole field of military and naval affairs in 600 words without the slightest mention of aircraft or air power.

In the fiscal year 1929 [ending June 30, 1929]. The fiscal year, always ending on June 30, is the calendar unit of all governmental finance. The present Budget relates to the fiscal year 1933, which will begin on July 1, 1932], the last of the Coolidge administration and the last to be completed before the depression struck, the Government spent \$3,300,000,000, not counting retirements of the public debt, yet receipts overbalanced that figure by almost

\$700,000,000. The estimates submitted for 1933 are \$150,000,000 higher, largely because of a \$600,000,000 increase in the cost of the Veterans' Administration, but the prospective receipts have fallen off by more than a third from the figure of four years ago, exposing the cheerless spectacle of a billion-dollar deficit.

Leaving out of account such items as the Veterans' Bureau, the payment of pensions, and the public debt, the amount proposed by the Budget for the current running of the Government in the coming fiscal year is \$1,734,000,000—almost the same as the expenditures of 1929, and approximately \$300,000,000 less than the appropriations for the present year. About one-half the total saving over 1932, however, is to be made on the Farm Board and the Shipping Board. With those exceptional items left out of account, next year's Budget stands about 8 per cent below that of the present year. The aeronautical items, and especially the proposed allotments for aviation in the Army and Navy, take much more than their share of the cut. The only ray of sunshine, from the aeronautical point of view, is in the fact that Congress has power to work its will on the Budget recommendations. Congress has made large increases in the Budget allotments for aviation before now, and Congress can do it again.

#### ARMY AND NAVY AVIATION

The total appropriations for the national defense have been reduced from approximately \$700,000,000 to approximately \$650,000,000, a cut of 7 per cent. The Budget estimates for the direct purposes of military and naval aviation, the allotments to the Army Air Corps and the Bureau of Aeronautics, are decreased from \$62,625,000 to \$52,133,000, a cut of 16 per cent. To put it in other terms, during the present year the direct appropriations for Army and Navy aviation are just 9 per cent of the total outlay for the national defense. The Budget estimates for next year provide for aviation only 8.1 per cent of the total national-defense allotment. Comment is superfluous.

Furthermore, from the point of view of the aircraft industry, this reduction, severe enough in any case, is even worse than it appears at first sight. Congress adopted some five years ago, at the time when the 5-year procurement programs were just getting under way, the device of permitting the Army and Navy to obligate the funds of future years for the purchase of aircraft. It was an expedient designed, by circuitous means, to disguise the sudden increase of appropriation that accompanied the introduction of the 5-year programs and to ease the shock of the sensibilities of the economically minded. The Army disentangled itself from that method of beating the financial devil around the bush a couple of years ago, but the Navy is still involved in it, and a very substantial proportion of the appropriation for naval aviation for the coming year has to be earmarked to meet the obligations of contracts already signed and to pay for aircraft already ordered and partially built. The nominal estimate for naval aviation for 1933 is set at \$26,660,000, as against \$31,145,000 for 1932. Analysis of the proposed wording of the appropriation bill, however, shows the amounts actually available for obligations in the two years to be \$24,460,000 and \$30,845,000, respectively. To be sure, presidential demands for economy during the past summer are expected to result in the saving of \$3,300,000 of this year's naval aviation appropriation, but even so, the amount proposed for the next year will be 11 per cent less than is being spent in the present year. The position and responsibilities of the Bureau of Aeronautics most nearly parallel, in the Navy Department, those of the Bureaus of Engineering and Ordnance. Engineering and Ordnance are taking cuts of only 5 per cent and 9 per cent, respectively, as against Aeronautics' 11 per cent. Furthermore, the Bureau of Aeronautics has been supporting the administration's economy program with such whole-hearted fervor that more than 10 per cent of the present year's naval aviation appropriation is scheduled to be turned back to the Treasury unused. None of the other technical bureaus, on the other hand, are expected to save as much as 1 per cent.

The Air Corps appropriations for 1932 were \$31,480,000. The estimate for 1933 is down to \$25,483,000, a reduction of 19 per cent, and the Air Corps is spending virtually up to the full amount of its appropriation this year, so that the 19 per cent will be a real cut of that amount in the sum available for use. For comparison with that drastic revision it is noteworthy that most of the other branches of the Army undergo cuts of 5 per cent or less, and that the provision for permanent seacoast defenses (coast artillery) is cut but 15 per cent and that for transportation by horses and mules only 4 per cent. Broadly speaking, more than one-sixth of the whole cut in the Army's budget is taken out of the Air Corps, which receives only one-eleventh of the total Army appropriation.

Of course, a very large part of these funds goes to maintenance work, which is of only indirect consequence to the aircraft industry. What most interests the manufacturer of aircraft, engines, or accessories is the amount to be expended for new equipment. And it is there that the budget cuts begin to look most painfully impressive.

#### FUNDS FOR BUYING NEW PLANES

The amount available for the maintenance and repair of naval aircraft is to be increased by \$700,000. The amount for the payment of the civilian employees of the Army Air Corps is to be cut by only 1 per cent. And the purchase of aircraft and engines will get slim pickings from what is left.

The Budget allowance for new planes and engines, equipment, spare parts, and accessories for the Army, including the Organized Reserves and the National Guard, is \$12,576,000. It is the lowest

figure since 1928. It is 24 per cent, or almost \$4,000,000, below that for the present year. But the Navy fares still worse.

The Navy has substantially completed its 5-year program, and the Budget has treated naval aviation without mercy. The total amount available for new aircraft for the next fiscal year, unless Congress shows itself more liberal than the President and the Director of the Budget have been, will be \$5,800,000. Not since 1925 has there been an appropriation for naval aircraft below \$11,000,000, and only once in 10 years has it gone below \$6,000,000. If Congress accepts the Budget figures, the industry that has been built up to supply flying equipment for the military and naval services will find itself transported back into the conditions of the days before the Morrow Board.

The treatment of aviation is in sharp contrast with that meted out to the surface and subsurface sections of the Navy. While the allotment for new naval aircraft undergoes a 49 per cent reduction, expenditures for new naval vessels are actually estimated to increase by 7 per cent. The change in the number of new planes to be bought is as striking as the change in the amount of money provided for buying them. The official explanatory statement reveals that the Budget is based on a plan to buy 238 new planes for the Army and only 150 for the Navy during the year, as against approximately 480 and 325, respectively, this year. Not since 1925 have the total purchases in a year by the two services been below 500.

There ought to be some explanation of the apparent discrepancy between these figures and the much more optimistic ones contained in various officially released tables. The differences are accounted for, in the first place, by the frequent ignoring of the effect of the contract authorizations on money available for obligations, and, in the second place, by the presentation of the figures representing actual payments from the Treasury instead of obligations. The bookkeeping in this article, in other words, relates to the number of things that can be bought during next year, while the Budget tables commonly represent the amount that is to be spent in paying the bills as they are presented. They relate largely to work done a year ago.

The Navy's specific allocation for instruments, radio, and other like accessories of aviation suffered almost as severely, with a cut from \$1,800,000 to \$950,000. Experimental work, on the other hand, was treated with surprising generosity, the total for the Navy remaining fixed at \$2,220,000 (excluding only the \$75,000 allotment made this year for the specific purpose of carrying on design work on a metal-clad airship), and the Army receiving an increase from \$2,810,000 to \$2,824,000.

#### RESERVES AND THE NATIONAL GUARD

The aviation reserves, by comparison, fare passably well. The specific appropriation for aviation material and fuel and other supplies for the aerial section of the Naval Reserve has been dropped from \$900,000 to \$575,000, and in the explanatory statement on the Budget it is said that the greatest effect of a \$780,000 reduction in the total of the Naval Reserve allocation will be to "curtail the number of reserves to be given basic and advanced aviation training." The allowance for aviation equipment for the Organized Reserves of the Army has been cut from \$441,000 to \$348,000.

In both the Army and Navy the specifically aeronautical items suffer a much larger relative cut than the total of the reserve appropriations. The National Guard, on the other hand, must have made a very favorable impression by its participation in the Air Corps maneuvers last May, for \$909,000 is estimated for new airplanes for the guard, an increase of \$24,000 over the 1932 figure.

The plan is to provide for 272 Air Corps reserve officers, the same number as in the present year, to go on a year of active duty with troops. The regular flying operations of the Air Corps are to be scaled down, and a saving of \$2,000,000 made in operating expenses, by imposing an unprecedented limitation on flying time. An average of only 165 hours per officer is to be permitted.

Lighter-than-air craft are the beneficiary of a grant for carrying on work on the *Akron*'s successor at a normal rate; \$1,450,000 will be provided. The Army's allowance for lighter-than-air equipment, on the other hand, is reduced from \$300,000 to the preposterous sum of \$100.

#### AIR MAIL

To the manufacturing industry the Army and Navy sections are the most important part of the Budget. For the transport operator their significance is negligible, compared with that of the Post Office Department.

The Post Office figures are much more encouraging. In spite of the pressure for economy, which leads to an estimated reduction of the postal deficit from \$195,000,000 this year to \$155,000,000, and in spite of cuts of \$10,000,000 in the total Post Office pay roll and \$9,000,000 in the allotment for rail transportation of mail, the total allowed for air mail is cut by only 4 per cent. The \$7,000,000 allotment for the foreign air mail is to be untouched. The reduction is all in the allowance for the domestic contract service, for which \$20,000,000 is appropriated this year and for which the estimates allow only \$19,000,000 in 1933. It is apparently intended that that shall involve no cancellation of routes, but that the reduction, and also any increases of compensation due to passage of a contracting line from a lower to a higher bracket under the Waters Act regulation, shall be taken care of by reductions in unit compensation, such as have already been made twice during the last year. Presumably, however, no new

routes and few, if any, increases of frequency of service on existing routes will be possible. The air-mail appropriation, of course, includes practically no overhead, and of the \$19,000,000 estimate all but \$51,000 will be directly available for payments to contractors. The average amount available will be \$1,579,000, as against \$1,562,000 monthly for the last eight months of the present fiscal year if a deficiency is to be avoided.

The air-mail contractors now receive 14 per cent of the total amount expended for domestic transportation of all United States mails, while 18 per cent of the total sum allotted for foreign mail transportation goes to carriers by air. Payments for the handling of mail by the merchant marine have been increasing more rapidly than those for foreign air mail, however, for in the fiscal year which ended last June more than 21 per cent of the foreign mail expenditure was for the aerial service, as against 18 per cent in the new Budget.

#### AIRWAY DEVELOPMENT

As the manufacturers are most concerned with the military services, and most of the transport operators with the Post Office Department, so the "independent" transport line or the small fixed-base-operator or itinerant flyer has his closest governmental relations with the Department of Commerce.

For Secretary Young's office the present Budget, if accepted by Congress, will mark the first check in the steady increase of the appropriation for air navigation facilities that has gone on ever since the Aeronautics Branch was founded. For the present fiscal year the appropriation attained a maximum of almost exactly \$9,000,000, of which \$8,800,000 will actually be spent. The estimate for 1933 cuts the total to \$7,628,000, a reduction of 15 per cent and a figure just below the 1931 level.

There will, of course, be no shutting down of existing airways and no abandonment of maintenance work, but the estimate has been based on a total cessation of new airway construction. The lighted airway system that has been growing steadily at the rate of 4,000 miles a year will be virtually static until the middle of 1933, at 19,500 miles total, unless Congress increases the Budget figures.

Most of the employees of the airways division are on maintenance work, and the estimated number for next year actually shows an increase of 17 per cent above the present level, to a total of 3,217 men. The growing significance of the radio on the airways is plain from the air navigation facilities pay roll. A year ago only 354 radio operators were employed by the Department of Commerce. A year from now, according to present signs, there will be 519.

The appropriation for regulations has also been cut down, again in part, at the expense of the aircraft industry. The estimate of actual expenditures for the current fiscal year is \$1,350,000 and for next year only \$1,301,000. The pay roll, accounting for two-thirds of the total, will be practically unaffected, but the amount for the purchase of airplanes and accessories for the use of the department is to drop from \$90,500 to \$75,000.

#### THE WEATHER BUREAU

An indispensable adjunct of the organized airways is the weather reporting service furnished by the Department of Agriculture. It has expanded with great rapidity in the last three years, with the appropriation for meteorological work for the benefit of aviation increasing from \$500,000 in the fiscal year 1930 to \$1,779,000 in the present year. In the 1933 estimates \$225,000 have been cut off this year's figure, more than three-quarters of the total amount of savings in Weather Bureau expenditures being taken out of the aeronautical work. That is bad enough by any standard, but not quite so serious as it appears at first sight, for substantial savings are being made now, and about \$160,000 of the 1932 appropriation will be unexpended. The actual cut in expenditures for next year as compared with this will be only about 3 per cent, and most of that will be for equipment, which has been purchased during the fiscal year 1932, and does not need to be duplicated. The Weather Bureau work, like that on airway development, will be continued substantially at its present level, but it is hardly to be expected that any expansion or improvement of the service can be undertaken.

#### COAST GUARD AND NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Although the Coast Guard has never been a very large purchaser of aircraft, its expenditures for seaplanes have played an important part in the calculations of some of the manufacturing companies. In the fiscal year 1931 the appropriation for new flying equipment for the Coast Guard was \$320,000. For 1932 it was \$160,000; for 1933 the item has been omitted from the budget. Taking Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Department of Commerce all together, the total available to be obligated for new planes and engines has dropped from \$32,401,000 last year to \$28,312,000 this, and for next year the estimate is only \$18,451,000, a decline of 43 per cent in two years.

In spite of the great amount of experimental work done by the Army, Navy, and Department of Commerce, all departments of the Government, and all units in the industry have learned to look to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for most of their basic research, especially on aerodynamic questions. The friendliness toward research that appears in the undiminished experimental allotment for the Navy and the increased figure for the Army is shown again in liberal treatment of the National Advisory Committee. Provision is made for a slight increase in the pay roll and number of employees, the latter to a total of 330, and also in expenditures for supplies and equipment. The total estimate for 1933 comes to \$988,000 as against \$1,028,000 appro-

priated, or \$955,000 expected to be actually expended in the current year. If the appropriations that have been made for special building construction, such as the full-scale wind tunnel or the seaplane towing channel at Langley Field, be deducted the national advisory committee had up to 1932 an unbroken record of annual increase in the sums provided for pay roll and general operating expenses. It is an exceptional testimony of the confidence that Congress and the administration have felt in the organization.

#### THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

The first business on the calendar was the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) establishing a joint congressional committee to make a general investigation and study of railroad problems.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have talked with the author of the concurrent resolution and have requested of him that it might go over for a few days. He has gladly consented, and I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

#### DEPORTATION OF ALIEN SEAMEN

The bill (S. 7) to provide for the deportation of certain alien seamen, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, when this matter came up before, I asked the chairman of the committee whether he would not be willing to have the bill rereferred to his committee in order that hearings might be had upon it. There are certain persons who believe that it is very much contrary to their interests; and no hearings have been held on this measure for some time.

I now ask the chairman of the Immigration Committee whether he will not be willing to have the bill go back to his committee in order that hearings may promptly be held, and the bill then brought back to the calendar.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who is the patron of the bill, to the request of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this measure has been before the Senate for a number of years. A similar measure was before the House perhaps in 1924 or 1925. It has passed the Senate at least twice, and my recollection is—upon three occasions. Hearings have been had upon at least three separate occasions when this bill or a similar measure was before the Committee on Immigration of the Senate. Those hearings were very full and complete. They presented the facts in support of the measure, and those who were opposed to it also had full opportunity to present their views.

The State Department made representations, and those representations were brought to the attention of the committee and duly considered by the committee. I know of nothing that could be added to the rather large volume of facts and testimony heretofore obtained in the various hearings. I think it would bring about unnecessary delay. The Senate and the country are familiar with the facts, and I do not feel like assenting to the bill going back to the committee.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, may I say that while it is true that the bill did pass the Senate at least on one occasion, it passed because I happened to be out of the Chamber for a few minutes. However, that is neither here nor there.

The point is that we are at the present time in a state of great difficulty with regard to business of all kinds. Our merchant marine is having a particularly difficult time. The representatives of the shipping companies operating on the Pacific believe that the passage of this bill would be disastrous to the American flag on the Pacific. There are others of us who believe that the passage of this bill would lead to serious difficulties with foreign nations, particularly with Asiatic nations, at this time when we are having a very difficult row to follow as it is.

Therefore, it seems to me that there is new testimony that might be adduced, and that no one should be denied the privilege of a hearing merely because hearings were

held several years ago; and I again renew my request to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to the bill being returned to the committee for hearings. Since the report of the bill to the calendar I have received several requests to be heard from representatives of steamship companies. While I am in favor of the bill, and the entire membership of the committee, about nine in all, were present and the bill was unanimously reported out with a recommendation that it pass, notwithstanding that, so far as I am concerned as chairman of the committee, I have no objection to its return so that those who wish to be heard can be heard upon the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be returned to the committee for hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I object.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I move that the bill be rereferred to the committee for hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Immigration. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I would be in a mood to respond to the appeal made by the Senator from Connecticut for hearings upon this bill were it not for the fact that he has resorted to every type of parliamentary tactics to prevent the consideration and passage of the measure.

The bill was on the calendar at the last session for many weeks. The Senator from Connecticut made no request for further hearings at that time. Later the bill passed the Senate in his absence, and he entered a motion to reconsider. Then finally, weeks later, when his motion came up, the Senator from Connecticut debated the merits of the bill at great length and quoted in extenso from the hearings which had been held upon it. Finally, when his arguments were exhausted and a vote taken, a mere handful of Senators, after listening to the argument and the debate, voted with the Senator to reconsider the measure. I hope the Senator's motion will not prevail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Immigration.

The motion was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

R. B. MILLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 159) for the relief of R. B. Miller, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$9,407.54, said amount representing the principal sum of \$6,336.38 overpayments in freight on" and to insert "\$2,500, in full and final settlement of all claims or demands of whatsoever nature, kind, or character against the Government, on account of the shipment of," and on page 2, line 5, after the word "law," to strike out "and the interest on said sum from the respective dates of shipment to April 1, 1926," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized to pay to R. B. Miller, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,500, in full and final settlement of all claims or demands of whatsoever nature, kind, or character against the Government, on account of the shipment of 75 carloads of manganese ore shipped over the Norfolk & Western Railroad from Suter, Va., Rocky Gap, Va., and Graham, Va., to Reading, Pa., Harrisburg, Pa., and Birmingham, Ala., during the period that said railroad was operated by the Director General of Railroads and which said amount was in excess of the regular freight rates published and allowed by law.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

C. M. WILLIAMSON AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 458) for the relief of C. M. Williamson, Mrs. C. E. Liljenquist, admin-

istratrix, Lottie Redman, and H. N. Smith, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "Mrs.," to strike out "C. E." and insert "Tura"; in line 6, after the word "administratrix," to insert "of C. E. Liljenquist, deceased"; and in line 8, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$13,134.99" and insert "\$8,824.10," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. M. Williamson, Mrs. Tura Liljenquist, administratrix of C. E. Liljenquist, deceased, Lottie Redman, and H. N. Smith, in accordance with their respective interests, the sum of \$8,824.10. Such sum represents the amount expended by them in installing a pumping plant and making necessary connections to bring water to their land on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation and the amount paid by them to the Idaho Power Co. during the years 1920 to 1927, inclusive, for power to operate said pumping plant.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of C. M. Williamson, Mrs. Tura Liljenquist, administratrix of C. E. Liljenquist, deceased, Lottie Redman, and H. N. Smith."

MILBURN KNAPP

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 971) for the relief of Milburn Knapp, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$22,960" and insert "\$16,000," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Milburn Knapp, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$16,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by him as the result of the revocation by the Department of the Interior, on November 12, 1913, of a permit granted for the use of the Williamson River in connection with a contract for the cutting and removal of certain timber lands in the Klamath Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, entered into on January 24, 1913, by Milburn Knapp and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on behalf of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED WHEAT FOR RELIEF PURPOSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to States or organizations for relief of people in distress, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That the Federal Farm Board is authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to make immediately available 40,000,000 bushels of the wheat of the Grain Stabilization Corporation, or so much thereof as in the judgment of the President may be needed, for the use of the American National Red Cross, and/or for the use of such other organization or organizations as the President, or such person or persons as he may designate to pass upon the matter, may deem advisable, in providing food for the needy and distressed people of the United States. It is expressly understood that no organization receiving wheat under the provisions of this resolution shall discriminate against any person who is in distress regardless of the causes of such distress. In the delivery of such wheat or any part thereof to any organization or organizations as provided herein, the Federal Farm Board shall be at no expense, and all expense incident to the receipt or distribution of such wheat shall be borne by the organization or organizations to which said wheat is delivered.

Sec. 2. The Federal Farm Board shall keep account of all wheat furnished and delivered as provided herein and shall keep a record of the average cost of such wheat to the board as a credit against its revolving fund.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether the National Red Cross will carry out the mandate of the joint resolution in the event it passes the Congress and becomes a law?

Mr. CAPPER. There is no doubt in my mind that it will. I believe the Red Cross is entirely sympathetic with the provisions of the measure.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Red Cross has indicated its willingness to administer the measure?

Mr. CAPPER. My information is that it has.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It has not, then, interposed the objection that this represents, in effect, an appropriation from the Federal Treasury for relief purposes, and that the Red Cross confines its benevolences to cases where the contributions are made by individuals voluntarily?

Mr. CAPPER. It has not. I have a letter from Mr. Payne, of the American Red Cross, as to this measure but nothing from him that would indicate any objection along the lines referred to by the Senator from Arkansas.

I might say at this point to the Senator from Arkansas that practically the same measure, except as to the amount of wheat made available, passed the Senate at the last session but failed finally of enactment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I remember that very well, and I also remember that a provision appropriating a sum to be administered by the Red Cross for the relief of persons in distress passed the Senate, and that its final passage was defeated for the reason that the Red Cross, specified in the measure as the administrator of the item, announced that it was the long-established practice of that very useful and charitable organization to limit its administrative efforts to sums contributed voluntarily from private sources, and that under no conditions could it accept responsibility for administering public funds.

While I understand that this is not an appropriation, there are provisions in the joint resolution which indicate the intention on the part of the authors of the measure to reimburse the Federal Farm Board for the wheat taken over and distributed, and in that view of the matter it becomes in effect an appropriation.

In addition to that, the wheat which is the subject of the resolution is owned by the Federal Farm Board. It will be recalled that at the last session of the Congress a bill introduced by me, as well as a bill introduced by the Senator from Kansas, was considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but neither of those bills was finally acted upon by the Congress. The need then was quite noted and decisive, but the principal reason assigned for the failure to enact one of those measures was that the Red Cross would not administer it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I think it fair to say that no representative of the Red Cross appeared before the committee in the consideration of three joint resolutions relating to this subject matter, two of which referred to charitable organizations which might administer whatever law was enacted. The third resolution referred to the Red Cross. When a subcommittee was appointed, I am advised, they considered the Red Cross organization, which was included among the charitable organizations, believing, I assume, that that organization might as well distribute this wheat as any other organization which might meet with the approval of the President.

The only witness who appeared before the committee was Chairman Stone, of the Farm Board. He approved of the general purposes of the three resolutions.

It may be proper for me to say that last year similar measures were before the committee, and Mr. Legge, the former chairman of the Farm Board, disapproved of them. There also appeared Mr. Payne, chairman of the Red Cross, who also disapproved.

What information the Senator from Kansas may have with respect to the attitude of the Red Cross is personal to him. No representative of that organization appeared before the committee; nor do I believe the committee thought it was essential to call for representatives of that organization because they believed in the purposes of the legislation and could designate whomever they please to administer it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, in connection with the statement just made by the Senator from Oregon, it may be pointed out that the language of the amendment which is under consideration is "and/or for the

use of such other organization or organizations as the President, or such person or persons as he may designate to pass upon the matter, may deem advisable in providing food for the needy and distressed people of the United States."

Plainly, that amendment contemplates the possibility, or I might say the probability, of a refusal on the part of the Red Cross to administer the act, but it devolves the duty on the President to designate the organization in the event the Red Cross does not function in this particular.

I desire to ask the Senator whether he is informed that the President would assume the responsibility imposed under the provisions of the measure.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I take it for granted the President would assume any responsibility imposed upon him by the Congress, though I have never conferred with the President regarding this matter.

I may say to the Senator that it is made optional; if the Red Cross refused to administer the act as a governmental or charitable agency, then the President could designate some other organization, or he might designate an organization which could act simultaneously and cooperatively with the Red Cross.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understand that perfectly, but my question was directed to whether the President is in sympathy with the joint resolution and will approve it, and whether, if the Red Cross does not function under it, the President would designate another organization or decline to do so.

It is well known that the President has not recommended the measure which is now before the Senate. It is well known that he has sent to the Senate a number of recommendations with respect to general economic conditions, but that he has taken the attitude that in so far as the relief of the distressed in this country is concerned, that must, for the present at least, and until private charity has been exhausted, be confined to voluntary contributions made through an organization he has established and which apparently is functioning. Does the Senator know whether the joint resolution will be effective if it passes?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I very specifically gave my views on that subject. I do not know what the President will do, but it is my judgment that the President will carry out any orders contained in a statute enacted by the Congress. There is no way to establish that fact except to present the resolution to him for his signature. In my heart and in my opinion, if he believes it is in the interest of those in distress, he will properly function under the joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Kansas or the Senator from Oregon whether the members of the Farm Board appeared before the committee with reference to this measure, and what their attitude is with reference to it.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the chairman of the Farm Board, Mr. Stone, appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and testified at some length. He was apparently entirely sympathetic with the purposes of the joint resolution. Yet later he sent a formal report on the measure, in which he made the point on the part of the board that they ought to be reimbursed financially. But it was not the thought of the committee, and there is nothing in the resolution that would contemplate any appropriation for this to the Farm Board. The resolution would simply afford the Farm Board the protection it wanted, that is, a bookkeeping record made showing offset for the wheat that had been used for relief purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that would be necessary in any event.

Mr. CAPPER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. My question was based on information which I had received from some source to the effect that the Farm Board felt that if this wheat should be distributed for the relief of distress—and I am in sympathy with the measure—Congress ought to reimburse the Farm Board in order not to cripple the revolving fund with reference to its obligations to cooperative organizations throughout the country

which had been promised aid by the Farm Board. I wondered whether the committee took that into consideration in framing the measure as they have brought it in.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, that was referred to in the discussions before the committee; but so far as I know, there was no member of the committee in favor of reimbursing the Farm Board for this wheat by a direct appropriation. Such a proposition would stand little chance here, in my judgment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know whether as a matter of fact the distribution of this wheat without any reimbursement will in any way involve the board in embarrassment with reference to the loaning of funds, within its hands now, to cooperative organizations which are in existence and which are calling for help?

Mr. CAPPER. I have no information along that line.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas a question. Did the Senator say a while ago that he had assurance from the Red Cross that it was willing to administer this measure, if it should be enacted?

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have no assurance officially. The word I had from Mr. Payne, the chairman of the Red Cross, led to believe that the Red Cross was sympathetic with the purposes of the resolution.

Mr. BRATTON. That is very interesting, in view of his unqualified declination about a year ago to receive money from the Federal Treasury for relief of suffering humanity.

Mr. CAPPER. I think his attitude may be different now.

Mr. BRATTON. I did not understand the Senator's remark.

Mr. CAPPER. I think the attitude of the Red Cross as to that may possibly have changed in the past year, but I have no authority to speak for them on that point.

Mr. BRATTON. That is encouraging, Mr. President. I was in disagreement with the Red Cross a year ago on that matter. It is gratifying to hear the Senator from Kansas say that in his opinion the Red Cross has changed its attitude and is now willing to administer wheat belonging to the Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Kansas, with the permission of the Senator having the floor—

Mr. BRATTON. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. At what rate did the chairman of the Federal Farm Board suggest the wheat should be paid for?

Mr. CAPPER. In his report he estimated that for 40,000,000 bushels, reimbursement to the extent of about \$16,000,000 would be required.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. He based his request for compensation on the present market value of the wheat?

Mr. CAPPER. Yes.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I shall not consent that the Farm Board be reimbursed for this wheat. It could be devoted to no better useful purpose than that contemplated in this legislation. The committee should be commended for disagreeing emphatically with the president of the Farm Board in his attitude that the board should be reimbursed from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRATTON. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Going back a moment to what the Senator said about the Red Cross, is not this a chance to test the Red Cross? If we find a refusal on the part of the Red Cross to administer the provisions of such a great humanitarian act, then we will very quickly take further action so that starving people may actually have some of the wheat that is now stored away.

Mr. BRATTON. I quite agree with the Senator from New York. If the Red Cross is unwilling to lend its cooperation to aid in the relief of suffering in this country through this method, then I should favor substituting the American Legion and availing ourselves of its cooperation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me—

Mr. BRATTON. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am compelled to leave the Chamber for a few moments and I wish to make this observation before going. We have heard much about a dole. The administration has had a good deal to say in repudiation of proposals for doles. Its head has insisted that it is a dangerous thing to enter into the Treasury of the United States for any amount, because necessarily there is established a precedent which may be followed by legislation calling for much larger appropriations and much more comprehensive action than can be taken under this measure. There is no disguising the fact that this is a dole as that term is commonly used.

Mr. BRATTON. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There is no disguising the fact that it is intended to cost the Federal Treasury \$16,000,000. It is a pitiable sum, in view of the probable needs of the country. It is a poor, futile way to deal with the question from which every Member of Congress has been shrinking. To appropriate \$16,000,000 as a dole in the form of wheat, and then to say that this great Government has performed its duty, that this great Government has been liberal, is foolish and absurd.

My judgment is that we had better proceed with some degree of caution unless we are willing to recognize this for what it is—a dole pure and simple, a precedent for appropriations which may run into hundreds of millions of dollars at a time when the Federal Treasury already has a deficit of something like \$2,000,000,000. Certainly no one here would advocate a policy of permitting people to starve in this country so long as any resources upon which the Government can draw are available to supply the needs. But it is not going very far, it is not doing very much when we take a product of which there exists a surplus, when we reach into an already bankrupt Treasury and take a small sum, and we are not by that means solving the problem that underlies proposals of this nature. We are establishing a precedent that is worthy of our serious consideration.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I quite concur with the Senator from Arkansas that in principle this is a dole. It is so closely akin to what we commonly call a dole that the two can not be distinguished nor differentiated. But when the issue arises between human suffering among Americans on the one hand and an appropriation from the resources of the Federal Government on the other hand with which to relieve suffering I have no fundamental objection to resorting to that means of relieving suffering humanity in this country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRATTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. There has been a rather facetious question propounded for a long time to this effect: "When is a door not a door?" The answer that is given is, "When it is ajar." I suppose we might inquire when is a dole not a dole, and answer it by saying that it is not a dole when it becomes a bushel.

But, as a matter of fact, \$16,000,000 representing at the present price 40,000,000 bushels of wheat does not represent the outlay on the part of the Government. In order to figure the full loss of the Government we would have to find out what the board paid for this wheat out of the \$500,000,000 fund set aside for that purpose. If we could figure the total amount involved here in the way of cost to the Government, probably it might be found to be in the neighborhood of \$40,000,000 instead of \$16,000,000. Of course, regardless of that I agree that we have this condition, and not a theory, confronting us, and the resolution ought to be adopted without regard to the effect it may have on the price of wheat.

Mr. BRATTON. Of course, when we talk about this legislation solving the stupendous problem which is confronting us it is like a popgun in a cyclone. It will not accomplish the whole, but it will aid to a limited extent. To say this

is not a dole and may be distinguished from a dole is a play upon words. It can not be differentiated upon tenable grounds.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRATTON. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The only possible difference is that if the Farm Board keeps the \$16,000,000 worth of wheat it will probably lose it the same as it lost the rest of it.

Mr. BRATTON. Of course.

Mr. WHEELER. So I feel it is really doing a charitable act to take the 40,000,000 bushels of wheat away from the Farm Board and give it to the suffering people where it will actually do some good rather than let it remain in the hands of the Farm Board and probably be wasted there.

Mr. BRATTON. But I am unwilling to reimburse the Farm Board either on the basis of the present value of wheat or the price at which it was purchased.

Mr. WHEELER. When the question came up before the subcommittee, of which I am a member, we refused to incorporate that principle in the joint resolution, feeling that we should let that question be decided later when the matter should be presented to the Appropriations Committee by the Farm Board.

Let me say further that I was one of the authors of the joint resolution and was responsible for the language written in it to the effect that it should be—

For the use of the American National Red Cross and/or for the use of such other organization or organizations as the President, or such person or persons as he may designate to pass upon the matter, may deem advisable.

I did not personally consult the Red Cross as to whether it would or would not take the wheat. My idea was that if it did not take it the President should designate some other charitable organization for that purpose. There were some members of the committee who felt that possibly we should turn the wheat over to various city or State governments. I myself was opposed to that idea, because of the fact that I feel that there are numerous charitable organizations at the present time working in the various cities, and that if it was turned over to some of those welfare workers, in my humble judgment it would be much better used than it would be if we turned it over to some of the city governments, which are rather notorious for the corruption that is going on within them. I felt it would be much better to turn it over to some charitable organization who would see that it actually got out to the people themselves.

The bill has a dual purpose, in my judgment. First, the Farm Board has this surplus of wheat which it is holding over the heads of the farmers of the country to help depress the price of wheat. If we take 40,000,000 bushels of wheat and turn it over to charitable organizations we are going to distribute it and feed it to people who actually are not able to get that amount of wheat, who could not otherwise get it probably at all.

There has been some objection to the joint resolution on the ground that we are taking the wheat away from the Farm Board. The Farm Board has already at the direction of the President of the United States turned a lot of this wheat over to China. In my humble judgment it is nothing more than a gift to China, because we will never get a cent for the wheat that we have turned over to China. Do not make any mistake about that at all. We are taking Chinese Government bonds or Chinese securities, but we will never get paid for them.

My idea is that charity begins at home. We have the wheat in the bins, and are holding it there and holding it over the head of the American farmer without the buyers knowing when it may be put on the market, thus depressing the price of wheat at a time when there are millions of people starving in the country because they have not any food. The testimony before the La Follette committee has shown that the local organizations are unable to take care of the people who are going hungry to-day, and yet we are in the Senate of the United States quibbling as to

whether or not we are going to give them a few bushels of wheat. It is just about the same situation that existed in Nero's time. We are going to be fiddling while Rome burns. I am not only in favor of giving this 40,000,000 bushels of wheat but I am willing and anxious to appropriate money out of the Treasury of the United States for the purpose of feeding the millions of people who are going hungry to-night in the various States and cities throughout the country, because I feel that if the local city, county, and State organizations can not do so it is the duty of the Government to then step in. We must do it whether we like it or not. We must do it to preserve this Nation.

Mr. BRATTON. Let me ask the Senator from Montana how much wheat we have sent to China?

Mr. WHEELER. I can not give the figures offhand.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield—

Mr. BRATTON. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. We turned over to China 5,000,000 bushels of wheat upon what was assumed to be at that time adequate security.

Mr. BRATTON. I was inquiring solely about the quantity and not the compensation.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRATTON. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. How much wheat has the Grain Corporation on hand?

Mr. McNARY. I can answer that as of December 19, 1931, when it was between 160,000,000 and 162,000,000 bushels at a cost on the average of 81 cents per bushel. Including the carryover charges, the amount taken from the Treasury of the United States would equal about \$1.17 per bushel. I am speaking about the amount on hand to-day which is about 160,000,000 bushels.

Mr. FLETCHER. Irrespective of what has gone to China?

Mr. McNARY. Yes. At one time the board had as much as 290,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the wheat remains in storage subject to attacks by worms, weevils, and what not, it will soon all be chicken feed anyhow. Is it quite fair for the people of the country to be hungry while the Government stores up wheat and keeps it there in that fashion?

Mr. BRATTON. Of course not. The disposal of this wheat, about 25 per cent of the entire quantity the board has on hand, will relieve in part or minimize the shadow that constantly hangs over the wheat producers of the country. They do not know when the wheat stored by the Farm Board will be placed in the channels of commerce in competition with their wheat. Of course, that depresses the market price of wheat. Making this disposition of 40,000,000 bushels of wheat will minimize that danger and reduce their constant dread. In addition to that, it will feed hungry men and women and children throughout the country. It will relieve suffering. Certainly, Mr. President, we should not quibble about the principle involved being a dole or not a dole when we are selling wheat to other governments, for which we may or may not collect, while our own people, worthy citizens of this country, fathers, husbands, wives, and families, are suffering. I hope that this joint resolution will be passed and that the wheat proposed to be used will be devoted to the humanitarian purpose intended.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the income of the American farmer in 1919 was set at \$16,000,000,000. Last year it was \$6,920,000,000. The farmer has about 55 per cent of his wheat yet on hand. Who are to be benefited by this measure? It will certainly not relieve the market of the 120,000,000 bushels which will be left in the hands of the Farm Board, and neither will it care for the hungry except by an appropriation from the Treasury of the United States. If we are going to make an appropriation, why not buy the wheat from the farmer?

It has been said that we sent 25,000,000 bushels of wheat to China, and that it was a gift. Mr. President, I do not hesitate to say that I wish we had sent the entire 160,000,000

bushels to China as a gift. In that event the farmer would have been infinitely better off, the Americana Treasury, in the end, would have been better off, and the American workingmen who are out of employment would have been fed just as effectively from the bins of the American farmer and just as cheaply.

I have no doubt of the good purpose and fine sentiments that are behind the joint resolution, but if we are going to feed those who are out of employment from the Treasury of the United States, what do we really gain by taking the wheat out of the bin of the Farm Board instead of taking it out of the bin of the American farmer? We are not giving him any added market value for the wheat which he holds through the disposal of wheat in this way; we are not aiding him in any respect by reason of it; and the hungry would just as soon eat the wheat from the farmer's bin as they would from the Farm Board's bin.

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

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator tell me where he gets the estimate that the farmers of this country are themselves holding at present 55 per cent of their last wheat crop.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know whether that estimate came from the Secretary of Agriculture or not, but it has been printed in the public press.

Mr. WHEELER. I was about to state that if there is any amount of wheat held by the farmers of this country it is being held not by the smaller farmers, such as he knows in his State and such as I know in mine, but it is wheat that is being held, if it is being held at all, by the National Grain Corporation, or some of the so-called cooperative organizations; it is not to-day being held by the American farmer.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think the Senator is in error. I myself have not communicated directly with any of the sources of information since I have seen in print the figures to which I have referred, but during the last days of November and early in December I sent a number of telegrams to individuals in the Northwest asking how much wheat was still in the hands of the farmers, and the telegraphic replies came back that from 60 to 65 per cent was being so held. What changes have taken place since that time I do not know. I put the figure at 55 per cent because I saw that estimate in the public print and, associating it with the answers to my telegrams, I thought it was probably correct.

I venture to say to the able Senator from Montana that there is quite a sufficient supply of wheat in the bins of the American farmer to supply five times over the 40,000,000 bushels now proposed to be donated.

Mr. WHEELER. But where does the Senator think we would buy the wheat? We would probably buy it from some of the great grain organizations, from some of the mills; we would not go out and buy from the American farmer this 40,000,000 bushels of wheat. There are a tremendous number of people who are not going to get sufficient bread to eat unless we give them the flour. I should much prefer to buy the wheat from the American farmer, but my judgment was that we could not get a bill through the Congress of the United States that would enable the wheat to be bought directly from the farmer, and I felt that as a practical proposition we could take 40,000,000 bushels of the wheat from the Farm Board and turn it over to various charitable organization to enable them to feed hungry men and women. I am looking at it purely as a practical proposition. I repeat I do not think we can get through the Congress of the United States a bill which would permit us to go out and buy 40,000,000 bushels of wheat; and if we did that we would not be buying it from the farmer but from the millers or the elevators or the large so-called cooperatives of the country.

Mr. BORAH. So long as this wheat is held as at present it is being held, whether 160,000,000 bushels or 120,000,000

bushels, it is going to keep the price of the American farmer down as it has done for the last year and a half. I venture to say that the policy of the Farm Board has cost the American farmer millions upon millions of dollars.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with the Senator as to that, and I voted against the bill, but I do not think it makes a particle of difference where we get the wheat so long as it is gotten off the market.

Mr. BORAH. If we could clean up the market so far as wheat is concerned, there would be something to that proposition, but the Farm Board would have 120,000,000 bushels left; and so long as 120,000,000 bushels are left on the market, just the same as in the case of 160,000,000 bushels, what benefit will it be to the farmer to have 40,000,000 bushels of it given away? If we could remove this incubus that has been resting upon the farmer for the last year and a half it would be a different proposition. I repeat what I said here a year ago, that if I had my way about it I would ship every bushel of this wheat to China, where not only thousands but millions of people are starving to death, and I would do so if we never got a cent back. In my opinion, we would get the money back in time, for the Chinese will pay their obligations, but whether they pay or not I would send them the wheat not only for their benefit but for our benefit and get rid of it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the impulses back of this joint resolution, as I understood them, were not so much to help the American farmer as to help those who are hungry. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry found that we had some 160,000,000 bushels of wheat and that no good use could be made of it. The Farm Board is selling its wheat at the rate of 5,000,000 bushels per month, and that is all. The Farm Board sold on contract, as has been stated, 25,000,000 bushels to China, for which they accepted bonds, and those bonds are not negotiable or at least are not salable. The Farm Board also agreed to sell and transfer a large amount of their wheat to Brazil in exchange for coffee, but under the contract the coffee can not now be sold for delivery. So the Federal Farm Board will get no return for its coffee at any near future date. We found a vast quantity of wheat in storage, and the question to-day before the Congress, it occurs to me, is whether or not we will feed this wheat to the weevil or feed it to the hungry of the United States.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I would agree with the Senator perfectly so far as the hungry man is concerned, if there were no other source from which to feed him as speedily as he may be fed in this way.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Upon that particular phase of the question, if the Congress were appropriating money to buy 40,000,000 bushels of wheat I would agree with the Senator from Idaho that it would be much better to buy it from the farmers than to buy it from the Federal Farm Board, but there is no one on the committee, so far as I know, in favor of buying the wheat from the Farm Board and giving it to the hungry people of the country. That would be of no benefit to the farmer. It would help the hungry people, that is true, but rather than appropriate money and pay the Federal Farm Board for its wheat it would be far better to appropriate money and buy the wheat from the farmers of the country and thus reduce the supply from their bins and granaries. The committee, however, does not think Congress would appropriate money with which to buy wheat from the farmers.

Mr. BORAH. We are doing the same thing, are we not, indirectly? Something has been said about a dole. That does not disturb me at all; I know that this is a dole; it is a dole just the same as all the money which has come from State treasuries is a dole; it is a dole the same as the money which has come from municipalities is a dole. We have been saying in this country that we do not want a dole; but we have had it for a year and a half. So that suggestion does not disturb me at all. However, I ask the Senator in all sincerity will not the purchase price of this wheat finally come out of the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It already has come out of the Treasury of the United States; the money has been paid

to the Federal Farm Board and they in turn have bought the wheat. The money has been appropriated; the money has been spent, and all we have to show for it is some cheap low-grade wheat in bins and elevators now being dissipated and destroyed by rats, mice, age, dampness, and weevils. What are we going to do with it?

Mr. BORAH. It may be that this joint resolution, as a matter of relief to the Farm Board, is justified.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it will help the Farm Board to some extent.

Mr. BORAH. I thought so.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I agree to that proposition, because if this joint resolution shall be passed, the Farm Board, which on its books is charged 81 cents per bushel for this wheat, can go on the open market and buy wheat for twenty-odd cents per bushel.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Because I anticipated that the board would seek to make a profit on account of their profligate expenditures by charging a great deal more than the market price, I have offered an amendment which provides that the board shall receive a credit for "the market price of the wheat so delivered and of the date of such delivery and may receive a credit therefor against its revolving fund."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I would have to vote against the Senator's amendment for this reason: The Farm Board paid an average price of 81 cents per bushel plus for the wheat they hold. If they turn over the wheat for which they have paid the sum of 81 cents, I think they are entitled to have credit on their books for such amount. However, if we enter the market and buy wheat, then, of course, we will try to buy it as cheaply as we can in order to save the taxpayers as much as possible. So I am against the amendment of the Senator from Utah on the ground that inasmuch as it is merely a paper transaction, a book transaction, the board is entitled to have the benefit of a return to them for book purposes an amount equal to the cost of such wheat; but if we make an appropriation from the Treasury, then, of course, I will support the Senator's amendment.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think, in view of the statement which he has made, that the wheat which is now impounded is being destroyed by rats and by mice and by weevils and also its value lessened by reason of the insurance that has to be paid and the rent charges, that we are doing a favor to take it out of the hands of the board and give them a credit even of 20 cents on the dollar or 20 cents a bushel? We are saving them that much loss.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am supporting the joint resolution, and I agree with the position just asserted by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator see any difference between sending this wheat over to China and supplying it to the Chinese and feeding Americans with it? If the Chinese did not get this wheat, they would have to go into the market and buy wheat from some other place.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, when we furnish wheat to China, we are not supplying a market; they could not possibly buy wheat elsewhere.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not at all sure about that. As a matter of fact, let me say to the Senator from Idaho that a miller complained to me the Government of the United States was selling China wheat and thereby destroying his market, for he was selling wheat to China.

If the Chinese are giving good security for the wheat they are purchasing from this country, then there is no reason

why they could not give good security to somebody else. I do not agree with the Senator from Idaho that they are giving good security. I am perfectly willing that the Government of the United States should take this wheat and get it off the market and feed it to China; but I think we ought to take it and use it to feed hungry Americans before we feed hungry Chinese.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. If we could serve the American farmer at the same time by doing that, I should agree with the Senator; but there is just one place to put this wheat so that the market of the American farmer would be benefited, and that is in the hands of the countless millions in China who can not go into the private markets and buy wheat, because the private markets would not take the kind of security that they have to offer.

Mr. WHEELER. The private markets would take it provided it was good security; but the point I make is that it is not good security. I agree with the Senator, of course, that if the Government of the United States wanted to be so charitable that it desired to go over and feed all the hungry Chinese, it probably would be a good thing for the farmers of the United States to do it, and I should not have any objection to it. First of all, however, there are a lot of hungry Americans who to-night are not getting enough to eat. If the Senator had heard the testimony that has been given day after day before the La Follette committee, the Committee on Manufactures, he would appreciate that fact; and I am sure he would want to see those people fed before he would want to see the Chinese people fed.

Mr. BORAH. I have read every word of the testimony given before the committee presided over by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETT]. It is a startling story. I am anxious and willing that the Government of the United States do its part in taking care of the situation. I am only speaking now of the fact that we are going to the Farm Board to get the wheat, and we do not aid the hungry man any more by getting it from the Farm Board than we do by getting it from the farmers themselves. We do aid the farmers, however.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in the event this joint resolution does not pass, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho how the wheat farmers of the country will be benefited. If the bill does pass, we at least will get rid of all the wheat that can be distributed and consumed; but in the event that this joint resolution does not pass, the unemployed will not consume that much wheat, because they have no money and no means of getting possession of it. If this joint resolution does not pass, the wheat that would be distributed under it will not be distributed and, of course, will not be consumed. If the joint resolution does pass, we will at least get rid of some of our surplus wheat, and for that reason I am supporting the joint resolution.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have read, and I ask the attention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GLENN in the chair). The amendment to the amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Minnesota offers the following amendment to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 22, after "United States," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

*Provided*, That donations shall be made only when the relief agencies can show that they have perfected arrangements for the milling of the wheat, or for its exchange for a corresponding quantity of milled wheat, or for the sale of such wheat and the purchase of flour and for the distribution of the flour on a definite charity basis.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the committee in charge of the joint resolution has an amendment to suggest which I think probably covers the purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota. I send the amendment to the desk and ask to have it read.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment to the amendment of the committee will be read for the information of the Senate.

**THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** On page 3, line 6, it is proposed to add the following:

Any organization receiving such wheat shall agree not to sell it, directly or indirectly, or to use any part of it in exchange for the cost of transportation, distribution, or milling; it being the intent of this resolution that the persons in distress shall receive the full benefit of such wheat without any costs deducted therefrom.

**MR. SHIPSTEAD.** Mr. President, if I understand the Senator's amendment correctly, it will not be possible to sell this wheat, directly or indirectly. A condition arises in my mind that might exist.

If the Farm Board had wheat in storage in Omaha, and people were in need of flour in Montana, it seems to me that the Farm Board or the organization that has the distribution of this wheat should be permitted to sell that wheat in Omaha and transfer the proceeds of the sale to Montana, where the money could be used for the purchase of flour in Montana, instead of sending the wheat from Omaha to Montana, under which conditions I can conceive that the freight rates would be more than the value of the wheat.

Under the Senator's amendment would it be possible for the agencies distributing this wheat to exchange the wheat for flour or sell the wheat and use the funds for the purchase of flour?

**MR. CAPPER.** Mr. President, I do not think the amendment offered by the committee would interfere with an exchange of wheat for flour, for milled wheat. What is contemplated in our amendment is that trafficking in this Government wheat after it has left the hands of the Government agency should not be permitted.

Our committee was informed that in the past, in the distribution of seed wheat and other grain and relief provided by the Government, there have been cases where the Government has been imposed upon, where wheat and seed have been drawn by parties who really were not entitled to them, and they have sold them and profited by the sale. It is the desire of the Farm Board that we guard against anything of that sort.

**MR. SHIPSTEAD.** The wheat will remain in the hands of the agencies that will have charge of its distribution until they have something to show for it, either flour or money that can be used for the purchase of flour after the sale of the wheat. Does the Senator intend to prohibit the sale of this wheat, so that wheat will have to be transported from where the Farm Board has it in storage to whatever locality may need it? It seems to me that would be an expensive transaction.

**MR. CAPPER.** The wheat will be under the control of the relief organizations; and it will be their duty to process it, to put it in condition to deliver to the needy persons who are asking for help.

If the Senator has any doubt about the wording of this amendment, and would like to have the words "directly or indirectly" stricken out, I have no objection to that. Then I think it would take care of what he has in mind. I do not believe, however, that the Senator's amendment is a proper one to put on the joint resolution.

**MR. SHIPSTEAD.** I do not want to press my amendment if the Senator's amendment accomplishes the same purpose.

**MR. CAPPER.** I think it does.

**MR. MCNARY.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

**MR. SHIPSTEAD.** Yes; I yield.

**MR. MCNARY.** I think the Senator from Kansas is entirely correct. The amendment which he offers does the same thing as that proposed by the Senator from Minnesota; namely, to permit the exchange of wheat for flour, or any other form of distribution that may meet the economic situation. I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that he adopt the amendment of the Senator from Kansas, which does precisely the same thing in broader language, and let us go to conference with that amendment.

**MR. SHIPSTEAD.** Having that assurance, I will withdraw the amendment I sent to the desk in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

**MR. MCNARY.** May I inquire whether the Senator from Kansas has offered his amendment? Is it now pending?

**MR. CAPPER.** I have offered it.

**MR. MCNARY.** Let us act upon it.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

**MR. WALSH** of Massachusetts obtained the floor.

**MR. KING.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me just for an inquiry?

**MR. WALSH** of Massachusetts. If there is any opposition, I will ask to have the floor, but I yield for a question.

**MR. KING.** I desire to ask the Senator from Oregon whether the amendment just offered would interfere with the amendment which I have pending.

**MR. MCNARY.** I do not know. I am not conversant with the Senator's amendment. Let me examine it while the Senator from Massachusetts is speaking.

**MR. KING.** I have no objection to the Senator's amendment.

**MR. WALSH** of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is unquestionably praiseworthy, but it seems to me it is most objectionable.

First of all, it opens up without any definite plan the whole question of relief. It admits the need and necessity for relief measures. Secondly, it admits and accepts the principle that the Federal Government, independent of State cooperation, should participate in extending relief. Thirdly, it opens up the whole question of the disposal of surpluses, which, in the opinion of many people, are the cause of our depression. Are we prepared, without a survey of the whole situation and a well-planned relief program, to establish these precedents?

Either this wheat is good wheat and has a value, or it is poor wheat and has no value. If the latter, we are giving worthless wheat to the depressed, suffering people of the country. I assume that it has a value; and, having a value, the net result of this measure is to take \$16,000,000 out of the National Treasury and apply it for relief to those who are in need through Red Cross societies, legionnaires, St. Vincent de Paul, Salvation Army organizations, and other relief societies that may be in a position to distribute relief.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we ought not to go about this matter of relief piecemeal; that we ought to decide, first of all, What have the States and other agencies done? Shall the Federal Government enter into the field of giving independent relief to the needy and distressed? Shall that relief be surpluses or cash? Shall it be publicly or privately distributed? Shall it be of wheat surpluses alone? If so, why stop at wheat? Why not boots and shoes? Why not the surpluses of fruits of various kinds? Why not the surpluses of cotton—it can be used in making clothes as well as wheat can be used to make bread?

Mr. President, I think this is a very dangerous proposition. I have heartfelt sympathy with any movement to relieve distress and starvation, but I want to know where it is going to end. I want to know in what direction I am going on this matter of relief; how much and how long we must tax the Public Treasury; and whether it is going to be done in the haphazard manner of distributing by agencies that are responsible to nobody, chosen by the President or his agents or advisers?

One thing the measure does: It admits that there is distress in the country, and it admits that the distress is greater among the industrial class than among the farmers, because this joint resolution proposes to give relief to a class that are not farmers, who are in want and in need; but we are limiting the relief only to wheat. Have not these other unfortunate people got to be sheltered? Have they not got to be given clothes? Is this amount of wheat to be appropriated every two or more months? How long will the depression continue to the extent of supplying the need of wheat and other necessities? In Heaven's name, where are

we to end if we start out by approving measures of this character and this kind without contemplating a general relief plan?

If we had before us a complete relief plan, there might properly be considered the question of taking this surplus of wheat and distributing it, but it seems to me that without a fixed plan this is opening the door and establishing a very dangerous precedent, and, as much as I sympathize with the poor, the unfortunate, the distressed, I can not see my way clear to recognizing the doctrine that we must go into the surpluses of this country in order to give relief to the distressed, and that we should limit relief merely to surpluses of wheat.

I repeat, let a committee bring before us a definite program of relief, recognizing, if it seems necessary, that the Federal Government must do its part, with the State governments and the municipal governments, and let a broad and comprehensive plan be brought forward, and let it include wheat, if it may be essential and necessary to have that one surplus alone treated and dealt with in a relief measure.

Mr. President, I consider this principle and policy unsound and a dangerous precedent, though I am anxious to extend relief if it is included in a general plan cooperating with State, municipal, and private welfare agencies.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, usually I find myself in perfect accord with the Senator from Massachusetts. I may be in accord with him to-day as to the general principle involved. But I can think of no more unwise action the Senate could take to-day than the defeat of this measure.

We are so sheltered and secluded here in Washington, we come so little in contact with the practical aspects of poverty that we have no appreciation, I am sure, of what is going on in this country. I have been in New York for a couple of weeks, and, frankly, I did not like to go near my office because of the appeals made to me there for jobs, appeals to which I could not respond, because I had no jobs to give. But I saw hundreds—yes, thousands—of men and women in the bread lines seeking food.

Those people read the newspapers. They may not buy a fresh, clean copy of a morning paper, but they will find one somewhere, in a wastebasket or elsewhere. If they were to read to-morrow that the Senate, after giving thought to the question of distributing 40,000,000 bushels of wheat to needy persons, an amount capable of furnishing 4 bushels to every unemployed person, those 4 bushels capable of making 240 loaves of bread—if they should read to-morrow that we refused to do that because we could not decide whether we wanted to do it this way or the other way, it would have a very saddening effect upon our people. It might well stimulate still more thoughts which are in their minds, thoughts which might be dreadful to us if they were put into effect.

The Senator from Massachusetts is right when he says that it is a haphazard thing, that it is only one of many, many measures. But why did not the Senate pass with approval last year on the plan suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]? That plan provided that there should be a new standing committee for the period of the emergency, a committee made up of representatives of the other committees interested, a standing committee to which could be referred for proper consideration measures like that now before the Senate, in order that there might be worked out a plan the different parts of which would dovetail with all the rest. That was not done. Scant consideration was given to that wise suggestion.

Senators, we can not afford to-day to defeat this joint resolution. Let us not do it.

It is all very well to talk about the distress of the farmer, and I am in the fullest sympathy with the farmer. I was born on a farm. My relatives are farmers. I myself live upon my farm in the summer, and I know something about the burdens of the farmer. But there never is a day on the farm when they can not go out and kill an old rooster and parboil him long enough to make him edible.

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

Mr. COPELAND. In a moment. There is not a day on the farm when they can not take some of the wheat out of

the granary and make it into bread. But in New York, or in Boston, or in any other of the cities, when hunger comes they have nothing to eat but sidewalks.

Are we going to decline to give \$16,000,000 worth of wheat, 40,000,000 bushels? If this proposal had never been made, if it had been referred, as the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested, with other plans, to some committee so that there might be worked out a great inclusive measure which would take care of other surpluses, that would do very well. But this measure has come to the floor of the Senate, and I beg Senators not to disregard it.

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

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NORBECK. The Senator has been talking about that rooster for a year. Has it not occurred to him that the rooster may be gone by this time?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; but my experience with farming farmers indicates that roosters are born every day [laughter], or every year; so I think perhaps there is a rooster still on the farm.

Mr. NORBECK. Out in the West the rooster is gone, but the Senator still talks about it.

Mr. COPELAND. But in the tenements of New York there are no roosters and no other food except that given by the generous-hearted people of my city, and we are spending a million dollars every day to take care of the hungry people in our community.

Mr. NORBECK. Where did the money you are spending come from?

Mr. COPELAND. I suppose it came largely from South Dakota. But I do not care where it comes from—at least, we are spending it. The Senator from South Dakota need not chide me. I have followed his lead in the consideration of all these measures which have had to do with the relief of the farmer, except that last monstrous measure, which I had the pleasure of voting against, and I am glad I did vote against it, because it has done harm to the farmer instead of good, in my opinion.

Mr. NORBECK. The Senator and I were on the same side in that matter, so he should get the record straight. We both voted against it.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well, then, the Senator and I have no reason for disputing to-day as to what should be done about the farm or about the farmer.

Mr. NORBECK. Not at all.

Mr. COPELAND. But, I beg of Senators, let us not send out word to the hungry people of the United States that because we are not buying this 40,000,000 bushels directly from farmers who have it, but are taking it from another source, wheat which originally came from those same farms, that we deny them this little bit of aid.

I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that it is very little, indeed, but at least it is that much.

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

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I want to say to the Senator that I have received numerous telegrams and letters from farmers indorsing the joint resolution now before the Senate. So that the farmers are not complaining because of the fact that we are to take the wheat from the Farm Board. They are urging that it be taken from the Farm Board. All they want is to have the surplus cut down and to have it go where it will do some good and will feed some of the hungry people in some of the larger cities of the country.

Mr. COPELAND. I am glad to hear that statement of the Senator. It confirms the belief I have always held, that the farmer is the hardest headed and most sensible man in the world. Any farmer who has followed the devious ways of the Farm Board must rejoice if 40,000,000 bushels of that wheat shall be taken care of. I join the Senator from Idaho in the wish that all of it might have been shipped to China, or, better still, fed to our people. Let us get rid of it, then give the farmers a chance of their own, and they will make good.

But just now there are nearly 10,000,000 men and women walking the streets of this country without any means of

support, without any jobs, without any food. Let us not put the Senate in the position of declining to give 40,000,000 bushels of wheat out of our great surplus.

Mr. President, in a country which has half the gold of the world, which has all the wealth we possess, and 140,000,000 bushels of wheat in storage, the hungry people can not understand why the Government, which is supposed to serve the people, can not interfere in some sensible way to relieve their distress.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Washington for a question?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. DILL. May I suggest to the Senator that not only the 10,000,000 who are hungry feel that way, but probably seventy-five or eighty million others who are being asked to take care of those hungry ones feel that way also?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; and when there are ten millions of unemployed the dependents of those 10,000,000 are without the means of support. So even 40,000,000 bushels of wheat made into bread would not go very far, but at least it would give evidence that we are not unmindful of their distress and that we are not unwilling to relieve it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think I feel as much distressed over the distress which prevails in this country as does any other Senator. But on the pending measure I am obliged to agree with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], rather than with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. Whatever is done ought to be done in a systematic and rational way and ought to be done so as not to produce more of evil than of good in the long run.

I hope that the bread furnished to the hungry under this measure will be better baked than the legislation itself. This measure is half baked. I am reinforced in making that statement by the amendment already offered by the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

Under this measure as reported to the Senate it seemed that each grain of wheat would have been earmarked and officially guided in its course to the mouth of the hungry and of the unemployed. Senators are simply deceiving themselves with the idea that there is some sort of charm in the wheat held by the Farm Board. Wheat still held by the farmers is just as nutritious and just as palatable.

I approve the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, and I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas will accomplish the same result.

It may be that the people are asking for bread. I think this measure would give them worse than a stone. Indeed, sir, I think it would be administering poison.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] is a physician, and I dislike to disagree with him in a prescription of this kind, or any other. But in arguing for this measure the Senator has stated the fundamental and controlling reason why it should not be enacted. He has erected here a red signal, a danger signal; and, if we pass it unheeding, I fear me that we shall never return.

The Senator says that millions of hungry people—and I deplore the fact—have their eyes riveted upon the Senate, and that if this measure does not pass they will not only be disappointed but will be discontented, and that their discontent will be aggravated by its defeat.

The Senator says that we have half the gold on the globe here in the United States, and that hungry men do not understand why they can not be fed out of the National Treasury.

Mr. President, some one has said the only lesson we learn from history is that we learn no lesson from history. I fear that is too true. I have in mind the experience of the Roman Republic. Caius Gracchus was the first to institute, not free grain, not to furnish grain free to the inhabitants of Rome, but to sell grain below the market price to the inhabitants of Rome. What happened? Aspiring politicians, competing for public favor, insisted that the price fixed by the government, even though below the market price, was a higher price than the free citizenship of

Rome should be required to pay. Competition for public favor induced promises that, if elected, the price would be reduced. The price was reduced and these reductions continued until the inhabitants of Rome were furnished grain free of charge, without money and without price. When Julius Caesar came to the dictatorship he found that 300,000 Roman citizens were listed as recipients of free grain; no charge whatever was made for this public bounty.

Other rulers, to propitiate popular favor, afterwards placed pork on the free list, contending that the free citizenship of Rome should not be required to purchase their pork at their own expense. Still another Emperor, in order that nothing should be left to annoy the citizenship of Rome, placed wine on the free list and ministered out wine to the populace of Rome. Other rulers, in order that the people should not look to the Government in vain, provided free shows for the inhabitants of Rome. So that the people had free meat, free bread, free wine, and free shows. But, sir, they lost their freedom. The reaction upon the character and the citizenship of Rome need not be described here or now. Historians are unanimous that this policy perhaps more than any other undermined and destroyed Roman character and in the end destroyed the Roman Republic and destroyed Roman liberty itself.

I do not believe the President of the United States would sign this measure. It is contrary to his fixed policy. The President of the United States was importuned frequently last summer to assemble Congress in extraordinary session in order that it might take steps to meet the unemployment situation during the coming winter—the winter that is now upon us. The President steadfastly, if not stubbornly, disregarded those petitions. If the Congress had assembled in the summer or in the early fall, it could have investigated the situation and could have enacted such relief measures as were found to be necessary and proper. Meeting and deliberating in midwinter, it is neither a physical nor a legislative possibility for the Congress to do now what it could have done last summer or last autumn, nor is it a legislative or physical possibility for the Congress to take deliberate measures at this juncture. I think that any measure passed by the Congress will be vetoed by the President. I am as sympathetic as any man, but I want this done deliberately. For my part I would not have the Congress appropriate one single dollar for the relief of the unemployed, distressing as the situation is, until President Hoover comes to Congress and says that his plan has failed, that he has not met the situation, that he can not meet the situation. If the President can meet and solve the unemployment situation and all its distresses by voluntary or private contribution, I bid him Godspeed. I will rejoice in his success and I believe the country would. I do not believe the country is clamoring at this time for this legislation.

The President assumed sole responsibility so far as he could for meeting the situation and for the evils of the situation which he did not avert. When he comes to the Congress and says, "I assumed responsibility. I would not assemble Congress to meet the emergency. I undertook to meet it myself with voluntary and private contributions and organizations of a private character. My efforts have been in vain. They have come to nought. Not only unemployment still exists but the evils of hunger and misery are still stalking the land. 'Help me, Cassius, or I sink!'" When he says that, then let the Congress do its duty.

No one is willing to play politics with human misery, least of all the sponsors of this benevolently designed legislation. I can not but think, I repeat, that the President would not sign this measure at this time. According to its own terms, it can not be administered without his approval and without his affirmative cooperation. I do not believe that will be forthcoming at this time. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that whatever is to be done should be done in a systematic way after a survey of the entire situation, if need be, by the enactment of legislation that would be effective and that would meet the situation

so far as humanly possible, so far as the obligation rests upon the Congress to administer such relief or to solve this distressing problem.

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

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KING. I want to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he does not regard the States and their political subdivisions, possessing as they do power to borrow money and with their exclusive authority over their internal affairs, as being competent to deal with the question? The suggestion was made by a Senator to-day that the Federal Government will have a deficit of more than \$2,000,000,000 for this fiscal year. It is obvious that even if taxes are greatly increased there will still be a deficit of perhaps \$1,000,000,000 or \$1,500,000,000. Already Government bonds are at a discount, as I recall, of 15 per cent. Have not the States, the counties, the municipalities, the authority to issue bonds, and is not their credit such as to enable them to borrow money?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I agree in a general way with the Senator from Utah as to the principle he lays down. I might say I agree pretty much in detail with the suggestion he has made. If the Senate will pardon me, I will make one further observation which will explain my attitude upon this measure in part and upon all of the measures of like character which may come up in the future.

The Senate will pardon me for saying I served for 14 years in this body when the country had the misfortune to lose the benefit of my services. [Laughter.] During my entire service I never voted to take one dollar out of the Treasury of the United States and give it to anybody on earth, either in the United States or outside of the United States. I voted uniformly—I may have made a mistake, but not out of hardness of heart—against every measure for the relief of distressed peoples of the Old World; not that I did not sympathize with those people but because I am old-fashioned enough—I did not intend to say this on account of its being so old-fashioned—to believe that the Congress of the United States has no power under the Constitution to take money away from the citizens of this country and give that money to aliens across the sea. I do not believe the framers of the Constitution ever contemplated such an act. It would be or could be made an act of unbridled tyranny and despotism. I do not believe the Government of the United States has the power—and I am certain it has not the right—to take money out of the humblest citizen of Oklahoma, to take money out of the pocket of a farmer selling his wheat for 20 cents a bushel and make him pay taxes into the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of such wheat, and then to bestow that as a gift upon strangers upon the other side of the world. I do not believe that Congress has the power to take money out of the pockets of one citizen and give that money to another citizen of the United States. That is one reason why I have always opposed the tariff so strenuously.

The Constitution provides that private property shall not be taken for public use except upon payment of just compensation to the owner. That contemplates that private property shall not be taken for private use either with or without compensation. I have often thought that one of the greatest glories of our free institutions is that the Government of the United States, with all its armies and all its navies, with all its power and all its majesty, can not strip a street urchin of the rags upon his back except with the urchin's consent or else upon payment and full payment for the rags.

I know that I am old-fashioned in this view and I had not meant to state it now. I do so that it may serve now and hereafter as a statement of my attitude. Whatever the necessity of the situation requires and whatever duty devolves upon the Congress under the Constitution, let us meet it in a deliberate way and not, as I think, in such a partial measure as that now pending. I doubt not, if the measure does not pass, that the predictions of the Senator from New

York [Mr. COPELAND] may come true. There may be mutterings and discontent, but, sir, if we pass this measure we shall hear increasing mutterings in the future to which we can not say nay.

During the delivery of Mr. GORE's speech—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The election of a President pro tempore.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside in order that we may continue with the business on the calendar and dispose of the pending joint resolution.

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

After the conclusion of Mr. GORE's speech—

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] did the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] a service when he led him to place his objections to this measure on the ground of unconstitutionality and upon his long-harbored and cherished ideals of old-fashioned principles of government, because in so doing he led him away from that fealty to the President of the United States which he had given as his reason for opposing the joint resolution. I can not believe that the Senator from Oklahoma would have the Senate or the country take him too seriously when he preaches the doctrine of fealty to the President of the United States to the point of letting people suffer by the thousands and even by the millions, simply because the President will not admit that he has made a failure of a policy that he has established.

However, Mr. President, I want to say one or two other things that have come to my mind in connection with this discussion. I wanted to embalm in the RECORD, if I might, my conception of the word "dole." The word "dole" has been greatly misused during the past year, not because of any real misunderstanding of its meaning among those who studied the question, but because of the President's misuse of the word. Some months ago when we were then attempting to enact legislation here to help certain sufferers in this country, the President himself put his objections on the basis that that would be a "dole," and from that hour until now every proposal of any kind to help the suffering people of America, if it were to come from the Federal Government in the form of a contribution, has been called a "dole."

The real meaning of the word "dole" by those who have understood it, has been the regular payment of stipends from the Government to certain individuals among the people. The dole in England does not consist of appropriations to provide food for people who are suffering; the dole in Germany does not provide appropriations of lump sums to take care of those who are in need; but the dole in those countries has a definite meaning, namely, the payment of a certain amount at stated intervals to those who are living under certain conditions.

I think the sentiment of our people, whether in public office or out of it, is practically universal in opposition to a dole system of that kind; but the officials of this Government have always been ready to vote money and to vote supplies from the Federal Government to take care of those in need. Such action was never called a dole; it was never considered a dole until the President, trying to defend himself against a policy which Congress was proposing, applied that term to the proposal, and from that time until now we have had a great confusion of ideas as to what the dole is.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] suggested something about this matter being taken care of entirely by the local authorities. I happen to have in my hand a telegram signed by all the city commissioners of my home city and all the county commissioners of the county in which I live—Spokane, Wash.—a portion of which I want to read:

The undersigned commissioners of the city and county of Spokane urge on Congress the immediate passage of legislation to aid the States, cities, and counties in taking care of their local

unemployment problem. The local communities have now carried on the work for two years and have about exhausted their ability. The problem is national in its scope and every agency of government, from the town to the Federal authority at Washington, should be exerted to alleviate the distressed. Local governments in administering relief are dependent wholly on direct taxes on tangible property and the burden can not be borne much longer.

I submit that in answer to what the Senator from Utah asked the Senator from Oklahoma.

Objections to the pending joint resolution are largely technical; they are placed on theoretical possibilities in the future. Senators know how difficult it is to get any kind of legislation out of committee and upon this floor. While the joint resolution may need amendment, while it may not come here in the form some of us would write it, the fact is that it is a definite, concrete proposal to provide food for the people of this country who need food, and at the same time, by relieving the Federal Farm Board of its embarrassing load of wheat, to that extent help the farmers of the country.

For my part, I feel under no obligation to continue the fatuous policy of the President of letting towns and communities take care of their poor when they do not take care of them. I feel a duty to the people of the State who sent me here and to the people of this country who expect me as a Senator to serve the interests of those in need.

Senators say the President will veto the joint resolution. Let him veto it if he so desires. It will be but one more act to convince the American people that there should be a change in the White House at the first opportunity the people have to make that change. Are we to sit here, idle and silent, and do nothing because the President will not admit that he has failed in the plan which he proposed; or are we to do our duty as Senators and pass the legislation which we, in our judgment, think will help the situation and place the responsibility upon the the President, if he dares take the responsibility, of refusing to make that proposed legislation law?

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I have no objection to the relief plan which has been suggested except, in my opinion, the money should not come out of the farmers' fund, but out of the Federal Treasury.

During the World War the Government handled the farmers' wheat, and the agency engaged in that activity accumulated a profit of some fifty or sixty million dollars. With this money Congress was very generous in dealing out relief. A good share of it went to Russia. The country praised the generosity of Uncle Sam, but the funds were furnished by the wheat farmers.

Every Senator knows that every dollar expended or lost by the Farm Board will in the future be an argument against doing justice to the farmer. We will be reminded of what large sums have been expended in the futile attempt to put agriculture on a better level; I came nearly saying foolish attempt, because I always considered the plan unsound and voted against it. But anyhow, it is going to be charged against the Farm Board and the farmers. The newspapers will be constantly reminding us of the \$500,000,000 that went to farm relief.

Now, why should we dip into this fund even for the purpose of feeding the hungry. Should not charity come out of the Treasury instead of out of the special farmers' funds? Why not draw on Andrew Mellon for this relief instead of on the Farm Board?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, perhaps I made an erroneous impression on the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] if I impressed him with the idea that I was going too far in my loyalty or fealty to the President, as I believe he termed it. Mr. President, I think that if any action was necessary, it ought to have been taken last summer or fall, when it could have been done with deliberation and with economy and efficiency. I think that the President has placed Congress in an impossible situation. No matter what it does now, it can not be done either with economy or efficiency.

The President refused steadfastly to give us that opportunity; he took unto himself the sole responsibility of meeting the exigency and the distress which now prevails. So

far as I am concerned, if I may be pardoned the expression, I would put the President "on the spot," and I would keep him there until he said to this Congress, "I did you an injustice," and until he said to those in distress in this country, "I did you an injustice in not permitting the Congress to come to your rescue and to your relief." That is the view I take, Mr. President, of the present situation, and that is the reason I do not think Congress ought to embark on this policy at this time.

I want to add, Mr. President, that there are only two possible reasons for the introduction of the pending measure, for its discussion or for its passage. I may say there are only two reasons that give rise to the discussion of relief; one is to provide relief for human misery and the other is to "play politics with human misery." I am sure that no Senator would be guilty of the latter. I do not think it is worth while to discuss this now for either reason, repeating that, in my judgment, the President would veto the measure if passed, and I therefore regard it as idle discussion for the moment. Of course, the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] said that such action on the President's part would be only an added reason for his retirement from the White House. I confess that in regard to such results I would be extremely indulgent. We can not now bring relief over the President's veto and the other, the playing of politics with human misery, is not to be considered.

It is my desire to see a policy pursued both in and out of Congress which will enable those who need help to help themselves.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, is the committee amendment now pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment pending is the one offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] to the committee amendment, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 6, it is proposed to add the following:

Any organization receiving such wheat shall agree not to sell it directly or indirectly, or to use any part of it in exchange for the cost of transportation, distribution, or milling, it being the intent of this resolution that the persons in distress shall receive the full benefit of such wheat without any costs deducted therefrom.

Mr. NORRIS. I assume that there will be no objection to that amendment, no matter how Senators may stand on the main proposition involved, and I do not want to interrupt a vote on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has an amendment on the table which he desires to offer.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I made the inquiry regarding the pending amendment a few moments ago because I knew that my colleague [Mr. HOWELL] had an amendment he desired to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I ask that the telegram which I hold in my hand may be read by the clerk.

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

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[Telegram]

OMAHA, NEBR., January 4, 1932.

Hon. R. B. HOWELL,

United States Senator, Senate Office Building:

Just received telegram signed by George Ready, chairman county Red Cross; A. K. Lammers, chairman joint relief committee; Ralph Smith, secretary chamber of commerce; George Beste, vice president First National Bank; J. P. O'furey, editor Cedar County News, setting out situation in seven northeastern counties of Nebraska. These suffering people feel that some way ought to be provided so that they can get food for themselves and their animals. They can not understand why supply from Farm Board surplus wheat should not be sent them, which would relieve the situation. The people are desperate. The need very great. If

something is not done at once thousands of families will be forced to abandon farms, starved out, frozen out. Will come to towns, morale broken. Will not be restored in generation. The signed mentioned above asked me to appeal to you and Senator NORRIS. Please take this up with NORRIS. Suggest you and NORRIS get in touch with persons mentioned by wire at once.

ROBERT SMITH.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, this telegram was received by me this morning during the discussion of this measure. The measure provides for food, but it does not provide that any portion of this wheat can be used for food for animals.

At the price at which wheat is now selling in this country it is a favorable food for animals. You will note that in this telegram attention is called to the fact that these people have not food for themselves nor for their animals. What it means is this: They are having to dispose of their young pigs, of their young stock, and dispose of it for any price they can get for it; but with some of this wheat available for use for animal feed as well as for human food they will be able to tide over until spring, and this necessary stock on their farms will save them from having to migrate to the cities.

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

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. A moment ago—I do not recall whether the Senator from Nebraska was in the chamber or not—the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] made the suggestion that the farmers of the country had 55 per cent of their wheat crop now in their own bins. It strikes me it would be "carrying coals to Newcastle" if we are going to give the farmers wheat when they already have wheat; and I should like to know whether or not the observation made by the Senator from Idaho is correct.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I am speaking of the drought-affected regions in South Dakota and in the northern counties of Nebraska. The drought was not limited to this particular region, either, as the Senator knows. There is a section there where they have nothing. They had no crops this last year; they had no crops the year before; and the consequence is that they have reached the limit of their endurance.

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

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am to assume, then, that in certain parts of Nebraska, and in South Dakota, and perhaps North Dakota, in that general area, there are large territories where no wheat at all, or no wheat of any consequence, was produced?

Mr. HOWELL. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. To what extent did these farmers avail themselves of the drought relief which Congress provided?

Mr. HOWELL. They availed themselves of it to the full extent that they were able. I want to say, too, that the Secretary of Agriculture was ultimately quite lenient in the terms under which the money could be borrowed. Money was loaned even on second mortgages; but in the regions to which I now am referring the people have no security upon which to borrow any money.

Mr. TYDINGS. My original question was as to a matter which the Senator has cleared up; namely, that there are certain sections of the United States devoted to agriculture where there is not any wheat in the bins.

Mr. HOWELL. There is no question whatever about that.

Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I am sending to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before the amendment is read will the Senator yield for a question?

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

Mr. HOWELL. I do.

Mr. KING. Has not the State of Nebraska, with its large resources and its considerable wealth, taken any steps to meet the situation that the Senator describes. If not, why not?

Mr. HOWELL. The legislature is not in session. The governor has made efforts to aid in these counties, and the people have responded; but it is beyond their ability now, apparently. I have these facts, which are facts, stated in this telegram; and I knew of this condition up in the northern tier of Nebraska counties and in South Dakota.

Mr. WHEELER and Mr. MCKELLAR addressed the Chair. The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Utah that this is true not only of northern Nebraska and South Dakota but of eastern Montana and western North Dakota. In many counties out there, which previously have been prosperous counties, there is not a spear of grass growing—not a spear. They put in their crops, and there was nothing in the way of a harvest. They are feeding their animals to-day upon Russian thistles that grew up there, just weeds, and in many places even Russian thistles would not grow. It is impossible to describe the condition and the suffering of those unfortunate people through that drought area.

It is all right to stand upon this floor and talk about why we should not aid people when they are starving, because of some theory that we may have; but the fact is that it is much more dangerous to let them starve than it is to appropriate a few dollars out of the public Treasury to feed them. As far as I am concerned, I want to say that where it is shown to me that men, women, and children are actually suffering either from drought or from unemployment, when they can not get employment, I am not going to let some theory stand in the way of aiding them.

I do not like a dole. I dislike it as much as anybody upon the floor of the Senate; but I want to call attention to the fact that one of the conservative members of the House of Commons has repeatedly said, after picturing all the evils of the dole, that it was the dole that saved England from a revolution.

Let me say to the Members of the Senate that if the present condition of affairs continues in this country, it will be necessary for the Government of the United States to appropriate money out of the Treasury in order to save the United States of America. Do not make any mistake about it. I am for saving this country, and I am for feeding these unfortunate men, women, and children in the country who are not able to save themselves; and I am not going to let some well-grounded theory keep me from doing it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HOWELL. I do.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator how many counties in Nebraska and how many people there are affected by this particular drought?

Mr. HOWELL. The seven northern counties of Nebraska were not only drought stricken, but they were invaded by grasshoppers, and the corn crop was eaten off the ground. The leaves were just simply devoured, so that the people have no fodder or very little fodder for the stock they have on hand.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It applies, then, to seven counties in Nebraska?

Mr. HOWELL. Seven counties in the northern part of Nebraska, and a number of counties in southern South Dakota.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

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

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wondered if the Senator had thought of how we might handle this situation in another way, which I should like to suggest briefly.

Suppose the Federal Government created a national relief fund; and then, if there was any State in the Union

which felt that it had not the finances with which to cope with its local situation, it could borrow from the Federal fund, on very reasonable terms, the sum of money which that State felt it was necessary to borrow to carry it over to better times. That would throw the responsibility of administering the fund in the most economical manner upon the people who were in the territory directly affected; and the Federal Government would not lose the money, because in better times the State would repay it to the Federal Treasury. Consequently, if a subdivision of the State was unable to handle its relief problem, it could borrow from the State fund; and in that way a relief fund would be provided, but it would all be returnable when better times came upon us again.

In the city of Baltimore, for example, the citizens have raised about a million and a half dollars to take care of our emergency. Lots of people have given more than they could really afford to give in order to raise a fund to take care of our people. I understand that in the city of Philadelphia 30,000 families have been evicted in the last month, or at least eviction proceedings have been started to put out that many families.

With that situation going on all over the country, if there were a revolving fund, which the Government would not lose and which might be loaned to the States on proper security, so as to make the States borrow just as little as was needed and to have the thing economically administered by people in authority who were familiar with the condition, would not that be fairer than to take these individual dips into the Treasury for drought relief and for wheat and something else for cotton and what not, when a comprehensive plan for the whole country could be worked out without a permanent expenditure from the Federal funds?

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I have always believed that relief should be taken care of locally so far as practicable.

I want to say, for instance, that in Omaha the community chest went over the top, and proportionately the amount provided by Omaha exceeds the amount to which the Senator from Maryland referred as being the community chest of Baltimore. It happens, however, that this section has been receiving relief, and it seems that the relief funds have been exhausted; and the people there seem to feel that with all this wheat in the elevators, with storage charges and insurance charges running against it, that wheat might be used to tide them over. The consequence is that I have this telegram, and I have already received a number of applications; so I have provided here that a certain proportion of this wheat might be used for the purpose I have indicated.

I now ask that the amendment be read.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield further, before the reading?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want the Senator to get the idea that I feel that there are not certain sections of the country which are unable to help themselves; but it did occur to me to be a better plan, one that would be more economically administered and be fairer all the way around, if that section could borrow from its State. Then, if the State felt that tax collections were bad, or it could not afford to donate any revenue, it could borrow from the Federal Government, thus putting each community on its own bottom, so to speak, but with the helping hand of the Federal Government where it was needed.

If we get into the field of promiscuous donations of wheat or money or what not, I feel that there is a great deal of opportunity for abuse of what should be a splendid thing for any government to do to help its distressed people. Therefore, if we should set up a system of that kind, it strikes me that more real good along certain lines would be obtained than from having these promiscuous doles, so to speak, in one form or another out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. HOWELL. I think there is a great deal of merit in the suggestion made by the Senator from Maryland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] offers the following amendment to the amendment of the committee: On line 22, page 2, after the words "United States," insert the following:

*Provided*, That not to exceed 5,000,000 bushels of said wheat shall be available for necessary animal feed in the drought-stricken agricultural regions of the country.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am just a little surprised at the opposition there appears to be to the enactment of this legislation. I realize that this joint resolution does not meet the situation as we will have to meet it. I realize that perhaps it is not a drop in the bucket. I think the theory which the committee had in reporting the measure was that the Government of the United States practically own, through the instrumentality of the Farm Board, a large amount of wheat, and it was thought that while there were millions of our people suffering for bread it would be a good idea to donate the wheat; and I regard it as a donation. I do not expect the Government to pay the Farm Board for this wheat. It is only a matter of bookkeeping. It was Government money that bought the wheat, and in reality it is the Government of the United States that owns it.

I am impressed with what some of the Senators have said. In the last few moments the Senator from Maryland has made some good suggestions as to what he thought would be a better way of meeting this problem, meeting it in a broader way. I would have no objection to that. But the very plan which the Senator proposes would meet with some very serious obstacles which might entirely defeat his purpose.

The Senator suggests that instead of this kind of legislation, we should pass some legislation which would enable the Government of the United States to lend money to the States. I would favor that kind of legislation, but the Senator will find, when he comes to examine the constitutions of the various States, that many of the States are without any authority whatever to borrow money along those lines, and in that respect such legislation could not be general.

Moreover, the Senator says, if that were done, the money would be returned through taxation from the various States. Of course, if that were possible, that would be a return, and if this terrible calamity which is upon us were confined to one or two States, I should think that would be the proper way to handle the situation. But this depression is general. Every locality in the United States is suffering more or less, and if we donate this wheat, somebody will lose it; and we must donate it, or somebody must donate it, if those who are starving are to be fed. It is quite immaterial, I think, when the suffering is general, whether it is the Federal Government or whether it is the States which afford the relief. In other words, it seems that we should not hold up some proposed remedy, even though we have a better remedy, even though we think we can suggest something which will be better. I confess I feel that if I could have my way I could propose better legislation than this. But we can not all have our way. We have to compromise. We have to yield our ideas. Now is a time of all others when we ought to be willing to yield, it seems to me, because people are starving in many localities, and while this will not help the situation except in a small degree, it is perhaps as good as any, as far as it will go.

If we pass this legislation, hundreds of thousands of people will get bread who would not get it if we did not pass such legislation. This is the situation, that the Government of the United States has 160,000,000 or more bushels of wheat stored in bursting elevators, while surrounding us on all hand are our citizens suffering for food.

Should we quibble now as to whether we could get a better remedy, or should we oppose this measure because it does not go far enough, and does not involve enough to spread all over the United States, and to relieve suffering completely, 100 per cent, everywhere? It will not do that. Those who are in favor of it do not believe it will do that. But it will be 40,000,000 bushels of wheat turned into food, donated to suffering people, and in this calamity that ought to be almost enough of an argument to cause us to pass the legislation.

Mr. President, there is some difference of opinion as to who should handle the matter; what instrumentality we should use. That is a serious question I admit. But it seems to me that at such a time as this we ought to be willing to suppress our own ideas in order to get together on some legislation that will be practicable and that will bring relief.

Personally, I think there are some things in the original joint resolution better than the provisions in the substitute offered by the committee, although I helped to frame the substitute myself. There are some things in the substitute resolution which are not in the original resolution. I want to call attention to one in particular. The substitute provides:

It is expressly understood that no organization receiving wheat under the provisions of this resolution shall discriminate against any person who is in distress, regardless of the causes of such distress.

I think I ought to tell the Senate that that was inserted in order to meet a case where a strike was on, particularly down in Kentucky, where there is a strike on now. We were told that the Red Cross, for instance, did not extend any relief to striking miners. Their children might be starving, they might be suffering from cold and hunger, but they could not get any relief from the Red Cross; because, under the organization of the Red Cross, as I understand it, they are prohibited from giving relief in that kind of a case. When a striking miner, who might have five or six children at home in his little shack starving, applied to the Red Cross for food for his family, he would be given a card which would say "You can get a job here," and he would be sent back to the company where he had formerly worked; and between which and the miners a terrible controversy was on.

I do not want to go into the merits of that; I do not know enough about it to go into the merits of it. But a statement of that situation ought to be sufficient, it seems to me, when we find children and women starving, to cause us to give them relief, if we have power to do it, regardless of the cause of the distress. Even though a man who had a family were a thief, though he were an escaped convict, if his children were suffering, and we had something with which we might feed them, would we not feed them? We can not enter into anything of that kind, and this provision was therefore put into the substitute resolution, and I think it is a good thing.

Now, referring particularly to the amendment offered by my colleague Mr. HOWELL, the question is asked—and it is a very proper question, I concede—are not the neighbors of these people in our States, in these six counties which are suffering, able to supply the money necessary to afford relief? Can not the people go to the government there and borrow the money with which to buy the wheat or the corn necessary to feed their stock and themselves?

I take it that in any such case no relief would be granted if such a condition existed. But some of those people can not borrow anything. Their crops have been complete failures. In some localities in the Dakotas, I understand, not a single thing has grown out of the ground; it has been absolutely barren. Everything those people had is mortgaged, and the people who have raised something in other localities can not get anything for it, and they can not lend money. They can live, and that is about all, because they have raised food for themselves and their animals. They have just enough for their own food and to feed their animals, and can, in a way, get through. But they can not sell their produce and get enough to pay the cost of production, and if they did, the mortgagees would get it all.

I do not want to draw a line here which will be perfectly arbitrary and say to those who are going to have charge of this wheat that certain things must be complied with technically. We are now in a situation where millions of our people are suffering and are unable to get relief in their localities. The localities where there is suffering have exhausted themselves. The States have exhausted themselves. The municipalities have gone the limit. Still there are millions suffering; and why, if we have the wheat now, should it not be used for the purpose of giving relief?

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that this was not a drop in the bucket. We will have to go much further before we get through, whether the administration favors it or not. So far we have confined our consideration to bills proposed by the administration, by the executive department. But before we get through, the Government is going to have to issue bonds, in my judgment, and it is going to have to issue a great many bonds, either to get food and distribute it as charity or go into the building of roads or other public improvements in order to give jobs to people whose families will otherwise starve.

We are not going always to be able to do the thing we would like to do. We are not always going to have everything just as we would like to have it. But now is not the time, it seems to me, to quibble over methods, methods of administration, methods of legislation, when we are confronted by demands for immediate relief.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska [MR. HOWELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

MR. KING. Mr. President, a few days ago I offered an amendment, and I ask that the clerk read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Utah.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Utah proposes to strike out, in section 2 of the substitute, the following: "the average cost of such wheat to the board as a credit against its revolving fund," and insert the following: "the market price of the wheat so delivered and of the dates of such delivery and may receive a credit therefor against its revolving fund."

MR. KING. Mr. President, as I understand, the joint resolution as reported provides that the Farm Board may receive a credit for the amount of wheat which may be disposed of by this bill at the average rate the wheat cost the Farm Board.

It seems to me that that is not a fair disposition to make of the question. Undoubtedly the Farm Board is being benefited by this proposed legislation, no matter what the amount of credit it receives for the wheat. The Senator from Oklahoma has indicated that the wheat held by the board is deteriorating, and he said that it would be destroyed. There are factors, of course, which are constantly diminishing the value of the wheat.

MR. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. KING. I yield.

MR. NORRIS. I did not quite understand the Senator's amendment. What change would it make?

MR. KING. It provides that the Farm Board shall receive a credit equivalent to the value of the wheat on the day they part with it and deliver it to the organizations which, under the pending joint resolution, will obtain it. The resolution itself gives them a credit amounting to the average price which was paid for the wheat from the beginning of the operations of the Farm Board.

MR. NORRIS. I had not thought of this before, I may say to the Senator, but I am rather inclined to look with favor on his amendment. But, after all, it is only a matter of bookkeeping.

MR. KING. I agree with the Senator.

The Farm Board has expended several hundred millions of dollars wrung from the taxpayers of the United States. What the ultimate loss will be to the Government, and of course to the taxpayers, can not definitely be determined. There is no question but that the losses will be very great. In the recent hearings before the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate sufficient facts were developed to show that the relief which was expected from the Farm Board had not been obtained; that there had been serious losses and grievous mistakes. I think the fact can be demonstrated that some of the so-called cooperatives organized under the direction of the Farm Board are not entitled to that name; that they have been an injury rather than a benefit to the agriculturists of the United States.

It is certain that legitimate business has been injured as a result of the operations of the Farm Board and that farmers in many instances have been victims of the policies which it has pursued. The losses to the wheat and cotton producers of the United States by reason of the policies of the Farm Board amount to colossal figures. This organization, in my opinion, engaged in activities not within the letter of the law and certainly not within its spirit. The wheat-gambling transactions have materially injured the wheat growers of the United States. Protests were made when the Farm Board was seeking to control the wheat market and to acquire hundreds of thousands of bales of cotton, but the board persisted in its policy, and the result was that at one time more than 200,000,000 bushels of wheat were purchased and held in elevators and storehouses. It is believed by some that the purchase and holding of such large quantities of wheat and cotton demoralized the market, forced the price of these commodities to low levels, and wrought incalculable harm to the farmers of our country.

It seems to me that the day of reckoning has come and that steps should be taken to have an accounting and to determine what disposition shall be made of this organization.

Undoubtedly the board would be glad to have a very large credit for the wheat which it is proposed by this bill to transfer to the Red Cross for distribution to the hungry people of the United States. A credit of \$1 per bushel or 80 cents a bushel would make a better showing for the Farm Board than a credit representing the actual value of the wheat at the time it will be delivered to the Red Cross. It has been said by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] that the present value of this wheat is \$16,000,000. If 80 cents were to be charged for the wheat, the Farm Board, of course, would receive a larger credit than the amount just indicated. The amendment which I have offered does not deprive the board of credit for the wheat but limits the credit to an amount representing the value of the wheat at the time it is delivered to the Red Cross.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator just reminds me of another thing to which I think I ought to call attention. I do not agree with the Senator that the wheat is going to deteriorate so rapidly that in a short time it will be worthless. Properly stored and cared for, it can be kept indefinitely. But it is true, and I think it ought to be mentioned in connection with the Senator's amendment, that it costs the Government something to keep the wheat.

Mr. KING. The storage charges are large and the cost of insurance is a factor contributing to the loss which the Government will sustain.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. I have forgotten the estimate of what it costs to store it.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. CAPPER. I am informed that it costs from 1 1/4 cents to 1 1/2 cents a month per bushel for storage.

Mr. NORRIS. So the longer we keep it the more we have to pay.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I inquire how much wheat the Farm Board has on hand now?

Mr. NORRIS. I believe it is about 162,000,000 or 163,000,000 bushels.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nebraska have any objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. Personally, I have not. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is not opposed to it, nor is the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], who has charge of the measure. May I say to my friend from Nebraska that the statement which

I made as to deterioration and possible loss of a considerable part of the wheat was based upon what was said by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who knows more about this than I do? Be that as it may, there will be some deterioration, and the costs of holding the wheat are increasing. I am informed that there is a progressive deterioration in the quality of the stored wheat, and it is obvious there has been a marked depreciation in its market value.

I shall not attempt at this time to discuss the operations of the Farm Board and its rather extravagant, and, as many believe, unsound, and irrational policies. Permit me to remark, however, that the conduct of the board has been the subject of violent controversy. Undoubtedly there are some who have been the beneficiaries of the munificence of this organization who are praising it and who are engaged in efforts to perpetuate its existence. I have had a number of letters from organizations that have secured loans from the board, and these organizations, of course, are concerned in its preservation. But from many parts of the country come strong protests against the continuation of the board.

I voted against the Farm Board measure, believing that such an organization would do more harm than good. I think that even the friends of the bill did not dream that it would engage in practices which are at variance with sound and fair business methods and policies. No one thought that hundreds of millions of dollars controlled by the board would be used, in part at least, for speculative purposes, and to attempt to set at naught the laws of supply and demand and to destroy business organizations that had been built up by years of thrift, enterprise, and honest and fair dealing.

No one thought that stabilization corporations of the character formed would be established, and that they would exercise the power which the board evidently was willing to confer upon them; or that the board would look with complacency upon the waste, inefficiency, and tyranny of such organizations. I believe that those who supported the bill creating the Farm Board are disappointed and grieved over its delinquencies and its mistaken policy, which have proven so serious an injury to agriculture.

It was claimed that the personnel of the board was of the highest character and quality; that under their wise leadership prosperity would come to the farmers of the United States. The high standing of Mr. Legge in the business world was regarded by the proponents of the bill and by the President as conclusive evidence that the Farm Board act would lift agriculture from its depressed condition.

There were some Senators and Members of the other branch of Congress who regarded the measure as unsound and who believed that it would work irreparable harm and injury. Speaking for myself, I preferred the so-called McNary-Haugen bill to the measure which was known as the "President's plan to effectively deal with the agricultural problem."

Senators will recall that measures dealing with the agricultural situation and which were approved by the two branches of Congress did not receive Executive approval. During the last presidential campaign Mr. Hoover promised that he would convene Congress in extraordinary session for the purpose of enacting a farm relief measure. After his election Congress was so convened, and the bill which met the President's approval was enacted into law. It was regarded, as I understand, by the President as well as some others, as a measure of the highest importance, and that it would bring permanent relief to the farmers of the United States. It was supposedly one of the crowning achievements of the administration.

I do not want to be partisan, but I can not repel the thought that this measure was a distinct injury to agriculture and will result in burdening the taxpayers of the United States with several hundred millions of dollars.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has offered a resolution asking for a searching investigation of the Farm

Board and its operations. I believe that this resolution will receive the support of most, if not all, Members of this body. There is a general feeling, so far as I can learn, that the situation brought about by the modus operandi of the board calls for investigation and for radical changes in the functions and work of the board if it shall be continued. A measure has been offered in the other branch of Congress to abolish this organization. I have prepared a measure, not yet offered, which transfers its functions to the Department of Agriculture. Undoubtedly that department could with greater economy, and certainly with better results, discharge the functions of the board as they are prescribed by the law creating it.

I hope the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] will speedily secure adoption of his resolution and before Congress adjourns legislation will be enacted that will prevent a repetition of the mistakes and blunders which have characterized the operations of the board up to the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, on page 2, line 18, I move to amend the amendment of the committee by inserting after the words "Red Cross" the following:

And any State or political subdivision thereof for use of Indians on any Indian reservation and among other Indians in distress.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, is that an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BLAINE. Yes; I offer that as an amendment. The reason why I do so arises out of a request which I have received from my own State from one of the departments which has been to a large extent authorized to assist the Indians on the Indian reservations in my State. That is a State organization, a public function. Then there are other sections in my State which are occupied by tribes of Indians, not on reservations or in tribal relationship, but to all intents and purposes constituting a distinct organization. The Government no longer has jurisdiction over them. Wherever they are located they have become a great burden upon the towns. I think it ought to be mandatory in a measure of this kind that a State or any of its political subdivisions shall receive its fair proportion of the wheat for the purpose of taking care of and feeding Indians, who stand in quite a different relationship to our Government than do the rest of mankind in this country.

They are wards of the Government. There is no question that there are thousands of them in distress, in the most abject poverty, and I think it ought to be emphasized in this particular measure that the States and the political subdivisions should have the opportunity to obtain the wheat for the purposes designated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Wisconsin send his amendment to the desk in order that it may be stated?

Mr. BLAINE. I send the proposed amendment to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 18, after the words "Red Cross," insert the following:

And any State or political subdivision thereof for use of Indians on any Indian reservation and among other Indians in distress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for the relief of people in distress."

#### THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, earlier in the session I asked unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business that we might proceed with the calendar. I now ask unanimous consent that we may complete the call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

#### AMENDMENT OF RADIO ACT

The bill (S. 1037) to amend the radio act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the bill be read.

The legislative clerk read the bill.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, the rest of the bill simply provides for the transfer over to the Radio Commission of the different parts of the radio services which are now in the Department of Commerce. I may say that the bill has twice passed the Senate as parts of other legislation. It has once passed the House, but we have been unable to get it enacted into law because of other parts of bills connected with it to which there was objection. Therefore the committee reported this part of the legislation separately, the whole purpose being that all of the radio control exercised by the Government shall be centered in the Radio Commission and not in a divided organization, a part in the commission and a part in the Department of Commerce. I hope the bill may pass now, because it has already passed this body twice.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Is the report unanimous?

Mr. DILL. It is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment the question is, Shall the bill be engrossed and read the third time?

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the radio act of 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 81), is hereby amended as follows:

"All powers and authority vested in and exercised by the Secretary of Commerce by the act entitled 'An act to require apparatus and operators for radio communication on certain ocean steamers,' approved June 24, 1910, as amended, and by the radio act of 1927, are hereby vested in and shall, after the approval of this act, be exercised by the Federal Radio Commission.

"(b) All the records and files of the Radio Division of the Department of Commerce are hereby transferred to the Federal Radio Commission and shall be available for use by such commission in all proceedings under the radio act of 1927, as amended, to the same extent as if such records and files were original records and files of such commission.

"(c) All property of the United States under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of Commerce used by the Radio Division of the Department of Commerce, including all monitoring radio stations, is hereby transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Radio Commission.

"(d) All officers and employees under the jurisdiction and control of the Radio Division of the Department of Commerce are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Radio Commission. Such transfer shall not operate to change the grade or salary of any such officer or employee.

"(e) All unexpended balances of appropriations to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce in the administration of the Radio Division of the Department of Commerce, available upon the date of the approval of this act, are hereby transferred to the Federal Radio Commission and shall be available for expenditure by the commission in the administration of the radio act of 1927, as amended.

"(f) All permits and licenses issued by the Secretary of Commerce under the radio act of 1927, as amended, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if they had been issued by the Federal Radio Commission under this act.

"(g) All rules and regulations of the Secretary of Commerce applicable to interstate and foreign radio transmissions and communications or to persons subject to the radio act of 1927, as amended, or to the act entitled 'An act to require apparatus and operators for radio communication on certain ocean steamers,' approved June 24, 1910, as amended, shall be effective as rules and

regulations of the Federal Radio Commission until said commission shall otherwise provide, and shall have the same force and effect as rules and regulations made by said commission under the Radio act of 1927, as amended.

(h) The enactment of this act shall not invalidate any proceeding by or before, or any of the acts or orders of the Secretary of Commerce prior to the date of the approval of this act. All proceedings, hearings, or investigations commenced or pending before the Secretary of Commerce with reference to matters covered by the provisions of the radio act of 1927, as amended, shall be continued by the Federal Radio Commission in the same manner as originally commenced before said commission, and said commission may exercise any of the powers conferred upon it by the radio act as amended in reference to such matters."

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Couzens	Hull	Robinson, Ind.
Austin	Dale	Johnson	Sheppard
Bailey	Davis	Jones	Shipstead
Barbour	Dickinson	Kean	Shortridge
Barkley	Dill	Kendrick	Smith
Bingham	Fess	Keyes	Smoot
Black	Fletcher	King	Steiner
Blaine	Frazier	La Follette	Swanson
Borah	George	Logan	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Glass	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Glenn	McKellar	Townsend
Broussard	Goldsborough	McNary	Trammell
Bullock	Gore	Metcalf	Tydings
Bulow	Hale	Morrison	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harris	Moses	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Neely	Walcott
Caraway	Hastings	Norbeck	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Hatfield	Norris	Waterman
Coolidge	Hayden	Nye	Watson
Copeland	Hebert	Patterson	Wheeler
Costigan	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	White

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

#### EXPANSION OF CIRCULATING MEDIUM

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, we have just heard read a message from the President of the United States calling attention to certain measures designed to assist in the rebuilding of prices and values and to quicken employment. I call special attention to the phrase "rebuilding of prices and values." After the message was read, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] introduced a bill providing for the restoration of silver as one of our basic monetary metals.

Two days ago the Washington Post, in its leading editorial, called attention to the "stringency of money in circulation." "The country needs more dollars," said the Post, "not inflated dollars, but 100-cent gold-value dollars."

It is true that we have a surplus of everything save money. We have a surplus of manufactured goods, a surplus of food supplies, and a surplus of clothing, yet many of our people are cold and hungry. We have a surplus of work and a surplus of labor, yet at this very hour men, unemployed and in desperation, are reported to be marching toward this Capital.

For many money is a memory. In some sections traders-stamped metal disks circulate as money. In other sections abandoned flour and grist mills have been reopened, where farmers trade wheat and corn for flour and meal. The Federal Farm Board has just traded American wheat for Brazilian coffee.

In one State students trade wheat for tuition. In another students pay their way with vegetables, fruits, meats, milk, and eggs. In many cities and in some States no money is available to meet salaries and public expenses.

Mr. President, the United States is the richest, strongest, and most influential nation of the earth. We have over 120,000,000 people. Only recently our massed wealth was estimated at \$500,000,000,000. We have foreign investments, public and private, in excess of \$25,000,000,000. Until now our annual foreign trade has amounted to approxi-

mately \$10,000,000,000. Our Federal taxes each year amount to over \$5,000,000,000. The annual State, county, and municipal taxes amount to \$7,000,000,000. The total massed debts of our people, national, State, municipal, corporate, public, and private, amount to over \$150,000,000,000. We have almost one-half of the world's gold monetary supply stored in our Treasury's strong box. Yet to pay all the taxes, pay all the interest, and to transact the business of our country and our business with the world, on July 31, 1930, we had only \$4,426,493,631 in circulation.

While the sum mentioned was theoretically in circulation, yet only a portion was actually performing services as money. The twenty-odd thousand banks are required by law to keep some \$800,000,000 as reserves in their vaults. Over \$1,000,000,000 are buried, hid, and hoarded. Five hundred million dollars are scattered throughout the world. Over \$100,000,000 are in Cuba. This leaves only some \$2,000,000,000 of actual money in practical circulation.

Who or what is responsible for the amount of money in circulation?

The Constitution says that the Congress shall have power to coin money and to regulate its value. The Congress has delegated this power to the Federal Reserve Board, and today the Congress indirectly and this board directly are responsible for the scarcity of money in circulation and responsible for the conditions caused by the policy adopted and followed.

During this depression we have had the smallest amount of real money in circulation since just after the close of the World War. During 1920, when we had the largest amount of money in circulation, wheat sold for over \$3 per bushel, corn sold for \$2 per bushel, oats sold for \$1 per bushel, cotton sold for 40 cents per pound, and oil sold for \$3 per barrel.

During recent months wheat has sold for 30 cents per bushel, corn has sold for 17 cents, oats have sold for 12 cents, cotton has sold for 5 cents per pound, and oil has sold for less than 10 cents per barrel.

When the largest sums of money were in circulation commodity prices were the highest, all wage earners were employed, wealth increased, and we enjoyed our best times. With the least money in circulation in a decade commodities will not bring cost of production; millions are idle; factories are closed; banks are failing; railways are bankrupt; bonds are defaulting; cities, counties, and States are unable to meet their bills; and even the Federal Government itself is floundering to keep its financial head above the water.

The Federal Reserve Board is directly responsible for the condition of which I complain. In 1920-21 the board put in force policies which caused one and one-half billion dollars to be withdrawn from circulation and canceled. This policy brought on the deflation, which has destroyed hundreds of billions of wealth, covering every form of property and now reaching fixed investments, such as notes, bonds, and even bank deposits themselves. The value of notes and bonds depends upon the value of the property back of such securities. The money in the banks listed and carried as deposits is backed by the property of those who have created the deposits. This property has now lost much, if not most, of its former value, and if relief is not had the holders of these bank deposits will suffer partial if not total loss.

The Federal Reserve Board can at will increase the amount of money in circulation. During the past few months the board has increased theoretically the circulation by over \$1,000,000,000. Banks suffering from currency withdrawals have been forced to sell their governmental notes and bonds in order to replenish their legal reserves. The Federal reserve banks have purchased such securities, paying therefor Federal reserve notes.

The Federal Reserve Board has the power at will to increase the circulation to any amount within the legal limits permitted by the amount of gold on deposit. We have available gold sufficient to legally secure the circulation of over \$10,000,000,000 in currency. We have the currency already printed, and now same is being "aged" and made ready for circulation.

The Federal reserve system can increase the circulation in at least three ways. First, by loans to the member banks; second, by purchasing bills in the open market; and third, by the purchase of governmental notes and bonds.

Mr. President, I contend that the amount of money in circulation is entirely too small. I assert that this small amount of circulation is largely responsible for the present low commodity prices; for the destruction of property values; for the lack of industrial activity; for the existing unemployment, and for the near collapse and chaos which we now face.

If a decreased circulation has wrought such havoc, then an increased circulation should bring some relief. The Federal Reserve has the money, it has the power and the legal authority to practically double the existing circulation.

In 1920 a circulation of less than six and one-half billions caused wheat to sell for over \$3 per bushel and other commodities in proportion. On December 23, 1931, we had in circulation the sum of five billion seven hundred million. Another billion added would make the total greater than the post-war circulation. It might not require so much to thaw out the frozen credits and bring back from hiding the billion now admitted to be hoarded.

A declared policy of voluntary, premeditated, and enforced inflation of the currency will serve notice to the country that the height of the buying power of the dollar has been reached and that unless the billions of "slack" dollars come out from hiding and go to work, that other dollars will be inducted into service to take their place; and, further, that sufficient currency will be placed in circulation to offset every dollar buried, hid, and hoarded and sufficient to be and become the basis of the credit required by the people of the country.

If such a policy should be announced, it would be notice to those so fortunate as to have deposits in the banks and they, financially wise as they must be, would lose no time in converting their deposit money into property before the rise in property values begins.

Mr. President, such an announcement of policy would turn the tide and the carrying out of such a policy would hasten the return of prosperity.

To the extent that money is added to the circulation and the actual circulation increased the value or buying power of the dollar will be decreased, and as the dollar comes down commodity and property values will go up.

Mr. President, taxes, interest, notes, bonds, debts, and salaries at any given time are definitely fixed in terms of dollars. If the ruinous policy of deflation can be stopped and the money withdrawn from circulation can be replaced, thus making money more plentiful and thereby cheaper, those who owe taxes, interest, notes, and bonds will be able to secure money necessary to meet such obligations for less of the products of their farms, factories, and mines.

If inflation of the currency will have the effect of doubling the price of wheat, corn, oats, and cotton, then such effect to the farmer will be comparable to a reduction of one-half in taxes, one-half in interest, and one-half on all the debts the farmer owes.

Mr. President, the people have never voted in favor of a policy of deflation. They have neither favored nor indorsed the policy of deliberately withdrawing money from circulation in order to decrease the price of the things they produce and at the same time add unearned value to notes, bonds, and credits.

To-day the demand is presented squarely to those who have their wealth in fixed investments, that unless they yield some of the value of such investments they stand a chance of losing all.

The people can not pay their obligations on the present basis or value of the dollar. Already farmers, wage earners, and industries have defaulted; counties, municipalities, and States will come next, and while they are falling the whole structure may tumble.

To date the Federal Reserve Board, the agent of the Congress, has failed but the Congress itself can not evade or escape its constitutional duty.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the editorial referred to in my opening paragraph.

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

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of Saturday, January 2, 1932]

TURN BONDS INTO MONEY

The amount of cash withdrawn from banks and hoarded by the people is estimated at \$1,000,000,000. If this cash were in banks it would furnish a basis of credit amounting to twenty times as much, or \$20,000,000,000.

The total amount of money nominally in circulation is over \$4,800,000,000, amounting to \$38 per capita. The amount actually in circulation is much less. The people have withdrawn and hoarded immense sums from circulating money, as well as from banks. The amount hoarded is unknown, but it is conservatively estimated that the total is equivalent to the shrinkage of \$40,000,000,000 of credit.

The value of stocks diminished \$60,000,000,000 after the market crash in 1929, affecting 17,000,000 stockholders. Real estate and other property diminished in value. Much of the apparent loss was unreal, because of fictitious values, but there were real losses running into billions. Property is now undervalued, because of pessimism and loss of confidence. Much property will recover normal value when confidence is restored.

There is a stringency of money in circulation. The dollar has an abnormal value because of the scarcity of dollars. A dollar will buy \$1.45 worth of commodities. It will buy ten times as much stock on the New York Stock Exchange as it could buy in 1929. It can buy 40 per cent more factory labor. Millions of citizens are unable to obtain these dollars at any price in exchange for labor.

The country needs more dollars—not inflated dollars but 100-cent gold-value dollars.

Section 4 of the Federal reserve act authorizes the reserve banks to deposit United States Government bonds with the circulating privilege and receive from the Comptroller of the Currency Federal reserve bank notes of the same par value as the bonds.

Congress is about to authorize the issuance of bonds to help make up the Treasury deficit. Why should not these bonds carry the circulating privilege and be exchanged for Federal reserve bank notes? The release of \$1,000,000,000 in Federal reserve bank notes, secured by the equivalent in bonds, would release \$20,000,000,000 of credit on a solid gold basis.

At present there are no bonds with the circulating privilege available for deposit with the Comptroller of the Currency. Unless the circulating privilege is stipulated in the forthcoming issue the Treasury will still further draw upon the public money resources, which are already too scanty to do the country's business. With the bonds exchangeable for Federal reserve bank notes the Treasury could pay out these notes for Government expenditures and thus put new money in circulation, thereby releasing an immense amount of credit.

With the passing of the emergency the bonds and notes should be retired, as the dollar and commodity prices will have returned to normal and there will be no need of extra circulation.

The Federal reserve act contemplates the issuance of Federal reserve bank notes secured by United States bonds in times of emergency. The emergency now exists, and yet the relief provided for by law has not been granted by Congress.

ELECTION OF A PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the unfinished business, the election of a President pro tempore.

Mr. McNARY. 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	Couzens	Hull	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Dale	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Bailey	Davis	Jones	Sheppard
Barbour	Dickinson	Kean	Shipstead
Barkley	Dill	Kendrick	Shortridge
Bingham	Fess	Keyes	Smith
Black	Frazier	King	Smoot
Blaine	George	La Follette	Steiner
Borah	Glenn	Logan	Swanson
Bratton	Goldsborough	McGill	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Gore	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Hale	McNary	Trammell
Byrnes	Harris	Metcalf	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Morrison	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hastings	Moses	Wagner
Connally	Hatfield	Neely	Walsh, Mass.
Coolidge	Hayden	Norris	Watson
Copeland	Hebert	Nye	White
Costigan	Howell	Patterson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The clerk will call the roll on the election of a President pro tempore.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BULOW (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with my colleague [Mr. NORBECK], who is absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. BYRNES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ODDIE], who is unavoidably absent from the Senate. If he were present, he would vote for Senator MOSES, and if I were at liberty to vote I should vote for Senator PITTMAN.

Mr. KENDRICK (when Mr. CAREY's name was called). I desire to announce again the absence of my colleague [Mr. CAREY] on official business, and to say that if he were present he would vote for Senator MOSES. He is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY].

Mr. CONNALLY (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HASTINGS (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] and will vote. I vote for Senator MOSES.

Mr. MCKELLAR (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND]. If he were present, he would vote for Senator MOSES, and if I were at liberty to vote I should vote for Senator PITTMAN.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], who is absent. If he were present, he would vote for Mr. MOSES. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] and will vote. I vote for Mr. PITTMAN.

Mr. FESS (when the name of Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana was called). The junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] has a pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. Were those two Senators present, the Senator from Mississippi would vote for Mr. PITTMAN and the Senator from Indiana would vote for Mr. MOSES.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. If he were present, he would vote for Senator PITTMAN, and if I were at liberty to vote I should vote for Senator VANDENBERG.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BINGHAM (after having voted for Mr. MOSES). Has the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. BINGHAM (after having voted for Mr. MOSES). I have a general pair with that Senator. Therefore, being unable to obtain a transfer, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senators from Washington [Mr. JONES and Mr. DILL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT] are necessarily detained in committee meetings; and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] wires that he is detained on an important Government emergency.

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I also desire to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] are necessarily out of the city.

The roll call resulted:

FOR SENATOR PITTMAN—31

Ashurst	Copeland	Kendrick	Smith
Bailey	Costigan	King	Swanson
Barkley	George	Logan	Thomas, Okla.
Black	Gore	McGill	Trammell
Bratton	Harris	Morrison	Tydings
Broussard	Harrison	Neely	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mass.
Coolidge	Hull	Sheppard	

FOR SENATOR MOSES—24

Austin	Glenn	Johnson	Shortridge
Barbour	Goldsborough	Kean	Smoot
Dale	Hale	Keyes	Steiner
Davis	Hastings	McNary	Vandenberg
Dickinson	Hatfield	Metcalf	Watson
Fess	Hebert	Patterson	White

FOR SENATOR VANDENBERG—10

Blaine	Couzens	La Follette	Shipstead
Borah	Frazier	Norris	
Capper	Howell	Nye	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote Senator PITTMAN has received 31 votes, Senator MOSES 24 votes, and Senator VANDENBERG 10 votes. Sixty-five votes having been cast, and 33 being necessary for a choice, and no Senator having received a majority of the votes, there is no election; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. In his absence, being unable to obtain a transfer, I withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote for Senator MOSES.

Mr. BULOW (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BYRNES (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous roll call, I withhold my vote.

Mr. KENDRICK (when Mr. CAREY's name was called). Making the same announcement as before with respect to the absence of my colleague, I desire to state that he is paired with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY]. If my colleague [Mr. CAREY] were present, he would vote for Senator MOSES, and I understand that if the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] were present he would vote for Senator PITTMAN.

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

Mr. HASTINGS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair, which I transfer to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN], I vote for Senator MOSES.

Mr. MCKELLAR (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSES. I desire to repeat the announcement of my pair which I made on the last roll call.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], I vote for Mr. PITTMAN.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and in his absence I withhold my vote. If the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] were present, he would vote for Senator PITTMAN. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote for Senator VANDENBERG.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BLACK. As previously announced, my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] is unavoidably absent on official business. He is paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS]. If my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] were present, he would vote for Senator PITTMAN.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS];

The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

The roll call resulted as follows:

FOR SENATOR PITTMAN—31

Ashurst	Copeland	Kendrick	Smith
Bailey	Costigan	King	Swanson
Barkley	George	Logan	Thomas, Okla.
Black	Gore	McGill	Trammell
Bratton	Harris	Morrison	Tydings
Broussard	Harrison	Neely	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mass.
Coolidge	Hull	Sheppard	

FOR SENATOR MOSES—24

Austin	Glenn	Johnson	Shortridge
Barbour	Goldsborough	Kean	Smoot
Dale	Hale	Keyes	Steiner
Davis	Hastings	McNary	Vandenberg
Dickinson	Hatfield	Metcalfe	Watson
Fess	Hebert	Patterson	White

FOR SENATOR VANDENBERG—10

Blaine	Couzens	Le Follette	Shipstead
Borah	Frazier	Norris	
Capper	Howell	Nye	

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** On this ballot Senator PITTMAN received 31 votes, Senator MOSES 24 votes, and Senator VANDENBERG 10 votes. Sixty-five votes have been cast; necessary for a choice, 33. No Senator having received a majority of the votes cast, there is no election.

LANDS IN LOUISIANA AND MISSISSIPPI

**Mr. BROUSSARD.** Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** The resolution will be reported for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 126), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby respectfully requested to suspend for 90 days from this date the further sale and patent of lands in Louisiana and Mississippi under the act approved April 11, 1928.

**Mr. McNARY.** Mr. President, has the resolution been referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, which has jurisdiction of the subject matter of the resolution?

**Mr. BROUSSARD.** I have conferred with the chairman of that committee, and he has no objection to the resolution. This is an urgent matter, and I wish the Senator would withhold any objection he may have in mind until I have opportunity to make a statement.

**Mr. McNARY.** Very well.

**Mr. BROUSSARD.** Mr. President, on January 6, 1930, Senator Ransdell introduced in the Senate the following bill:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent certain lands in Louisiana and Mississippi," approved April 11, 1928, is hereby repealed.

As we all know, toward the close of the last session there was a congestion of legislative matters, and no action was taken on this bill. My colleague went out of the Senate with the close of the last session, so I have been requested by the same parties who suggested the legislation to him to introduce a similar bill, which I did introduce on the 10th of December last.

The Committee on Public Lands and Surveys has had no meetings in the meantime, and after I had been given to understand by the Department of the Interior that there would be no disposition of the lands affected, I have been advised that during the holidays an opinion was rendered in a case involving such lands.

So far as I am advised by the people interested who have gotten in touch with me, the act of April 11, 1928, would seem to grant a prior right to an individual who has never been on the property, and deprive others who have been on

the property and who, under the general public land laws of the United States, would have preference. Not only that, but this act of April 11, 1928, deprives ex-soldiers of a prior right to enter these lands, and the department has refused to grant any patents under the general laws to ex-soldiers who have applied for them. This is merely to suspend the granting of patents or the selling of those lands for 90 days so that the committee may consider the matter.

I tried the best way I could to reach the committee during the holidays. I was notified about five days ago and got in touch with the chairman of the committee immediately after his return. After getting in touch with the Secretary of the Interior, who promised to give me an answer to-day, I found it necessary to do something because I expect to leave the city to-morrow. The committee will have hearings, but I would not like to have these lands disposed of to a perfect stranger to that community when others have prior rights there.

The situation is entirely in conflict with the general public land laws of the United States. This measure was enacted into law when no one paid any particular attention to it, so I am informed, and for a special purpose. I am not charging that to anybody, because I do not know who introduced the bill; but such is the information I have. In view of the fact that I have to leave the city to-morrow I ask the Senate to pass the resolution deferring the matter for 90 days until the committee can act on it.

**Mr. McNARY.** The bill has not reached the committee, I understood the Senator to say?

**Mr. BROUSSARD.** The bill has been referred to the committee, but the committee has had no meeting up until this time.

**Mr. NYE.** Mr. President, if I may be permitted a brief statement, the committee had before it in a former session of the Congress a bill similar to that which the Senator from Louisiana has introduced in this session. Hearings were held on that bill and the hearings were printed. I have endeavored to ascertain why the committee took no action on the legislation following the hearings. I have been unable to ascertain why, unless it was merely a case of the committee being crowded and others interested directly in the legislation being crowded to a point where they could not follow through with it. The hearings are printed and are a matter of record.

It has occurred to me, in my contact with the Senator from Louisiana to-day, that there certainly would be no harm done in the acceptance of the resolution which he has offered, to the end that the committee may be afforded a chance straightforward to resume its hearings and give more definite consideration to the pending legislation.

**Mr. McNARY.** I have no objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

**Mr. McNARY.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATIONS REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate sundry nominations, which were appropriately referred.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS

**Mr. AUSTIN**, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of William F. Rampendahl, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney, eastern district of Oklahoma.

**Mr. HASTINGS**, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Edward W. Wells, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney, eastern district of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee what, if any, report has been made upon the nomination of Mr. Justice Morton to the United States Circuit Court for the District of Massachusetts?

Mr. NORRIS. The committee reported that nomination back to the Senate to-day. It will be on the calendar at the next executive session.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is not on to-day's calendar?

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator.

#### REREFERENCE OF NOMINATION OF SAMUEL PURVIS

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary I ask that the nomination of Samuel Purvis, to be United States marshal, middle district of Georgia, be referred back to the Judiciary Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and, without objection, the nomination will be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 5, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 4, 1932*

#### CONSUL GENERAL

Emil Sauer, of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a consul, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

#### SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS

Thomas S. Stephenson, of Altoona, Pa., to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 11, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa., in place of James E. Rininger, whose term expired on March 17, 1931.

#### POSTMASTERS

##### ALABAMA

John L. Miller to be postmaster at Berry, Ala., in place of J. L. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1931.

Anna M. Nabors to be postmaster at Boothton, Ala., in place of A. M. Nabors. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Charles W. Massengale to be postmaster at Greensboro, Ala., in place of L. M. Otts, resigned.

Euline G. Holsonback to be postmaster at Kennedy, Ala., in place of H. M. Guin, deceased.

Robert S. Cartledge to be postmaster at Mobile, Ala., in place of R. S. Cartledge. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Ivy J. King to be postmaster at Opp, Ala., in place of A. R. Woodham. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Frances J. Davis to be postmaster at Repton, Ala., in place of D. M. McMillan, resigned.

Tyler M. Swann to be postmaster at Roanoke, Ala., in place of T. M. Swann. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Clarence N. Anderson to be postmaster at Silverhill, Ala., in place of E. P. Forsman, deceased.

##### ALASKA

Earl T. Stannard to be postmaster at Latouche, Alaska, in place of E. T. Stannard. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

##### ARIZONA

Herman L. Snyder to be postmaster at Ajo, Ariz., in place of L. L. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1931.

Leonard D. Redfield to be postmaster at Benson, Ariz., in place of L. D. Redfield. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Harry G. White to be postmaster at Glendale, Ariz., in place of H. G. White. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

Luther Cadwell to be postmaster at Holbrook, Ariz., in place of Luther Cadwell. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Henry M. Hall to be postmaster at Mesa, Ariz., in place of H. M. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Myrtle Prophet to be postmaster at Oatman, Ariz., in place of G. A. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1930.

George H. Staiger to be postmaster at Ray, Ariz., in place of G. H. Staiger. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

James R. Welker to be postmaster at Safford, Ariz., in place of C. B. Yett. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

Anna M. Hall to be postmaster at San Simon, Ariz. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Dilworth Baird to be postmaster at Tempe, Ariz., in place of R. W. Still, deceased.

Luella L. Reneer to be postmaster at Thatcher, Ariz., in place of O. L. Larson. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1931.

Charles G. Montgomery to be postmaster at Whiteriver, Ariz. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Chester A. Williamson to be postmaster at Willcox, Ariz., in place of C. A. Williamson. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Warren O. Perkins to be postmaster at Williams, Ariz., in place of F. O. Polson, removed.

Alfred R. Kleindienst to be postmaster at Winslow, Ariz., in place of A. R. Kleindienst. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

##### ARKANSAS

Mary Brown to be postmaster at Alpena Pass, Ark., in place of Mary Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Roy W. Stevens to be postmaster at Ashdown, Ark., in place of R. W. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Thomas T. West to be postmaster at Beebe, Ark., in place of T. T. West. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Milton R. Stimson to be postmaster at Brinkley, Ark., in place of M. R. Stimson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charlie I. Grayson to be postmaster at Camden, Ark., in place of J. C. Russell, deceased.

Kay S. Rolley to be postmaster at Crawfordville, Ark., in place of K. S. Rolley. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Edith M. Cook to be postmaster at De Valls Bluff, Ark., in place of E. M. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Robert M. Deason to be postmaster at El Dorado, Ark., in place of R. M. Deason. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William J. Rumsey to be postmaster at Hardy, Ark., in place of W. J. Rumsey. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Oliver A. Hill to be postmaster at Hartford, Ark., in place of O. A. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Ralph C. Lehman to be postmaster at Hoxie, Ark., in place of C. C. Cherry. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1930.

Charles L. Jones to be postmaster at Junction City, Ark., in place of C. L. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

George H. C. Palmer to be postmaster at McGehee, Ark., in place of G. H. C. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Dennis M. Townsend to be postmaster at Mena, Ark., in place of D. M. Townsend. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1931.

Ethel Roberts to be postmaster at Mountain Pine, Ark., in place of L. D. Bledsoe, resigned.

Harry L. Shambarger to be postmaster at Mulberry, Ark., in place of H. L. Shambarger. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Paul Smith to be postmaster at Nettleton, Ark., in place of Paul Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Roscoe J. Gammill to be postmaster at Ozark, Ark., in place of A. J. Hansberry, resigned.

Ned P. Atkin to be postmaster at Parkdale, Ark., in place of N. P. Atkin. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

James H. Ward to be postmaster at Quitman, Ark., in place of J. H. Ward. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Edress A. Casner to be postmaster at Rector, Ark., in place of M. J. Gogue. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1931.

John J. Eckart to be postmaster at Subiaco, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Nona E. Robertson to be postmaster at Thornton, Ark., in place of N. E. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

#### CALIFORNIA

Chester T. Steele to be postmaster at Arroyo Grande, Calif., in place of E. F. Hopkins, deceased.

Harry W. Crider to be postmaster at Artesia, Calif., in place of H. C. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Jessie A. Collins to be postmaster at Clearwater, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Chelso A. Maghetti to be postmaster at Davis, Calif., in place of C. A. Maghetti. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

John L. Olson to be postmaster at Decoto, Calif., in place of J. L. Olson. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Knowles C. Weiss to be postmaster at Downey, Calif., in place of J. E. Van Matre, deceased.

Charles C. Jenkins to be postmaster at El Centro, Calif., in place of C. C. Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Lillian G. Brackett to be postmaster at Geyserville, Calif., in place of L. G. Brackett. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

George E. Preston to be postmaster at Harbor City, Calif., in place of Charles Hofstetter, resigned.

William R. Harriman to be postmaster at Hondo, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Minnie E. Dewar to be postmaster at Hueneme, Calif., in place of M. E. Dewar. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Clarence A. Acton to be postmaster at Inglewood, Calif., in place of F. E. Laxdal, deceased.

Fred W. McCullah to be postmaster at Long Beach, Calif., in place of F. W. McCullah. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Grace D. Perkins to be postmaster at Los Nietos, Calif., in place of G. D. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

James M. Cremin to be postmaster at Marysville, Calif., in place of Ed Lewis, deceased.

Donald L. Burbeck to be postmaster at Mill Valley, Calif., in place of D. L. Burbeck. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1930.

Flora Dahl to be postmaster at Mokelumne Hill, Calif., in place of Flora Dahl. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

John L. Steward to be postmaster at Monterey, Calif., in place of J. L. Steward. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

Jacob J. Shroy to be postmaster at Newman, Calif., in place of J. J. Shroy. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Sidney E. Burritt to be postmaster at Niland, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Earl D. Cline to be postmaster at North Los Angeles, Calif., in place of E. D. Cline. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Warren N. Garland to be postmaster at Oakdale, Calif., in place of W. N. Garland. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1931.

James H. Pearce to be postmaster at Oilfields, Calif., in place of W. M. Vaughn, resigned.

Fadette T. Gossard to be postmaster at Olive View, Calif., in place of F. T. Gossard. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

John H. Canning to be postmaster at Oxnard, Calif., in place of Flournoy Carter. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Florence E. Buckner to be postmaster at Pacific Palisades, Calif., in place of F. E. Buckner. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Edgar L. Etter to be postmaster at Palos Verdes Estates, Calif., in place of E. L. Etter. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Euell Y. Gray to be postmaster at Placerville, Calif., in place of J. D. Elliot, resigned.

Mary K. Davis to be postmaster at San Carlos, Calif., in place of M. K. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Josephine Zucca to be postmaster at Selby, Calif., in place of Josephine Zucca. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Alice C. Elmore to be postmaster at Sequoia National Park, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Addie E. Waits to be postmaster at Solana Beach, Calif., in place of A. E. Waits. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Meta C. Stofen to be postmaster at Sonoma, Calif., in place of M. C. Stofen. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

Myrtle E. Catterall to be postmaster at Sunland, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Bess Morabe to be postmaster at Sutter Creek, Calif., in place of V. W. Norton, deceased.

Nicholas Kitchak to be postmaster at Taft, Calif., in place of C. Z. Irvine, removed.

Edwin A. Reeves to be postmaster at Terra Bella, Calif., in place of F. S. Stephenson, resigned.

Pierce P. Correll to be postmaster at Tujunga, Calif., in place of N. M. Chapman, resigned.

Cinderella L. Phiney to be postmaster at Tustin, Calif., in place of C. L. Phiney. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Mathilda Busch to be postmaster at Verdugo City, Calif., in place of Mathilda Busch. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Hazel E. Avise to be postmaster at Walnut Creek, Calif., in place of H. E. Avise. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Edith M. Kennedy to be postmaster at Weimar, Calif., in place of E. M. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

#### COLORADO

Adelbert E. Humeston to be postmaster at Collbran, Colo., in place of A. E. Humeston. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1926.

Alexander G. Johnson to be postmaster at Fort Lupton, Colo., in place of A. G. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

William B. Sweezy to be postmaster at Fort Lyon, Colo., in place of E. J. Feistel, deceased.

Lawrence H. Dewey to be postmaster at Fruita, Colo., in place of L. H. Dewey. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Lula D. Trimble to be postmaster at Georgetown, Colo., in place of L. D. Trimble. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Walter H. Morris to be postmaster at Granada, Colo., in place of G. W. Karn, deceased.

James M. Brown to be postmaster at Mancos, Colo., in place of J. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

William A. Sawyer to be postmaster at Mount Morrison, Colo., in place of W. A. Sawyer. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Ellsworth A. Weller to be postmaster at New Castle, Colo., in place of E. A. Weller. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Anna Richards to be postmaster at Ouray, Colo., in place of Anna Richards. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Juan R. Valdez to be postmaster at San Luis, Colo. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Harry G. Moore to be postmaster at Victor, Colo., in place of D. D. Pennington, deceased.

#### CONNECTICUT

John W. Cook to be postmaster at Beacon Falls, Conn., in place of J. W. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Leontine M. Root to be postmaster at East Berlin, Conn., in place of L. M. Root. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Sarah L. Ruic to be postmaster at Farmington, Conn., in place of S. L. Ruic. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Prentice W. Chase to be postmaster at Jewett City, Conn., in place of W. T. Crumb, deceased.

W. Burton Allen to be postmaster at Litchfield, Conn., in place of W. B. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Joseph H. Derenthal to be postmaster at Madison, Conn., in place of J. H. Derenthal. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Ernest F. Brown to be postmaster at Manchester, Conn., in place of E. F. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Courtland C. Potter to be postmaster at Mystic, Conn., in place of C. C. Potter. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Walter E. Brown to be postmaster at Naugatuck, Conn., in place of W. E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Henry R. Carignan to be postmaster at North Grosvenor Dale, Conn., in place of H. R. Carignan. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Casper K. Bailey to be postmaster at Norwich, Conn., in place of C. K. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Fred R. Alford to be postmaster at Oakville, Conn., in place of F. R. Alford. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William C. Bushnell to be postmaster at Plantsville, Conn., in place of W. C. Bushnell. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William P. Stone to be postmaster at Salisbury, Conn., in place of W. P. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Thomas B. McDonald to be postmaster at Sharon, Conn., in place of T. B. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Nelson E. Welch to be postmaster at Somers, Conn., in place of N. E. Welch. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John P. McGrath to be postmaster at Southington, Conn., in place of J. P. McGrath. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Frank B. Crocker to be postmaster at South Manchester, Conn., in place of O. F. Toop, deceased.

John V. Abbott to be postmaster at Watertown, Conn., in place of J. V. Abbott. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Adele P. Brush to be postmaster at West Cornwall, Conn., in place of A. P. Brush. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

#### DELAWARE

George W. Mullin to be postmaster at Marshallton, Del., in place of G. W. Mullin. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

George H. Wright to be postmaster at Smyrna, Del., in place of A. L. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

#### FLORIDA

George P. Farnall to be postmaster at Belle Glade, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Harold A. Rosenberg to be postmaster at Canal Point, Fla., in place of C. C. Coleman, removed.

Stuart T. Morse to be postmaster at Greenville, Fla., in place of J. T. Phillips, deceased.

John F. Yearty to be postmaster at Gulf Hammock, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Joseph M. Griffin to be postmaster at Holopaw, Fla., in place of J. M. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Sara E. Sweat to be postmaster at Inverness, Fla., in place of A. Van Wormer, resigned.

Frederick L. Cory to be postmaster at Jupiter, Fla., in place of R. E. Damon. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1929.

William H. Turner to be postmaster at Largo, Fla., in place of W. H. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

Cason Walker to be postmaster at Milton, Fla., in place of J. H. Collins, removed.

Charles W. Stewart to be postmaster at Naples, Fla., in place of C. W. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1931.

Sinclair A. Bryan to be postmaster at Raiford, Fla., in place of L. B. Ritch. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Thomas J. Chason to be postmaster at Tallahassee, Fla., in place of W. H. May. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1930.

Elizabeth D. Barnard to be postmaster at Tampa, Fla., in place of E. D. Barnard. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1931.

Jessie A. Heath to be postmaster at White Springs, Fla., in place of Maxfield Sellers, resigned.

#### GEORGIA

Ralph A. Waters to be postmaster at Alpharetta, Ga., in place of R. A. Waters. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Lucius Hannon to be postmaster at Atco, Ga., in place of Lucius Hannon. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1930.

James A. Brackett to be postmaster at Blairsville, Ga., in place of J. A. Brackett. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1931.

Elizabeth H. Quinn to be postmaster at Barnesville, Ga., in place of C. P. Graddick, resigned.

Floy D. Walker to be postmaster at Blue Ridge, Ga., in place of F. D. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

William B. King to be postmaster at Bluffton, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Joseph D. Long to be postmaster at Bremen, Ga., in place of J. D. Long. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1930.

Martha C. Aultman to be postmaster at Byron, Ga., in place of M. C. Aultman. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1931.

Jesse S. Weathers to be postmaster at Cairo, Ga., in place of J. B. Crawford, resigned.

Robert H. Ridgway to be postmaster at Canon, Ga., in place of R. H. Ridgway. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Alexander Davidson to be postmaster at Cleveland, Ga., in place of Alexander Davidson. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1930.

Fred Fitts to be postmaster at Dahlonega, Ga., in place of Fred Fitts. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Horace T. George to be postmaster at Eatonton, Ga., in place of H. T. George. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1930.

James H. McCowen to be postmaster at Forsyth, Ga., in place of L. A. Hooks. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

William C. Chambers to be postmaster at Fort Gaines, Ga., in place of W. C. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

Charles H. Crumbley to be postmaster at Greensboro, Ga., in place of C. H. Crumbley. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1931.

Lois Horton to be postmaster at Guyton, Ga., in place of M. D. Shearouse. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1930.

John H. Cash to be postmaster at Hapeville, Ga., in place of S. K. Hogue. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1930.

Sara B. Fox to be postmaster at Harlem, Ga., in place of S. B. Fox. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1930.

Joseph O. Rodgers to be postmaster at Homerville, Ga., in place of W. A. Howell, removed.

George D. Griffith to be postmaster at Kinderlou, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

James C. Perry to be postmaster at Kingsland, Ga., in place of W. N. Casey. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Vennie M. Jones to be postmaster at Lavonia, Ga., in place of V. M. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1930.

Kate Harris to be postmaster at Leesburg, Ga., in place of Kate Harris. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1930.

Clifton O. Lloyd to be postmaster at Lindale, Ga., in place of C. O. Lloyd. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1931.

Theron E. Watson to be postmaster at Lithonia, Ga., in place of T. P. Philips. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1930.

Christine P. Hankinson to be postmaster at McDonough, Ga., in place of C. P. Hankinson. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1930.

Benjamin N. Walters to be postmaster at Martin, Ga., in place of B. N. Walters. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Huram R. Hancock to be postmaster at Maysville, Ga., in place of H. R. Hancock. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Effie Hambleton to be postmaster at Meigs, Ga., in place of J. H. Pullen. Incumbent's commission expired June 30, 1930.

Rois A. Martin to be postmaster at Milner, Ga., in place of R. A. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired May 21, 1930.

Marcus G. Keown to be postmaster at Mount Berry, Ga., in place of M. G. Keown. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1931.

Minnie P. Abt to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ga., in place of M. P. Abt. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

J. Stanley Newton to be postmaster at Norman Park, Ga., in place of R. L. Callan, resigned.

May Mixon to be postmaster at Patterson, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Marie E. Harrell to be postmaster at Pearson, Ga., in place of M. E. Harrell. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Joe B. Saunders to be postmaster at Ringgold, Ga., in place of J. B. Saunders. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1930.

Baxter Sutton to be postmaster at Rochelle, Ga., in place of Baxter Sutton. Incumbent's commission expired June 30, 1930.

Eugene H. Wood to be postmaster at Roswell, Ga., in place of E. H. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1930.

Gordon G. Ridgway to be postmaster at Royston, Ga., in place of G. G. Ridgway. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1930.

Isaac F. Arnow to be postmaster at St. Marys, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Watson K. Bargeron to be postmaster at Sardis, Ga., in place of W. K. Bargeron. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1930.

James M. Wright to be postmaster at Screven, Ga., in place of J. M. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1930.

Arthur F. West to be postmaster at Shannon, Ga., in place of W. E. Colquitt, resigned.

William V. Cobb to be postmaster at Smyrna, Ga., in place of W. V. Cobb. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

Claude M. Proctor to be postmaster at Summit, Ga., in place of C. M. Proctor. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1930.

Morine Allgood to be postmaster at Temple, Ga., in place of M. E. Sewell. Incumbent's commission expired June 22, 1930.

William B. Smith to be postmaster at Tennille, Ga., in place of W. B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Halton L. Dayton to be postmaster at Thomaston, Ga., in place of H. L. Dayton. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1930.

Paul J. Ridgway to be postmaster at Toccoa, Ga., in place of P. J. Ridgway. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1931.

Nathaniel O. Carter to be postmaster at Vidalia, Ga., in place of N. O. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired July 3, 1930.

Frank H. Moxley to be postmaster at Wadley, Ga., in place of F. H. Moxley. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1930.

Rebie I. Corbin to be postmaster at Warrenton, Ga., in place of W. T. Pilcher. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1929.

Walter A. Seaman to be postmaster at Waycross, Ga., in place of J. F. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1930.

#### HAWAII

Charles S. Ishii to be postmaster at Kamuela, Hawaii. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Antone Fernandez to be postmaster at Kekaha, Hawaii, in place of Antone Fernandez. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Arthur W. Carlson to be postmaster at Lanai City, Hawaii, in place of H. B. Brown, resigned.

Virginia S. Mathias to be postmaster at Waiakea, Hawaii. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Antone F. Costa to be postmaster at Wailuku, Hawaii, in place of A. F. Costa. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Louis P. Lino to be postmaster at Waipahu, Hawaii, in place of E. H. Travis, resigned.

#### IDAHO

Iva F. Madden to be postmaster at Cascade, Idaho, in place of H. P. Gorton, removed.

Arthur D. Kelley to be postmaster at Challis, Idaho, in place of B. D. Fox. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1931.

Ward Evans to be postmaster at Craigmont, Idaho, in place of George Odenius, deceased.

Benjamin H. Thomas to be postmaster at Dubois, Idaho, in place of E. M. Whitzel, removed.

Vida I. Perry to be postmaster at Elk City, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Herbert L. Spencer to be postmaster at Paris, Idaho, in place of H. L. Spencer. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

Carrie M. Shortlidge to be postmaster at Peck, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

#### ILLINOIS

John R. Funkhouser to be postmaster at Albion, Ill., in place of J. R. Funkhouser. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1931.

Wilbur G. Black to be postmaster at Aledo, Ill., in place of H. R. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Raymond C. Moon to be postmaster at Annawan, Ill., in place of R. C. Moon. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Nancy Michael to be postmaster at Argo, Ill., in place of Nancy Michael. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1930.

H. Melville Potter to be postmaster at Ashley, Ill., in place of H. T. Peeck. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

Earl W. Nichols to be postmaster at Assumption, Ill., in place of A. C. Etchison. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1931.

Claude I. Miller to be postmaster at Atlanta, Ill., in place of M. F. Watt, deceased.

Joseph J. Janda to be postmaster at Berwyn, Ill., in place of J. J. Janda. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1930.

George W. Mockmore to be postmaster at Camp Point, Ill., in place of Louis Lindenbauer. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1931.

Harold B. Hamilton to be postmaster at Carlock, Ill., in place of U. G. Stutzman. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Charles H. Collins to be postmaster at Casey, Ill., in place of C. H. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired June 30, 1930.

Charles V. Champion, sr., to be postmaster at Catlin, Ill., in place of Lem Neville, removed.

Richard Tyer to be postmaster at Cave in Rock, Ill., in place of Richard Tyer. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1930.

Clarence Duckles to be postmaster at Chesterfield, Ill., in place of Clarence Duckles. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Clarence L. Kiger to be postmaster at Cisne, Ill., in place of C. L. Kiger. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1930.

Jessie L. Wilson to be postmaster at Dalton City, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

William C. Lewman to be postmaster at Danville, Ill., in place of W. C. Lewman. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Ruby R. Remick to be postmaster at Earlville, Ill., in place of J. E. Hughes, removed.

Edith M. Tuxhorn to be postmaster at Edwardsville, Ill., in place of E. M. Tuxhorn. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Eldon P. Fleming to be postmaster at Fairfield, Ill., in place of E. D. Freshwater. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

William F. Temple to be postmaster at Fairmount, Ill., in place of W. F. Temple. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

William M. Karr to be postmaster at Flora, Ill., in place of W. M. Karr. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Walter J. Fagan to be postmaster at Flossmoor, Ill., in place of W. J. Fagan. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

William W. Ramsey to be postmaster at Galatia, Ill., in place of P. W. Norman. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

John J. Lord to be postmaster at Galva, Ill., in place of J. J. Lord. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

August F. Kietzman to be postmaster at Gilman, Ill., in place of G. L. Thrasher. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

Claire A. Harlan to be postmaster at Girard, Ill., in place of J. J. Stowe. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

George F. Sutton to be postmaster at Harvey, Ill., in place of G. F. Sutton. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Leo H. Borgelt to be postmaster at Havana, Ill., in place of L. H. Borgelt. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Earl Cory to be postmaster at Hazel Crest, Ill., in place of Earl Cory. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Ralph K. Munro to be postmaster at Heyworth, Ill., in place of R. O. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1931.

George H. Bargh to be postmaster at Kinmundy, Ill., in place of G. H. Bargh. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1931.

Allen C. Stoltz to be postmaster at Lawrenceville, Ill., in place of E. H. Mills. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1930.

Frank E. Fairlamb to be postmaster at Leaf River, Ill., in place of H. H. Myers, removed.

Fred C. Whisler to be postmaster at Mackinaw, Ill., in place of G. A. Field. Incumbent's commission expired May 14, 1930.

William L. Beebe to be postmaster at Manito, Ill., in place of W. L. Beebe. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Mode Morrison to be postmaster at Manteno, Ill., in place of Mode Morrison. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1931.

William H. Blakely to be postmaster at Milan, Ill., in place of C. D. Smith, deceased.

John W. Meierhofer to be postmaster at Minonk, Ill., in place of M. B. Heider. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

Alonzo M. Spaeth to be postmaster at Mount Carmel, Ill., in place of A. M. Spaeth. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Henry J. Troeger to be postmaster at Mount Olive, Ill., in place of F. A. Sassenmannshausen. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

William E. Tharp to be postmaster at Nashville, Ill., in place of W. E. Tharp. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

James H. Cawthon to be postmaster at Oakwood, Ill., in place of J. H. Cawthon. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Lawrence P. Ready to be postmaster at Odell, Ill., in place of W. D. Abbaduska. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Wales S. Stamper to be postmaster at Olympia Fields, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Bernie N. Griffin to be postmaster at Patoka, Ill., in place of B. N. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Ulysses S. G. Blakely to be postmaster at Plainfield, Ill., in place of U. S. G. Blakely. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Alice G. Dunbar to be postmaster at Prairie City, Ill., in place of Jefferson Louk. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Henry L. Haynes to be postmaster at Ramsey, Ill., in place of H. L. Haynes. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Florence Roseberry to be postmaster at Riverton, Ill., in place of Katherine Adams. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1931.

Leverett E. Phelps to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Ill., in place of J. K. Hoagland. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Albert L. Pickel to be postmaster at Springfield, Ill., in place of W. H. Conkling. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Margaret O. Wolff to be postmaster at Steger, Ill., in place of H. O. Manuel, removed.

Bond B. Blackman to be postmaster at Stonefort, Ill., in place of B. B. Blackman. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Harold M. Lathrop to be postmaster at Sumner, Ill., in place of J. W. Vangilder, removed.

Herman A. Eisenmayer to be postmaster at Trenton, Ill., in place of C. A. Hollow. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1930.

William C. Karr to be postmaster at Vermont, Ill., in place of W. C. Karr. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Ernest L. Crain to be postmaster at Villa Ridge, Ill., in place of E. L. Crain. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Henry Zobel to be postmaster at Warsaw, Ill., in place of M. T. Hunt. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1931.

Walter W. Lesch to be postmaster at Washburn, Ill., in place of V. E. Buckingham. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1931.

Vernon G. Keplinger to be postmaster at Waverly, Ill., in place of V. G. Keplinger. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

Lloyd R. Winn to be postmaster at White Hall, Ill., in place of L. R. Winn. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Herbert Tucker to be postmaster at Williamsfield, Ill., in place of Herbert Tucker. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Nathan S. Doty, jr., to be postmaster at Williamsville, Ill., in place of Doris Shuck. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

#### INDIANA

Grace K. Freeman to be postmaster at Amboy, Ind., in place of M. J. Haines, removed.

Guy J. Shaughnessy to be postmaster at Angola, Ind., in place of F. B. Rowley. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Roscoe V. Dunn to be postmaster at Atlanta, Ind., in place of A. G. Kauffman, resigned.

J. Frank McDermond, jr., to be postmaster at Attica, Ind., in place of E. D. Robison. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1931.

Neil D. McCallum to be postmaster at Batesville, Ind., in place of N. D. McCallum. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Edward R. Siegel to be postmaster at Boonville, Ind., in place of H. P. Roetzel, removed.

Arthur J. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Cedar Lake, Ind., in place of A. J. McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

Ralph E. Busse to be postmaster at Chesterton, Ind., in place of L. J. Gustafson, removed.

James E. Reed to be postmaster at Columbus, Ind., in place of C. G. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Robert E. Black to be postmaster at Corydon, Ind., in place of R. E. Black. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Frost R. Harden to be postmaster at Covington, Ind., in place of J. W. McMahon. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Ivan W. Blase to be postmaster at Cynthiana, Ind., in place of I. W. Blase. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Harvey E. Mayall to be postmaster at Decker, Ind., in place of H. E. Mayall. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Burr S. Balser to be postmaster at Delphi, Ind., in place of Morton Hefner. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

John M. Sweeney to be postmaster at Dugger, Ind., in place of J. M. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Lester L. Wildman to be postmaster at Dupont, Ind., in place of L. L. Wildman. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

William Teutemacher to be postmaster at Dyer, Ind., in place of William Teutemacher. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John A. Thompson to be postmaster at Edinburg, Ind., in place of Samuel Haslam. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Arthur E. Dill to be postmaster at Fort Branch, Ind., in place of A. E. Dill. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1931.

Raymond B. McConnell to be postmaster at Francisco, Ind., in place of G. P. Witherspoon, removed.

Carl W. Sims to be postmaster at Frankfort, Ind., in place of E. A. Spray. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Clyde W. Ward to be postmaster at Gas City, Ind., in place of C. W. Ward. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Normal V. McClellan to be postmaster at Goodland, Ind., in place of W. G. Beal. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1930.

Frank M. Martin to be postmaster at Gosport, Ind., in place of T. C. Dodd. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1931.

Clarence W. Bertram to be postmaster at Haubstadt, Ind., in place of C. H. Magenheimer. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1930.

George O. Davidson to be postmaster at Idaville, Ind., in place of G. O. Davidson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Leslie D. Clancy to be postmaster at Indianapolis, Ind., in place of R. H. Bryson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Ernest M. Hunt to be postmaster at Kokomo, Ind., in place of Morton Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Harry E. Nichols to be postmaster at Madison, Ind., in place of H. H. Cope. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Logan Motsinger to be postmaster at Medora, Ind., in place of M. I. Massena, deceased.

George H. Merritt to be postmaster at Michigantown, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Carlyle D. Barnes to be postmaster at Milford, Ind., in place of J. W. Robinson, deceased.

Harry R. Manlove to be postmaster at Milton, Ind., in place of C. H. Callaway, deceased.

William H. Wright to be postmaster at Montezuma, Ind., in place of W. H. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Philip E. Rowe to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ind., in place of O. A. Weilbrenner, removed.

Henry D. Long to be postmaster at New Harmony, Ind., in place of H. D. Long. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

Charles E. Ballance to be postmaster at Oaktown, Ind., in place of C. E. Ballance. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Dwight M. Hayes to be postmaster at Odon, Ind., in place of E. P. Laughlin. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1930.

Pearle H. Moulton to be postmaster at Parker, Ind., in place of C. F. Morris, resigned.

Nellie G. Hallowell to be postmaster at Pendleton, Ind., in place of C. L. Bragdon. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1930.

Lloyd Burch to be postmaster at Petersburg, Ind., in place of W. E. Davisson, removed.

Jacob C. McCarter to be postmaster at Pierceton, Ind., in place of E. E. McCarter, deceased.

Sol A. Tuttle to be postmaster at Pleasant Lake, Ind., in place of Martha Wise. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1930.

Alfred M. Johnson to be postmaster at Princeton, Ind., in place of F. R. Ewing. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1930.

James J. McCauley to be postmaster at Richmond, Ind., in place of E. E. Eggemeyer, deceased.

Ernest A. Bodey to be postmaster at Rising Sun, Ind., in place of E. A. Bodey. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Hilbert Bennett to be postmaster at Rockport, Ind., in place of G. H. Walker, removed.

Frank B. Harding to be postmaster at Rockville, Ind., in place of C. A. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Iver C. Bain to be postmaster at Russellville, Ind., in place of S. D. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1931.

Sylvester H. Klueh to be postmaster at St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Ind., in place of S. H. Klueh. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Travis E. Carter to be postmaster at Seymour, Ind., in place of Haskell Lett. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Alfred W. Hill to be postmaster at Shelburn, Ind., in place of A. W. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Oris T. Kercheval to be postmaster at Sheridan, Ind., in place of C. V. Norman, deceased.

Newton H. Brown to be postmaster at Star City, Ind., in place of J. B. King, removed.

Charles L. Grishaw to be postmaster at Tipton, Ind., in place of C. L. Grishaw. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Omer R. Huff to be postmaster at Troy, Ind., in place of Lawrence O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1930.

Clyde H. Peters to be postmaster at Vallonia, Ind., in place of D. W. White. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1930.

Gretchen H. Cole to be postmaster at Vevay, Ind., in place of J. S. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1931.

Valance U. Slater to be postmaster at Warren, Ind., in place of D. P. Keller. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Claude C. Darnell to be postmaster at Waynetown, Ind., in place of Isaac Sutton. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1931.

James C. Harris to be postmaster at Windfall, Ind., in place of Fred Dunn, removed.

Harry J. Baker to be postmaster at Worthington, Ind., in place of Rex Hannum, deceased.

#### IOWA

Anna B. Chambers to be postmaster at Agency, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Edward J. Kooreman to be postmaster at Alton, Iowa, in place of E. J. Kooreman. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Lucian C. Tilden to be postmaster at Ames, Iowa, in place of L. C. Tilden. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Arthur L. Remley to be postmaster at Anamosa, Iowa, in place of A. L. Remley. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Eddy L. Newton to be postmaster at Anita, Iowa, in place of E. L. Newton. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Howard C. Walter to be postmaster at Arnolds Park, Iowa, in place of H. C. Walter. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

George L. Beeler to be postmaster at Bellevue, Iowa, in place of G. L. Beeler. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Lloyd Lock to be postmaster at Castana, Iowa, in place of Lloyd Lock. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Hellen B. Randolph to be postmaster at Chapin, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

William H. Beacon to be postmaster at Clayton, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Omar H. Brooks to be postmaster at Cleghorn, Iowa, in place of O. H. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William M. Crosier to be postmaster at Coggon, Iowa, in place of W. M. Crosier. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Earl F. McClelland to be postmaster at Corning, Iowa, in place of E. A. Cupp. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1930.

Orlean P. Riordan to be postmaster at Correctionville, Iowa, in place of O. P. Riordan. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Frank M. Williams to be postmaster at Council Bluffs, Iowa, in place of F. M. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Earl A. Rhinehart to be postmaster at Dallas Center, Iowa, in place of G. C. Lloyd, resigned.

Ressie E. Scheib to be postmaster at Delmar, Iowa, in place of R. E. Scheib. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Adam F. Deadrick to be postmaster at Dike, Iowa, in place of A. F. Deadrick. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Ralph R. Ray to be postmaster at Doon, Iowa, in place of R. R. Ray. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Howard C. Snyder to be postmaster at Earlville, Iowa, in place of H. C. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles A. Clark to be postmaster at Fort Des Moines, Iowa, in place of C. A. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

William L. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Glidden, Iowa, in place of W. L. McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles F. Christians to be postmaster at Grafton, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Robert D. Adey to be postmaster at Granger, Iowa, in place of R. D. Adey. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Howard L. Nickerson to be postmaster at Grundy Center, Iowa, in place of H. L. Nickerson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William F. Wolf to be postmaster at Hawarden, Iowa, in place of R. E. Metcalf. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

John C. Foster to be postmaster at Hedrick, Iowa, in place of J. C. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Alexander M. Donnan to be postmaster at Hudson, Iowa, in place of A. T. Joder, deceased.

John G. Devine to be postmaster at Humboldt, Iowa, in place of Frank Jaqua. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1930.

Alfred G. Rigby to be postmaster at Independence, Iowa, in place of A. G. Rigby. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Charles W. Woodward to be postmaster at Kellogg, Iowa, in place of C. W. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Dora M. Schenken to be postmaster at Keystone, Iowa, in place of D. M. Schenken. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Frank E. Gibbs to be postmaster at Klemme, Iowa, in place of E. A. Gibbs, deceased.

Maurice L. Curtis to be postmaster at Knoxville, Iowa, in place of M. L. Curtis. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Edwin E. Starr to be postmaster at Lake Park, Iowa, in place of E. E. Starr. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

James J. Pruitt to be postmaster at Larchwood, Iowa, in place of J. J. Pruitt. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Roland A. Walter to be postmaster at Lenox, Iowa, in place of J. E. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1931.

Fred A. Okell to be postmaster at Lewis, Iowa, in place of L. C. Temple, deceased.

Harold H. Phillips to be postmaster at Luverne, Iowa, in place of E. A. Haskell. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1931.

Frank L. Ratliff to be postmaster at Lynnville, Iowa, in place of A. L. Meredith, deceased.

William D. Lorenzen to be postmaster at McCallburg, Iowa, in place of W. D. Lorenzen. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Irven L. Donner to be postmaster at Malvern, Iowa, in place of I. L. Donner. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Gus E. Holmberg to be postmaster at Manning, Iowa, in place of G. E. Holmberg. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Thomas V. Welch to be postmaster at Marathon, Iowa, in place of L. H. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

Hope C. Niemann to be postmaster at Marcus, Iowa, in place of H. C. Niemann. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Harland J. Maurer to be postmaster at Mechanicsville, Iowa, in place of H. J. Maurer. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Milton G. Irwin to be postmaster at Merrill, Iowa, in place of M. G. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

William E. Males to be postmaster at Milo, Iowa, in place of W. E. Males. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

George Guyan to be postmaster at Monticello, Iowa, in place of George Guyan. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles S. Rogers to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Iowa, in place of C. S. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William S. McKee to be postmaster at Muscatine, Iowa, in place of W. S. McKee. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

James M. Crawford to be postmaster at New London, Iowa, in place of J. M. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Roy H. Bailey to be postmaster at Newton, Iowa, in place of R. H. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Alexander J. Irwin to be postmaster at New Virginia, Iowa, in place of A. J. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Lanah A. Lawler to be postmaster at North English, Iowa, in place of L. A. Lawler. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Carl A. Wissler to be postmaster at Oakdale, Iowa, in place of C. A. Wissler. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Christopher C. Morris to be postmaster at Oakland, Iowa, in place of C. C. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John B. Balkema to be postmaster at Orange City, Iowa, in place of J. B. Balkema. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Louis F. Bousquet to be postmaster at Pella, Iowa, in place of L. F. Bousquet. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Maude E. Barkley to be postmaster at Pierson, Iowa, in place of M. E. Barkley. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Silas L. McIntire to be postmaster at Pocahontas, Iowa, in place of S. L. McIntire. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

Edward Oldis to be postmaster at Preston, Iowa, in place of Edward Oldis. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Jo G. Milligan to be postmaster at Pulaski, Iowa, in place of J. G. Milligan. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Lola Thomas to be postmaster at Randolph, Iowa, in place of A. V. Gillette, resigned.

Regina W. Spiegelberg to be postmaster at Rembrandt, Iowa, in place of R. W. Spiegelberg. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Anna N. Dixon to be postmaster at Rock Valley, Iowa, in place of A. N. Dixon. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

H. Peter Hendrickson to be postmaster at Royal, Iowa, in place of J. M. Thomsen, resigned.

Lloyd R. Hughes to be postmaster at Sac City, Iowa, in place of L. R. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Gabriel L. Archer to be postmaster at St. Charles, Iowa, in place of G. L. Archer. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

Lucille Brouillette to be postmaster at Salix, Iowa, in place of Lucille Brouillette. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Warren W. Fulton to be postmaster at Selma, Iowa, in place of M. J. Stump. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Hiram K. Evans, jr., to be postmaster at Seymour, Iowa, in place of H. E. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

William H. Needham to be postmaster at Sigourney, Iowa, in place of H. M. Harlan, deceased.

Walter E. Witten to be postmaster at Sloan, Iowa, in place of W. E. Witten. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Edward R. Bender to be postmaster at Spencer, Iowa, in place of E. R. Bender. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Eunice M. Miller to be postmaster at Stanhope, Iowa, in place of E. M. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

George W. Sisler to be postmaster at Stanwood, Iowa, in place of G. W. Sisler. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John A. Schmitz to be postmaster at Storm Lake, Iowa, in place of J. A. Schmitz. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

John D. Herriott to be postmaster at Stuart, Iowa, in place of J. D. Herriott. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Nellie J. Solleeder to be postmaster at Thurman, Iowa, in place of W. C. Solleeder, deceased.

Dwight C. Kessler to be postmaster at University Park, Iowa, in place of D. C. Kessler. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Tabitha Yelsma to be postmaster at Ute, Iowa, in place of Tabitha Yelsma. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Lennie L. Hoffman to be postmaster at Vail, Iowa, in place of L. L. Hoffman. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Frank Kirscher, jr., to be postmaster at Van Meter, Iowa, in place of Frank Kirscher, jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Layton E. Brown to be postmaster at Victor, Iowa, in place of L. E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Clarence A. Knaack to be postmaster at Walcott, Iowa, in place of C. A. Knaack. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Lindley L. Birkett to be postmaster at West Liberty, Iowa, in place of A. L. Richards. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1931.

Robert L. Parry to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Iowa, in place of K. E. Lewis, removed.

James A. Smiley to be postmaster at Winfield, Iowa, in place of J. A. Smiley. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Letha Doughten to be postmaster at Woolstock, Iowa, in place of Letha Doughten. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

#### KANSAS

Frederick H. Dodd to be postmaster at Altoona, Kans., in place of F. H. Dodd. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John G. Hyde to be postmaster at Beloit, Kans., in place of J. G. Hyde. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

James R. Galyon to be postmaster at Burden, Kans., in place of J. R. Galyon. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Linnihan M. Kelleher to be postmaster at Burlingame, Kans., in place of L. M. Kelleher. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Claude W. Simpson to be postmaster at Cawker City, Kans., in place of C. W. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Elwood M. Jones to be postmaster at Council Grove, Kans., in place of E. M. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Alfred N. Parrish to be postmaster at Dunlap, Kans., in place of A. N. Parrish. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Reuben H. Funk to be postmaster at Durham, Kans., in place of R. H. Funk. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

James W. Way to be postmaster at Elmdale, Kans., in place of J. W. Way. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Harry A. Osborn to be postmaster at Emporia, Kans., in place of H. A. Osborn. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William L. Oliver to be postmaster at Erie, Kans., in place of W. L. Oliver. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Delle Duncan to be postmaster at Esbon, Kans., in place of Delle Duncan. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

David A. Nywall to be postmaster at Formoso, Kans., in place of D. A. Nywall. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

John F. Mitchell to be postmaster at Fort Dodge, Kans., in place of J. F. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Jessie I. Cramer to be postmaster at Galva, Kans., in place of J. I. Cramer. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Edward M. Brown to be postmaster at Greensburg, Kans., in place of E. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Bessie M. Achenbach to be postmaster at Hardtner, Kans., in place of B. M. Achenbach. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Ferdinand Scharping to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Kans., in place of Ferdinand Scharping. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Kirby L. Griffith to be postmaster at Kanopolis, Kans., in place of K. L. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles S. Smith to be postmaster at Lakin, Kans., in place of C. S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

John A. Bryan to be postmaster at Leoti, Kans., in place of J. A. Bryan. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Harold R. Starbuck to be postmaster at Lincoln, Kans., in place of H. R. Starbuck. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Eben Carlsson to be postmaster at McPherson, Kans., in place of Eben Carlsson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John O. Rodgers to be postmaster at Mankato, Kans., in place of J. O. Rodgers. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William C. Loveless to be postmaster at Marion, Kans., in place of D. D. McIntosh, resigned.

Clarence L. Keith to be postmaster at Menlo, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Josiah Foltz to be postmaster at Newton, Kans., in place of Josiah Foltz. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles P. Stevenson to be postmaster at Oberlin, Kans., in place of M. M. Marks. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1931.

Herman F. Kiesow to be postmaster at Osage City, Kans., in place of H. F. Kiesow. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Karl O. Ranney to be postmaster at Osawatomie, Kans., in place of A. L. January. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1930.

Charlie Gray to be postmaster at Pretty Prairie, Kans., in place of Charlie Gray. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Leslie Fitts to be postmaster at Reading, Kans., in place of Leslie Fitts. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Earl R. Ipson to be postmaster at Rolla, Kans., in place of E. R. Ipson. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Albert E. Kerns to be postmaster at Saint Marys, Kans., in place of A. E. Kerns. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Guy E. Woodhouse, jr., to be postmaster at Sharon Springs, Kans., in place of G. E. Woodhouse, jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Etta M. Hall to be postmaster at Solomon, Kans., in place of Winifred Hamilton, resigned.

Viola E. Stauffer to be postmaster at Valley Center, Kans., in place of V. E. Stauffer. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Mary O. Bittmann to be postmaster at Wamego, Kans., in place of M. O. Bittmann. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles E. Painter to be postmaster at Waverly, Kans., in place of C. E. Painter. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Clarence E. Swanson to be postmaster at Weskan, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

John F. Allen to be postmaster at Yates Center, Kans., in place of J. F. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

#### KENTUCKY

Lenard W. Thrasher to be postmaster at Burkesville, Ky., in place of L. W. Thrasher. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1931.

Lizzie B. Davisworth to be postmaster at Cumberland, Ky., in place of Walter Creech. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1931.

Claude P. Freeman to be postmaster at Fulton, Ky., in place of C. P. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Mary L. Easum to be postmaster at Jeffersontown, Ky., in place of M. L. Easum. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Mary O. Manby to be postmaster at La Grange, Ky., in place of M. O. Manby. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John B. Searcy to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, Ky., in place of J. B. Searcy. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1931.

Lillie M. Jackson to be postmaster at Lebanon, Ky., in place of L. M. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Frank A. Mohney to be postmaster at Lynch, Ky., in place of S. F. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1931.

Carl A. Reis to be postmaster at Mogg, Ky., in place of C. A. Reis. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Gilson P. Tate to be postmaster at Monticello, Ky., in place of J. W. Tate, resigned.

Burton Roberts to be postmaster at Richmond, Ky., in place of Burton Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1931.

Edith Eaton to be postmaster at Uniontown, Ky., in place of Edith Eaton. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1930.

Tacie G. Thoroughman to be postmaster at Vanceburg, Ky., in place of T. G. Thoroughman. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

James L. Howard to be postmaster at Wallins Creek, Ky., in place of J. L. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1931.

#### LOUISIANA

Effie O. Broussard to be postmaster at Allemands, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Regina D. Melanson to be postmaster at Arnaudville, La., in place of R. D. Melanson. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Homer A. Toms to be postmaster at Bienville, La., in place of W. L. Huckabay. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1930.

Ella M. Perot to be postmaster at Campti, La., in place of E. M. Perot. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Robert B. Matthews to be postmaster at Castor, La., in place of R. B. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Jeannette Clarkson to be postmaster at Clarks, La., in place of P. B. Albritton, resigned.

Rufus W. Echols to be postmaster at Converse, La., in place of R. W. Echols. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Ruth W. Monroe to be postmaster at Elton, La., in place of H. J. Monroe, deceased.

John G. Bourgeois to be postmaster at Goodhope, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Theodore F. Seiler to be postmaster at Grayson, La., in place of T. F. Seiler. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Elizabeth Crawford to be postmaster at Gretna, La., in place of E. F. Crawford, deceased.

Jesse M. Hutchinson to be postmaster at Kentwood, La., in place of A. O. Ott. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Howard A. Hudson to be postmaster at Lake Arthur, La., in place of B. S. Marquart. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1930.

Alvin C. Brunson to be postmaster at Mangham, La., in place of A. C. Brunson. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Frank Warren to be postmaster at Merryville, La., in place of Frank Warren. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

James A. Gannon to be postmaster at Natchitoches, La., in place of J. A. Gannon. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1931.

John Aiton to be postmaster at Newlano, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

James M. Cook to be postmaster at Oakdale, La., in place of J. M. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1931.

John T. Boyett to be postmaster at Sarepta, La., in place of J. T. Boyett. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Carey P. Duncan to be postmaster at Shreveport, La., in place of C. S. Clarke, resigned.

Thomas L. Hardin to be postmaster at Sicily Island, La., in place of J. M. Coan, deceased.

Edna H. White to be postmaster at Slagle, La., in place of Overton Smith, resigned.

Stellie F. Milstead to be postmaster at Sterlington, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

#### MAINE

Asa H. Hodgkins to be postmaster at Bar Harbor, Me., in place of B. H. Young, deceased.

Ernest L. Harmon to be postmaster at Biddeford, Me., in place of E. J. Gove, resigned.

Cleveland P. Curtis to be postmaster at Bowdoinham, Me., in place of V. H. Lowell, resigned.

Everett E. Brown to be postmaster at Brooks, Me., in place of E. E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Leslie D. Ames to be postmaster at Camden, Me., in place of L. D. Ames. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Mark W. McGown to be postmaster at Carmel, Me., in place of R. S. McGown. Incumbent's commission expired June 30, 1930.

Fred A. Pitts to be postmaster at Damariscotta, Me., in place of F. A. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Everett M. Vannah to be postmaster at East Boothbay, Me., in place of E. M. Vannah. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Sarah J. Jordan to be postmaster at Ellsworth Falls, Me., in place of S. J. Jordan. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Harry B. Brown to be postmaster at Farmington, Me., in place of H. B. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John E. Sargent to be postmaster at Fryeburg, Me., in place of J. E. Sargent. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Stephen H. Ward to be postmaster at Kennebunk Port, Me., in place of S. H. Ward. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

George D. Vose to be postmaster at Kingfield, Me., in place of G. D. Vose. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles E. Perry to be postmaster at Kittery Point, Me., in place of C. E. Perry. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Walter B. Stone to be postmaster at Lovell, Me., in place of W. B. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Mary G. Kennison to be postmaster at Madison, Me., in place of M. G. Kennison. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Bernice E. Morse to be postmaster at North Jay, Me., in place of B. E. Morse. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Clarice O. Small to be postmaster at Ridlonville, Me., in place of C. O. Small. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Alice C. Havener to be postmaster at Searsport, Me., in place of A. C. Havener. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Earle R. Clifford to be postmaster at South Paris, Me., in place of E. R. Clifford. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

George H. Hopkins to be postmaster at Stockton Springs, Me., in place of G. H. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Frank O. Wellcome to be postmaster at Yarmouth, Me., in place of F. O. Wellcome. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

## MARYLAND

Earle H. Ault to be postmaster at Accident, Md., in place of E. H. Ault. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Nettie Fowler to be postmaster at Bowie, Md., in place of Nettie Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

George G. Young to be postmaster at Cumberland, Md., in place of E. L. Shaw, deceased.

Leland T. Short to be postmaster at Denton, Md., in place of S. G. Nuttle. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

Thomas E. Brian to be postmaster at Ellicott City, Md., in place of T. E. Brian. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Joseph J. Banz to be postmaster at Essex, Md. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Beatrice B. Bounds to be postmaster at Fruitland, Md., in place of B. B. Bounds. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

William D. Wilkinson to be postmaster at Halethorpe, Md., in place of E. S. Wootton, removed.

George W. Nichols to be postmaster at Hurlock, Md., in place of Mary Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired June 30, 1930.

Jacob H. Reinhardt to be postmaster at Lansdowne, Md., in place of J. H. Reinhardt. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Louis E. Lamborn to be postmaster at McDonogh, Md. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Mary W. Stewart to be postmaster at Oxford, Md., in place of M. W. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

Robert H. Phillips to be postmaster at Salisbury, Md., in place of R. H. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Turner B. Waters to be postmaster at Severna Park, Md., in place of J. H. Lamon, deceased.

Floyd R. Bennett to be postmaster at Sharptown, Md., in place of J. P. Cooper, resigned.

Herbert W. Mason to be postmaster at Snow Hill, Md., in place of D. S. Hickman. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

Victor F. Cullen to be postmaster at State Sanatorium, Md., in place of V. F. Cullen. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

William E. Tull to be postmaster at Stockton, Md., in place of Leon Clifton, removed.

George W. Stevens to be postmaster at Sudlersville, Md., in place of G. W. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Howard R. Damuth to be postmaster at Thurmont, Md., in place of H. R. Damuth. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Philip E. Hunt to be postmaster at Waldorf, Md., in place of P. E. Hunt. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1931.

Harry M. Kimmey to be postmaster at Westminster, Md., in place of H. M. Kimmey. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Clarence E. Deane to be postmaster at Athol, Mass., in place of C. E. Deane. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

George R. Bruce to be postmaster at Ballard Vale, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Harold F. Peck to be postmaster at Belchertown, Mass., in place of A. L. Pratt, deceased.

Wilfred B. Littlefield to be postmaster at Brockton, Mass., in place of L. T. Briggs, deceased.

George W. Peterson to be postmaster at Chelmsford, Mass., in place of R. C. Hazeltine, resigned.

Ralph C. Putnam to be postmaster at Clifton, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

James R. Delaney to be postmaster at Dedham, Mass., in place of F. A. Campbell, deceased.

John K. Parker to be postmaster at Duxbury, Mass., in place of R. B. DeWolf, resigned.

Charles M. Rollins to be postmaster at East Boxford, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Arthur I. Maguire to be postmaster at East Walpole, Mass., in place of B. S. Whittier, resigned.

Godefroy de Tonnancour to be postmaster at Fall River, Mass., in place of Godefroy de Tonnancour. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Joseph J. Tebo to be postmaster at Fisherville, Mass., in place of J. J. Tebo. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

James A. Fulton to be postmaster at Gilbertville, Mass., in place of E. O. Meuse, resigned.

Arthur F. Cahoon to be postmaster at Harwich, Mass., in place of A. F. Cahoon. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Charles E. Hamblin to be postmaster at Huntington, Mass., in place of C. E. Hamblin. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Samuel L. Wildes to be postmaster at Montague, Mass., in place of S. L. Wildes. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Louis H. Chase to be postmaster at Norfolk, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Dorothy T. Swift to be postmaster at North Falmouth, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

George M. Campbell to be postmaster at Rutland Heights, Mass., in place of G. M. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Osgood L. Small to be postmaster at Sagamore, Mass., in place of O. L. Small. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Ella M. Ovenden to be postmaster at West Boylston, Mass., in place of E. M. Ovenden. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Eugene B. Tobey to be postmaster at West Hanover, Mass., in place of E. B. Tobey. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

J. Hormisdas Hebert to be postmaster at West Warren, Mass., in place of W. C. A. Hebert, resigned.

Charles H. Ellis to be postmaster at Westwood, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Stanley H. Matthews to be postmaster at Yarmouth Port, Mass., in place of S. H. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

## MICHIGAN

Maurice Kenel to be postmaster at Ahmeek, Mich., in place of Maurice Kenel. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Roy W. Maddock to be postmaster at Benzonia, Mich., in place of L. J. Chandler, resigned.

Joseph L. Gotta to be postmaster at Bessemer, Mich., in place of Jennie McMinn, resigned.

Claud E. Ford to be postmaster at Caledonia, Mich., in place of C. E. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Hilda M. Hammer to be postmaster at Carney, Mich., in place of H. M. Hammer. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Martin Donahue to be postmaster at Center Line, Mich., in place of Martin Donahue. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Lew E. Davy to be postmaster at Clare, Mich., in place of S. C. Kirkbride, deceased.

Gladys E. Daniells to be postmaster at Coleman, Mich., in place of G. E. Daniells. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Robert D. Gifford to be postmaster at Eaton Rapids, Mich., in place of J. S. Hamlin, resigned.

George H. Florian to be postmaster at Grand Junction, Mich., in place of G. H. Florian. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Frank E. Darby to be postmaster at Kalkaska, Mich., in place of F. E. Darby. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

Arthur O. Drevdahl to be postmaster at Manistique, Mich., in place of F. R. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

Cornelius G. Schuur to be postmaster at Marne, Mich., in place of C. G. Schuur. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Kate Turner to be postmaster at Michigan Center, Mich., in place of Kate Turner. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Victor Gustafson to be postmaster at Nahma, Mich., in place of Victor Gustafson. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Gwendolyn E. Stockman to be postmaster at Oscoda, Mich., in place of G. E. Stockman. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

John F. Reed to be postmaster at Ravenna, Mich., in place of R. S. Cox, removed.

Mattie D. Read to be postmaster at Richland, Mich., in place of M. D. Read. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Napoleon Valrance to be postmaster at Rockwood, Mich., in place of Napoleon Valrance. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Theodore C. Bruning to be postmaster at Rogers City, Mich., in place of F. J. Adams, removed.

Louis A. Lowen to be postmaster at Roseville, Mich., in place of L. A. Lowen. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

#### MINNESOTA

Thomas R. Ohnstad to be postmaster at Cannon Falls, Minn., in place of T. R. Ohnstad. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1931.

Cora A. Ilstrup to be postmaster at Cromwell, Minn., in place of W. W. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1931.

Edgar Stivers to be postmaster at Dodge Center, Minn., in place of Edgar Stivers. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1930.

Louis C. Hebeisen to be postmaster at Hamburg, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Charles F. Mallahan to be postmaster at Jackson, Minn., in place of C. F. Mallahan. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1931.

Herman Herder to be postmaster at Jordan, Minn., in place of Herman Herder. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Charles A. Allen to be postmaster at Milaca, Minn., in place of C. A. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1930.

Will G. Mack to be postmaster at Plainview, Minn., in place of W. G. Mack. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1931.

James A. Christenson to be postmaster at Preston, Minn., in place of J. A. Christenson. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1931.

Werl I. Smith to be postmaster at Proctor, Minn., in place of C. J. Hertzog, resigned.

Charles A. Luscher to be postmaster at Redwood Falls, Minn., in place of H. W. Ward, deceased.

Mathew Rivers to be postmaster at Rollingstone, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Harry H. Johnson to be postmaster at Spring Valley, Minn., in place of H. H. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1931.

Axel M. Croonquist to be postmaster at Stillwater, Minn., in place of A. M. Croonquist. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1931.

Hugh R. Smith to be postmaster at Wabasha, Minn., in place of H. R. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1931.

Samuel A. Nystrom to be postmaster at Watertown, Minn., in place of S. A. Nystrom. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1931.

William G. Gish to be postmaster at Waterville, Minn., in place of A. W. Knaak, deceased.

Richard E. Wakefield to be postmaster at Wayzata, Minn., in place of C. H. Wise. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1931.

Frank H. Wherland to be postmaster at Welcome, Minn., in place of F. H. Wherland. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1931.

#### MISSISSIPPI

Robert B. Cox to be postmaster at Batesville, Miss., in place of R. B. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1931.

Scott H. Speck to be postmaster at Blue Springs, Miss., in place of S. H. Speck. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Bess L. Scarborough to be postmaster at Bude, Miss., in place of H. B. Griffing, resigned.

Louise H. Gray to be postmaster at Greenville, Miss., in place of R. K. Haxton, resigned.

Holcombe H. McDonald to be postmaster at Lake, Miss., in place of H. H. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

Roy Scott to be postmaster at Lake Cormorant, Miss., in place of N. M. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Anna C. Morehead to be postmaster at Laurel, Miss., in place of A. A. Edwards, resigned.

Daniel F. Hitt to be postmaster at Louin, Miss., in place of D. F. Hitt. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Ella C. Covington to be postmaster at Lyon, Miss., in place of Ruth Seale. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1930.

William G. Sloan to be postmaster at Northcarrollton, Miss., in place of M. A. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

Myra P. Varnado to be postmaster at Osyka, Miss., in place of M. P. Varnado. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Etoyle S. Countiss to be postmaster at Pittsboro, Miss., in place of E. S. Countiss. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

William F. Henson to be postmaster at Ripley, Miss., in place of A. L. Stanford. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Joel L. Peach to be postmaster at Saltillo, Miss., in place of W. P. Gardner, jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1920.

Samuel L. Deavenport to be postmaster at Scott, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Mary C. Carr to be postmaster at Tylertown, Miss., in place of W. W. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

#### MISSOURI

William P. Rowland to be postmaster at Bevier, Mo., in place of W. P. Rowland. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1930.

David W. Puthuff to be postmaster at Bolivar, Mo., in place of D. W. Puthuff. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Amy E. Larey to be postmaster at Buckner, Mo., in place of Rue Chatburn, resigned.

Charles Gustin to be postmaster at Edgerton, Mo., in place of I. P. Hopkins, deceased.

Ross A. Prater to be postmaster at Essex, Mo., in place of R. A. Prater. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Florence E. Gilbert to be postmaster at Fillmore, Mo., in place of F. E. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Flora L. Brentlinger to be postmaster at Fordland, Mo., in place of T. K. West, removed.

Henry W. Schupp to be postmaster at Fremont, Mo., in place of H. W. Schupp. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Glenn Vaughn to be postmaster at Green Castle, Mo., in place of G. E. Guiles. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Alta O. Snow to be postmaster at Holt, Mo., in place of W. H. Smith, removed.

Helen Barnes to be postmaster at Ilasco, Mo., in place of John Fleurdeleys, removed.

Estella D. Seaton to be postmaster at Lathrop, Mo., in place of E. D. Seaton. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William A. Black to be postmaster at Lawson, Mo., in place of A. R. Lebold. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Roy R. Quinn to be postmaster at Moberly, Mo., in place of R. R. Quinn. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

George H. Thomas to be postmaster at Norborne, Mo., in place of C. S. Beck. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

Robert J. Hann to be postmaster at Robertson, Mo., in place of T. J. Bryant, resigned.

David L. Wilder to be postmaster at Ste. Genevieve, Mo., in place of L. T. Wilder, resigned.

Gilbert W. Jones to be postmaster at Seymour, Mo., in place of A. L. Williams, deceased.

Alfred O. Lowman to be postmaster at Smithville, Mo., in place of A. O. Lowman. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Emmett R. Lindley to be postmaster at Stanberry, Mo., in place of E. R. Lindley. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

Robert R. Marshall to be postmaster at Steele, Mo., in place of W. B. Little, removed.

Charles F. Hamrick to be postmaster at Stover, Mo., in place of C. F. Hamrick. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1930.

Virgil Smee to be postmaster at Sugar Creek, Mo., in place of Virgil Smee. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1930.

Frankie F. Tanner to be postmaster at Union Star, Mo., in place of L. D. Fisher, deceased.

Anna M. Schaper to be postmaster at Warrenton, Mo., in place of J. J. Schaper, deceased.

James A. Allison to be postmaster at Waverly, Mo., in place of J. A. Allison. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Harry E. Jackson to be postmaster at Winfield, Mo., in place of L. L. Buchanan, deceased.

Annie M. Johnson to be postmaster at Winston, Mo., in place of A. M. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

#### MONTANA

Daniel E. Freshour to be postmaster at Arlee, Mont., in place of H. C. Hoyt, removed.

Harly J. Stephenson to be postmaster at Belgrade, Mont., in place of H. J. Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Alfred Briscoe to be postmaster at Cascade, Mont., in place of Alfred Briscoe. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Joseph Keeler to be postmaster at Crow Agency, Mont., in place of Joseph Keeler. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

George D. Dutro to be postmaster at Dodson, Mont., in place of G. D. Dutro. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

William S. Carlson to be postmaster at Ekalaka, Mont., in place of W. S. Carlson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Jennie W. Chowning to be postmaster at Ennis, Mont., in place of J. W. Chowning. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Arthur D. Liberman to be postmaster at Fort Harrison, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Cass E. Parker to be postmaster at Fromberg, Mont., in place of C. E. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Adeline F. Kolnitchar to be postmaster at Geraldine, Mont., in place of Andrew Kolnitchar, deceased.

Otto M. Christinson to be postmaster at Glasgow, Mont., in place of O. M. Christinson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John R. Lloyd to be postmaster at Great Falls, Mont., in place of J. R. Lloyd. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

James R. Minugh to be postmaster at Harlem, Mont., in place of J. R. Minugh. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Frederick B. Gillette to be postmaster at Hinsdale, Mont., in place of F. B. Gillette. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Harry W. Sankey to be postmaster at Jordan, Mont., in place of P. E. Winfield, resigned.

Estella K. Smith to be postmaster at Lima, Mont., in place of E. K. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1931.

Henry B. Chambers to be postmaster at Manhattan, Mont., in place of H. B. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Donald A. Petrie to be postmaster at Martinsdale, Mont., in place of D. A. Petrie. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Harry Kennedy to be postmaster at Rosebud, Mont., in place of Harry Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles P. Hahnkamp to be postmaster at Turner, Mont., in place of C. E. Kern, removed.

Amy B. Cowee to be postmaster at Wibaux, Mont., in place of A. B. Cowee. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

#### NEBRASKA

Carl K. McCleery to be postmaster at Blue Hill, Nebr., in place of F. E. Britton, resigned.

Clarence E. Johnson to be postmaster at Gibbon, Nebr., in place of L. A. Wight, resigned.

Ross D. Rash to be postmaster at Gordon, Nebr., in place of A. A. Strong. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1930.

Merwyn C. Johnson to be postmaster at Hyannis, Nebr., in place of L. A. Howard, removed.

William A. Barraclough to be postmaster at North Platte, Nebr., in place of L. C. Sturges, resigned.

Clarence B. Benson to be postmaster at Upland, Nebr., in place of H. C. Rogers, deceased.

Frank E. Crawford to be postmaster at Wymore, Nebr., in place of F. E. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1931.

#### NEVADA

Helen C. Thrasher to be postmaster at Gerlach, Nev., in place of W. E. Dalton, resigned.

Harold E. Haviland to be postmaster at Winnemucca, Nev., in place of W. S. Norris, deceased.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE

Willard R. Heath to be postmaster at Concord, N. H., in place of W. R. Heath. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1931.

Louis T. Pike to be postmaster at Pike, N. H., in place of F. J. Aldrich, resigned.

#### NEW JERSEY

Samuel D. Mitchell to be postmaster at Blairstown, N. J., in place of W. E. Allen, removed.

Mary H. Jeffrey to be postmaster at Deal, N. J., in place of M. H. Jeffrey. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

Charles V. Weiler to be postmaster at Flemington, N. J., in place of H. W. Bellis, deceased.

Samuel Munyan to be postmaster at Gibbstown, N. J., in place of Samuel Munyan. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

Isaac E. Bowers to be postmaster at Groveville, N. J., in place of I. E. Bowers. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

Charles C. McKinley to be postmaster at Haddon Heights, N. J., in place of R. E. Bromley, resigned.

James C. Norris to be postmaster at Hightstown, N. J., in place of J. C. Norris. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

George H. Russell to be postmaster at Jersey City, N. J., in place of John Rotherham. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1931.

Richard F. Holt to be postmaster at Kenvil, N. J., in place of J. D. Seals, removed.

Dallas G. Young to be postmaster at Keyport, N. J., in place of D. G. Young. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Renview L. Hull to be postmaster at Lebanon, N. J., in place of R. L. Hull. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Samuel A. Gruver to be postmaster at Madison, N. J., in place of F. E. Marinaccio, removed.

George C. Kloss to be postmaster at Manasquan, N. J., in place of G. C. Kloss. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Winfield L. Smith to be postmaster at Mantua, N. J., in place of W. L. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Elvord G. Chamberlin to be postmaster at Montclair, N. J., in place of E. G. Chamberlin. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John S. Inman to be postmaster at New Egypt, N. J., in place of J. S. Inman. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

George I. Harvey to be postmaster at Palmyra, N. J., in place of G. I. Harvey. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

Arthur H. Gilbert to be postmaster at Park Ridge, N. J., in place of G. C. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

Richard T. Wilson to be postmaster at Ridgewood, N. J., in place of C. R. Stoneall. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1931.

Remington E. Rose to be postmaster at Rutherford, N. J., in place of Reid Howell. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1931.

Mary F. Brophy to be postmaster at Skillman, N. J., in place of C. W. Brophy, deceased.

Elizabeth C. Brill to be postmaster at Stewartsville, N. J., in place of J. H. Kinkel. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

Charles H. Wilson to be postmaster at Swedesboro, N. J., in place of C. H. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

W. Burts Havens to be postmaster at Toms River, N. J., in place of W. B. Havens. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Jacob Feldman to be postmaster at Woodbine, N. J., in place of Jacob Feldman. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

#### NEW YORK

Raymond B. Mott to be postmaster at Angelica, N. Y., in place of A. J. Lytle, resigned.

Henry W. Ware to be postmaster at Batavia, N. Y., in place of H. W. Ware. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Mary J. O'Brien to be postmaster at Bedford, N. Y., in place of E. B. Stead, resigned.

Irving Barrett to be postmaster at Bedford Hills, N. Y., in place of Irving Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles J. Amsden to be postmaster at Bolivar, N. Y., in place of C. J. Amsden. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Nicholas Reilly to be postmaster at Brentwood, N. Y., in place of Nicholas Reilly. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

Etta Merritt to be postmaster at Brewerton, N. Y., in place of Etta Merritt. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Theodore W. Grahlf to be postmaster at Central Valley, N. Y., in place of Richard Bullwinkle, deceased.

Arthur B. Barker to be postmaster at Clifton Springs, N. Y., in place of William Holmes, deceased.

Arcade G. Boivin to be postmaster at Cohoes, N. Y., in place of J. E. McDonald, removed.

Mary Young to be postmaster at Cornwall Landing, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Carrie S. Johnson to be postmaster at De Kalb Junction, N. Y., in place of C. S. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Ernest U. Smith to be postmaster at Eagle Bay, N. Y., in place of E. U. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Alexander Glendinning to be postmaster at East Quogue, N. Y., in place of Alexander Glendinning. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Hattie D. Lyon to be postmaster at East Setauket, N. Y., in place of H. D. Lyon. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

Ellsworth Allen to be postmaster at Farmingdale, N. Y., in place of J. E. Duryea, resigned.

Cornelius T. E. Van Horne to be postmaster at Fultonville, N. Y., in place of A. L. Van Horne, deceased.

William C. Monsell to be postmaster at Greenport, N. Y., in place of Joseph Ogle, deceased.

James E. Colgan to be postmaster at Hamden, N. Y., in place of J. E. Colgan. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Fred N. Parquet to be postmaster at Inlet, N. Y., in place of F. N. Parquet. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Charles F. Fowler to be postmaster at Iona Island, N. Y., in place of C. F. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Roscoe C. Van Marter to be postmaster at Ithaca, N. Y., in place of C. D. Tarbell. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

Henry W. Koster to be postmaster at Narrowsburg, N. Y., in place of H. W. Koster. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Maude E. Butterfield to be postmaster at New Berlin, N. Y., in place of M. E. Butterfield. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Philip W. Burdick to be postmaster at Old Forge, N. Y., in place of W. F. Winterbotham. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

John J. Lynch to be postmaster at Oscawana, N. Y., in place of J. J. Lynch. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Phelps Smith to be postmaster at Paul Smiths, N. Y., in place of Phelps Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Read Clarke to be postmaster at Perry N. Y., in place of E. V. Jenks, deceased.

George H. Stanton to be postmaster at Pine Bush, N. Y., in place of S. K. Seybolt, resigned.

Edward W. McBriar to be postmaster at Port Washington, N. Y., in place of I. B. Smith, resigned.

J. Edward Uline to be postmaster at Ransomville, N. Y., in place of J. E. Uline. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

George W. Harris to be postmaster at Richmondville, N. Y., in place of G. W. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Kenneth B. Preston to be postmaster at Roxbury, N. Y., in place of B. S. Preston, resigned.

Edith F. Tyler to be postmaster at Setauket, N. Y., in place of L. B. Sellock. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Alfred A. Clairmonte to be postmaster at South Fallsburg, N. Y., in place of A. A. Clairmonte. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Jay M. Glover to be postmaster at Southold, N. Y., in place of J. I. Fanning, resigned.

Bert P. Wood to be postmaster at Springfield Center, N. Y., in place of B. P. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Laura E. Bedle to be postmaster at Spring Valley, N. Y., in place of N. L. Bedle, deceased.

Francis D. Lynch to be postmaster at Stony Point, N. Y., in place of F. D. Lynch. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1931.

William L. Bouchard to be postmaster at Sunmount, N. Y., in place of W. L. Bouchard. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Frank W. Withey to be postmaster at Wyoming, N. Y., in place of G. R. Dodson. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

#### NORTH CAROLINA

Benjamin E. Atkins to be postmaster at Apex, N. C., in place of B. E. Atkins. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

James J. Hathaway to be postmaster at Battleboro, N. C., in place of A. L. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1930.

Jed Shepardson to be postmaster at Belhaven, N. C., in place of J. M. Selby. Incumbent's commission expired May 21, 1930.

John P. Hoffman to be postmaster at Dallas, N. C., in place of L. V. Rhyne, removed.

Neill S. Green to be postmaster at Dunn, N. C., in place of W. D. Holland. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1930.

J. Lee Norman to be postmaster at East End, N. C., in place of B. I. Hauser. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1931.

Laurence T. Gibson to be postmaster at Gibson, N. C., in place of A. M. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Coy S. Lewis to be postmaster at Hemp, N. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1931.

Edith E. Holton to be postmaster at Jamestown, N. C., in place of E. E. Holton. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

William R. Stephens to be postmaster at Leaksville, N. C., in place of J. B. Fagg. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1930.

Mary W. Yarborough to be postmaster at Louisburg, N. C., in place of M. W. Yarborough. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1930.

George E. Hunsucker to be postmaster at Maiden, N. C., in place of G. L. Harbinson, removed.

Charles F. Scarborough to be postmaster at Mount Gilead, N. C., in place of J. E. Green, resigned.

Thelma Dickey to be postmaster at Murphy, N. C., in place of A. B. Dickey, deceased.

Blanche H. Edwards to be postmaster at Newport, N. C., in place of J. L. Edwards, deceased.

James W. Smith to be postmaster at Pembroke, N. C., in place of F. K. Thagard, resigned.

Raymond C. Edwards to be postmaster at Pomona, N. C., in place of C. A. Hinton, removed.

Alfred L. Purrington to be postmaster at Scotland Neck, N. C., in place of A. B. Hill, deceased.

Evelyn Hill to be postmaster at Snow Hill, N. C., in place of B. W. Hill, deceased.

John C. Matthews to be postmaster at Spring Hope, N. C., in place of M. H. Brantley, removed.

Lucy B. Hofler to be postmaster at Sunbury, N. C., in place of L. B. Hofler. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Osmund F. Pool to be postmaster at Taylorsville, N. C., in place of Ross Matheson. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Lawrence Harris to be postmaster at Wake Forest, N. C., in place of C. Y. Holden. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

George H. Wright, jr., to be postmaster at Wendell, N. C., in place of G. H. Wright, jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Ina L. Jordan to be postmaster at Winton, N. C., in place of L. V. Owen, deceased.

#### NORTH DAKOTA

Leo Rolle to be postmaster at Brinsmade, N. Dak., in place of Leo Rolle. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

James Taylor to be postmaster at Cando, N. Dak., in place of James Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

James E. Galehouse to be postmaster at Carrington, N. Dak., in place of J. E. Galehouse. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1931.

James E. Cusator to be postmaster at Cleveland, N. Dak., in place of J. A. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1931.

Martin Olsen to be postmaster at Devils Lake, N. Dak., in place of F. A. Scott, removed.

Earl M. Sanness to be postmaster at Enderlin, N. Dak., in place of E. M. Sanness. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Louis Hansen to be postmaster at Esmond, N. Dak., in place of Louis Hansen. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Hugh H. Parsons to be postmaster at Fessenden, N. Dak., in place of H. H. Parsons. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Otto Gackle to be postmaster at Fredonia, N. Dak., in place of Otto Gackle. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William D. Sinclair to be postmaster at Hannaford, N. Dak., in place of W. D. Sinclair. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Duncan McLean to be postmaster at Hannah, N. Dak., in place of Duncan McLean. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Clarence O. Abrahamsen to be postmaster at Kathryn, N. Dak., in place of K. O. Abrahamsen, deceased.

Louie L. Gardner to be postmaster at Langdon, N. Dak., in place of L. L. Gardner. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Leta L. Davis to be postmaster at Lansford, N. Dak., in place of H. W. Willis. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Nellie E. Gagner to be postmaster at Lignite, N. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Alice Stewart to be postmaster at Linton, N. Dak., in place of Alice Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Francis R. Cruden to be postmaster at McHenry, N. Dak., in place of F. R. Cruden. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1930.

Jens B. Dyrud to be postmaster at Maddock, N. Dak., in place of J. B. Dyrud. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Albert M. Marchand to be postmaster at Rolla, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Marchand. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Ralph H. McKean to be postmaster at Sanborn, N. Dak., in place of R. H. McKean. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Carl L. George to be postmaster at Sarles, N. Dak., in place of C. L. George. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Bridget A. Hennessy to be postmaster at Tolna, N. Dak., in place of B. A. Hennessy. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Albert J. Drake to be postmaster at Westhope, N. Dak., in place of A. J. Drake. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

## OHIO

Thomas D. Ziggafos to be postmaster at Albany, Ohio, in place of E. W. White. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Edwin E. Foster to be postmaster at Amherst, Ohio, in place of J. B. Coburn. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Mark E. Miller to be postmaster at Ashtabula, Ohio, in place of M. E. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Henry J. Snyder to be postmaster at Ashville, Ohio, in place of C. M. Dunnick, resigned.

Harold E. Simon to be postmaster at Barberton, Ohio, in place of J. W. McCoy, removed.

Robert O. Cady to be postmaster at Bay Village, Ohio, in place of R. O. Cady. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Ambrose B. Wingate to be postmaster at Beach City, Ohio, in place of A. B. Wingate. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Ralph P. Crane to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Ohio, in place of R. P. Crane. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Matthew C. Morrison to be postmaster at Bradner, Ohio, in place of J. P. Evans, resigned.

Effie W. Mansfield to be postmaster at Brilliant, Ohio, in place of E. W. Mansfield. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Carl A. Brown to be postmaster at Bucyrus, Ohio, in place of C. A. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Starling F. Trimble to be postmaster at Crestline, Ohio, in place of S. F. Trimble. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Arthur M. Eidson to be postmaster at Cygnet, Ohio, in place of A. M. Eidson. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Lawrence W. Hall to be postmaster at East Sparta, Ohio, in place of L. W. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

John W. Darling to be postmaster at Elmore, Ohio, in place of J. W. Darling. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Henry A. Taylor to be postmaster at Cleveland, Ohio, in place of H. A. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1931.

Robert B. Lersch to be postmaster at Elyria, Ohio, in place of J. W. McHenry. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Florence Hilgefert to be postmaster at Fort Loramie, Ohio, in place of Florence Hilgefert. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Guy W. Reuter to be postmaster at Fort Recovery, Ohio, in place of G. W. Reuter. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

James G. Lewis to be postmaster at Girard, Ohio, in place of J. G. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Fred Brockmeyer to be postmaster at Glendale, Ohio, in place of Fred Brockmeyer. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Charles S. Brown to be postmaster at Glenmont, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Bertha M. Rising to be postmaster at Grafton, Ohio, in place of L. M. Robson, resigned.

Edward L. Jones to be postmaster at Granville, Ohio, in place of E. L. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Fred B. Reed to be postmaster at Green Springs, Ohio, in place of F. B. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Warren H. Noble to be postmaster at Greenwich, Ohio, in place of W. H. Noble. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Jennie Pfeiffer to be postmaster at Grover Hill, Ohio, in place of Jennie Pfeiffer. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

William H. Tracy to be postmaster at Harrison, Ohio, in place of W. H. Tracy. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Wilber F. Bush to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, Ohio, in place of W. F. Bush. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

George H. Methane to be postmaster at Lima, Ohio, in place of A. E. Gale, deceased.

Alpheus E. Huls to be postmaster at Logan, Ohio, in place of I. C. Steinman. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Lincoln A. Slusser to be postmaster at Louisville, Ohio, in place of L. A. Slusser. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Garnet E. Sharp to be postmaster at McArthur, Ohio, in place of J. C. Gill. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1930.

Francis M. Fletcher to be postmaster at McComb, Ohio, in place of F. M. Fletcher. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Elmyra L. Griswold to be postmaster at Macedonia, Ohio, in place of E. L. Griswold. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Charles E. Penquite to be postmaster at Mason, Ohio, in place of C. E. Penquite. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Harry E. Coil to be postmaster at Mendon, Ohio, in place of H. E. Coil. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Anna Heise to be postmaster at Middle Bass, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Pearl C. Brown to be postmaster at Middlefield, Ohio, in place of P. C. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

French C. Stillings to be postmaster at Milford Center, Ohio, in place of F. C. Stillings. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Elmer W. Armstrong to be postmaster at Monroeville, Ohio, in place of D. H. Beck, removed.

Edwin S. Randolph to be postmaster at Newark, Ohio, in place of W. G. Corne, deceased.

Harry M. Day to be postmaster at New Richmond, Ohio, in place of H. M. Day. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Albert S. Nye to be postmaster at New Washington, Ohio, in place of A. S. Nye. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

John M. Harmon to be postmaster at Oakwood, Ohio, in place of E. M. Stover, deceased.

Marshall O. Brooke to be postmaster at Peebles, Ohio, in place of M. O. Brooke. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Charles E. Morris to be postmaster at Philo, Ohio, in place of Nora Kassell, deceased.

Victor Ferrari to be postmaster at Piney Fork, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

George A. Fisher to be postmaster at Port Clinton, Ohio, in place of G. A. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Harry A. Doerr to be postmaster at Portsmouth, Ohio, in place of W. H. Harsha. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1931.

Lema M. Collins to be postmaster at Proctorville, Ohio, in place of M. V. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1929.

Clarence R. Seymour to be postmaster at Ravenna, Ohio, in place of C. R. Seymour. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Lloyd B. Folk to be postmaster at Rawson, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Harry W. Hayes to be postmaster at Reynoldsburg, Ohio, in place of H. W. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Helen M. McGuire to be postmaster at Rudolph, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Fred O. Foster to be postmaster at Seville, Ohio, in place of F. O. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Charles M. Sauder to be postmaster at Smithville, Ohio, in place of C. M. Sauder. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

M. Margaret Searl to be postmaster at South Webster, Ohio, in place of M. M. Searl. Incumbent's commission expires January 27, 1932.

Elmer E. Weaver to be postmaster at Sugarcreek, Ohio, in place of E. E. Weaver. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Oral H. Hilborn to be postmaster at Tiro, Ohio, in place of O. H. Hilborn. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Raymond M. Swank to be postmaster at Trotwood, Ohio, in place of R. M. Swank. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Karl H. Hale to be postmaster at Upper Sandusky, Ohio, in place of G. H. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1931.

Ralph L. Stamm to be postmaster at Versailles, Ohio, in place of R. L. Stamm. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

George P. Ewing to be postmaster at Vinton, Ohio, in place of G. P. Ewing. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

George W. Hassenier to be postmaster at Wapakoneta, Ohio, in place of G. W. Hassenier. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Robert D. Fisher to be postmaster at Warrensville, Ohio, in place of F. M. Brakeman, removed.

Dora A. Kramer to be postmaster at West Alexandria, Ohio, in place of D. A. Kramer. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Elva L. Gauch to be postmaster at West Manchester, Ohio, in place of E. L. Gauch. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

John A. Gatchell to be postmaster at Wharton, Ohio, in place of J. A. Gatchell. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Edward T. Siddens to be postmaster at Winchester, Ohio, in place of C. S. Daulton. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

#### OKLAHOMA

James W. Lewis to be postmaster at Ada, Okla., in place of M. F. Manville. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Nealy Godwin to be postmaster at Alex, Okla., in place of R. B. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Garnett O. Fields to be postmaster at Aline, Okla., in place of E. K. Merchant. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Clyde O. Thomas to be postmaster at Arapaho, Okla., in place of C. O. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1931.

John R. Hibbard to be postmaster at Asher, Okla., in place of J. R. Hibbard. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Samuel M. Wilson to be postmaster at Barnsdall, Okla., in place of Lee Hilton, resigned.

Herbert L. Burke to be postmaster at Beaver, Okla., in place of J. E. Spurrier. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Vernon A. Farmer to be postmaster at Broken Bow, Okla., in place of V. A. Farmer. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

Maud W. Cassetty to be postmaster at Calvin, Okla., in place of M. W. Cassetty. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1931.

John R. McIntosh to be postmaster at Chelsea, Okla., in place of J. R. McIntosh. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1932.

James W. Blair to be postmaster at Clayton, Okla., in place of J. W. Blair. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

Osman A. Gilbert to be postmaster at Cleveland, Okla., in place of Ward Guffy. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

Dory E. McKenney to be postmaster at Custer, Okla., in place of D. E. McKenney. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1931.

Guy M. Babcock to be postmaster at Denoya, Okla. in place of M. M. Adams, resigned.

Clarence E. Werrell to be postmaster at Depew, Okla., in place of C. E. Werrell. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1931.

Roy R. Dodd to be postmaster at Fairfax, Okla., in place of G. S. Prentiss. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1930.

John N. Voorhees to be postmaster at Fairview, Okla., in place of C. E. Seese, deceased.

Doris M. Tyrrell to be postmaster at Fargo, Okla., in place of B. A. Tyrrell, deceased.

John W. Dagenhart to be postmaster at Gage, Okla., in place of J. W. Dagenhart. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Lynn F. McDonald to be postmaster at Goodwell, Okla., in place of L. F. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Pauline I. Beardsley to be postmaster at Gracemont, Okla., in place of P. I. Beardsley. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Walker D. Guthrie to be postmaster at Granite, Okla., in place of W. D. Guthrie. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1930.

Frederick M. Deselms to be postmaster at Guthrie, Okla., in place of F. M. Deselms. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1932.

June M. Jarvis to be postmaster at Haileyville, Okla., in place of J. M. Jarvis. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

James H. Sparks to be postmaster at Healdton, Okla., in place of J. H. Sparks. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1931.

Isom P. Clark to be postmaster at Heavener, Okla., in place of I. P. Clark. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1932.

Jean C. Buell to be postmaster at Holdenville, Okla., in place of J. C. Buell. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Louia M. Amick to be postmaster at Jefferson, Okla., in place of L. M. Amick. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

James L. Lane to be postmaster at Kiowa, Okla., in place of J. L. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Lyle H. Ball to be postmaster at Laverne, Okla., in place of L. H. Ball. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Robert B. Morford to be postmaster at Lawton, Okla., in place of R. B. Morford. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1931.

Lura Williams to be postmaster at Manitou, Okla., in place of Lura Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

Marshall G. Norvell to be postmaster at Marietta, Okla., in place of M. G. Norvell. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Harry Andrews to be postmaster at Marland, Okla., in place of Harry Andrews. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Onie L. Tapp to be postmaster at Marlow, Okla., in place of D. L. Lindsey, resigned.

Elinore Jett to be postmaster at Nash, Okla., in place of Elinore Jett. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Bruce W. Hutton to be postmaster at Oakwood, Okla., in place of B. W. Hutton. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

L. Manuel Merritt to be postmaster at Roff, Okla., in place of L. M. Merritt. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

Otto G. Bound to be postmaster at Ryan, Okla., in place of O. G. Bound. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Elmer D. Rook to be postmaster at Sayre, Okla., in place of E. D. Rook. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1931.

James O. Seger to be postmaster at Seminole, Okla., in place of R. A. Hoffman. Incumbent's commission expired April, 20, 1930.

Harold F. Facker to be postmaster at Shamrock, Okla., in place of H. F. Facker. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

Jonas R. Cartwright to be postmaster at Shattuck, Okla., in place of J. R. Cartwright. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1931.

Alvin L. Derby to be postmaster at Shidler, Okla., in place of A. L. Derby. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Irl J. Trout to be postmaster at Stigler, Okla., in place of E. A. Loyd. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1930.

Floyd A. Rice to be postmaster at Strong City, Okla., in place of F. A. Rice. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

George F. Benge to be postmaster at Tahlequah, Okla., in place of G. F. Benge. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

George Logsdon to be postmaster at Taloga, Okla., in place of George Logsdon. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

Emil G. Etzold to be postmaster at Temple, Okla., in place of E. G. Etzold. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

Clarence O. Payne to be postmaster at Tipton, Okla., in place of Mark Gough, resigned.

William A. Vassar to be postmaster at Tryon, Okla., in place of W. A. Vassar. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Severe L. Massie to be postmaster at Tyrone, Okla., in place of S. L. Massie. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Sol A. Glotfelter to be postmaster at Verden, Okla., in place of S. A. Glotfelter. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

Bertha A. Wolverton to be postmaster at Wapanucka, Okla., in place of B. A. Wolverton. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1931.

William C. Wallin to be postmaster at Watts, Okla., in place of W. C. Wallin. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

Fred Hudson to be postmaster at Webb City, Okla., in place of Fred Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

William C. Colvin to be postmaster at Westville, Okla., in place of W. C. Colvin. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

Elmer D. Orwig to be postmaster at Wewoka, Okla., in place of Horace Bradley. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Sarah E. Goodwin to be postmaster at Wirt, Okla., in place of S. E. Goodwin. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1930.

Orland H. Park to be postmaster at Wright City, Okla., in place of O. H. Park. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

#### OREGON

Lillian E. Wheelhouse to be postmaster at Arlington, Oreg., in place of O. C. Stephens. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1931.

Alice K. Gallier to be postmaster at Bandon, Oreg., in place of A. K. Gallier. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

John S. Horn to be postmaster at Bonanza, Oreg. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Fred C. Matches to be postmaster at Dayton, Oreg., in place of F. C. Matches. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Walter W. Mascall to be postmaster at Dayville, Oreg. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Oscar C. Maxwell to be postmaster at Elgin, Oreg., in place of O. C. Maxwell. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1931.

John W. Bubb to be postmaster at Huntington, Oreg., in place of V. B. Greenslade, removed.

George W. Johnson to be postmaster at Lakeview, Oreg., in place of G. W. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Thomas R. MacMillan to be postmaster at Lebanon, Oreg., in place of T. R. MacMillan. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Charles B. Wilson to be postmaster at Newberg, Oreg., in place of C. B. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Daniel E. O'Connor to be postmaster at Paisley, Oreg. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Harold R. McIsaac to be postmaster at Parkdale, Oreg., in place of H. R. McIsaac. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

James E. Jenks, Jr., to be postmaster at Tangent, Oreg. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Thomas G. Tucker to be postmaster at Umatilla, Oreg., in place of M. A. Hower, removed.

Ann B. Heydon to be postmaster at Valsetz, Oreg., in place of A. B. Heydon. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

William P. Bush to be postmaster at Bellwood, Pa., in place of I. R. Burns, deceased.

Howard P. Schaeffer to be postmaster at Bernharts, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Henry Doering to be postmaster at Bethayres, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Robert K. Ritter to be postmaster at Bethlehem, Pa., in place of H. W. Thatcher, deceased.

Karl R. Volk to be postmaster at Boswell, Pa., in place of Comfrey Ickes. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Clarence G. Dixon to be postmaster at Butler, Pa., in place of C. G. Chase, deceased.

Chestina M. Smith to be postmaster at Centralia, Pa., in place of C. M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1931.

George F. Marsh to be postmaster at Clifton Heights, Pa., in place of F. F. Duke, resigned.

William S. Behanna to be postmaster at Connellsburg, Pa., in place of W. S. Behanna. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1931.

Samuel E. Spare to be postmaster at Doylestown, Pa., in place of J. G. Hart, deceased.

Fred A. Wyckoff to be postmaster at East Stroudsburg, Pa., in place of G. C. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1930.

John Martinelli to be postmaster at Fairbank, Pa., in place of John Martinelli. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1930.

Henry W. Redfoot to be postmaster at Fredonia, Pa., in place of H. W. Redfoot. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Mahlon C. Cleaver to be postmaster at Girardville, Pa., in place of M. C. Cleaver. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Rachel M. Thurston to be postmaster at Iselin, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Carl Steuer to be postmaster at Johnstown, Pa., in place of W. E. Shissler. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

William N. Baker to be postmaster at Lewisburg, Pa., in place of W. N. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Elmer G. Cornwell to be postmaster at Mansfield, Pa., in place of E. G. Cornwell. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Irvin L. Romig to be postmaster at Mertztown, Pa., in place of I. L. Romig. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

William F. Houser, sr., to be postmaster at Middletown, Pa., in place of W. F. Houser, sr. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Clarence E. McGhee to be postmaster at Minersville, Pa., in place of I. B. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1931.

Oscar R. Moser to be postmaster at Mont Alto, Pa., in place of O. R. Moser. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

Evalyn M. Roberts to be postmaster at Morganza, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Rapha C. Sieg to be postmaster at Mountainhome, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Mary R. Clapper to be postmaster at New Enterprise, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Frank M. Berk to be postmaster at New Ringgold, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Lina E. Williams to be postmaster at Reno, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Eli B. Weaver to be postmaster at Ruffs Dale, Pa., in place of G. G. Wallace, deceased.

Daniel M. Witmer to be postmaster at Safe Harbor, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Anna E. Snyder to be postmaster at Seven Valleys, Pa., in place of H. F. Groff, deceased.

Laura M. Gilpatrick to be postmaster at Seward, Pa., in place of M. F. McCullough, resigned.

Herman S. Van Campen to be postmaster at Shavertown, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Raymond Williams to be postmaster at Shoemakersville, Pa., in place of J. D. Williams, deceased.

Harvey E. Rogers to be postmaster at Spring City, Pa., in place of H. E. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Harry B. Lee to be postmaster at Springville, Pa., in place of W. L. Miserole, resigned.

Ezra M. Cooper, jr., to be postmaster at Union City, Pa., in place of S. J. Downs, deceased.

William D. Ghrist to be postmaster at Uniontown, Pa., in place of W. D. Ghrist. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1930.

Elmer E. Grover to be postmaster at Wapwallopen, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Charles B. Rothenberger to be postmaster at West Leesport, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Joseph P. Kearney to be postmaster at Wynnewood, Pa., in place of M. A. Jefferis, resigned.

#### RHODE ISLAND

Lillian G. Hoxie to be postmaster at Shannock, R. I., in place of L. G. Hoxie. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

#### SOUTH CAROLINA

Guthrie W. Woodham to be postmaster at Bishopville, S. C., in place of Irene Stuckey, removed.

Clarence J. Fickling to be postmaster at Blackville, S. C., in place of H. A. Rich. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1930.

George B. Patrick to be postmaster at Bowman, S. C., in place of G. B. Patrick. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Caleb F. Pendleton to be postmaster at Cheraw, S. C., in place of J. L. McCown. Incumbent's commission expired July 3, 1930.

Tully A. Sawyer to be postmaster at Chesnee, S. C., in place of T. A. Sawyer. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Walter L. Gettys to be postmaster at Clover, S. C., in place of W. L. Gettys. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Allen T. Collins to be postmaster at Conway, S. C., in place of B. T. Frierson, removed.

Henry W. Garrison to be postmaster at Easley, S. C., in place of J. E. Folger, removed.

Joseph G. Holland to be postmaster at Edgefield, S. C., in place of J. G. Holland. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Paul DeL. Mazyck to be postmaster at Gaffney, S. C., in place of F. B. Gaffney. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Murray S. McKinnon to be postmaster at Hartsville, S. C., in place of J. S. Cathcart. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1930.

Fore J. Watson to be postmaster at Kingtree, S. C., in place of Louis Stackley, deceased.

John B. Harmon, jr., to be postmaster at McCormick, S. C., in place of D. B. Woodward, removed.

Loka W. Rigby to be postmaster at Moncks Corner, S. C., in place of L. W. Rigby. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Eugene C. Jones to be postmaster at North, S. C., in place of C. G. Schoenberg. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1931.

Alonzo D. Webster to be postmaster at Orangeburg, S. C., in place of A. D. Webster. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

#### SOUTH DAKOTA

William B. Poe to be postmaster at Andover, S. Dak., in place of S. T. Wickre, resigned.

Truman C. Knott to be postmaster at Bristol, S. Dak., in place of T. C. Knott. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Lemont C. Ashbaugh to be postmaster at Butler, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Charles A. Olson to be postmaster at Claremont, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Olson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Claud I. Force to be postmaster at Clear Lake, S. Dak., in place of C. I. Force. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1931.

Valentine J. Fetzner to be postmaster at Colome, S. Dak., in place of L. D. Houk, removed.

Ernest F. Roth to be postmaster at Columbia, S. Dak., in place of E. F. Roth. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1931.

Frank Den Beste to be postmaster at Corsica, S. Dak., in place of Frank Den Beste. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

Leland W. Willis to be postmaster at Custer, S. Dak., in place of D. J. Delaney. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1930.

John Schafer to be postmaster at Delmont, S. Dak., in place of John Schafer. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William O. Johnson to be postmaster at Faulkton, S. Dak., in place of W. O. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1931.

Lewie E. Gorder to be postmaster at Frederick, S. Dak., in place of G. M. Gorder, deceased.

Lyle E. Swift to be postmaster at Gettysburg, S. Dak., in place of E. C. Hoover, resigned.

Earl J. Meredith to be postmaster at Groton, S. Dak., in place of E. J. Meredith. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Myron J. Cannon to be postmaster at Hermosa, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Clyde H. Cotton to be postmaster at Hitchcock, S. Dak., in place of C. H. Cotton. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Peter E. Koistinen to be postmaster at Lake Norden, S. Dak., in place of O. W. Geranen, removed.

Thorvald Jordeth to be postmaster at Lebanon, S. Dak., in place of Thorvald Jordeth. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Adolph B. Holien to be postmaster at Madison, S. Dak., in place of Henry Rohrer, deceased.

Clarence S. Johnson to be postmaster at Milbank, S. Dak., in place of C. S. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Gustavus M. Finotti to be postmaster at Missionhill, S. Dak., in place of G. M. Finotti. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Oscar W. Coursey to be postmaster at Mitchell, S. Dak., in place of Henry Swindler, deceased.

Garfield G. Tunell to be postmaster at Mobridge, S. Dak., in place of G. G. Tunell. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1931.

Catherine M. Kuehl to be postmaster at Mound City, S. Dak., in place of C. M. Kuehl. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Eugene M. Coffield to be postmaster at Oelrichs, S. Dak., in place of E. M. Coffield. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Percy R. Miklebost to be postmaster at Peever, S. Dak., in place of P. R. Miklebost. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1930.

Richard Whalen to be postmaster at Pine Ridge, S. Dak., in place of Richard Whalen. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Justin Snyder to be postmaster at Stephan, S. Dak., in place of Pius Boehm, resigned.

Lawrence E. Hosking to be postmaster at Vivian, S. Dak., in place of Joseph Matt. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1931.

Clarence I. Hougen to be postmaster at Wilmot, S. Dak., in place of C. I. Hougen. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

Thomas R. Worsley to be postmaster at Witten, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

#### TENNESSEE

Henry I. Smythe to be postmaster at Bristol, Tenn., in place of J. M. Fain. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1930.

Berry L. Morgan to be postmaster at Dayton, Tenn., in place of S. C. Patton, removed.

Robert T. Johnson, jr., to be postmaster at Elizabethton, Tenn., in place of D. L. Hyder, resigned.

Edgar H. Miller to be postmaster at Jellico, Tenn., in place of G. W. Harp, deceased.

Lulu M. Divine to be postmaster at Johnson City, Tenn., in place of L. M. Divine. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Lee R. Griffitts to be postmaster at Philadelphia, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Ethel King to be postmaster at Raleigh, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Jasper A. Berry to be postmaster at Bullgap, Tenn., in place of J. A. Berry. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

#### TEXAS

George W. Ragland to be postmaster at Abernathy, Tex., in place of G. W. Ragland. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Lindsey C. Payton to be postmaster at Abilene, Tex., in place of L. C. Payton. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Roberta G. Sterrett to be postmaster at Albany, Tex., in place of R. G. Sterrett. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Edgar W. Burkett to be postmaster at Andrews, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Mack M. Pittman to be postmaster at Annona, Tex., in place of M. M. Pittman. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John R. Martin to be postmaster at Anson, Tex., in place of J. R. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Joel A. Reese to be postmaster at Ballinger, Tex., in place of J. A. Reese. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Alice S. Cummings to be postmaster at Balmorhea, Tex., in place of M. C. Lucky. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Fred A. Mansfield to be postmaster at Bandera, Tex., in place of F. A. Mansfield. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Frederick W. Guffy to be postmaster at Belton, Tex., in place of F. W. Guffy. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Vina Johnson to be postmaster at Bertram, Tex., in place of Vina Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

George J. Skarda to be postmaster at Bloomington, Tex., in place of A. J. Skarda, deceased.

John K. Ford to be postmaster at Bogata, Tex., in place of J. K. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Flora G. Bowers to be postmaster at Borger, Tex., in place of Harold Rothschild, removed.

Jeptha G. Flato to be postmaster at Bovina, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Pearl G. Boynton to be postmaster at Bronte, Tex., in place of P. G. Boynton. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Charles S. Myers to be postmaster at Bryan, Tex., in place of C. S. Myers. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Sallie C. Milburn to be postmaster at Bryson, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Ray C. Kelley to be postmaster at Caddo, Tex., in place of R. C. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Hester Thomason to be postmaster at Centerville, Tex., in place of D. T. Cook, removed.

Alfred A. Thomas to be postmaster at Chandler, Tex., in place of A. A. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John J. Crockett to be postmaster at Chapel Hill, Tex., in place of J. J. Crockett. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1928.

Millard T. Jones to be postmaster at Chillicothe, Tex., in place of M. T. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Viola L. Harris to be postmaster at Christoval, Tex., in place of Maggie Hannum, deceased.

Etta Varley to be postmaster at Collinsville, Tex., in place of Etta Varley. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Claude H. Martin to be postmaster at Crane, Tex., in place of C. H. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Wilson I. Lawler to be postmaster at Deport, Tex., in place of W. I. Lawler. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Frederick V. Blesse to be postmaster at Dilley, Tex., in place of F. V. Blesse. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Wiley Fox to be postmaster at Dumas, Tex., in place of Wiley Fox. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Grady C. Edmonds to be postmaster at Elsa, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Charles H. Cmajdalka to be postmaster at Fayetteville, Tex., in place of C. H. Cmajdalka. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Gladys Arnold to be postmaster at Forsan, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Ferman Carpenter to be postmaster at Franklin, Tex., in place of Ferman Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Charles W. Silliman to be postmaster at Ganado, Tex., in place of C. W. Silliman. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

James P. Hewitt to be postmaster at Giddings, Tex., in place of J. P. Hewitt. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Virgil G. Pritchett to be postmaster at Gladewater, Tex., in place of V. G. Pritchett. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Eleanor B. Johnston to be postmaster at Goree, Tex., in place of S. G. Hampton. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Emma J. Cleveland to be postmaster at Grand Prairie, Tex., in place of E. J. Cleveland. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William I. Rodgers to be postmaster at Gunter, Tex., in place of W. I. Rodgers. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

James M. Everett to be postmaster at Hedley, Tex., in place of J. M. Everett. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Lillie Brinkley to be postmaster at Howe, Tex., in place of Lillie Brinkley. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Walter S. Street to be postmaster at Humble, Tex., in place of E. W. Corley. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Charles F. Adams to be postmaster at Jacksonville, Tex., in place of C. F. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Helen M. Peel to be postmaster at Jourdanton, Tex., in place of H. M. Peel. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles E. Smith to be postmaster at Kerens, Tex., in place of C. E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Annie D. Barker to be postmaster at Kilgore, Tex., in place of A. D. Barker. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

James T. Davis to be postmaster at Kopperl, Tex., in place of J. T. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Nicholas C. Nail to be postmaster at Krum, Tex., in place of N. C. Nail. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Helen C. Wallace to be postmaster at Kyle, Tex., in place of H. C. Wallace. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Alex E. Jungmann to be postmaster at Lacoste, Tex., in place of A. E. Jungmann. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

James D. Dyer to be postmaster at Lamesa, Tex., in place of J. D. Dyer. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William R. Wagle to be postmaster at Lampasas, Tex., in place of W. R. Wagle. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

John H. Anderson to be postmaster at Lawn, Tex., in place of J. H. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Raymond I. Gabbert to be postmaster at Los Fresnos, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Jessie L. Kay to be postmaster at Lytle, Tex., in place of J. L. Kay. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Tryon Lewis to be postmaster at McCamey, Tex., in place of Tryon Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Iona Cooke to be postmaster at Mart, Tex., in place of J. E. Cooke, resigned.

Paul Fomley to be postmaster at Maud, Tex., in place of H. H. Helms. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Oscar J. Adcock to be postmaster at Merkel, Tex., in place of O. J. Adcock. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

William H. Spratt to be postmaster at Mingus, Tex., in place of T. A. Guthrie, deceased.

Santford P. Rosette to be postmaster at Mission, Tex., in place of S. P. Rosette. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1930.

Mollie A. Hough to be postmaster at Montgomery, Tex., in place of M. A. Hough. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Wenzel K. Richter to be postmaster at Moulton, Tex., in place of W. K. Richter. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

William C. Simmons to be postmaster at Murchison, Tex., in place of W. C. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Henry A. Williamson to be postmaster at Nacogdoches, Tex., in place of H. A. Williamson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Elmer J. Mayo to be postmaster at Nevada, Tex., in place of E. J. Mayo. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Fannie H. Miller to be postmaster at Newton, Tex., in place of F. H. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

James R. Kersey to be postmaster at Ozona, Tex., in place of J. R. Kersey. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

Bessie E. Fairless to be postmaster at Palo Pinto, Tex., in place of B. E. Fairless. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Hattie M. Culpepper to be postmaster at Palmer, Tex., in place of H. M. Culpepper. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

David E. Cecil to be postmaster at Pampa, Tex., in place of W. A. Crawford, resigned.

Ida B. Gilliland to be postmaster at Paradise, Tex., in place of J. R. Gilliland, deceased.

Charles B. Myers to be postmaster at Poteet, Tex., in place of T. E. Franklin, resigned.

Andrew J. Sitton to be postmaster at Pyote, Tex., in place of A. J. Sitton. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Jasper W. Blount to be postmaster at Quinlan, Tex., in place of J. W. Blount. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Arthur N. Brown, jr., to be postmaster at Richland, Tex., in place of A. N. Brown, jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Henry L. Goodwin to be postmaster at Roaring Springs, Tex., in place of H. L. Goodwin. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Efren M. Ramirez to be postmaster at Roma, Tex., in place of E. M. Ramirez. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Gayle T. Snedecor to be postmaster at Rosenberg, Tex., in place of G. T. Snedecor. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John W. Ledbetter to be postmaster at Round Rock, Tex., in place of F. L. Aten. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1930.

Kelsey R. Dort to be postmaster at Saint Jo., Tex., in place of K. R. Dort. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Atheniar Wade to be postmaster at San Augustine, Tex., in place of C. M. Martin, removed.

Archie C. Saxon to be postmaster at Saratoga, Tex., in place of R. M. Foster, removed.

Walter Kurz to be postmaster at Somerset, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Thomas C. Murray to be postmaster at Sonora, Tex., in place of T. C. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Nobye Hamilton to be postmaster at Stanton, Tex., in place of R. H. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Turner H. Perry to be postmaster at Stephenville, Tex., in place of T. H. Perry. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Nelson L. Yates to be postmaster at Stratford, Tex., in place of N. L. Yates. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Winfred C. Wilson to be postmaster at Sunset, Tex., in place of W. C. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Daniel G. Shields to be postmaster at Sweetwater, Tex., in place of M. B. Howard, deceased.

John E. Kimsey to be postmaster at Texon, Tex., in place of J. E. Kimsey. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Miles B. Earnheart to be postmaster at Trenton, Tex., in place of M. B. Earnheart. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Bertha M. Nicholson to be postmaster at Trinidad, Tex., in place of B. M. Nicholson. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

Ralph D. Gilbert to be postmaster at Trinity, Tex., in place of R. D. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Vera Butler to be postmaster at Troup, Tex., in place of Vera Butler. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Thomas W. McCormick to be postmaster at Tuscola, Tex., in place of T. W. McCormick. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Alfred S. Maddox to be postmaster at Valley View, Tex., in place of A. S. Maddox. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Robert H. Rhodes to be postmaster at Waelde, Tex., in place of R. H. Rhodes. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1931.

Mary J. Lovely to be postmaster at Weslaco, Tex., in place of M. J. Lovely. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1930.

Laura E. Tidwell to be postmaster at Whittenburg, Tex., in place of L. E. Tidwell. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

#### UTAH

Wallace L. Holst to be postmaster at Brigham, Utah, in place of W. L. Holst. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Erastus F. Birch to be postmaster at Eureka, Utah, in place of Frank Beesley. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1930.

James C. Hill to be postmaster at Elsinore, Utah, in place of J. C. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Will C. Barton to be postmaster at Garfield, Utah, in place of W. C. Barton. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John H. Hall to be postmaster at Hurricane, Utah, in place of J. H. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Alta A. Dayton to be postmaster at Magna, Utah, in place of A. A. Dayton. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Henry C. Jacobs to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Utah, in place of H. C. Jacobs. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Harold C. Nelson to be postmaster at North Salt Lake, Utah, in place of Andrew Adamson, Jr., removed.

George G. Rosevear to be postmaster at Park City, Utah, in place of G. G. Rosevear. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Porter A. Clark to be postmaster at Parowan, Utah, in place of P. A. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1931.

Mary Cooper to be postmaster at Pleasant Grove, Utah, in place of Mary Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

#### VERMONT

Mabel W. Roberts to be postmaster at East Poultney, Vt. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Ralph Gaul to be postmaster at North Bennington, Vt., in place of Ralph Gaul. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1931.

Earl R. Sheldon to be postmaster at Rupert, Vt. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Jessie E. Dyer to be postmaster at Salisbury, Vt., in place of F. C. Dyer, deceased.

George E. Carpenter to be postmaster at Waterbury, Vt., in place of G. E. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

#### VIRGINIA

John Q. Blackburn to be postmaster at Amelia Courthouse, Va., in place of L. O'N. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Charles B. Graves to be postmaster at Chester, Va., in place of C. B. Graves. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1930.

Robert J. Blackburn to be postmaster at Endless Caverns, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

John O. Hawkins to be postmaster at McGaheysville, Va., in place of C. F. Harmon, resigned.

Lawrence C. Page to be postmaster at Norfolk, Va., in place of C. L. Wright, resigned.

Mary R. Piggott to be postmaster at Purcellville, Va., in place of A. E. Lybolt. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Berkeley Williams to be postmaster at Richmond Va., in place of J. W. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Walter H. Oakey to be postmaster at Salem, Va., in place of E. S. Barnitz. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Alfred L. Benson to be postmaster at Tangier, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

#### WASHINGTON

Joseph L. Milner to be postmaster at Almira, Wash., in place of J. L. Milner. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Walberg Tonstad to be postmaster at Auburn, Wash., in place of M. G. Wilkinson. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Augusta Hunt to be postmaster at Burton, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Donald M. Mitchell to be postmaster at Camas, Wash., in place of N. M. Field, deceased.

Isaac Knutson to be postmaster at Chinook, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Ruth Monroe to be postmaster at Clearlake, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Inez G. Spencer to be postmaster at Creston, Wash., in place of I. G. Spencer. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Alonzo E. Emerson to be postmaster at Ellensburg, Wash., in place of A. E. Emerson. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Charles C. King to be postmaster at Entiat, Wash., in place of C. C. King. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Clarence W. Fisk to be postmaster at Ferndale, Wash., in place of E. K. Field, removed.

William F. Byars to be postmaster at Goldendale, Wash., in place of T. A. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1931.

Lynn P. Hart to be postmaster at Hunters, Wash., in place of L. R. Menkee, resigned.

John H. Gibson to be postmaster at Issaquah, Wash., in place of J. H. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Henry T. Bennett to be postmaster at Monroe, Wash., in place of Arthur Bailey. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Zelda Ellis to be postmaster at Morton, Wash., in place of N. D. Tower, deceased.

Jennie A. Smith to be postmaster at Peshastin, Wash., in place of E. C. Bosma, resigned.

Rachel A. M. Hilstad to be postmaster at Port Blakely, Wash., in place of H. P. McVicker, removed.

Orien L. Renn to be postmaster at Touchet, Wash., in place of O. L. Renn. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1931.

Arthur W. Calder to be postmaster at Vancouver, Wash., in place of A. B. Eastham, deceased.

Anna C. Dowling to be postmaster at Vashon, Wash., in place of M. B. Bridgman, resigned.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Enoch L. Ellison to be postmaster at Beckley, W. Va., in place of A. M. McKinney. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

John K. Quick to be postmaster at Cedar Grove, W. Va., in place of R. L. McClung, resigned.

Stewart S. Stepp to be postmaster at Chattaroy, W. Va., in place of S. S. Stepp. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1930.

Levi Gay to be postmaster at Eccles, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

James T. Jarrell to be postmaster at Edwight, W. Va., in place of C. F. Tomlinson, removed.

Harrison G. Vicars to be postmaster at Fort Gay, W. Va., in place of Oscar Sipple, removed.

Willie J. Ayers to be postmaster at Grantsville, W. Va., in place of C. C. Hathaway, removed.

Harry O. Lockman to be postmaster at Helen, W. Va., in place of H. O. Lockman. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

James G. Meadows to be postmaster at Hinton, W. Va., in place of J. G. Meadows. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Grafton S. Stidger to be postmaster at Littleton, W. Va., in place of C. F. Stewart, resigned.

Ethel M. Zimmerman to be postmaster at McMechen, W. Va., in place of E. M. Zimmerman. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Cecil H. Kirby to be postmaster at Minden, W. Va., in place of C. B. Wright, resigned.

Godfrey B. Beebout to be postmaster at New Cumberland, W. Va., in place of G. B. Beebout. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Thomas C. Scott to be postmaster at Philippi, W. Va., in place of T. C. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1931.

George A. Brooks to be postmaster at Pineville, W. Va., in place of G. A. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

Thomas C. Bond to be postmaster at Powellton, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Joseph D. Brown to be postmaster at Renick, W. Va., in place of K. W. Snedegar. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Rex Michael to be postmaster at Rivesville, W. Va., in place of G. H. Spencer, removed.

Ira W. Folden to be postmaster at Ronceverte, W. Va., in place of I. W. Folden. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Sylvester V. Riggs to be postmaster at Saint Marys, W. Va., in place of S. V. Riggs. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1930.

William A. Meredith to be postmaster at Shinnston, W. Va., in place of C. S. Randall. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1930.

Emmett W. Williams to be postmaster at Stotesbury, W. Va., in place of E. W. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

George L. Wilcoxon to be postmaster at Tams, W. Va., in place of H. R. Tribou, resigned.

William H. Snedegar to be postmaster at Ward, W. Va., in place of Virginia Ekberg, resigned.

Willard E. Hatfield to be postmaster at Williamson, W. Va., in place of W. E. Hatfield. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

## WISCONSIN

Jerry J. Jerabek to be postmaster at Algoma, Wis., in place of J. J. Jerabek. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Emmery A. Greunke to be postmaster at Appleton, Wis., in place of W. H. Zuehlke, resigned.

John F. Lambert to be postmaster at Crandon, Wis., in place of J. F. Lambert. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Edward C. Szyperski to be postmaster at Cudahy, Wis., in place of Paul Mlodzik. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1931.

Charles C. Randolph to be postmaster at East Troy, Wis., in place of H. B. Linde, removed.

Otto E. Born to be postmaster at Fond du Lac, Wis., in place of T. A. Watson, deceased.

Dean J. Hotchkiss to be postmaster at Foxlake, Wis., in place of D. J. Hotchkiss. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Benjamin O. Wall to be postmaster at Holmen, Wis., in place of B. O. Wall. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

William C. Curry to be postmaster at Kiel, Wis., in place of A. C. Eckardt. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Anton Schiesl to be postmaster at Laona, Wis., in place of Anton Schiesl. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Clarence A. Loescher to be postmaster at Menasha, Wis., in place of W. H. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Ethel F. Pilgrim to be postmaster at Menomonee Falls, Wis., in place of E. F. Pilgrim. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1931.

Grace A. Johnson to be postmaster at Merrimack, Wis., in place of G. A. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Edith S. Bartlett to be postmaster at Nashotah, Wis., in place of E. S. Bartlett. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1931.

Peter D. Harris to be postmaster at Oneida, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Harry W. Nyenhuis to be postmaster at Oostburg, Wis., in place of Herman Graskamp, resigned.

Fisk W. Carlin to be postmaster at Palmyra, Wis., in place of G. G. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Louis J. Bettinger to be postmaster at Plain, Wis., in place of L. J. Bettinger. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1931.

Alma Colt to be postmaster at Poy Sippi, Wis., in place of Alma Colt. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles F. Ninman to be postmaster at Sauk City, Wis., in place of C. F. Ninman. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

John Feutz to be postmaster at Slinger, Wis., in place of John Feutz. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

LeRoy H. Ardern to be postmaster at Springbrook, Wis., in place of L. H. Ardern. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Russell E. Burlingame to be postmaster at Statesan, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Louis C. Currier to be postmaster at Stoughton, Wis., in place of L. C. Currier. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1931.

LeRoy Winters to be postmaster at Twin Lakes, Wis., in place of LeRoy Winters. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

Ralph W. Lathrop to be postmaster at Wauzeka, Wis., in place of R. W. Lathrop. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1931.

Sam Dewar to be postmaster at Westfield, Wis., in place of Sam Dewar. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Edward F. Sweeney to be postmaster at Whitewater, Wis., in place of R. C. Bulkley. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1931.

## WYOMING

Verne W. Mokler to be postmaster at Casper, Wyo., in place of E. M. Bean. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1930.

Wilson A. Clark to be postmaster at Clearmont, Wyo. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

William H. Davis to be postmaster at Douglas, Wyo., in place of H. C. Miller, deceased.

Arthur W. Crawford to be postmaster at Guernsey, Wyo., in place of A. W. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Edward Bottomley to be postmaster at Kleenburn, Wyo., in place of Edward Bottomley. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1931.

Daniel C. Carson to be postmaster at Pinedale, Wyo., in place of D. C. Carson. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

Hedwig C. Hurtt to be postmaster at Sundance, Wyo., in place of H. C. Hurtt. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

William Russell to be postmaster at Winton, Wyo. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, again the sweep of time has brought us to the threshold of a new year. Solemn and tender, indeed, are the thoughts which fill our minds. We pray that it may have for us mental and spiritual treasure to enrich our whole lives. We thank Thee that we are the children of Thy handiwork; were it not so, the brightest day of earth would be darkness and every joy would pass under a perpetual eclipse. We are supported by the sublime truth that the angels of Thy providence will go before us and the angels of Thy mercy will camp about us, and from the heavens above the divine hand will pour light upon our pathway. Do Thou sustain and direct our President, our Speaker, and every Member of this House, that they may be brave to investigate and fearless to decide. In this hour so grave, so intense, so agitated may we listen, may we hearken to the highest challenge of faith and hope. May all selfishness, sectarian bias, and evil design melt away into brotherly love and pour into the golden circle of our homes the fullest measures of purity and sweetness, and may we relate ourselves in every way to the upper movements of our country. O Thou who art the ancient of days, put Thy finger upon the fevered pulse of the world, replenish its wasted places; may it feel the shame of its unworthy living and come back to Thy footstool. In defeat and in victory may we pledge ourselves to Him, the Master over all. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 22, 1931, was read and approved.

## JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on December 23, 1931, present to the President for his approval a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to authorize the postponement of amounts payable to the United States from foreign governments during the fiscal year 1932, and their repayment over a 10-year period beginning July 1, 1933.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on

the following date the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

December 23, 1931:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to authorize the postponement of amounts payable to the United States from foreign governments during the fiscal year 1932, and their repayment over a 10-year period beginning July 1, 1933.

## SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. TAYLOR, of the second district of the State of Tennessee, presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

## MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I present a request, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs asks permission to sit during the sessions of the House for the period of one week beginning January 5, 1932.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not understand the request of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for one week. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House Resolution 82

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and the subcommittees thereof are authorized to sit during the sessions for one week from January 5, 1932.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

## COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE, RADIO, AND FISHERIES

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House Resolution 83

*Resolved*, That clause 9 of Rule X is amended to read as follows:

"9. On Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries, to consist of 21 members."

Clause 9 of Rule XI is amended to read as follows:

"9. To merchant marine, radio, and fisheries—to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the only change which is made in the rule is that of adding "radio" to the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. That is the Chair's understanding of it. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the only change is really in the name.

Mr. COLLIER. In the name, yes; that committee already having jurisdiction over radio.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Let us hope the committee will exercise that jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he has consulted with the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, about this change.

Mr. COLLIER. This is the unanimous report of the committee on committees and it received the approval of all

the Democrats. I know of no objection to it from any source. That committee already has jurisdiction over radio, and this resolution simply adds "Radio" to the title of that committee, making it the Committee on the Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

Mr. MAPES. I do not know whether the gentleman from Mississippi intended not to answer my question or not, but my question concretely was as to whether the gentleman had consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. COLLIER. I do not think I have.

Mr. DAVIS. If the gentleman will permit, I will say that the gentleman from Texas was present at the meeting of the Democratic caucus at which this change was unanimously adopted. I discussed it with him afterwards and he has no objection to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 84

*Resolved*, That those Members of the House elected to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries are hereby elected to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries, and all records and papers of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries are hereby transferred to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

That all bills, resolutions, papers, documents, petitions, and memorials heretofore referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, are hereby referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by having printed therein a telegram from the county commissioners of Spokane County, Wash.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the subject?

Mr. HILL of Washington. It has reference to the need of Federal aid for the unemployed.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I think such petitions will come in by the score or hundreds or thousands. I object.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, may I submit a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Did I understand there was a message received from the President? There was so much confusion I could not hear what was the message that was submitted to the House.

The SPEAKER. The message has not been laid before the House, so the gentleman could not understand what it contains.

Mr. UNDERHILL. What is the parliamentary situation with respect to the message?

The SPEAKER. It is on the Speaker's desk.

Mr. UNDERHILL. When will it be laid before the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will lay it before the House at a very early date.

The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HON. SCOTT FIELD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on December 20, 1931, just before Congress recessed for the holidays, there passed away at his home in Calvert, Tex., the Hon. Scott Field, a former Member of this body. For four years, in the Fifty-eighth and Fifty-ninth Congresses, he represented the sixth congressional district of Texas, the district that I now have the honor to represent.

He became a Member of the House at the same time that our distinguished Speaker [Mr. GARNER] began his service. The present able leader of the majority [Mr. RAINY] also began his service in the same Congress. Had Mr. Field desired to do so, he could have remained a Member of the House doubtless for many years, but he did not desire reelection, and voluntarily retired at the expiration of his second term on March 4, 1907.

Mr. Field was born in Canton, Madison County, Miss., January 26, 1847, and during the Civil War, at the age of 16, enlisted in the Confederate Army as a member of the Harvey Scouts; he later served in Maj. Gen. W. H. Jackson's division, Forrest's corps; saw active service in northern Alabama and through the Georgia and Tennessee campaigns under Generals Johnson and Hood. After the war he was graduated from the University of Virginia, thereafter taught school for two years, studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1872, having moved to Calvert, Tex., that year, and continued to make that his home until his death.

He served as prosecuting attorney of Robertson County, Tex., 1878-1882; served in the State Senate of Texas, 1887-1891; and was delegate to the Democratic National Convention at Chicago in 1892.

He was an able and successful lawyer, and was actively engaged in the practice of his profession until 1913. He was also for many years engaged in extensive agricultural pursuits. In the later years of his life, Mr. Field's vision became materially impaired so that he was practically blind, but this affliction did not cause him to lose the cheerful and optimistic spirit that he had always possessed; neither did it affect his interest in public questions.

Always a loyal Democrat, in the presidential campaign of 1928 he spoke in his home county in behalf of the Democratic ticket.

Mr. Field possessed a most pleasing personality—quiet and unassuming in manner, uniformly courteous, considerate of the welfare of others, he was truly a gentleman of the old school.

When one considers his long life of nearly 85 years, and his record as a soldier, a statesman, a citizen, and a friend, it can be said of him as was said of another, "He was tried in many high offices and critical enterprises and found faithful in them all."

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. To-day is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the calendar.

HOSPITAL AND HOME FACILITIES FOR VETERANS OF CONFEDERATE ARMY AND NAVY

The first bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4577) to extend hospital and home facilities to veterans of the Confederate Army and Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the bill go over.

Mr. RAINY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may go over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRNS, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee submitted a privileged report on the bill (H. R. 6660) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1932, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 15), which was read the first and second times and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAPES reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6660) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes. And pending that I would like to make some agreement as to the time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would like to ask the gentleman if he expects to read the bill to-day?

Mr. BYRNS. I have enough requests for general debate for the entire day if the gentleman from Indiana has some requests.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The bill has not yet been printed, has it?

Mr. BYRNS. It has not, but we will have it by to-morrow, and we can have general debate to-day.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from Tennessee intends to go on with the general debate to-day, one-half of the time to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to interfere with the prerogatives or privileges of the Speaker, but I would ask if it is not usual when a message is received from the President of the United States that it be at once laid before the House so that we may know what the message contains?

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the custom has been to investigate these messages before they are laid before the House in order that the Chair may determine what reference shall be made of them and whether the documents appended to the message shall be printed. That investigation is being made at the present time. Whether it is laid before the House now or later this afternoon can make but little difference.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Tennessee couple with his request a statement that the bill will not be taken up to-day under the 5-minute rule, so that we may be advised what is in it before it is taken up?

Mr. BYRNS. Pending action, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] if he has any number of requests for general debate?

Mr. WOOD. I have but one or two requests. I will suggest to the gentleman that the bill be taken up to-day for general debate and that the time be not limited.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman that I have requests for an hour and 40 minutes in addition to the time I shall consume in explanation of the bill. So, if the gentleman from Indiana has any number of requests—

Mr. WOOD. Up to the present time I have two or three requests which will occupy about three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. BYRNS. I think I can assure the gentleman from New York that the bill will not be taken up for consideration under the 5-minute rule until the House meets to-morrow. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided between the gentleman from Indiana and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee that the time be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MOREHEAD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

H. R. 6660

A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, it is not my purpose to consume any more time of the committee than may be necessary for explanation of this bill. I propose to limit my remarks almost entirely to the bill now before you.

I may say, however, as a preliminary, that a good deal has been said in the newspapers of the country about the reduction of appropriations and expenditures. I am very sure that I voice the sentiment of every member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I feel sure of every Member of this House, when I say that every possible effort should be made to cut down appropriations and expenditures. It has been stated many times on the floor of this House by Members on both sides of the Chamber that there is never any partisanship in the Committee on Appropriations in the consideration of appropriation bills. That custom will, of course, be continued, I hope, for all time to come. Everyone is interested in the amount that is appropriated for the expenditures of the Federal Government. It is a matter which appeals not only to every actual taxpayer, but also to every consumer in the country, because in the last analysis they have the taxes to pay. The Committee on Appropriations, I am happy to say, since I have been a member of it, for 20 years or more, has never indulged in any partisanship when it comes to consider any items of expenditure.

This bill is reported to you by the unanimous action of that committee. Before I take it up let me say this with reference to the effort that will be made by the committee and by the House toward a reduction of estimates submitted by the President. Up to the present time those estimates amount to \$4,601,000,000, in round numbers, for the fiscal year 1933.

Of that amount \$497,000,000 represents the sum that will be needed by way of reduction in the principal of the debt from the sinking fund and other debt-retirement funds, an amount which, I think you will agree with me, can not, of course, under the law as it now reads, be reduced. There will also be required \$640,000,000 of interest on the public debt, which, of course, must be paid, and which can not be scaled. The Veterans' Administration, including permanent appropriations, has an estimate pending before the committee amounting in round numbers to \$1,072,000,000. Under present law fixing the amount of compensation, insurance, and other expenditures made necessary by way of pensions, and so forth, for veterans of all wars, I take it there is very little possibility of reducing that amount.

In addition to that the Post Office Department and the Postal Service have estimates for \$814,000,000. Just how much that can be reduced I do not know. Of course, if the Congress should take any action with reference to the reduction of salaries, there would be some decrease in that estimate, and then the other permanent appropriations, other than those enumerated, which are not passed on by the Congress amount to \$77,000,000, which makes a total of \$3,100,000,000. I have called attention to these figures just to let you see how difficult it is going to be for Congress with every good intention to reduce these estimates in an amount that the people might expect them to be reduced, and which we ought to do, in the interest of the taxpayer, and for the purpose of calling your attention to the fact

that if this Congress pursues a practice which has been followed in previous years of increasing commitments and obligations on the part of the Government, you are going to have a situation which will not only result in defeating actual reduction, but in an increase beyond your expectations. That leaves a balance of \$1,501,000,000 out of these estimates, and in those figures is \$125,000,000 for Federal-aid roads, forest roads and trails, and roads in national parks. You gentlemen know as well as I do just how much those estimates can be reduced, and how difficult it may be if anyone makes an effort to reduce them, without passing upon the question of whether or not they should in all good conscience be reduced. Those estimates include also \$120,000,000 for the public buildings program in 1933. They include also \$93,000,000 for rivers and harbors and flood control, exclusive of permanent appropriations. That makes a total of \$338,000,000 for those three items of public expenditure, involving the construction of public works. Then they include also an estimate of \$342,000,000 for the Navy and \$301,000,000 for the military expenditures, exclusive of permanent appropriations, making a total for those two departments of \$643,000,000. That leaves for all other activities of the Government in these estimates as they are now before Congress of approximately \$520,000,000.

I have called these figures to your attention for the purpose of emphasizing the necessity upon the part not only of every member of the Committee on Appropriations, but of every Member of this House, of guarding the Treasury and cutting down the deficit by not loading onto the Treasury additional burdens and new expenditures and new obligations in this time of stress. [Applause.] I hope that every Member will realize that we must all make certain sacrifices with reference to expenditures by the Federal Government which we feel are needed in our own States.

There never was a time in the history of our Government when we had a peace-time deficit such as those we are now facing. The deficit was over \$900,000,000 in the fiscal year just closed. The President tells us in his message that for the year ending June 30, 1932, the deficit will amount to \$2,120,000,000, and that for the year to end June 30, 1933, from present indications, the deficit will amount to \$1,400,000,000. The country is looking to you, it is looking to me, it is looking to every Member of Congress to exercise economy and to cut down expenses, and the country will, as it ought to do, hold you and me responsible if we fail by our votes to cut them down.

I think we all agree that in the interest of the credit of our country, in the interest of future generations, one of the most important, if not the most important, problems, that now confronts Congress is the balancing of our Budget. That can be done by a reduction of expenditures, and, of course, by the passage of such additional laws as will be necessary to bring in more revenue.

When we think about these additional taxes we must consider the depression that exists throughout the country; the fact that every business at the present time is crippled; that the revenues of the Federal Government have been greatly decreased under the present law by the falling off of income; and that it is not fair to them, it is not fair to business, it is not just to the taxpayers for Congress to fail to meet this emergency and use the scalping knife upon these appropriations as they come to us.

It is not a pleasant job for the Committee on Appropriations to deny requests. It is not a very pleasing thing for any member of the Committee on Appropriations to tell a colleague or to tell the country that it is not going to make an appropriation for this or for that, especially when we realize that if conditions were different the appropriation would be in order; that it would be most desirable if we had the revenues with which to meet it; but I think I can promise you, ladies and gentlemen, that the members of the committee are going to bring these bills before you, we are going to exercise our best judgment in reducing them, and then it is up to you Members of the House as to whether or not you shall sustain the committee in its effort to reduce the expenditures, or whether or not they will be increased.

Now, I want to take a few minutes to explain this bill which is now before you. The estimates which were submitted to the committee carried a total of \$139,330,162.75. The amount recommended to be appropriated in the bill is \$125,886,262.75, which is \$13,443,900 less than the Budget estimate.

If you will look at the report of the committee you will find that these reductions are contained in a comparatively few of the items. You will remember that this is a deficiency bill, and it is not always easy to reduce estimates for this character of bill, because these estimates either represent deficiencies already incurred or they are made for supplemental appropriations during the fiscal year, and at a time when it has been demonstrated to the department just how much money will be needed to carry on its activities until the close of the fiscal year.

I am not going to refer to all of these items unless some Member wishes some information in regard to a particular item; but I will take up some of the principal items, possibly not in the order in which they appear in this bill.

The first item to which I wish to call attention is the appropriation which will be necessary for the remodeling of the present House Office Building so as to accommodate those Members who will remain in that building, and give them practically the same facilities that will be accorded to those who move into the new building, which it is anticipated will be ready on the 1st day of next January.

The Architect of the Capitol submitted, with the approval of the House Building Commission, an estimate of \$760,000 for remodeling the old House Office Building. That will necessitate the tearing out of partitions, the cutting off of one of the offices so as to supply a storeroom and other facilities and accessories similar to those provided in the new building; the rearrangement of all the plumbing and other things necessary in that building, which is now about 24 years old. Of course, the committee does not know, and no one can definitely say, just what will be found to be necessary when that work is undertaken. The Architect of the Capitol stated that he had made a very close and careful investigation; he had secured the advice of those in whom he had confidence as to the amount of money that would be necessary. Those figures have been placed before the House Building Commission, which, as you know, consists of the Speaker and one member of each of the two parties, and those figures have met the approval of that commission.

The Committee on Appropriations knew of no way whereby it could reduce that estimate. The Architect of the Capitol stated that unless that appropriation was carried in this bill it would be impossible for him to make any promise that that work would be carried on and that Members would be able to get in, without inconvenience to themselves, and occupy these new quarters in December, 1933. He stated that this appropriation must be made now if he is to have time to draw his plans and specifications, to secure proper fabrication of the material that is necessary, and to call for bids and make his contracts, so that work should begin promptly in March, 1933, immediately after the adjournment of the present Congress, and be concluded, as we hope, within the eight months intervening before the regular session in December of that year. So the committee, feeling that it was the wish of the House and feeling further that every Member of Congress was entitled to the same facilities and the same advantages in his office work, has allowed that estimate.

The other estimate submitted was one for \$550,000 for furnishings and equipment for the new House Office Building. The committee felt that it had the right, although it was approved by the House Building Commission, to exercise a little judgment with reference to that. We found certain items which the deficiency subcommittee was unanimously opposed to. For instance, there was \$10,000 for the installation of gymnasium equipment in that building. I am not here to question the advisability of gymnastics, but we have a modest gymnasium in the old building, very modest, it is true. I have never been in it, but I have

been told about it. We felt that under the circumstances the taxpayers of this country should not be charged with \$10,000 for a purpose of that sort. It is quite important that we all take exercise, but I think we can do that in other ways and at our own expense.

There was an item of \$5,000 for certain moving-picture equipment in a room in that building, which we have cut out for obvious reasons, and which the committee does not expect to be expended out of this appropriation.

There was an estimate of \$1,780 each for the furnishing of 251 office suites, consisting of furniture and other equipment, such as desks for a couple of secretaries, desks for Members, tables, chairs, and other necessary office equipment. The committee felt that that was possibly too much; that in this day of decreasing prices that estimate could be safely cut and ought to be cut. Your committee therefore reduced that amount, feeling that considerably less than \$1,800 should furnish each suite appropriately.

There was also an estimate for five large committee rooms, estimated to cost \$3,750 each, which we felt was high and could be reduced. There were estimates for seven smaller committee rooms, amounting to \$2,100 each, which we felt could be cut, and after a thorough consideration of the matter your committee came to the unanimous conclusion that that estimate should be cut \$150,000, and therefore we have recommended \$400,000 for that purpose.

There is another item in this list to which I wish to call your attention, and that is the appropriation of \$321,201.94 more for the acquisition of a site for the annex for the Library of Congress, the land just back of the present Library. I call it to your attention for this reason: This appropriation is made necessary to pay the awards of the courts in condemnation proceedings. The authorization for this land was \$600,000, and that money has been appropriated. The commission in charge tried to purchase the land, but after negotiation concluded it should resort to condemnation proceedings, and the court awards result in this additional amount of \$321,000, and there seems to be no way on earth by which Congress can avoid making the payment if we want the land. But, gentlemen, in view of the cry that is set up in the District every time it is proposed to increase taxes here, I want to call your attention to this fact—which has been called to your attention in numerous other cases, and particularly with reference to the condemnation of land for the Botanic Garden: This \$321,000 in the way of awards represents nearly 128 per cent more than the assessments on that particular property. I venture to say that there is not a city in the United States, certainly none within my knowledge, where the assessments are so low that a court of record could under its oath decide that the actual value of the land was 128 per cent more than that which had been fixed by the tax assessor.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Was that by jury or judge?

Mr. BYRNS. By jury and judge. I hope the people of the District, when they talk about their extra taxes and the fact that increased taxes are being imposed upon them, will remember that practically every time we come to the question of condemnations in the courts it is found that these assessments are amazingly and extravagantly—and I was about to say scandalously—low.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GLOVER. I notice that this bill carries an appropriation of \$4,260,000 for fighting fires, which I figure is something over \$8 an acre. Does not the gentleman think that is exceedingly excessive?

Mr. BYRNS. Well, I will say that the forest supervisor stated that there had been an unusual epidemic of fires in the last year and beyond any past experience, as I recall, of the Department of Agriculture. The gentleman will recall that the regular annual bill carries \$100,000 by way of a lump-sum appropriation for the fighting of forest fires. It does it with the idea that none of it may be needed or that a situation may result in these forests when many times that amount will be needed. Under the law the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to use other appropriations for the

purpose of extinguishing and preventing these fires, and this is the amount which has actually been expended—so we were told by the Chief Forester—from other appropriations to control these fires and suppressing them during the last summer and fall, and, of course, it is necessary to reimburse the appropriations from which this money has been taken.

That is unusually large if you take the past record of the department into consideration. But, of course, in all fairness we must admit that the department and no one else can control these matters. If the fires occur it is their duty to put them out and to protect the public domain.

Mr. GLOVER. I happen to know some of the lands that were burned over, and the lands themselves with everything on them are not worth \$8 an acre. I would like to know whether the committee had a sufficient showing to know that all of this money was required.

Mr. BYRNS. No. The only thing we had was the showing that the amount of \$4,260,000 had actually been expended, and upon that showing, definite and positive as it was, we made that appropriation in order to reimburse the other appropriations.

Now, gentlemen, there is an estimate of \$30,000 for the protection of the interests of the United States in matters affecting the oil lands in naval reserves. This lawsuit involves lands said to be worth from \$5,000,000 to \$50,000,000 in the naval reserves in California. Appropriations have been made heretofore for the payment of attorneys and other expenses involved in that litigation, amounting, as I recall, to about \$215,000. The suit is now ready for presentation to the district land office and also for appeal, if necessary, to the Secretary of the Interior. It was stated that \$10,000 was needed, \$5,000 of which was to be expended for the appointment of oil experts, who were expected to go into the briefs of the Standard Oil Co. and other interests which are fighting this suit and assist the attorneys in preparing their replies, and that \$5,000 was to cover traveling and other expenses. Your committee felt, of course, that in a lawsuit of that importance and involving that amount, where it was stated these oil experts were necessary, it would be very unwise and very foolish not to allow a sufficient amount of money to provide these experts to help prepare the cases for hearing.

Twenty thousand dollars was estimated for the further payment of two attorneys engaged in this suit. They have been paid a great deal of money up to date. One of them has been paid over \$24,000 during the past year. Another one something like \$11,000. I think one of them during the past five years, and during the pendency of that suit, has been paid about \$83,000, and another one about \$30,000. So your committee felt that Uncle Sam was pretty good for his debts, and that if these attorneys were entitled to any more money they could certainly wait until this suit was concluded, which it is expected will happen very soon. Therefore we eliminated the \$20,000 which was intended for the payment of attorneys.

I am going to call your attention particularly to the eliminations because you are entitled to such information in advance of your consideration of the bill.

There was \$20,000 estimated for the Federal Trade Commission for stenographic reporting. I am not going to comment on the fact here, but I wish sometime at your leisure you would read the hearings and see what the Federal Trade Commission and other commissions in Washington are spending for stenographic work. It appeared here that 75 cents a page was being paid to a New York contractor for this work, most of which has been done in the State of Texas in an investigation of the cottonseed industry. I do not know what you may think about it, but, speaking for myself, I consider it is outrageous to pay 75 cents a page for stenographic work of this character.

Stenographers can be secured in Texas, hundreds of them, who would do the work for far less and do just as good a job, because, after all, they actually do the work anyway. It appears that a contract is made on bids, they say, with some man at the present time living in the State of New York. He does not do a lick of the work. Whenever they

notify him they are going to have a hearing in Dallas, Tex., for instance, he gets in touch with his representatives there and employs them to do the work and pays them a certain amount, I do not know exactly what, and puts the balance in his pocket. I do not see why the Federal Trade Commission can not do this itself. If it has stenographic work to be performed in Dallas, Tex., for instance, it ought to have on its list the names of the stenographers in that city and be able to employ them direct and to pay them the amount which they are getting for reporting in the courts of Dallas and for other work which they perform there. I see no reason why it should be necessary, unless it is to save somebody a little trouble in these commissions, to go to New York or to any other place and get one general contractor and have him handle the job.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I agree with what the gentleman has said, but I take it that in eliminating any amount asked for by the Federal Trade Commission, it is not the intention of the committee to curb the very excellent work the Federal Trade Commission is doing in reference to their power investigation?

Mr. BYRNS. No; and it is not the purpose of the committee to even curb the work that is being done with reference to this particular industry, and I am glad the gentleman has asked the question. The gentleman knows that it is the custom of another body to adopt separate resolutions directing the commission to investigate this or that industry, or to make any other investigation which may occur to it ought to be made. The House has never had the privilege of even passing upon such resolutions. The House and the Senate pass appropriations here providing what they believe to be necessary for the investigations under way and with a promise that the appropriations will be expended in that way. Then another body passes a resolution providing an entirely different and new investigation and the Federal Trade Commission abandons its investigation, at least in part, as to these other subjects and uses the money appropriated for a particular purpose for this new investigation.

I think this is wrong. I think the Federal Trade Commission should use the money that is appropriated for specific purposes in accordance with its promise made to both Houses, and thus give both Houses an opportunity to pass upon the matter; and this being a Senate resolution, we felt we would eliminate it and let it go over to the Senate and let the Senate act, as it did in the first instance, and provide the necessary money; and, of course, if it is necessary, we will approve it when it comes back.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman, as chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, speaks with a great deal of authority, and I think the country would want to be assured by the gentleman that it is not the intention of his committee to in any way curb or hamper or limit the splendid work that the Federal Trade Commission is doing in the investigation of power conditions in this country.

Mr. BYRNS. I have had occasion a number of times to express myself personally on that subject. I am in favor of those investigations and I do not want to curb any of them in the slightest degree. What I am contending is that when Congress makes an appropriation to investigate power conditions, for instance, or the chain stores, the money so appropriated should be expended for that purpose, and that the Federal Trade Commission should not be in a position to come back and tell us, at the end of the year, "We did not complete the investigation; we did not use all the money you appropriated for that purpose, because another body passed a resolution directing us to do something else." It is in the interest of the investigations such as the one to which the gentleman has alluded and the ones to which I have referred that I have made this statement.

The chain-store investigation started several years ago, and yet we are now in a position where we are told that even by next June the work will not have been completed, and, as I recall, more than a year ago the House was assured it would be ready, and ready at a very early date.

The only reason and explanation given is that a part of the money at least has been used in another special investigation.

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEMPLE. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Federal Trade Commission has taken money appropriated by bills that have passed both Houses for a specific purpose and spent it for a purpose that the House of Representatives has not passed upon?

Mr. BYRNS. I did not mean to make it that broad. What I meant to say was this: The Federal Trade Commission will come before the Committee on Appropriations of the House in support of its estimates, and it will indicate to the Committee on Appropriations that it needs so much money for this investigation, so much for that investigation, and so much for the other. The Committee on Appropriations makes its report to the House based on these statements, and the House presumably acts on those representations, and the bill goes to the Senate, and the appropriation becomes a law.

Later on the other body will pass a resolution providing for an investigation of some other subject which was not anticipated when that appropriation was recommended to the House and passed. Then, the Federal Trade Commission—and I am not making any criticism of the commission, although I think it is improper—feeling that it becomes its duty to make the investigation under that resolution, will use some of its funds for that purpose, as it did in the investigation of the oil-industry matter, and thus divert the funds which the House and the Senate had appropriated for other purposes.

I do not mean to make any severe criticism of the Federal Trade Commission, but I think it is a practice that ought to be stopped.

Mr. TEMPLE. Does not the gentleman think it would be proper to spend the money provided in the appropriation bill which passes both the Senate and the House on projects submitted to them by both the House and the Senate, and if the Senate has an additional investigation that it should be paid for out of the Senate contingent fund?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; or at least if the Federal Trade Commission has not the money to make the investigation without impinging upon the fund provided by the Senate and the House they ought to go to the Budget officer and say, "We must have an additional appropriation," and thus enable the House to have some say about the matter.

Now, the George Washington Bicentennial Commission is a matter that appeals to me very strongly, because I happen to be a member of that commission, not at my own request, but I was honored by an appointment by the former Speaker of the House.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Does the gentleman feel interested to the extent of a million and a half dollars?

Mr. BYRNS. I was about to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am not assuming any credit for the good work of this commission, because I am not entitled to it, and other members of the commission are. I am not taking anything away from the distinguished chairman, Mr. Fess, of Ohio, nor the director of that commission. I feel that in fairness to him it should be stated that he has done a wonderful work in bringing the attention of the country to this great celebration which is to take place this year in commemoration of the great services and the memory of the Father of our Country.

Of course, it has cost a great deal more money than anyone expected when the commission was created; far more money, I assume, than those who originated the idea anticipated. It has grown to large proportions, and while I do not want to put it on a commercial basis, I will say to my friend from Massachusetts that it is stated the Government will realize a million and a half dollars in the sale of stamps alone. The stamp sale the other day realized \$100,000 in this city, I am told by the postmaster. The statement has been made that the Government will realize a million dollars and a half. That was made by the director and also by our

late lamented friend, Mr. Ackerman, of New Jersey, who had considerable experience in the collection of stamps and in whose judgment we all had great confidence.

It is also provided that the 2,000 copies of the definitive writings of Washington out of the 3,000 sets to be published shall be sold for a sufficient amount of money to pay for the entire 3,000 sets.

So that when all the books are balanced I do not know that we are going to find that the Bicentennial Commission has cost anything like the present figures will indicate.

Eight hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars has been appropriated up to this time for this commission. Four hundred and twenty-seven thousand dollars was estimated for this deficiency bill. An estimate is pending before the committee for the next year of \$452,000. This estimate of \$427,000, with which we are concerned now, provided for \$312,000, to be expended on the publication of pamphlets on George Washington and various phases of his career; also in certain musical and other publications and publicity which you will find set forth in the hearings. It also provided \$115,000 for certain celebrations. Fifty thousand dollars was for the celebration of February 22.

The Congress having already provided a joint committee for the purpose of taking proper action with reference to February 22, it was felt by the committee that it was hardly within its province or within the province of the commission to consider that. That is a matter that could be properly left to the joint committee, and if the joint committee needs any money it can ask for it out of the contingent funds of the two Houses. It provided \$10,000 for Flag Day, \$10,000 for Mother's Day, \$10,000 for the Lee Mansion, and \$15,000 for the opening of the bridge and the Mt. Vernon Highway, and possibly some other dedications amounting to some \$115,000. Your committee felt that while all those things were very desirable, in view of the present circumstances we had no business even considering making appropriations of that kind at this time. I would rather see some of the money in the Treasury taken to feed the people than to be used for the purpose of celebrations and other unnecessary activities in the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman tell us just what is the objective of this campaign, of all this advertising, of all this expenditure by the Washington Bicentennial Commission? Is it to convince the people of the country that George Washington was a great man and a patriot? Is it necessary to go to all this expense to convince us at this time that he was the Father of his Country? I am serious in asking that question. What are we trying to accomplish in spending this six or eight hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is a question that I was going to ask.

Mr. BYRNS. The professed objective, and I am sure that is the real objective, is to inculcate the spirit of patriotism and love of country in the little children of the country and coming generations, and also to provide information in a definite, fixed form for future generations, with reference to every phase of George Washington's life and period.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does the gentleman feel that in all this expensive campaign there is anything of any substantial value toward creating a love of country in the hearts of the American people?

Mr. BYRNS. I confess to the gentleman that I believe it will be and is of great value. When the gentleman talks about great expenditures that are being made at this particular time, of course, some question may be made as to whether it is proper. When this was undertaken and these expenditures started it was not expected that our Treasury would be in the condition that it is to-day, or that the condition of the people would be as it is to-day. I think it is going to be of tremendous value in the sense that there is hardly a schoolroom in the United States which will not have information as to the life of Washington which will prove an inspiration to its pupils. The school-teachers of the country have been urged—and I take it they will all do

so—to carry on a course of training of the children in these schools throughout the land, encouraging them to study Washington and to study his life and what he stood for and what he accomplished and what this Government has accomplished, due largely to his personality and achievements. So in that sense I think it is of great value. The gentleman has his own opinion as to whether it is worth the amount expended.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. May I suggest to the gentleman that he has pointed out purely superficial aspects of patriotism. Putting up a picture of Washington in a schoolroom so that a child may be familiar with the physiognomy of the Father of his Country seems to me to be of very slight value in teaching that child to love his country and be willing to serve it.

Surely love of our country stands upon some more substantial footing than merely admiration for one of the founders of the Republic, greatest though he may have been. Surely it is our institutions, the institutions of liberty; surely it is the opportunities that are afforded the American citizen which inculcate patriotism, and not this mere lip service, a bowing and scraping before personalities and advertising that is being carried on. This hullabaloo is comparable to an effort to draw a crowd into a circus. It is belittling to Washington; it is belittling to our country.

Mr. BYRNS. Of course, my reference to the picture was incidental. I think the real value comes from the fact that these writings have been collected and that all these incidents in the life of Washington have been combined in various volumes for future generations.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What does it all matter? Every school child in the country is familiar with the history of George Washington. Everybody who knows anything of our country is familiar with it. We already have adequate sources of information. The story of Washington is drunk in with the mother's milk; it is poured into the ears of the child from the time he starts to school. The really patriotic citizen is bound to maintain that had George Washington never lived we would have had the great American Republic, and would have had the same love for American institutions that we now have. He was merely one of the great men who founded this country. This groveling at the feet of a mere man belittles our institutions.

Mr. BYRNS. I think that we can not afford to be too materialistic about these things. I think as we pass along through the world we ought to look a little to the sentimental side of life and encourage our children to do it, and succeeding generations, also.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I would rather some of the starving school children in my district had a loaf of bread than a picture of George Washington or any other great man. [Applause.] I think that this money that is being wasted in this hullabaloo, a large part of which is to advertise certain individuals and to pay men for their literary and artistic performances and for the work of printing presses, all constituting a sort of "racket," might much better be devoted to the relief of our distressed citizens.

Mr. BYRNS. The committee is not altogether out of sympathy with the ideas expressed by the gentleman, I want to assure him, and that is the reason the committee has reduced this estimate nearly 50 per cent. It has cut out every dollar that was intended for the purpose or may have been utilized for the purpose to which the gentleman has referred, and has appropriated a less amount by \$62,000 than it was said would be necessary.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. A large part of these expenditures under a patriotic cloak are to draw people to Washington, so that the hotel and boarding-house keepers and merchants may be able to skin the visitors while here. A large part of this pretense of honoring Washington is based upon the grossest materialism and is an insult to patriotism. The boarding-house and lodging-house keepers in Washington have already listed their rooms at extortionate figures, expecting visitors to come here so that they can soak them in connection with this patriotic purpose.

Mr. BYRNS. I may say to the gentleman from Alabama that there is not a dollar contained in this appropriation and not a dollar that has heretofore been appropriated out of the Federal Treasury that can be utilized for any celebration of any kind or description in the District of Columbia or anywhere else. We have confined these appropriations solely to the purpose which I have outlined.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But there is all this advertising campaign. The gentleman is advised of the proposals that are being made to hold celebrations in Washington?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; and \$100,000 has been appropriated in another bill for that purpose.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The fundamental purpose is to draw people to the city of Washington.

Mr. BYRNS. But those are District revenues, and not Federal revenues.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But we give the subject all this advertising and then the District makes an outlay so as to cash in on it. That is the whole thing.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to know what items have been eliminated by the committee. I entirely disagree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON]. I do not think that if this Nation lives a thousand years it can honor George Washington too much. I would like to know what items the committee has stricken out.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman permit me to answer the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. George Washington can not be honored by the cheap device of sending his picture around over the country and making a hullabaloo over it. George Washington is to be honored by the people of this country following his example of devotion and self-sacrifice and modest retirement. Only in that way can George Washington be really honored—not by a circuslike program of ballyhooing.

Mr. BYRNS. I may say to my friend from Maryland that the committee has eliminated the following items:

There was an item of \$50,000 which it was proposed to utilize on February 22 in connection with the birthday of George Washington, which we eliminated for the reason I stated to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How will we celebrate it without any money?

Mr. BYRNS. A joint committee has already been appointed by the two Houses for the purpose of making plans for what shall be done on February 22, and we felt that that was a matter for that joint committee to determine and to submit their plans, and if they need any money they can get it out of the contingent fund.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is that for a general celebration or for a celebration in the House of Representatives and the Senate?

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, no. This fund has never been intended for any general celebration. There was never to be anything of that kind either in the District or in the State. It was only to bring to the attention of the country the facts with reference to the achievements of George Washington and the accomplishments of that day and to permit the States and the local communities to do their own celebrating at their own expense. So that there has never been any money appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Maryland is going to celebrate George Washington's birthday at its own expense, and its people and societies will do the same thing.

Mr. BYRNS. Absolutely. And this commission, as I understand, has been exerting its best endeavors to bring about that situation in the various States and communities.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The people of this country are looking to the city of Washington, the seat of the National Government, to lead in this matter, and they are looking for bigger things here than they are looking for in the various States and cities of the Union.

Mr. BYRNS. The bill which was passed at the last Congress carries \$100,000 to enable the city of Washington to

celebrate in the manner that it thinks best. In addition to that, it is expected that this local commission will be able to derive a great deal of revenue from the sale of seats and other concessions like that, from which it is thought they will have plenty of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has consumed one hour.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional hour, or for such length of time as he may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is always eminently fair, but it seems to me the statement he made might be misleading. As a matter of fact, is it not true that any new or special issue of stamps will always bring in \$1,000,000 on the first sale? That has been long established in almost every country in the world, so that the Bicentennial Commission had absolutely nothing to do with the sale of those stamps, except to exploit the sale as one of their own achievements.

Mr. BYRNS. Well, I will say to the gentleman that the work which has been done by the Bicentennial Commission, of course, has been of tremendous advantage in advertising those stamps and causing them to be bought. The gentleman knows more about that general subject than I do, because I am not one of these stamp collectors; but it was stated that it is not expected that these stamps, in the largest measure, will be used in the actual mailing of letters.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is absolutely true.

Mr. BYRNS. And, therefore, it will be a clear gain to the Government.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. When I was a member of the Post Office Committee I remember distinctly that the Postmaster General, or the person in charge, testified that on every new issue of stamps there is a purchase of about \$1,000,000, and that they are not used in the carrying of the mails. Some of the new countries immediately after the war financed themselves on the issuance of new stamps. That is my objection to the commission. I say that with all due deference and respect to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman that I am a small part of the commission and have had very little to do with it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to exclude certain gentlemen from my criticism. The gentleman has said that the commission has advertised the stamps. Not at all. The stamps advertised the commission. It has been said that the commission is advertising George Washington. Not at all. Certain members of the commission are exploiting George Washington. That is the trouble, and it is the attitude of advertising George Washington or selling George Washington to the American people that has brought certain members of the commission into ridicule—their effort to advertise and sell George Washington.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the commission pass on the activities of the director? For instance, if the director advocates tire covers for distribution, does the commission act on the plan before it is put into execution?

Mr. BYRNS. I do not see the associate director; the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] here and I would like to have the gentleman wait until this bill comes up under the 5-minute rule, at which time he can interrogate the gentleman. I will say to the gentleman, however, that all items of expense have to be approved by the chairman.

Mr. DYER. Who is the chairman of the executive committee?

Mr. BYRNS. The Senator from Ohio, Mr. FESS.

Mr. MICHENER. Was the gentleman present as a member of the commission when it was determined to distribute these automobile-tire covers?

Mr. BYRNS. No; I was not.

Mr. MICHENER. As well as these tags for the front of cars, these busts to set up in different places, as well as the music that has been written?

Mr. BYRNS. I imagine the gentleman heard about that as soon as I did. I got my information from the newspapers.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think the commission has been doing pretty well and that the American people are getting pretty well acquainted with George Washington?

Mr. BYRNS. I think so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the commission ever considered the total amount it will expend for the proper celebration of the memory of George Washington?

Mr. BYRNS. I do not think that matter—certainly not in my presence—has ever come up, and I have attended several meetings of the commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the commission or the commissioner going to have unlimited access to the Treasury of the United States in order to exploit the name of the Father of our Country just as the commission or the commissioner may see fit?

Mr. BYRNS. The Treasury, of course, is in charge of the Congress of the United States, and the commission can not have unlimited power in that respect unless the gentleman and other Members of Congress give that power.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will remember my criticizing the commission in preparation of the Writings of George Washington, as well as the extravagant amount of the appropriations for that work—\$56,000. At that time I contended that was a matter for private publishers, and not for the Government; and I now notice in the hearings that there has been appropriated to date \$835,000, and in this deficiency bill a further quarter of a million of dollars. What has the commission before it as the total amount that will be expended for a proper celebration in memory of the Father of our Country?

Mr. BYRNS. I am sorry I can not answer the gentleman personally.

Mr. STAFFORD. In these piping times I approve of the gentleman's expression that we should be economical, but here we find in the hearings thousands of dollars being spent on tours without any restriction at all, just to advertise the person himself.

Mr. BYRNS. Gentlemen, this appropriation of \$250,000, which is a reduction of \$177,000 from the original estimate of \$427,000, is before the House. The gentleman has the same power to fix the future expenditures of the commission as either the gentleman now speaking or any other Member.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, the phraseology of the appropriation is "for the same objects specified under this head in the independent offices appropriation act of 1932." I sent for a copy of that act. The commission has unlimited authority to spend money for any character of activity it sees fit, and it seems that one commissioner alone is determining the policy. I read here in the hearings about Senator Sterling and others going around the country stopping at expensive hotels and advertising themselves.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman referred to is not a member of the commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand he is not, but he has gotten funds from the commission to spend in advertising himself, and the reason I am taking the floor is because in reading the hearings I find that the distinguished commissioner refers twice to the city which I have the honor in part to represent as having been favored by one of these illustrious historians going there to exploit the Treasury in an attempt to advertise the memory of the Father of our Country.

Mr. BYRNS. I may say to the gentleman that the gentleman to whom he has referred is now deceased. He was

never a member of the commission, and I know he has not been connected with the commission in any way for a long time. He was chosen for a certain specific work and performed that work for a short time, so far as I know, with his usual ability and fidelity. He was selected by the chairman of the commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; and he also performed very faithful work in connection with some private claim bills which were on the calendar at the last session of the Congress.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not want the gentleman to abuse me for something for which I am not responsible.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman from Alabama has called the attention of the committee to the fact that this celebration has developed somewhat into a midway plaisance. I agree with the gentleman, at least partially.

The Speaker of this House has been advocating economy, and this country certainly needs economy now in order to take care of the wants of the people in various respects, including education, and I do not believe that education, so far as George Washington is concerned, is needed. The question I would like to ask the gentleman to answer, if he can, is how much money is being expended by this commission for rent and for hire of personnel?

Mr. BYRNS. There is a pretty full list of expenditures put in here by the commission.

Mr. DYER. I understand they have an entire floor rented here in a very expensive office building.

Mr. BYRNS. No; I think they have about one-half of a floor.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That amount is between \$24,000 and \$34,000, which includes amount used to remodel the offices. I can not remember exactly now, but we had that up several months ago.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman is a member of the commission, and at the same time I know the gentleman has a great deal of other work to do as chairman of the important Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. BYRNS. I can tell the gentleman how much is being spent for rent, as appears from this statement—\$15,301.04.

Mr. DYER. In this one building here?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman tell the committee whether or not the commission itself has had anything to do with the leasing of these quarters and the hiring of the personnel. I understand there are several hundred people employed.

Mr. BYRNS. I can only say to the gentleman, as one member of the commission, I was appointed without my request and without my knowledge by the former distinguished Speaker of this House, and I have had nothing to do with it. What other members of the commission have had to do with it I do not know. My impression is that it was done with the approval of the chairman of the commission, and certainly with the acquiescence of the entire commission.

Mr. DYER. Is there any great emergency for any money carried in this bill for this celebration at this time?

Mr. BYRNS. The only purpose for which this money can be used is for the carrying out of the contracts or commitments which have been undertaken and which are now pending for various publications.

Mr. DYER. Who made these contracts?

Mr. BYRNS. I take it they were made by the director and with the approval of the chairman of the commission.

Mr. DYER. Of course, the commission itself has not passed upon any of these matters.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not know what the commission may have passed upon. The only action that was taken with reference to rents or with reference to the employment of personnel or with reference to the salary roll was that there came before the entire commission and before the executive committee from time to time the question of the publication of these definitive writings of Washington, and those things were approved by the commission. There were other

things, and I would not want to say that the commission did not have any information as to what was being done down there. I believe if the gentlemen will defer their questions until this matter comes up under the 5-minute rule they will then be in position to get information, possibly, from those who have been in direct charge rather than to attempt to get it from me.

Mr. DYER. Oh, no; far be it from me; but the gentleman's committee has brought into this House and we have now for consideration a matter of appropriating quite a large amount of money for the continuance of this work. I believe as one Member of the House that the gentleman's committee should have gone into this fully or laid it aside and eliminated it. It should have made a close examination of these expenditures—under whose authority they were made and whether or not we could save to the people some of this money which it is charged is being wastefully, extravagantly, and uselessly expended.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman that if he will do the committee the honor of reading the hearings he will find that the committee did just what the gentleman says it should have done. We went into the matter closely, as the gentleman will find if he examines the 15 or 20 pages of the testimony.

Mr. DYER. What witnesses were before the committee?

Mr. BYRNS. Hon. Sol Bloom, the associate director, and there was present the accountant and the Budget officer and also Mr. Williams, who has another responsible position—

Mr. DYER. But no member of the commission appeared.

Mr. BYRNS. No; no member of the commission.

Mr. DYER. They are the ones responsible to Congress for the expenditure, and none of them appeared to show the necessity for further expenditure.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. In my section of the country there is a growing feeling against these appropriations. For instance, I have received through the mail printed literature sent out by the "George Washington Bicentennial Commission Costumes (Inc.)" in New York City, sent to merchants selling costumes, in which it is stated that the Federal Government has spent millions of dollars in advertising this celebration and urging the local merchants to buy these costumes, and the literature indicates, by inference, that it is sent out with the approval, at least, of this commission. I am receiving letters asking me if it is true that the Federal Government, which is trying to reduce expenditures at this time, is appropriating millions of dollars to advertise George Washington.

Mr. BYRNS. I feel that I can not too emphatically say that in the publication of advertisements and circulars the commission has not authorized it nor given indirect approval to it. That is wholly incorrect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one-half hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is an item on page 3 of the print I have of the bill, line 16, "House Office Building: For reconstruction and remodeling of the House Office Building \* \* \* \$760,000." That is for reconditioning and improvement of the present House Office Building. It seems to me that this is a very serious item, and naturally the inquiry arises whether we can not postpone this improvement to a more propitious time. What great business enterprise, under the present distressing circumstances, would undertake to do that which can be done without serious consequences at any other time?

Mr. BYRNS. That matter was discussed extensively at the beginning of my remarks when the gentleman from Virginia was temporarily out of the Chamber. I can only re-

peat what I said then. It is expected that the new House Office Building will be ready for occupancy on January 1 of next year. It is expected that half of the membership who will not be able to occupy that building but will have to remain in the present building should be given the same facilities and conveniences and advantages that are given to the other half that moves into the new building.

The Architect of the Capitol stated that unless this appropriation was made now he would be unable to have the material fabricated and plans and specifications drawn so as to get the work into shape by March, 1933, and complete it in eight months.

Therefore, unless it was carried in this bill, it would practically amount to a postponement of the work in that building for two additional years, on to 1935. It is a question for the House as to whether it wants to give the convenience and advantages to half the membership that are not accorded to the other half for two or three years later. The committee felt, in view of the action of the House and determination to give to Members reasonable office advantage, that it was entirely proper to make this appropriation at this time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It seems to me that the object was originally to give two offices to each Member, and I suggest that a very small appropriation would cut the necessary doors between the partitions and provide two offices, and that the other conveniences alluded to could be put in hereafter.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman would find if that were done that it would cost twice the amount it would cost to do the job at one time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What? To cut doors between partitions?

Mr. BYRNS. I think if it is done at all it ought to be done at one time, because the cutting of the doors may involve the rearrangement of the plumbing and various things of that sort, that no one can determine now. I think the gentleman would find, if we undertook to do the work in two jobs, that we would spend more than we would in one job. I think it would be better to do it all at once or defer it all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That may be true. Then give each Member two keys to two rooms and wait until the depression that now rests upon us shows some sign of improvement, instead of cutting down salaries and wages and employees of the Government, to give us advantages which we have not heretofore enjoyed. It seems to me that this is an inopportune time to do that.

Mr. BYRNS. While recognizing that Members needed two offices, yet I was one of those who voted against the appropriation for the new House Office Building. However, the Congress by a large and overwhelming vote made provision for it. It has authorized the work to be done. We feel as a committee that we could do nothing other than obey the directions of the House and report it to the House. If the House itself wants to cut it out, that will be agreeable to me.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. If one will but read the program laid out by President Hoover's Unemployment Committee, he will see where proposals are made that housekeepers and house owners and factory owners put the unemployed at jobs that can be done to-day to much better advantage than if put off until next year. The work that is suggested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] is work that will not take machinery; it will employ the maximum number of men. On the first floor of our office building will be men working at odd jobs removing plumbing and tearing out partitions and putting in new doors, just such work as we are advising the people of America to do now and not put off until next year. Not putting vast machines to work where the number of men is negligible, but starting work employing the maximum number of men at the greatest variety of work. I want this Government to lead the way in placing the unemployed at work.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Reverting to another subject, in the discussion of the appropriation made for the Federal Trade Commission it appeared that certain funds appropriated for a specific purpose by this House were diverted to other investigations. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRNS. I would not use the word "diverted." They were used for investigations ordered by another body; or, a certain part was.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Is not that a matter that can be controlled by the Comptroller General?

Mr. BYRNS. I take it, no; because there was no limitation or specification in the bill as to the particular investigations on which that money should be used. It was a lump sum appropriation made to carry on these investigations, and I take it that the Federal Trade Commission was authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I wish briefly to refer to two or three items, and then conclude. One is with reference to the estimate of \$60,000,000 which was submitted by the Department of Agriculture for the building of roads. The committee has reduced that estimate to \$50,000,000, making a reduction of \$10,000,000. It did so for these reasons: In the first place, no one can say now just how much money will actually be needed for cooperation with the States in the building of the roads.

The legislatures of practically all the States meet next winter, and we do not know and no one can tell just what provisions those legislators will make in their respective States, by way of appropriations, to cooperate with the Government; and no one can tell, as the director frankly stated, just how much might be needed. It is the custom, and the next bill will undoubtedly carry an authorization making the funds appropriated in that bill immediately available, so there is no question but that the amount appropriated here, even if the full amount of the funds is needed, will be more than sufficient to carry on this work, and your committee felt in view of the uncertainty and the importance of conserving the Treasury, that this reduction was entirely in order and accordingly made it.

Another item to which I call your attention is the public-building estimate for \$20,000,000, which the committee has reduced to \$17,000,000. I call attention to the hearings, and if gentlemen will read them they will find it was stated that they had on hand on December 1, \$55,000,000, and that they will need between then and June 30, \$72,000,000 to \$75,000,000. Your committee took the minimum of the amount stated by those who appeared and made the appropriation \$17,000,000, which we feel will be amply sufficient to provide for that work until June 30. In this connection let me call attention to the fact that the committee has inserted a proviso in this bill which prohibits the use of any money appropriated herein or heretofore for the remodeling of the State, War, and Navy Building, down on Pennsylvania Avenue.

The committee felt that the expenditure of \$3,000,000 at this time for the purpose of reducing space and for the purpose of making that building conform to the Treasury Building and the White House was an entirely useless and extravagant waste of money. Personally I do not think it ought to ever be done. [Applause.] I think there could be no greater extravagance than to spend \$3,000,000 in tearing off the top story of that building, reducing the space necessary for the Government service, merely, as was said in the paper the other day, to make a frame in connection with the Treasury Department for the White House. I think that 40 or 50 years from now people who come to Washington will have their attention specifically pointed to that splendid old building down there, which was erected in the eighties as a type of architecture of that period. I think it is nothing more than a matter of conceit on the part of this generation and, if you please, the Fine Arts Commission saying, "We know all and have the last word in the matter of architecture, and therefore everything done in the past should be destroyed." [Applause.]

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. LOZIER. When this matter was before Congress a year ago I called attention to the fact that in the State, War, and Navy Building we have one of the most splendid types of the Italian Renaissance type of architecture. Buildings of this type will be found throughout Europe, and the Europeans would no more think of destroying a building of that character than they would think of jacking a Greek temple or the cathedrals that were a thousand years in building. When people from all over the United States come to the Capital of the Nation we should have here in Washington not only buildings embodying the Grecian or classical types of architecture but in our more than two score public buildings we should have structures typifying all the distinct and outstanding styles of architecture with which enlightened nations have adorned the earth and bequeathed to future generations as a priceless heritage.

It is nothing short of vandalism to destroy this the most splendid type of Italian Renaissance architecture in America.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I take issue with the gentleman. I took issue with the gentleman at the time, and I hope the gentleman's taste for beauty is not so "offside" as to hold that monstrosity of a building as representing any type of architecture.

Mr. LOZIER. The gentleman from New York should know that architectural art, beauty, and harmony are embodied in that building. I regret the attitude of the gentleman, for whose opinion on most subjects I entertain a very high regard. I fear he is not as good an art critic as legislator. His views are at variance with the opinions of many architects of world-wide celebrity, and with that great school of architects who have filled Europe with buildings of that type, now the outstanding show places in every nation in Europe.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But not a building like that.

Mr. LOZIER. Buildings not nearly so beautiful, ornate, or harmonious as the State, War, and Navy Building.

Mr. BYRNS. I may say to the gentleman from New York respecting his views, which differ from mine, that I hope at least for the time being, in view of the present condition of the Treasury, the gentleman will raise no opposition to this particular provision which involves \$3,000,000, and which can be saved until some future Congress decides upon the question.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I promise to close my eyes every time I pass it and then gaze on the beautiful new structure.

Mr. BYRNS. I am sure we are indebted to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman from New York give his promise now to close his eyes?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. To that one building, on the outside. I will keep my eyes open on the inside.

Mr. HOWARD. I thought the gentleman was going to close his eyes with respect to that one particular style of architecture—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That particular building has no style.

Mr. HOWARD. Which was said to have been suggested to one of the ancients by discovering a beautiful Greek maiden dressed in her hair.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They are no ancestors of mine, I assure the gentleman. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Now, gentlemen, the committee has recommended a reduction of \$11,900 from the estimate-carrying appropriations for judgments of the Court of Claims, and I call that to your attention simply in order that those who have the expenditure of this money may know just what the committee had in mind. The gentlemen will remember that my distinguished predecessor as chairman of this committee, one of its most economical chairmen, and one whom I have always been delighted to serve under, and one who has coop-

erated in the preparation of this bill, has heretofore called this matter to the attention of the House. General Dalton, a retired brigadier general, was appointed president of the Fleet Corporation at a salary of \$18,000. When he appeared before the subcommittee he was asked whether or not he was drawing his \$4,500 retirement pay in addition to the \$18,000 he was drawing as salary from the Fleet Corporation, and he assured the committee, as the hearings show, that he was not, and he distinctly left that committee, I think I am fair in saying, under the impression that he was not going to draw it. He thereby left Congress under the same impression.

If he had not done so, there is not a shadow of doubt but what the committee at that time would have reduced his salary to the extent of \$4,500, so as to make the total \$18,000. He served between two and three years, and at the conclusion of his service he then demanded the \$4,500 retirement pay per annum, amounting in all to \$11,900. It was not paid to him. He brought suit in the Court of Claims. The facts I have stated, I understand, were presented to the Court of Claims, and the Court of Claims in an opinion rendered some time ago, gave him judgment for \$11,900.

There was a dissenting opinion on the part of Judge Green. Now, the committee thought it was not fair to the Treasury and to the taxpayers, especially in view of the representation he had made to the committee, for him to go to the Court of Claims, after his services were concluded, and ask for the payment of his retired pay, and I hope that this Congress and all future Congresses will decline to pay the judgment he has obtained, and for that reason we have eliminated it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Are there not several retired officers of the Army who are drawing their regular compensation as well as their retired pay?

This matter came up on the floor several times but was simply brushed aside by saying they were not drawing their retired pay, but here is a specific instance where a retired officer has made a claim for his retired pay in addition to his regular salary. Yet it is my understanding that this salary was granted on the assurance that the retired pay would not be paid, although I can not put my hand on the date of that assurance at this moment. However, is it not true that there are several retired officers of high rank who are drawing their retirement pay and also their regular pay, for instance, a public utilities commissioner and also a commissioner of the District of Columbia? Are they not drawing both amounts?

Mr. BYRNS. I can not tell the gentleman, but I hope that the subcommittees which have charge of these bills will see to it that inquiry is made in every instance where there is a retired Army or Naval officer as to whether or not they are drawing the regular salary which would be paid to a civilian in addition to their retirement pay, and certainly if such a condition is discovered, they should carefully consider both sources of pay.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Could we not bring that about by a limitation in the various appropriation bills?

Mr. BYRNS. I think that could be done, and if such a thing is warranted I will say to the gentleman it will be done.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. YON. That would apply, I suppose, to those who are employed in the public service and not to those in private employment?

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, no. It would apply only to those in the public service.

Now, gentlemen, one other matter and then I am going to conclude. I want to again apologize to the House for taking so much of its time. The Members have been very patient. It develops there is a deficiency in the War Department, under the head of pay and allowances, of \$660,000. That deficiency, of course, has already been brought about and there is nothing to do but to make provision for it out of an unexpended balance. It does not require any additional appropriation, but it came out of the Treasury nevertheless.

I am calling it to your attention now for the purpose of placing in the RECORD a couple of letters with the view of putting the matter on record so that in the future, if a similar condition arises, the House may be advised of it and possibly refuse to recognize the deficiency unless it appears it was absolutely necessary. That deficiency of \$660,000 could have possibly been avoided in one way, and that is by cutting enlistments down to the point of meeting the appropriations which were provided. In fairness to the War Department I want to say that the Budget officer explained that this deficiency was not discovered until some time last February, and that it was possibly too late to take action before June 30 last so as to meet it. However, in the course of his statement to the committee he said it was already apparent, and had been for some little time, that there would be a deficiency in the current appropriation for pay of the Army which might amount to something like \$1,400,000. He was asked if the War Department proposed to cut down enlistments so as to prevent that deficiency, and he was reminded that the law relative to deficiencies applied to the Army as well as it did to any other department of the Government, and that it was the duty of the War Department to prevent any such deficiencies if it was within its power to do so.

However, he stated that the Secretary of War held to the idea that Congress had made an appropriation with the view of maintaining a strength of 118,750 men, and feeling that Congress had made an appropriation with that idea in view this deficiency had occurred.

Of course, I am not impeaching the good faith of anyone. I am not for one moment seeking to reflect or to criticize anyone, but I venture to suggest now, as I did in the hearings, that I think the Secretary of War has gone the other way around, with all due deference to him, and that Congress, especially at this time, is more interested in saving \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 to the Treasury than it is in having the enlisted Army up to 118,750 men; and that if by reducing the Army a few thousand men it is possible to save this money, I feel this should be done.

I took the liberty, on my own personal responsibility and, of course, not acting on behalf of the committee, to send word to the Secretary of War through the Budget officer that we felt he ought to take the steps which I have indicated, and stated that if a deficiency came up here at the next session of Congress we were possibly not going to look with much favor upon it; and speaking for myself, I was not going to approve it unless I felt every possible effort had been made to prevent such deficiency.

I received a very polite letter from the Secretary of War, which I appreciate, explaining exactly the position of the War Department; and I feel in justice to him and in justice also to the record and to the position of some of those in opposing it, I ought to put it in the RECORD, together with my reply; and I want to repeat now that while I appreciate the very strong and urgent reasons given by the Secretary of War, I can not agree with him, and unless the appropriation of this year is held within bounds, and unless steps are taken between now and June 30 to prevent a deficiency, as one Member I am going to ask the House to agree with me that we will not recognize the deficiency if it is sent up here and that the War Department will have to get along the best it can without it, and I hope I shall have the support of the House if this is done.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has it not been the history of all prior administrations that the amount appropriated for the enlisted personnel in the War Department appropriation bill has been the amount for the department to keep within?

Mr. BYRNS. Absolutely, yes; and the matter is considered with respect to the dollars appropriated rather than to the number of enlisted men.

Mr. STAFFORD. In my service on the War Department Appropriation Subcommittee years ago, it was always intended that the amount fixed by the subcommittee should be the guiding amount for the department and not the mere basis of the estimated number of enlisted men.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. What difference in the enlisted personnel is represented by this deficiency?

Mr. BYRNS. I can not say to the gentleman, because they were unable to tell us exactly.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Are they not carrying about 46 officers over the limit placed by the law?

Mr. BYRNS. I understand so, but it is contended they have the authority under the law to take money out of the rivers and harbors appropriations for that purpose, but this certainly was never the intention of the Congress.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That was certainly never intended.

Mr. BYRNS. No; that was not the intention.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman risk an approximation of the number?

Mr. BYRNS. I could not, because I fear I would miss it too much. I will get the information and give it to the gentleman.

I now want to ask for unanimous consent in this connection to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the two letters to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MOREHEAD). The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, D. C., December 28, 1931.

CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,

*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Budget officer for the War Department has informed me that on December 19, 1931, you directed him to advise me that as an individual member of the Appropriations Committee you were convinced that the consensus of opinion in Congress will not be favorable to a deficit in pay of the Army, fiscal year 1932. I deeply appreciate your counsel in this matter, and I am glad to have this opportunity to present to you and to the committee the policy being followed by the War Department in administering the 1932 budget.

As you know, the annual act, fiscal year 1932, carried \$328,915,068 for military activities, of which \$134,664,164 was for Pay of the Army. It was formulated at a time when the full effect of neither the increased purchasing power of the dollar nor the unemployment situation could be definitely anticipated. Commodity price changes, coupled with the exercise of rigid economy, have reduced expenditures, while the unemployment situation has resulted in an increase of the cost of pay of the Army. The War Department, alive to the pressing need for economy, has insisted that all possible savings be effected.

Before the 1932 budget became effective it was carefully re-studied, a search being made for possible economies, especially due to the drop in commodity prices, and as early as August 16, 1931, permanent savings aggregating \$1,308,478 were made available to be carried to the surplus fund of the Treasury. The War Department estimates, fiscal year 1933, reflect similar savings to the amount of \$5,322,511. Additional retrenchments amounting to \$2,467,011 are now contemplated. As a result of the above actions, \$9,098,000 will be saved to the Government from the fiscal year 1932 appropriations for military activities.

On the other hand, unemployment has decreased attrition rates for all classes of personnel and thereby increased expenditures for pay and allowances in all components of the Army. These conditions have imposed an abnormal load on the appropriation, Pay of the Army. The annual act provides for this item: "In all, \$135,464,164, less \$800,000 to be supplied by the Secretary of War for this purpose from funds received during the fiscal year 1932, from the purchase by enlisted men of the Army of their discharges." Present indications are that receipts from the purchase of discharge may not exceed \$600,000, leaving a deficit of \$200,000 in this one project. Similar shortages appear in other parts of the appropriation.

An accurate estimate for pay of the Army is fraught with difficulty, due to the large amount involved and the conditions affecting it. The department endeavors to keep the appropriation just as low as possible while still making reasonable provision for the personnel, and the fact that the estimates were very conservative was frankly presented at the hearings. An error of 1 per cent in estimating aggregates in cost more than one and one-third million dollars. In the fiscal years 1929 and 1930 the estimates were high, and in attempting to adjust them more closely to the requirements too drastic curtailments were applied in the fiscal years 1931 and 1932. Based on expenditures for last year there appears to be a prospect of a deficiency of approximately \$1,400,000, which is but slightly more than 1 per cent, and practically all of which, except for the \$200,000 enumerated above, is in projects which are fixed by law. The principal items susceptible to administrative control and available to offset this probable shortage pertain to the pay and allowances of enlisted men. The War Department is already curtailing enlisted activities to the extent

compatible with the public interest and fairness to the individual. Enlistments are practically restricted to the reenlistment of desirable soldiers within 90 days of discharges. The average strength for flying cadets has been reduced more than one-fourth. Air mechanics have been limited in number. General instructions have been issued to effect by positive administrative action such economies as are practicable. Through these measures the threatened deficiency will be materially reduced, but the possibility of its entire elimination is remote, and further savings could only be made by depriving enlisted men of allowances to which they are entitled or by disrupting the Army.

In the past similar threatened deficiencies in pay of the Army have been avoided through the employment of funds derived from the purchase of discharge of enlisted men. However, since the fiscal year 1931 Congress has seen fit to include the receipts from this source as part of the appropriation, with the result that the only reserve available to the War Department for meeting a deficiency has been eliminated. I understand that in the Navy Department annual act this contingency is provided for by making the sum of \$1,000,000 immediately available. This enables the Navy to estimate its pay needs very closely. A request for a similar provision in the language of the War Department act was forwarded to the Bureau of the Budget this year but was not included in the President's Budget. The situation in reference to pay of the Army, 1932, was fully presented to the Bureau of the Budget this year at the time the War Department presented its 1933 estimates. The Director, Bureau of the Budget, has accepted the War Department's presentation of the case and authorized the submission of a supplementary estimate for pay of the Army, fiscal year 1932 provided, however, the same was financed within our total limiting figure. As explained above, this can be financed several times over with the savings we are making, and it is therefore planned to make a request in a supplementary estimate for the transfer of any funds that may be found necessary.

You will see from the foregoing that the War Department, through the exercise of the most stringent economy, has been able to effect savings to the Government to the extent of over \$9,000,000; but due to the abnormal conditions and to pay expenditures which are fixed by law, over neither of which the War Department has any control, a deficiency of only slightly more than 1 per cent in the one item, pay of the Army, is threatened. If this situation develops, as indicated, the War Department will be compelled to ask merely that less than one-sixth of the savings it has effected be transferred to cover the threatened deficiency in the one item in which the abnormal conditions caused an excess of expenditures.

It is a matter of satisfaction to the War Department to furnish you with this frank statement of the situation with respect to this appropriation, and it is realized that your consideration will be of great assistance in meeting any emergency which may arise.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK J. HURLEY,  
*Secretary of War.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SEVENTY-SECOND CONGRESS,  
Washington, D. C., January 2, 1932.

Hon. PATRICK J. HURLEY,  
*The Secretary of War.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I thank you for your full and frank letter of December 28, in the matter of a deficiency in the current appropriation for pay of the Army.

I am gratified to learn of the savings thus far accomplished and of others that appear probable, particularly those that have accrued or may accrue as the result of administrative action, but despite such economies I am not convinced, with the Treasury so deplorably situated, that you should not so administer recruiting as absolutely to avoid a deficiency in the appropriation pay pay of the Army for 1932.

I shall not attempt to estimate the extent to which you would have to reduce the enlisted strength, but it seems to me that you must resort to this way out. This was done during Mr. Coolidge's régime, and I am sure to a far greater extent than will be necessary now to offset the prospective deficit of \$1,400,000.

My position in the matter remains unaltered, and I feel constrained to repeat that I shall not give my approval to any estimate that may be presented to satisfy a deficiency in the appropriation in question.

Very sincerely,

Jos. W. BYRNS, *Chairman.*

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the gentleman going to discuss the next item, which is a deficiency of \$250,000 in the Militia Bureau?

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman that that item is on a different basis. It was clearly understood in the hearings that the amount requested and the amount appropriated would not be sufficient to meet the needs. They have now about 190,000 members of the National Guard. I suppose, due to the depression and due to the fact they get pay for the drills each week, there has been an unexpected increase in the enlistments in the National Guard throughout the States, and this is what has brought about the deficiency of \$250,000. I, therefore, believe this is on an

entirely different status from the item to which I have just referred.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Except this, the gentleman will remember that last year, and every year, we have the usual skirmish here when we arrive at the item of the appropriation for the National Guard and the reserves.

They are rather powerful now and are organized in the congressional districts, so that every year we have this contest for more appropriations. Last year the appropriations were cut down—not materially, but they were cut down a few thousand dollars, I believe—and so they simply ignored the limitations placed by the appropriations and have gone ahead, and now we are asked to appropriate \$250,000 more. Let me say that when the National Guard goes out on parade on Decoration Day it is charged up as a drill. I have the last voucher in my office now. It seems to me that there is one place where we can economize without doing any damage at all.

Mr. BYRNS. I think the estimates for 1933 provide for a reduction of the number of drills.

Now, may I say this in conclusion, that I hope you gentlemen will not take the time that I have consumed in the presentation of this bill as an indication of the fact that I am going to impose upon your patience in other bills that I may have the honor to present in the future. I thank you for your attention. [Applause.]

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, just the day before we recessed over the holidays the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] launched a very vigorous and bitter attack against the Federal Farm Board. He held in his hand while he was talking the hearings held before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate between November 24 and November 28, 1931.

During his remarks he pointed to several pages giving the names and salaries of men connected with the Grain Corporation, the Elevator Corporation, and various cooperatives throughout the country. He made the statement at that time that the salaries of the farm cooperatives throughout the country were fixed by the Federal Farm Board and the salaries were paid by that board.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. STEVENSON. I did not state that they were paid by the board, but they were fixed by the board and ultimately came out of the other cooperatives or the Government that furnished the money to buy the cotton. I called attention to the fact that Senator CAPPER asked Mr. Jones, "How do you justify the payment of these large salaries?" And he said, "We justify it on the ground that we were seeking service, and we did not care anything about the salaries so that we got the service."

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman has just confessed to the charges that he made against the Farm Board. He maintains that because the Federal Farm Board loans to cooperatives through the country, farmer owned and controlled, that for that reason they fix and pay the salaries of the officers of those farm cooperatives.

Now, as a matter of fact, in order to clear the record and clear the public mind of that charge I have written to Mr. Stone, and I have his letter which I wish to read into the RECORD. It is as follows:

FEDERAL FARM BOARD,  
Washington, January 4, 1932.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. REED: In response to your letter of January 2, the Federal Farm Board neither fixes nor pays the salaries of officers or employees of any cooperative association. This is done by the cooperatives themselves, which are owned and controlled by their farmer members. I am inclosing herewith statements on this subject recently issued by the directors of the American Cotton Cooperative Association and a committee of the directors of the Farmers National Grain Corporation.

I am also sending you herewith the statement on loans to New York cooperatives, which you requested to-day.

Very truly yours,

JAMES C. STONE, Chairman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Not just now. The gentleman from South Carolina made that statement and I challenged the statement on the floor, and I asked the specific question if he was certain. He insisted on the accuracy of his assertion. I went to the phone and called up an officer of the Federal Farm Board, and he sustained the position I had taken—that the farm cooperatives selected and paid the officials out of their own funds. I came back and corrected the gentleman, who still insisted that the salaries were paid by the Federal Farm Board. Not only that, but the gentleman charged the members of the Federal Farm Board with being incompetent and unqualified for their jobs and made a bitter attack on them, but that was effectively answered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

I shall now say a word with reference to one member of that board from New York State, Mr. Wilson. Mr. Wilson for years was connected with Cornell University, being the head of its agricultural department. He has been one of the most active men in a practical way among the farm organizations in the State of New York. No man has the respect and esteem of the farmer to a greater extent than has Mr. Wilson, of the Federal Farm Board. He is not only a highly educated man, a man who has studied farm problems all of his life, but he has been a leader in many worth-while agricultural activities in the State of New York. No man has exerted a finer influence over the farm youth than has Mr. Wilson, and I am proud that he is a member of the Federal Farm Board.

In regard to the salaries paid by these farm cooperatives the gentleman challenged the right of the farmers to select their officials and pay their salaries. I have some figures here that may be of interest. I do not know why the farmers who are handling millions of dollars' worth of produce, trying to market it in an orderly way, trying to narrow up the spread between the \$10,000,000,000 they receive on the farm and the \$20,000,000,000 or \$21,000,000,000 which the consumer pays, should not be permitted to do so in their own way. The consumer pays enough for what he buys, but in between there is a great spread of some \$10,000,000,000 which they are endeavoring to take care of and eliminate by orderly marketing. If they can do that, then the farmers will not be in desperate straits at all. An attack, of course, is launched from every part of the country against the farm cooperatives and against Congress for trying to help the farmers to create a marketing system that will save them from this unconscionable spread of \$10,000,000,000.

I have here the figures paid by the business concerns to their executives. I take this from the Saturday Evening Post of September 20, 1930:

The largest salary paid a life-insurance company president is \$200,000 a year, but there is only one president who gets that much money. The average salary paid presidents by the largest 15 companies is \$71,000. The lowest salary for the group is \$35,000. \* \* \*

The full executive staff of one great insurance company, with assets in excess of \$2,000,000,000, consists of 38 persons. The salary roll of this insurance company, which perhaps is as nearly typical of big business as any one company in this field comes, is made up as follows:

President	\$100,000
Vice presidents in charge of—	
Administration	60,000
Agencies	45,000
Actuarial matters	40,000
Legal affairs	40,000
Investments	40,000
Secretarial	38,000
Accounts	35,000
Real estate	33,000
Purchases	30,000
Statistics	27,000
Treasurer	25,000
General solicitor	25,000
Medical director	16,000

Another company in the mutual field, which is only one-fourth the size of the company just mentioned, pays its president half as much. Its four vice presidents receive from \$24,000 to \$30,000, the treasurer \$18,000, the secretary \$15,000, and the actuary gets \$17,000.

Salaries of railroad executives: \$100,000 a year is maximum. Executive vice presidents receive from \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year.

In the field of communication, which embraces telegraph, telephone, radio, and kindred manufacturing interests, the head of one large company placed the maximum salary to-day at \$150,000; and he added "that is not augmented by any bonus or other form of compensation."

## SALARIES PAID BY BIG OIL COMPANIES

The La Follette committee, 1923, reports show that the total compensations paid by a leading corporation with headquarters in New York City:

President	\$125,000
Three vice presidents	each 100,000
A vice president and treasurer	100,000
A director who devotes his entire time to the company	85,000
Four other directors similarly engaged	each 50,000
General counsel	50,000
Associate counsel	30,000
Manager marine department	30,000
Chairman manufacturing committee	25,000

## BANK SALARIES

A bank of \$75,000,000 total resources located in a southern city of 250,000 pays \$40,000 to its president and \$30,000 to its principal vice president.

[From the Literary Digest, June 21, 1930]

Edward A. Filene is quoted as follows:

"I would, for instance, pay Owen Young a million and feel sure I would get more than a million profit as my share of his work. I would pay Henry Ford a million to run Ford Motors."

[From the Boston Post]

When the salaries paid to great singers and movie stars and the big fees drawn down by great lawyers and physicians are borne in mind, the possibility of a million for a business genius does not seem so startling.

The farmers find themselves in competition with some of the keenest executive minds in the country when they try to sell through their cooperatives, and they have come to the conclusion that it pays to hire men who are trained for the job. No matter what salaries they are paying, they are paying them with their own money, and they have a right to pay those salaries. The gentleman who attacked the Farm Board has received benefits in his State to the extent of \$6,000,000 in loans from the Federal Farm Board to his cooperatives down there, and so far they have not paid back their loans, though I assume that they will pay them back.

The Federal Farm Board has loaned money to the cooperatives in my county. I do not know what the farmers would have done had it not been for the loan which they received. They are receiving checks now for their crops produced this last year. They have had one loan. One cooperative was loaned \$175,000, and \$95,000 of it has been paid. This balance of \$80,000 will be paid by August 1 of this year (1932). This loan and others made in Chautauqua County saved these cooperatives from great distress. In other words, the farmers would have received nothing in the meantime for their crops, but with the loan from the Federal Farm Board they were able to hold their crops, process them, and now they can go into the market and sell even more cheaply to the consumer and derive a larger profit than they have heretofore derived for their products. In other words, the Federal Farm Board, through its assistance to cooperatives, is narrowing up the spread between what the farmer gets at the farm and what the consumer pays, and I feel that it is unfair for a man who comes from a State that has called on the Federal Farm Board for a loan of \$6,000,000 to aid her farmers, money they could not possibly get from their banks, to tide them over, to come here and launch a vicious attack against the hand that is feeding the farmers in his State.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a statement made to the Federal Farm Board by the Farmers' National Grain Corporation at its meeting held in Chicago, bearing out what I have had to say with reference to the payment of the salaries of farm cooperatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

## FARMERS' NATIONAL GRAIN CORPORATION CONTROLLED BY MEMBER COOPERATIVES

The Federal Farm Board has received a copy of the following report, which was adopted by a committee of the board of directors of the Farmers' National Grain Corporation at a meeting held in Chicago, Ill., December 8, 1931, and submitted to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for inclusion as a part of the record of the committee's recent hearing on agricultural legislation:

"Whereas during recent sessions of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and since in the public press the matter of salaries paid by Farmers' National Grain Corporation to certain of its officers and employees has been the subject of considerable discussion; and

"Whereas we, the members of the board of directors of Farmers' National Grain Corporation, have taken note of these discussions and desire a clear understanding on the part of the members of your committee, the Congress of the United States, and the public generally, now, therefore, we herewith call to your attention certain pertinent facts.

"First and foremost, we desire to point out that Farmers' National Grain Corporation is a national cooperative grain marketing association, wholly and solely owned by State and regional cooperative grain marketing associations composed of grain producers; that this board of directors is composed solely of the accredited representatives of these producer organizations, and that our responsibility as such directors is primarily to our own stockholders and membership, who are producers and organizations of producers of grain. Nor do we recognize any obligation on the part of this corporation to make public its business transactions, including the employment of personnel and the fixing of their compensation. Nevertheless, the conduct of our business has been such that we are willing, in this instance, to forego our fundamental rights as a privately owned business corporation in the interests of a clearer understanding on the part of the public of our aims and purposes and the soundness of the structure of this corporation.

"The burden of a large portion of the criticism of salaries paid by this corporation rests upon the mistaken theory that these funds are dispensed by the Federal Farm Board out of the Public Treasury. The facts are that the Federal Farm Board has had nothing whatever to do either with the payment of salaries to officers and employees of Farmers' National Grain Corporation or with determining the amounts to be paid to such officers and employees. These matters are solely within the authority and discretion of this board of directors and in the selection of personnel and the fixing of salaries this board has been guided at all times by the determination to place in charge of Farmers' National Grain Corporation men thoroughly qualified by training and experience to conduct grain marketing operations on a vast scale.

"The operations of Farmers' National Grain Corporation during the first two years of its existence, from October 29, 1929, to October 31, 1931, seem to this board to offer complete justification of its course. During that time the corporation has purchased and handled more than 390,000,000 bushels of grain, and we regard it as a challenge to all other grain marketing organizations that this vast amount of grain has been handled at a cost of less than 1 cent a bushel, including a total cost of salaries and wages in all departments and branches of not to exceed one-fifth of 1 cent on all bushels bought, handled, and/or sold.

"To make it clear that this 1 cent per bushel includes all general and administrative expenses is merely to prove, in our opinion, that operations of Farmers' National Grain Corporation have been conducted with utmost efficiency. It may be well in this connection further to point out that the unit cost above mentioned covers the organization period of this corporation, during which nation-wide grain-merchandising machinery has been established and set in motion, and includes all the costs incidental thereto. Net earnings of the corporation, after the setting aside of reserves necessary to insure the soundness of the corporation's structure, represent a gain to organized grain producers of 2.3 cents per bushel, which amount does not include important benefits that have come to them in narrowed margins and reduced discounts in the purchase of grain at both country and terminal points. That these benefits have been gained is easily proved by the records available in any terminal market.

"No public moneys is or has been used in the payment of any salaries of officers or employees of Farmers' National Grain Corporation. From the very beginning of its operations this corporation has been on a profit-making basis, and no part of the revolving fund available for grain marketing has ever been drawn upon for use in payment of salaries of Farmers' National Grain Corporation officers or employees.

"It is quite the general thing for those who oppose cooperative grain marketing because it menaces their own profits to magnify certain items in connection with cooperative marketing. The purpose, of course, is to make it appear to grain farmers that waste and extravagance are being practiced. Farmers, however, are quite well aware that costs of buying and selling always have been borne by the grain itself, that they have always footed the bills, and that the profits taken by the private

handlers of grain have built up numerous large fortunes. They turn to cooperative marketing in order that these profits may revert to themselves as a part of the value of their commodity.

"C. B. STEWARD,

"President Farmers Westcentral Grain Co., Omaha, Nebr.,  
"Chairman of Committee."

FEDERAL FARM BOARD,  
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1931.

The Federal Farm Board is advised that the following resolutions of the American Cotton Cooperative Association at a meeting held in New Orleans, December 8, 1931, have been submitted to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by Mr. U. B. Blalock, president of the association:

"Whereas at the recent hearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, a request was made to submit for the record a statement of salaries paid to the directors, executives, and employees of the Cotton Cooperative Associations affiliated with the American Cotton Cooperative Association; and

"Whereas at the same hearing it was stated by representatives of the American Cotton Shippers Association that the management of the American Cotton Cooperative Association was selected and that its policies have been and are directed by the Federal Farm Board; and

"Whereas, in utter disregard of the world-wide depression, it was stated by the representatives of the Cotton Shippers that the Federal Farm Board is responsible for the present low price of cotton; and

"Whereas it has been previously stated by the representatives of the Cotton Shippers that the average cost of handling cotton by its members is less than the cost of the cooperatives, but with no effort on their part to compare the services of the shippers with the services of the cooperatives; and

"Whereas said Cotton Shippers through propaganda and the circulation of unfounded rumors and misstatements directed against the agricultural marketing act, the Federal Farm Board, and the American Cotton Cooperative Association have in effect acted against public interest to serve their individual business interests; and

"Whereas at the hearing the committee was advised the cooperatives would welcome an investigation of the Federal Farm Board, the American Cotton Cooperative Association, and the cotton trade generally: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved, by the directors of the American Cotton Cooperative Association in a call meeting assembled, That the American Cotton Cooperative Association secure from its affiliated associations a statement in detail of salaries paid to directors, executives, and employees, and that such statements be promptly forwarded to the Hon. CHARLES L. McNARY; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the statement of the cotton shippers to the effect that the Federal Farm Board selected the management and directs the policies of the American Cotton Cooperative Association is not founded on facts; that the directors of the American Cotton Cooperative Association selected and will continue to select the management of this association and have and will continue to fix salaries and have and will continue to direct its policies; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That we reaffirm our faith in the agricultural marketing act and our faith in its administration by the Federal Farm Board, through which, in our opinion, the cotton producers of the South have derived benefits far in excess of the possible losses which may eventually occur through stabilization operations; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That we not only indorse an investigation of the general cotton situation but earnestly request an investigation of the Federal Farm Board in regard to its relations with the cotton cooperatives; and further request an investigation of the cotton cooperatives, the cotton shippers, and the cotton exchanges. We believe such an investigation will demonstrate that the actual overhead charges made to the members by the cooperatives are less in most instances than the overhead charges of the cotton shippers, and that in all cases, services considered, the cost of the cooperatives is materially less than the average cost of the cotton shippers; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That we believe a general investigation will clarify the atmosphere and that it will, once and for all, stop propaganda, unfounded rumors, and misstatements which have been so against the public interest during the past two years and that it will result in constructive action being taken to materially improve the general cotton situation; be it further*

*"Resolved, That the president of this association be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Hon. CHARLES L. McNARY, chairman."*

The cotton cooperative associations affiliated with the American Cotton Cooperative Association and the number of their farmer members are: Alabama, 35,498; California, 765; Georgia, 13,441; Louisiana, 12,079; mid-South (Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee), 18,976; Mississippi, 21,692; North Carolina, 13,245; Oklahoma, 39,481; South Carolina, 5,519; southwestern irrigated, 1,052; Texas, 40,128. Total membership of all member associations is 201,876.

The letter of Mr. Blalock transmitting the resolutions to Senator McNARY, chairman of the committee, follows:

AMERICAN COTTON COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,  
Raleigh, N. C., December 11, 1931.

Senator CHARLES L. McNARY,  
Chairman Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to the request made at the recent hearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that a statement of salaries paid to the directors, executives, and employees of the Cotton Cooperative Associations affiliated with the American Cotton Cooperative Association be furnished your committee, the board of directors of the American Cotton Cooperative Association at its regular meeting in New Orleans on December 8 unanimously passed a resolution, a copy of which is herewith inclosed for your files, asking the various State associations affiliated with the American Cotton Cooperative Association to forward to Mr. E. F. Creekmore, vice president and general manager, a list of all salaries paid by each association to their directors, executives, and employees, these lists in turn to be forwarded to you by Mr. Creekmore at his earliest convenience. We are very glad to comply with this request and hope the information asked for will be of service to the members of your committee in their deliberations.

You will also note that we not only indorsed an investigation of the general cotton situation but earnestly requested an investigation of the Federal Farm Board in regard to its relations with the cotton cooperatives, and further requested an investigation of the cotton cooperatives, the cotton shippers, and the cotton exchanges. If an investigation is to be held, it seems to us that there could be no more opportune time than now to investigate the general cotton situation in all of its phases; and it would seem to be the fair and equitable thing to investigate not one but all agencies engaged in the distribution of American cotton.

As one of those attending the recent hearing it appeared to me that quite an effort was being made:

First. To create the impression that the cotton cooperatives are extravagant in their ideas concerning salaries and not so careful in looking after general operating costs as they should be; and there seemed to be a disposition to place more or less responsibility for this on the Federal Farm Board.

Second. There seemed to be quite a question in the minds of some as to the relative cost and advantages of handling cotton through the cooperatives as compared with costs and advantages of handling it through the cotton shippers.

In regard to the first proposition I want to say, as a member of the board of directors of the American Cotton Cooperative Association, that we select our own executive officers and reach an agreement with these officers as to the basis of their pay. It is true that these agreements with these executive officers are subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Board, and we think rightly so as long as it is assisting in financing our operations. For the purpose of discrediting the cotton cooperatives, much is being said at present about the salaries paid for expert service, but it is our opinion that when the proper committee investigates the cotton industry as a whole it will find in executive positions in cotton firms many men who are drawing fully as much or more salary and bonus than is paid similar executives by the cooperatives; and, furthermore, that these executives are responsible for the distribution and sale of a very much smaller volume of cotton than are the cooperative men.

The cooperative marketing of cotton is a business proposition pure and simple, and a cooperative organization handling 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 bales of cotton, to be successful, demands and requires just as expert "cotton brains" as it requires to handle the same volume of business for a cotton firm or corporation. A \$75,000 salary and bonus for a man responsible for the financing, the handling, and distribution of 3,400,000 bales (Stabilization Corporation, 1,300,000 bales; American Cotton Cooperative Association, 2,100,000 bales) is a fraction over 2 cents per bale. A 1-cent-per-bale or a half-cent-per-bale man can easily be found, but an intelligent American public knows that he could just as easily lose us 5 cents, 10 cents, or more per bale on account of a lack of ability and experience in meeting keen cotton competition.

In regard to comparative costs between the cooperatives and the cotton shippers I want to say that from my several years' experience as a cotton shipper myself, from my 10 years' experience in the cooperative marketing of cotton, and from my lifelong experience as a cotton producer there can be no fair comparison of operating costs without a comparison of services rendered by the cooperatives as compared with those rendered by the cotton shippers.

The cotton shippers buy cotton from the farmers as a business and to make a profit for themselves, and not with the idea of rendering a service to the farmers. Naturally there is the incentive to so class the cotton of the farmers and to buy it and resell to the best advantage of the shipper. The incentive of the cooperative organizations, on the other hand, is to grade and staple the producers' cotton in the interest of the producer and sell it direct to the consumer with as little cost as possible, all profits going to the producer.

But a cooperative cotton association is much more than a marketing agency; it is a farmers' organization for the promotion of the cotton farmers' welfare in many other ways; it is a farmers' organization without annual dues for taking care of many other services rendered the producer. If an annual charge for dues were assessed against our over 200,000 members, as is assessed by some

organizations, it would reduce our operating costs to an exceedingly low cost per bale.

Much complaint has been registered in the past because of the deterioration of American cotton. One of the chief functions of a cooperative association is to distribute to its members thousands and thousands of bushels of high-grade, pure-bred cottonseed annually, and wonderful progress is being made in raising the standard of American cotton through cooperative efforts. The development of the community growing of one variety of cotton is now receiving much attention by the cooperatives, and they are working in closest harmony with other agricultural agencies along this line.

The cooperative organizations are interested in developing better ginning methods and are exerting considerable effort to achieve their goal. Their records show that they are saving their members many thousands of dollars annually in the reworking of gin cuts. In several States they are promoting and assisting in financing cooperative gins for the benefit of their members.

In many States they are effecting the saving of thousands of dollars annually for their members in the distribution of fertilizer and all kinds of fertilizer materials, boll-weevil poisons, improved field seeds, and other farm supplies on a nonprofit basis.

A good many State associations are furnishing group life insurance, fire insurance, and automobile insurance at less cost to their members than it could be obtained otherwise.

The cotton cooperatives fight the battles for all cotton producers, organized and unorganized, in matters of State, national, or world-wide interest. Over a long period of years the cotton cooperatives contested a rate case before the Interstate Commerce Commission and finally succeeded in bringing about a much more equitable adjustment in the cost of cotton transportation. This was in the interest of all cotton producers. The cotton shippers were very conspicuous by their absence in this fight.

The cotton cooperative associations, joining hands with the Cotton Seed Crushers Association, were largely instrumental in preventing many mid-Western States passing laws that would have prohibited the sale of cottonseed products in these States.

The cotton cooperative associations are working hand in hand with the cotton manufacturers' associations and the Cotton-Textile Institute in the promotion and development of new uses for cotton.

They are just now engaged in urging the present session of Congress to adopt a net weight law for American cotton. A net weight law will permit and encourage the use of cotton bagging.

It was the cotton cooperatives and the Stabilization Corporation that cooperated with the southern bankers in the movement to take off the present market 7,000,000 bales of cotton and holding it until July 31 of next year.

But are the costs of handling cotton through the cotton shippers really lower than the costs of handling through the cooperatives? We quote the following from an expert cotton man, a former president of the American Cotton Shippers' Association:

"As we figure it, the old method of handling through the merchants must ultimately and cumulatively place greater costs against the cotton, which must ultimately come from the producer, than those under the cooperative method."

His opinion is based upon the fact that in a large portion of the Cotton Belt cotton passes through the hands of 2, 3, and sometimes 4 merchants and distributors before reaching the consumer, each of whom must have his operating costs and a profit. In each change of hands there is additional cost in a change of insurance policies, a reweighing of the cotton and rehandling, and additional expense of resampling. As compared to these various handlings, the cooperatives receive the cotton from the producer and distribute it to the manufacturer under one insurance policy, usually under one warehousing charge, and under only one draft or bank commission.

There is undoubtedly at the same time a natural advantage in the concentrated sales of all cooperative cotton through a single hand as well as a distinct profit in such sales. Undoubtedly the American Cotton Cooperative Association, with the volume it has at its command, can secure better prices than the average smaller merchants. It is our experience that a large buyer feels it to his advantage to make large single purchases from one organization rather than many small purchases from smaller dealers and is willing to pay more for his cotton, since he feels an assurance that the larger organization can and will give him the quantity purchased out of stock and has a greater security in receiving the exact quality specified.

The problem of "country damage," which, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, costs the American cotton producers many millions of dollars, has been completely eliminated, so far as the cooperatives are concerned, by reason of the fact that the cotton of the cooperatives goes into the warehouses directly from the gins, giving the cooperatives cotton that is much more desirable than that which has been left out in the weather weeks and sometimes months.

In comparison with these various services rendered by the cooperatives to the producers we would like to ask the 800 members of the Cotton Shippers Association just what they have ever done—

- (1) To help raise the standard of American cotton?
- (2) To bring about the consumption of more cotton?
- (3) To increase the price to the producer?
- (4) To induce the grower to plant better seed?
- (5) What service have you rendered in securing lower freight rates or insurance rates?

(6) What support have you ever given to any legislation pertaining to the producers' welfare? And finally,

(7) What do you propose to do now that will in any way help the producers to raise prices to dispose of surplus crops or reduce acreage for 1932?

Very truly yours,

U. BENTON BLALOCK,  
President American Cotton Cooperative Association.

Affiliated State associations:	Number of members
Alabama	35,498
California	765
Georgia	13,441
Louisiana	12,079
Mid-South (Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee)	18,976
Mississippi	21,692
North Carolina	13,245
Oklahoma	39,481
South Carolina	5,519
Southwestern Irrigated	1,052
Texas	40,128
Total	201,876

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, in every nook and corner of this land of ours the uppermost subject of discussion for long weary months has been the desperate economic plight of the rank and file of our citizens. Since the convening of the Congress this unhappy state of affairs has occupied our thoughts, and possible measures of alleviation have predominated in the discussions on this floor.

It seems to me that many of the measures proposed would, if adopted, be of little or but temporary value, since they do not go to the root of our present difficulties. I would not, however, say a single word to discourage any honest attempt to lighten the dark pall which hangs over our country simply because the relief to be secured might be but temporary. I stand ready to assist by my voice and vote every effort which offers even a small or temporary relief of the present distressing situation.

I prefer to be an optimist, rather than a pessimist. I should like to believe the Congress alone could take action that would immediately and completely lift the country from the depths of depression into which it has been forced. I am ready to aid effort in that direction, but I fear, in fact I am certain, that any basic remedial measures which this body might adopt would not be acceptable to the executive branch of our Government.

It seems to me that our present distressing situation is the direct and logical result of an unsound governmental policy, insidiously fostered and imposed upon us throughout the years by those special interests which regard and have made of the Government an instrument to grant them special advantages to enrich themselves, rather than the means of affording equal protection and opportunities to the great mass of our citizens. As an inevitable consequence of this system of economic advantage through governmental favor these evil interests have waxed fat while the common citizen, often without clearly seeing or understanding the process by which he is despoiled, has found himself receiving an ever smaller reward for his efforts and industry.

I know that this system which has been imposed upon us over many long years can not be remedied in a day. I know it will never be overthrown until the American people shall confine the control of all branches of the Government to men who are genuinely representative of the rights and interests of the common men and women of this country and are entirely free from the control and influence of those greedy interests whose manipulation of our Government for so many years has brought us to our present unhappy condition.

In recent times the method of control exercised by the special interests, such as the international bankers, Power Trust, and kindred combinations of organized wealth, has begun to be understood by the general public. The American people now realize that one powerful representative of these interests is to all intents and purposes the Government of the United States. They have seen him frequently control the actions of the Congress and, always, those of the Execu-

tive. All Washington has long known, and now the country generally is awakening to the fact that for 10 years Andrew Mellon has had his hand on the back of the presidential chair, tilting it backward, forward, or sidewise at pleasure, swaying a Harding, a Coolidge, and a Hoover to the rhythm of his tilting.

How long will this continue? It can only continue while the masses of the American people shall remain asleep to their own best interests or can be divided by cunning maneuvers. Just now the masses give every indication of uniting in a mighty endeavor to put an end to the orgy of special favors by our Government to the evil predatory interests which have so long fattened thereon, and to restore a government of and for the people. But though the people may sometimes sleep, the special interests never do. The voice of the great mass of the people is beginning to be heard throughout the land in tones so loud that their demand may not be openly ignored. But their demand, if acceded to, would end the reign of special privilege and, since it can not be openly opposed, must be met by subterfuge. Therein lies the great danger to the Republic.

Saturday, January 9, 1932, will be a day of danger to the struggling masses—a day of danger to the Republic—a day of danger to the Democratic Party.

On that day the Democratic National Committee will meet in Washington to choose a place in which to hold the next National Democratic Convention.

On that day the mighty international bankers will send their best bird dogs to Washington to plan and plot to defeat the acknowledged will of the Democrats of the Nation in the selection of a presidential nominee.

On that day the angels of Power Trusts will join with the bird dogs of the international bankers to defeat the desire of the masses of Democratic electors throughout the Nation to secure the nomination of a presidential candidate who has never bowed and will not bow to the decrees of Power Trust and international bankers.

Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt is to-day the choice of a vast majority of Democrats for the presidential nomination.

Governor Roosevelt is to-day the most dangerous enemy of the evil influences which will meet in Washington January 9 to try to hypnotize the national committee and to lay plans to prevent the nomination of Roosevelt.

Why do these evil influences hate and fear Roosevelt?

They hate any man who is not obedient to their orders. They know that Roosevelt is not obedient. They know that on many occasions he has been brave enough to spit in the face of the Power Trust bulldog. [Applause.]

How can the international bankers and Power Trust defeat Roosevelt in the Democratic National Convention? I earnestly hope they can not defeat him, but I know how they are planning to defeat him at any cost in dollars or otherwise. They plan to bring out in as many States as possible a "favorite son." Usually a State will give its delegation to a "favorite son." By that plan the Democrats in many States where Roosevelt is the favorite among the Democratic electors will be asked to give the State delegation to a "favorite son"—not in the hope of nominating him, but only to give him a "complimentary" vote. Then Power Trust and international bankers' smooth manipulators will try to assemble the votes of those States which have "favorite sons." They will seek to assemble such delegations in support of some Democrat who will be just as satisfactory to Power Trust and the international bankers as Hoover is satisfactory. If they can defeat the nomination of Roosevelt and secure the nomination of some Democrat who will be obedient to their commands, then, as between Hoover and a Power Trust Democratic nominee, those mighty evil interests will have no choice. They will take no part in the presidential campaign, well knowing that their interests will be in safe hands, no matter whether Hoover or a Power Trust Democratic nominee shall be elected.

It does not seem possible that the Democratic electors of the Nation will fall for the scheme of Power Trust and the

international bankers. To-day Governor Roosevelt is easily the choice of a large majority of Democrats in practically every State in the Union. Can it be within the power of the mighty combination of the evil interests of the international bankers and Power Trust to stem the popular tide in behalf of Roosevelt? It does not seem possible, and yet I fear the damnable deal may be accomplished. I have watched the way of these mighty interests for many years. I have seen them make puppets out of supposedly strong and supposedly clean men.

January 9, 1932, will indeed be a day of danger to the people of the United States. Power Trust and the international bankers already have their man on the Republican side as good as nominated. On January 9 they will play their best cards in effort to hypnotize the Democratic National Committee and make it their servant in the effort to nominate in the Democratic convention some Democrat who will be just as acceptable to those evil interests as Hoover is acceptable.

How can this dastardly deal be defeated? The friends of Roosevelt can defeat it if they will boldly tell all stoolie-pigeon "favorite sons" in all the States to stand aside and let delegations from such States represent in the national convention the true sentiment of the people—a sentiment which in 9 out of 10 States is in favor of the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER].

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, during the Seventy-first Congress, in a series of addresses, I advocated a withdrawal of our sovereignty from the Philippine Islands. In those remarks I presented many reasons which not only justify but make this action imperative. At this time I desire to submit some additional observations on this important public problem.

The charge that the Filipinos are not capable of self-government is a phantasm cunningly devised by sinister and selfish interests to affright timid souls and mislead the uninformed as to the aptitude of the Filipino for governmental affairs. These misleading claims are industriously circulated to halt the march of public opinion in favor of granting, without further delay, self-government to the islanders. The native inhabitants are being rapidly molded into a cohesive nation. They are entitled to enjoy a freedom restrained and safeguarded by laws of their own making. Our further exercise of sovereignty over these far-away islands is contrary to the genius and spirit of our institutions and is not founded on either necessity, utility, or expediency.

When a people establish their independence and assume the responsibilities of self-government they undergo rapid and radical changes. There is a prompt recognition of their new relationships, new duties, and new obligations. They realize that they have been transformed from a provincial or tribal life into a self-governing commonwealth. Their whole attitude toward their government, their institutions, their fellow citizens, and mankind in general is changed, and they quickly become nation minded, patriotic, public spirited, and conservative. They realize that they are citizens and integral parts of a self-governing state, which relationship imposes grave responsibilities and calls for a larger contribution by the individual citizen.

The admission of their own government into the family of nations inspires a better citizenship, broadens their vision, stabilizes their conduct, quickens their ambitions, sobers their judgment, and restrains and mellows their vagrant impulses.

Conscious of the fact that the eyes of the world are upon them and that their racial destiny and national life hang tremblingly in the balance, the Filipinos will strive to justify their independence and endeavor to meet and discharge all their national and international obligations. Racial pride, self-interest, and a laudable ambition to make a distinct and worth-while contribution to the society of nations will prompt

them to give to their new-born republic all that is best within them. The responsibilities incident to independence will exert a potential, wholesome, unifying, restraining, and uplifting influence. I am convinced that the Filipino will be an apt pupil and will quickly master the art and science of self-government, guided and inspired by the ripe experience and unparalleled accomplishments of the United States in the evolution of our free institutions, and in the symmetrical development of our national life and culture.

Centuries of oppression under the iron yoke of Spain subdued the spirit and destroyed the initiative of the Filipino race, as the heavy harrow crumbles and crushes the clods of the field; as the tropical tempest levels the forest primeval; as the rude northern blasts ravish the earth; but with the obligations incident to self-government, there will come from the mountains, valleys, jungles, and blood-stained furrows of the Philippines, new initiative, new hopes, new aspirations, new strength, new vision, and new capacity for the creation of a new commonwealth and the development of a new and distinct culture which, we may with reason hope and believe will combine that which is best in both occidental and oriental civilizations.

The inhabitants of the Philippines are not insensible to their obligations to the American people. For three centuries they were the mercilessly exploited pawns of the arrogant Spanish Hapsburgs. They came to us as hostages of a war which we did not provoke and into which we were reluctantly drawn, and then only from the most compelling, unselfish, disinterested humanitarian, and altruistic motives. When they came under our flag we lifted the yoke from their necks, and from their calloused and festering arms and ankles we struck the shackles that had been worn, first by sires and then by their sons, for 10 generations. With a spontaneity, renunciation, self-abnegation, and exalted justice that have always characterized the American people, we promptly granted them a generous, humane, and benevolent autonomy, promising full and complete independence after they had established a stable government. This has long since been accomplished, and now 13,000,000 brown-skinned men and women stand hat in hand, with characteristic patience, courtesy, and gratitude waiting for us to speak the word that will complete their manumission and give them a permanent status as a free and self-respecting nation. Every principle of fairness and all the rules of reason eloquently urge that we keep faith with these feeble folk and grant their plea, which we can not deny without a stultification of our national conscience, and a substantial diminution of our national self-respect.

The threads of the Filipinos' destiny are strangely entangled in the warp and woof of our national life. Our wealth and their poverty, our power and their weakness, our phenomenal accomplishments and their tragic history all accentuate our obligations to them. As the world's outstanding example of a successful, benevolent, and efficient republic, the United States should not be too severe and exacting in fixing the standard by which the capacity of the Filipinos for self-government is to be measured.

The criterion for measuring the competency of a people to govern themselves is not the same in all countries because of local conditions, character of the population, their state of development, their opportunities and educational facilities, their relationship to the past and existing governments, and their general experience and aptitude for a proper discharge of the duties incident to citizenship. The test is not the same in any two nations or in any two republics.

I concede that there are a few comparatively small groups of natives who, while gradually responding to modern influences and the inborn urge for the higher and better life, have nevertheless not progressed very far from a primitive state. In remote corners of the islands a negligible number live in squalor, untutored and untouched by the cultural forces which have so materially contributed to the upbuilding of our western civilization. Obviously, the rank and file of the native inhabitants of the Philippine Archipelago are not as well educated or experienced in the arts of government as the rank and file of the American people, but

this does not prove that the Filipinos as a race are not qualified to govern themselves.

It would be extremely unreasonable to demand or expect of the Filipino masses, but recently emerging from three centuries of exploitation and oppression, the same intimate knowledge and efficient application of the useful, mechanical, liberal, and fine arts, the same genius for agriculture, industry, finance, transportation, and big business, the same love of wealth, the same passion for power, the same nationwide culture, the same comprehension of governmental problems, and the same mastery of statecraft that the citizens of the United States are presumed to possess after 150 years of national life and experience.

Of course, the average man in the United States is better qualified for citizenship than the average man in Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, and other Latin American Republics. While in all the Central and South American Republics a distressingly large proportion of the population is illiterate, uncultured, and untaught in the science of progressive government, still in this democratic age no one will seriously contend that the people of these Republics, taken as a whole, are not qualified for self-government. They are capable of establishing and administering a government that might not measure up to your or my ideals, but it meets their present needs and is the kind of government they want and require in their present state of development.

In practically all the Latin American Republics the people have become more enlightened and progressive under the benign influence of democratic institutions, and have conclusively demonstrated their ability to establish and maintain stable governments. Many of these so-called backward nations have produced masters of statecraft, unsurpassed in the chancelleries of the world. And, moreover, practically every Latin American revolution, instead of being destructive and iconoclastic, has been constructive and progressive, for the correction of administrative abuses, extension of the right of suffrage, strengthening the governmental structures, and for the establishment of better, more liberal, and more efficient governmental systems.

In the Philippines, as in every other land that has not as yet enjoyed the blessings of self-determination, many of the inhabitants are primitive and inexperienced and have only a limited comprehension of the philosophy of government, but in our own Republic we have millions of ignorant men and women who not infrequently hold the balance of power in elections, and who have no real understanding of our scheme of government and but little appreciation of the dignity, exalted privileges, and value of American citizenship.

A large proportion of the Filipino population, especially among the middle and upper classes, is made up of educated men and women who have already demonstrated a remarkable capacity for governmental activities and who, when independence is achieved, will ably and efficiently administer the affairs of the Philippine republic, chart a safe course for its ship of state, develop a high type of citizenship comparable with ours, promote social justice, the supreme purpose of all just governments, and nurture and stabilize their democratic institutions, which, in the providence of God, are destined to tranquilize, enlighten, and leaven the Orient. The Philippine republic will be a new center from which shall radiate the forces of western civilization, which, I verily believe, the Supreme Ruler of the Universe has decreed shall quicken and rehabilitate the Far East. [Applause.]

Though coming up through great tribulations, these islands, now on the threshold of a great destiny, when liberty-endowed and freedom-blessed, will not only become a puissant nation, but will be an outpost or station from which the spirit of our free American institutions shall be relayed to Asia and her clusters of outlying islands. Then Asia, whose bosom sepulchers the dust of probably three-fourths of all the men, women, and children who have walked this old earth since God spoke humanity into existence, and within whose far-flung borders now live one-half of the world's 2,000,000,000 population; Asia, whose potential wealth and diversified natural resources stagger finite

comprehension; whose illimitable riches have been securely locked for innumerable aeons in the bowels of her mountains, valleys, plains, inhospitable jungles, and impenetrable forests, unawakened, undeveloped, and untransformed by the magic touch of labor or the indomitable genius of man—then Asia, from whose prolific womb sprung all of the world's great religions; Asia, the cradle of the human race, the mother of ancient empires, and the seat of mighty civilizations that flourished in the morning twilight of the world; Asia, the slumbering giant, will awaken from her age-long inertia, experience a new birth and a baptism of Americanism, and dedicate her myriad millions and limitless resources to the cause of freedom, enlightened government, and the happiness and well-being of mankind. Then no longer need we chant with Tennyson in Locksley Hall:

Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay.

My colleagues, I repeat that by rearing the Filipino republic we are setting in motion the irresistible forces that will rejuvenate the Orient and neutralize and modernize the effete and static civilizations of the Old World. Then the Far East will exchange its decadent, sensual, and neurotic systems of absolutism for benign, self-respecting, and self-governing commonwealths. Then countless millions of tawny Asiatics will barter their tattered rags of pagan pomp, pageantry, and penury for the less ornate yet more useful habiliments of western civilization and culture. Then the dim and rapidly dying lights of Asia will flicker and fade, and the innumerable hosts who sit in darkness and who are now intellectually, politically, and spiritually lame, halt, and blind will run and leap with joy, rejoicing in the sure possession of a newly found, undiminishing, and fully satisfying life, light, strength, hope, and freedom. Then from the crumbling ruins of empires venerable with antiquity will spring powerful, progressive, and forward-looking republics, reflecting the ideals and patterned after the institutions founded by our constitutional fathers. [Applause.]

In liberating the Philippines we fulfill a solemn and sacred covenant, benefit ourselves and 13,000,000 Filipinos, the flower of the Malayan race, who yearn for independence and a place in the sun, and by the same token we serve mankind and light the fires of freedom on 10,000 oriental altars.

In the renaissance of the Far East, in the tumbling of crowns and wreck of monarchies, in the shifting and changing of governmental institutions, I humbly beseech the God of all the earth that these transitions be not cataclysmic, but by peaceful and orderly processes, so it may not be necessary to spill the blood of patriots to fertilize the tree of liberty, whose leaves are for the healing of nations. [Applause.]

Man's longing for liberty is innate, irrepressible, and deathless. No lash, sword, scaffold, or prison can destroy or suppress it. It sustains him in adversity and comforts him in affliction. It lightens the burdens of oppression, feeds the flames of hope, and inspires a courage and heroism that lead even to martyrdom. You may manacle his hands, shackle his feet, scourge his quivering flesh, imprison his body, reduce him to beggary but you can not control his thoughts, subdue his will, or enslave his soul. Happy is the race that has had no conquerors. Thrice happy are those who have emerged from the shadow and plague of oppression and are now living under enlightened laws, in the enactment and administration of which they had and have a part.

Eagerly and impatiently the Filipinos await the word that will acknowledge their independence and transform them from subjects of a foreign nation and alien race into citizens of an upstanding, forward-looking republic of their own creation. We should no longer hesitate to get out of the Philippines and end our adventure in the Orient. Public policy, political ethics, and common honesty dictate that this be done. [Applause.]

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I wish that the members of the Appropriations Committee would give me their attention for a moment, as it is to them my remarks are especially di-

rected. It is with reference to an amendment that I expect to offer to this appropriation bill, under the head of the Navy providing employment, that will not cost the Government an extra penny, but will save hundreds of men from the loss of their positions. It is with reference to the modernization of the three battleships.

The draftsmen are paid out of a special fund, and that fund has been allocated and they can not get any more. They are now working overtime in order to keep up with the work. They will not be able to complete the work in time. I have been advised that it will be impossible by July 1 to expend the money already appropriated, and if a sufficient number of draftsmen are employed to keep the work flowing smoothly a considerable saving in time and money will be effected.

The purpose of my amendment is to allow the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to employ out of this modernization fund as many draftsmen as will be necessary to keep the work going smoothly.

I hope the committee will favor my amendment, and I hope that no objection will be made to it, because it is simply a philanthropic measure and adds nothing to the cost. [Applause.]

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH].

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, on Monday, December 14, 1931, one of our distinguished colleagues from the great State of Pennsylvania and one of our most eminent constitutional lawyers of our Republic, the Hon. JAMES M. BECK, delivered a most brilliant address in defense of the foreign policy of President Hoover. He said:

It is all part of one problem, the national debts due us, the debts owed by business corporations and municipal subdivisions of those foreign nations to us, and all of it must be worked out in order that credit may be restored, and if credit is to be restored it must be restored in Europe before it can ever be really restored here, because, whether we like it or not, we are a part of a situation world wide in extent and beyond the power of any one nation to solve.

Succinctly put, Mr. Beck believes that Europe must be stabilized first before America can recover from its great economic depression. I shall endeavor to prove, in the light of European history, that the economic stabilization of Europe under the Versailles treaty is impossible of realization. Therefore we should stabilize America first in order to bring happiness and prosperity to 8,000,000 men unemployed and 12,000,000 partially employed, whose dependents are the tragic victims of penury, hunger, and want in this land of plenty, this great Republic of ours. [Applause.]

In 1815, in the city of Vienna, an infamous treaty was adopted at a conference presided over by Prince Metternich, the adroit Prime Minister of Austria. In that conference were representatives of Russia, Prussia, Austria, and England, who shortly thereafter retired. This group constituted the league of nations of their day. It was called the Holy Alliance. The purpose of this alliance was to make the world safe for monarchy. Liberalism and progressionism, wherever they were found, were to be crushed and annihilated. Reactionism, autocracy, and conservatism sat in the saddle. Progress, liberalism, and reform, under the name of democracy, were driven into subterranean channels in order to survive.

Why did monarchy hate liberalism and try so desperately to suppress and destroy it? Because prior to the French Revolution liberalism gave birth to an intellectual, economic, political, and industrial revolution. The intellectual revolution began with Voltaire, who pilloried and excoriated the church as the custodian of hidebound tradition; Montesquieu, who preached the gospel of parliamentary constitutional government for France the same as was found in England; Rousseau, who in his treatise on the Social Contract enunciated the political concept that governments derived their just powers from the consent of the governed—that kings do not rule by the divine right of God, but through the sovereign right of the people. The new school of political economy was founded by Turgot, of France, and

by Adam Smith, whose *Wealth of Nations* was the bible of this new economic school in England. Its disciples were men like Jeremy Bentham, David Ricardo, John Stuart Mill, and Thomas Robert Malthus. Most of the writings of some of these men were incorporated in an encyclopedia by the great French writer Diderot. This publication was given wide distribution and had a tremendous effect upon the people of France.

About this time a bloodless revolution took place in England. It was called the Industrial Revolution. No speeches were made, no conventions held, no battles fought. It was a silent revolution that altered the life of millions of people. Through the perfection of science, machinery was invented that converted England from an agricultural to an industrial nation. Men began to work with machines instead of their hands. A new institution was founded. It was called the factory. People left their farms to go to the factory. That is why Oliver Goldsmith wrote the famous poem, the *Deserted Village*. With the factory came the evils and abuses incidental to that system—long hours, low wages, unsanitary and unhealthful conditions; children working in the mills, mines, looms, and factories. These conditions reflected themselves upon the social and economic status of the people of England. Across the channel the French peasants were in misery. The financial condition of France was desperate. Thousands were unemployed. Families were starving. Taxes were imposed upon those least able to bear them just as in our Republic. That was the spark that caused the conflagration that soon thereafter not only engulfed France but encompassed the entire civilized world as well.

Prince Metternich and his associates, while sitting around the conference table in Vienna in 1815, ascribed the French Revolution to the growth of liberalism in western Europe. In order to prevent monarchy from ever again being challenged by democracy they determined not only to check liberalism in science, art, literature, philosophy, and statesmanship but even endeavored to bring back to Bourbon Spain its lost colonies in South and Central America.

The only nation that proudly bore the torch of democracy was the United States, which was then only in its infancy. James Monroe, who was then the President of the United States, realizing the true purport that inspired the Holy Alliance to extend monarchy in North and South America, then promulgated his famous Monroe doctrine. This theory declared in no unmistakable terms to Metternich and to his associates in the Holy Alliance that the realization of their aims and objects in South America would be considered a threat against the sovereignty of the United States, yea, an overt act which would likely lead to war. This courageous act of President Monroe and his Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, was the only effective barrier erected against the world domination of monarchy through the dictatorship of the Holy Alliance. The entire course of history would have been entirely different had not the struggling young Republic, the United States, through its President, thwarted the efforts of Metternich and his allies in making the Western Hemisphere as monarchical in its complexion as they had succeeded in making the Eastern.

While democratic ideas were very seriously eclipsed in the period following the termination of the Napoleonic wars, they could not be permanently submerged. The dark era of liberalism was the decade immediately following the Battle of Waterloo and the creation of the Holy Alliance. The years from 1830 to 1848 saw the weakening of the reactionary strangle-hold that absolute monarchy had upon the world, and represented the dawn of a new period of liberal thought. This was merely symptomatic of the change of philosophy which came over Europe about that time. The thinkers of western Europe came out of their underground passages again, and once more effectively challenged the onslaughts of monarchy.

For many decades the Holy Alliance continued to suppress all liberal ideas by force and intervention. On other occasions they employed suppression through censorship and

espionage. For a generation Metternich dictated these policies.

The tragedy of reaction, as the lessons of history clearly indicate, is that it brings in its wake not merely suppression of liberalism but the creation of extreme and dangerous doctrines of action and thought. The Holy Alliance sounded the death knell of democracy not wisely but too well. When its influence had waned there had grown in the place of the liberalism of Voltaire the socialism of Karl Marx. In place of the freedom of Montesquieu the anarchism of Bakunin and Proudhon, and instead of the laissez faire doctrine of Bentham and Mill the communistic anarchy and "mutual aid" of Prince Kropotkin.

We can pause more profitably at this juncture and contemplate the bitter lessons of history. If we do so, we learn that the temporary suppression of free thought ultimately leads to something infinitely worse. That it is far better for mankind to freely think and to speak, even if their thoughts prove ultimately wrong, for suppression leads to revolutionary acts and the cultivation of violent doctrines.

From 1815 to 1914 this bitter conflict between monarchy and autocracy on the one hand and liberalism and democracy on the other persisted. For 100 years every monarchical government in Europe vied with each other to enlarge its domain and its economic influences under the guise of nationalism.

Human blood flowed everywhere. Innocent people had to pay the penalty with their lives in order that monarchical Europe might enlarge its economic sphere and its geographical borders. So we find wars between Russia and Turkey, Germany and Austria, Austria and Hungary, Italy and Austria, Germany and Denmark, France and Prussia, England, Turkey, and Russia. War after war engulfed Europe during the last 100 years.

To enlarge the influence of a nation, large standing armies and navies were the rule. Billions of dollars were spent in maintaining formidable armaments. This money, instead of being utilized to promote education and social justice among its people, was employed to foster war and the glories and conquest that come therefrom. Again we find the disciples of democracy appealing to the conscience of the people to outlaw war; that human beings were not created to be made fodder for cannon. As the cries of those who toil in the quarries of labor kept incessantly increasing for peace, and as the armies of liberals and progressives kept multiplying decade after decade and refused to vote appropriations for war and for standing armies, the thrones of monarchies again began to feel insecure.

Kings trembled as they saw the specter of democracy looming on the horizon.

Liberalism could not be crushed. It was still fighting the battle of the middle classes and the common people whose interests it was determined to preserve. [Applause.]

To divert attention from monarchy, to divide and scatter the forces of liberalism, to preserve the glory that comes from waging a successful war, monarchy united and threw the world into the maelstrom of war, hoping that the tides, eddies, currents, and whirlpools of this conflict would so enmesh liberalism and democracy as to destroy it for another hundred years.

Thus we behold, almost a century after the treaty of Vienna, monarchy again trying to destroy democracy. Woodrow Wilson, the greatest philosopher of democracy that this Nation has ever produced since the days of Thomas Jefferson, recognized this fact and, to preserve democracy, carried the Monroe doctrine over to Europe. The conscience of America, public opinion, and its physical and material resources followed him. Our President declared that "the world must be made safe for democracy." [Applause.] When the World War was concluded, monarchy succumbed. Democracy triumphed. The Hohenzollerns of Germany were eliminated. The Hapsburgs of Austria were destroyed. The Romanoffs of Russia collapsed. Just as Napoleon was banished to St. Helena, so the Kaiser was exiled to Doorn. In the ashes of these autocratic governments there rose tri-

umphantly the Republics of Russia, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. [Applause.]

Just as the Holy Alliance was formed in 1815 to protect the rights of monarchy, so was the League of Nations formed in 1919 to protect the rights of democracy. Just as the treaty of Vienna in 1815 changed the geographical complexion of Europe, so the new treaty of Versailles in 1919 changed the geographical complexions of Europe and the entire world. Just as the treaty of Vienna was infamous and unfit and caused 100 years of conflict, so will this treaty of Versailles go down in history as an iniquitous treaty that will bring havoc and injustice to millions of men and women throughout Europe. [Applause.]

In the Holy Alliance a century ago, Russia, Prussia, and Austria sat in the saddle while France was the slave. So to-day, 100 years later, France sits in the saddle while Germany, Austria, and Hungary are its economic slaves.

France and England have not paid off the debts of the Napoleonic war after 100 years. It is my contention that it will take the combatants of the World War many more centuries to repay the debts incurred from the last war. Therefore the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] was right when he said:

In my judgment, the man is not living in this Chamber who will see the ultimate end of economic crisis which the destructive World War has inflicted upon humanity.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, Mr. BECK contends that we must first stabilize Europe and place her upon a basis of economic prosperity before our country can ever recover. Mr. Chairman, Europe is to-day an armed camp. Amidst all the depression and panic that exist over there, France is the richest nation of the world. She has subsidized, financed, and armed Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Poland with billions of dollars to maintain the largest standing armies ever known in the history of Europe. Seventy to eighty cents of every dollar collected in taxes is being maintained for the great armaments in preparation for the next war. She has formed a military armed ring against Germany, Austria, and Hungary, three sister republics that we are pledged to preserve. Secret diplomacies and alliances are being formed all over Europe. The next war is already in the offing, and when it comes, as it inevitably must, woe betide the white races of Europe!

Since the World War we have been united to continental Europe by a financial umbilical cord. The time has now arrived when the great obstetrician, Uncle Sam, must cut in twain that financial umbilical cord and allow American democracy to live, thrive, and develop free and untrammeled as an independent and useful organism. It must not be affected by the financial cancer of moribund Europe. America must remain American, true to its ideals and traditions as the preserver of democracy. [Applause.] That is why President Hoover and all his advisors are wrong when they are first trying to stabilize Europe, which is impossible of realization. For 20 centuries European governments have waged war against each other. Their soil is saturated with the innocent blood of martyred citizens. The leopard can not change its spots! The Versailles treaty has created so much prejudice, rancor, hatred, bitterness, and sorrow among the nations of Europe that time can not efface it. Europe can not be stabilized. Revenge is in the air. Those whose rights have been trampled upon through the Versailles treaty are looking for the day when might will make right. Let us save America first by stabilizing our own country. [Applause.]

The founder of our Republic, George Washington, in his Farewell Address to the American people, warned us against entangling alliances with European countries. He was right then. Time proves he is right now.

I would be unworthy of the respect of the membership of this House if I were to give vent to thoughts that bore hatred and malice toward the peoples of Europe. One need not be internationally minded to view the conditions of all the nations of the world and their present sorrow and suffering with a degree of profound sympathy. I do not yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania in his desire not

merely for the stabilization of Europe but for the rehabilitation of all the struggling peoples of the world. My allusions to the history of Europe, particularly to the century or so that has elapsed since the Napoleonic era, show that because of nationalistic, geographic, racial, religious, linguistic, and economic problems permanent peace, which is the genuine object of any degree of stabilization, is impossible in continental Europe.

Mr. BECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIROVICH. With deference to the gentleman, I should like to continue the sequence of my thoughts.

Mr. BECK. I was only going to ask a simple question.

Mr. SIROVICH. When the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania spoke he refused to yield to Congressman SUMNERS, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, on the ground that the interruption would interfere with the orderly flow of his address. Upon the same basis I would most respectfully ask my distinguished colleague to desist until I have concluded my remarks, when I shall be pleased to answer any questions that any Member of the House might desire to propound.

Mr. BECK. Certainly.

Mr. SIROVICH. Two forces have been loosened from the East that further threaten not only the equilibrium of the world, but the future of our civilization as well. Some 80 years ago, Commodore Perry gave the island of Japan its first glimpse of the industrial civilization that we have evolved in the west. Since then the progress that the Nipponese have made in adopting the processes of the industrial revolution, and taking advantage of western civilization and culture, veritably beggars description. Japan is to-day the industrial overlord of the Far East. It looks with longing eyes upon two enormous giants who are still sleeping under the spell of a medieval gloom, without stable political governments and with an economic system that savors of the feudal period. The slumbering 800,000,000 human beings in China and India, living in the most unenlightened conditions in countries abounding in natural resources, are anxiously viewed as fertile fields for exploitation by the pioneer industrial chieftains of Japan. If the next 80 years shall see an economic development in the mainland of Asia that would somewhat parallel the progress that Japan has made since the days of Perry, a new and tremendous disruptive element would necessarily be introduced to threaten the stability, not only of Europe but of the entire world as well.

Mr. BECK has very aptly stated that the first great crisis in modern world history came with the fall of the Roman Empire in the year 476 of the Christian era. The hordes of Ghengis Khan, Alaric, and Attila, which stormed and sacked Rome and, by slow infiltrations followed by actual conquests, shattered the flower of ancient civilization, may find their counterpart in the menace of the modern oriental hordes led by Japan which will seek to overwhelm occidental culture. Rome, weakened and exhausted through its imperialistic attitude in conquests, battling in Hispania, Gaul, the modern Balkan states, Greece, Macedonia, Asia Minor, and Carthage, fell an easy prey to the barbaric hosts from Asia in the east, as well as the Teutonic races that came from the north. It took Rome 14 centuries to recover from that blow.

Are we to witness once again the destruction of an elaborately developed civilization weakened, devitalized, and enervated by conquest and vice as a result of the onslaught of brute forces of an inferior people?

At the crossroads between the Occident and the Orient there stands a new world power developed in a novel fashion in the last 14 years and occupying one-sixth of the world's area. A new power that is still in its infancy, and that may yet stand as the bulwark of western civilization against the onrushing forces of the Far East. Soviet Russia, at once creating a political state and an economic organism, makes a new departure from all theories of government that have heretofore prevailed in the world and furnishes additional conflict to the forces that have already prevented the stabilization of Europe. To the problems of monarchy as opposed to democracy, and of autocracy as contrasted with liberal-

ism, have now been added a racial challenge from the Far East and an economic one from Soviet Russia. With the growth and aggravation of all these enormous conflicts, it would seem very clear to the human eye that the stabilization of Europe will become, as years go by, relatively more difficult. What, then, should be the position of the American Government? A sympathetic attitude toward Europe, yes; but an active interest in European affairs, no. [Applause.]

Many media could be suggested for the possible stabilization of Europe. As an American observer looking over the high seas, one can view objectively the inadequacy of an economic system which sets off innumerable tariff walls and trade restriction barriers in a territory not much larger than that covered by the United States.

One remedial solution comes immediately to mind; namely, that an economic federation of Europe be organized, retaining the autonomy of the various countries as natural sovereign powers but breaking down the indescribably petty commercial rivalries which in past times made so much for discord in Europe. Just as we have 48 States in our Union enjoying equal economic relations, but with separate bodies of law, so Europe could be constituted into a vast economic union with no loss of individual dignity to its component parts. It would be a veritable United States of Europe. Such a union would clear away the maze of formidable tariff barriers which choke international trade and prevent European recovery.

As a second suggestion, I would seek to mollify the rigor of the Versailles treaty, by revising that pact in its entirety. I would declare to the nations of the world that the portions of it that were written in the spirit of anger, and at an hour when the roar of cannon on the battlefields of Europe had just ceased, should give way to the sober second thought of mankind. The passions of war have now somewhat subsided, and the statesmen of the world can view international politics from saner heights. A condition precedent to any degree of stabilization in Europe would therefore be an amicable and friendly revision of the Versailles treaty in all its manifold aspects. [Applause.]

Still another suggestion that an American can make to Europeans seeking betterment of their own conditions, would look toward immediate and rigorous reductions in the armaments of the various nationalities. Presumably any effort toward European stabilization would have, as the major premise, an indication of good faith on the part of leaders of European public opinion. Such good faith can best be expressed by the ceasing of the various countries of Europe to act as if they were preparing for another bloody conflict. An individual citizen seeking peaceful relations with his neighbor, does not continually arm himself to the hilt; so nations, on the larger scale, must rid themselves of appearances that are obviously warlike and threaten the well being and safety of other countries. It is unbelievable that the lessons of the last war should be so completely lost on present-day Europe, as to cause them to spend from 70 to 80 per cent of all their taxable income on preparations for another war. An immediate universal agreement to radically slash the military and naval budgets of all countries, would at least, to an American mind, indicate that Europe sincerely desired peace, and was earnest in its intention to achieve stability. A rational and liberal revision of the Versailles treaty, accompanied by radical reductions in European armaments and followed by the creation of economic united states of Europe would unquestionably aid in the stabilization of Europe. [Applause.]

However, Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, although these ideals are Utopian in character, every lover of humanity would gladly pray to have them realized. When one views Europe through the telescope of its history, it can be easily understood, however, that they are incapable of practical realization. Let us leave Europe then and turn our eyes toward the American scene where a vast degree of stabilization is most needful at the present time. Stabilization, like charity, should begin at home.

I shall propose a modern economic decalogue for American stabilization. It may serve as a present-day "Ten Commandments."

COMMANDMENT 1

Scrap the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill from top to bottom. Right the wrongs of injustices done therein. Then establish reciprocal relations and understanding with all the nations of the world for the mutual benefit of all concerned. [Applause.]

COMMANDMENT 2

Place agriculture on a parity with industry by passing a bill similar to the McNary-Haugen bill, introducing the principle of debenture or the equalization fee.

This will place agriculture upon a parity with industry and bring justice and happiness to 40,000,000 farmers who are the victims of a high protective tariff that compels them to purchase their goods and materials in the restricted markets of our country and sell the products of nature's soil in the competitive markets of the world. Let us, therefore, stabilize the farming interests of our country by helping them in this the greatest hour of need so that there shall be no repetition of over a thousand banks failing in their midst. [Applause.]

COMMANDMENT 3

Abolish child labor. Children under 16 belong in the schoolhouse, not in the mills, mines, looms, and factories. They should not compete with adult men and women for work that rightfully belongs to them. [Applause.]

COMMANDMENT 4

Establish a 5-day week and a 6-hour day in industry. Machinery has dislocated production. It has displaced men and women in every industry. We should frankly recognize that in our machine age mechanisms are superior to men, and the creation of a shorter working week with fewer working hours per day would better enable man to cooperate with the advance of machinery.

COMMANDMENT 5

Establish unemployment insurance and old-age pensions in every State of the Union so that in times of prosperity we may be able to prepare for days of adversity. Unemployment insurance and old-age pensions are neither new nor radical ideas. The arch conservative, Bismarck, instituted them in Germany way back in 1883. The liberals, Asquith and Lloyd George brought them about in England in 1909, and the socialists, Briand and Clemenceau, introduced them in France in 1910. Twenty-eight other nations of Europe adopted them in one form or another. Why then should America, the most advanced country of the present age, lag behind? [Applause.]

COMMANDMENT 6

Institute employment agencies throughout the United States through the cooperation of the Federal and State Governments so that labor may easily be shifted from one part of the country to another in times of economic depression.

My distinguished colleague and associate from New York, Senator ROBERT WAGNER, introduced the Wagner unemployment bills which, if signed in toto, would have been instrumental in relieving to a very great extent the burden of 8,000,000 people who are unemployed and seeking opportunity to work at anything to support their dependent children and their families. Herbert Hoover, President of the United States vetoed that particular feature of the bill which is the heart and soul of that humane legislation. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, if that militant Democrat, that liberal and humanitarian, our beloved Speaker, JOHN N. GARNER, were the President of the United States, as a lover of his fellow man, deeply imbued with feeling and sympathy for the suffering and distressed, he would have signed that bill. [Applause.]

If the distinguished Governor of the State of New York, the Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, were President of the United States, he too, as a progressive Democrat interested in the great masses of his fellow men, would have signed that bill. [Applause.]

If the idol of the democracy of New York City, a gentleman whose whole life has been dedicated to the interests of his fellow man, Al Smith, were the President of the United States, he too would have signed that bill. [Applause.]

COMMANDMENT 7

Guarantee bank deposits in every bank of the country through a national bank insurance fund so that no depositor should ever be permitted to lose a single penny through the closure of any bank, whether due to frozen assets, incompetent or corrupt management, or economic depression. [Applause.]

COMMANDMENT 8

Put teeth into the Federal Trade Commission act so that grossly unfair methods of competition should be prevented.

COMMANDMENT 9

Recognize Soviet Russia and so open up to American capital and labor the vast markets and resources of that enormous expansive territory containing 160,000,000 inhabitants who are yearning for the friendship of Americans and who are begging to be permitted to buy from them and to do business with them. Millions of unemployed American men and women could be put to work to-morrow to supply the needs of Soviet Russia if we recognized that country immediately.

COMMANDMENT 10

Modify the Volstead Act to permit the sale of light wines and beer. [Applause.] This would at once deal a death-blow to racketeering and bootlegging in this country. At the same time it would turn billions of dollars into the Treasury of the United States, relieving our citizens of the enormous burdens of taxation. [Applause.]

The effectual realization of these "Ten Commandments" would immediately restore prosperity to the United States. The rehabilitation of our own economic order can not await the stabilization of Europe!

Congressman BECK says stabilize Europe first. I say stabilize America first! The moratorium will not save Europe. It is only a temporary palliative. However, for the momentary good it might accomplish, I voted for it.

The only effective way to cure suffering Europe is to cancel all debts and obligations between the peoples of the world that have been bequeathed to us by the late war, which I would be in favor of doing, provided—mark you, I say provided—we could be guaranteed and assured of complete and universal disarmament that would outlaw and forever abolish war. Universal disarmament would save billions of dollars for all the nations of the world, billions of dollars that could be used for culture, education, social justice, and all humanizing influences that would ennoble man. This, then, would be the greatest gift offered by the democracy of America upon the altar of universal peace, guaranteeing stability and order to all the governments of the world and happiness to all mankind. [Applause.] I yield now to anyone who desires to ask me any questions.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes.

Mr. SEGER. I assume that it would be highly improper to add another commandment to those mentioned, but would the gentleman accept an addition to his fifth commandment to abolish night work for women?

Mr. SIROVICH. That would naturally come under the principle of the 5-day week and the 6-hour day.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIROVICH. Oh, certainly. I don't think any speech would be complete unless my friend BLANTON were in it.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the distinguished scientist believe that idleness produces happiness? I am sure my friend wants the people to be happy. My experience is that people can not work five days a week, six hours a day, and be happy. They can not do it. They must be busy at work if they expect to be happy.

Mr. KNUTSON. You are right, Tom.

Mr. SIROVICH. I see my distinguished friend wears the Masonic insignia on the lapel of his coat. Masonry, I am sure, has taught him that 5,000 years ago our fraternity

divided the 24-hour day into three parts, 8 hours for labor, 8 hours for sleep, and 8 hours for refreshment.

Mr. BLANTON. And I am in favor of that.

Mr. SIROVICH. But that was 5,000 years ago, before machinery was ever invented to take the place of the labor of man.

Mr. BLANTON. And things have not changed much since. [Laughter.] Idleness is still the devil's workshop. I am still in favor of 8 hours for labor, 8 for sleep, and 8 for amusement.

Mr. SIROVICH. That is because the gentleman lives in Texas. [Laughter.] If the gentleman had lived in any other part of the country, he would think differently.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I was interested in the statement of my distinguished friend that he would favor the cancellation of all war debts to America provided the foreign governments would disarm.

Mr. SIROVICH. I would demand universal and complete disarmament.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman think for one moment that the foreign governments would comply with that proviso?

Mr. SIROVICH. That is a very interesting question, and I am honest enough to confess as a practical idealist that to me it is Utopian. They will never agree to it. A leopard does not change his spots, and since Europe refuses to disarm but continues piling up large armaments and great standing armies to wage war against the innocent people of other nations, I want them to pay back every dollar that rightfully belongs to the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. ERK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes.

Mr. ERK. Speaking of Russia, has the gentleman ever known an individual or a nation to succeed that was godless?

Mr. SIROVICH. In my humble opinion there has never been a nation in the world that tried to destroy religion but that in the end was itself destroyed. During the French Revolution, under the dictatorship of the triumvirate of Robespierre, Marat, and Mirabeau, they placed the goddess of reason upon the pedestal of the Lord. As the years rolled by the goddess of reason toppled and crumbled and in its place freedom of worship of God according to a person's conscience was rightfully restored to its proper position.

The population of Russia is 160,000,000. Three to four millions are avowed atheists. At the present time they control their Government. That does not necessarily imply that all Russia is atheistic. When I visited Russia a few months ago and discussed religion with many of their leaders, I was told by them that Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, and Benjamin Franklin were atheists during the period of our colonial revolution, but that did not necessarily imply that all of our American citizens were atheists.

The word "God" is not found in the Constitution of the United States or in the Declaration of Independence. In my humble opinion it was kept out of the Constitution because King George III, who persecuted our American forbears, ruled in the name of God and so our colonial forbears refused to have the God of King George III in the Constitution of the United States. They claimed the voice of the people, that is the voice of God.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman does not mean to say that the statement coming from a Russian is a correct statement of the men he named and of American history at that time?

Mr. SIROVICH. I am simply repeating the statement given to me in Russia.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let us not have the gentleman stating it as a correct statement of history.

Mr. SIROVICH. Was not Tom Paine an atheist?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am suggesting that the gentleman has stated a series of situations that does not exist either regarding the Constitution or the Declaration of Independence, nor regarding two of the three men named.

Mr. SIROVICH. Either I do not understand the gentleman's question, or my distinguished friend from Nebraska does not understand me.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have always understood that Tom Paine was an agnostic.

Mr. SIROVICH. He has been considered an agnostic by some and an atheist by others.

As a matter of fact, what is the difference between agnosticism and atheism? An atheist is one who does not believe in any God. An agnostic is one who sits on the fence and says, "There may be a God and there may not be one." Having read most of the writings of Thomas Paine, I am convinced he was not an agnostic. I have taken him as an atheist.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the membership of this House for the cordial and gracious manner in which they have listened to me and for their uniform kindness in receiving my remarks.

All I tried to show in my address was that charity should begin at home. That we must stabilize America first. That the interests and happiness of 120,000,000 Americans is paramount to that of any other peoples of the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH] yields back 11 minutes.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am not going to cover the history of the world nor enter into any discussion of it. I want to call the attention of the House to a bill which I introduced this morning on the subject of guaranteeing deposits in national banks and member banks of the Federal reserve system. There is no pride of authorship in my bill, but certainly the subject will require the very careful thought and study and consideration of this House within the next few weeks. There is nothing original in my bill. The idea is taken from the law of the State of Nebraska and from discussions on the subject during the past years. I think Governor Shallenberger at one time had a great deal to do with the Nebraska statute. He carried it through the courts, and its validity was established in the Supreme Court of the United States.

In a few days we will be called upon to consider a bill for the creation or recognition or support of the so-called Federal Credit Corporation. I submit that the first step in the stabilization of our banking system and in restoring the confidence of the American people in our banks is to guarantee the deposits in a bank. [Applause.] Anyone who deposits in a bank has a right to sleep nights and know that his deposits are absolutely secure. My bill in this instance does not call for assurance by the Government. I am very conservative in this instance. A guaranty fund is created in each Federal reserve district by the banks themselves building up a fund equal to 1 per cent of the daily average deposits in that district. It commences with a first installment of one-fourth of 1 per cent of the daily average deposits in the preceding six months. That is followed the next six months by one-quarter of 1 per cent for two years, and then, if the fund is equal to 1 per cent of the daily average of deposits, the contribution is one-twentieth of 1 per cent every six months.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Where do they get this money?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. From the banks themselves.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Where do they get it—from deposits or out of profits?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They set aside the amount—the same as they set aside their reserves now.

Mr. O'CONNOR. They can not get it out of surplus.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Out of profits, of course.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Most of them have no reserves now.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If they have no reserve, the comptroller or receiver walks in. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am not so sure of that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, absolutely. Once a bank can not maintain the reserve required either by the State law or by the Federal reserve system, the bank commissioner walks in and closes the bank.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is capital and surplus. Call reserve what you will, they have no reserve. I do not know where they will get the money unless it is either out of capital or surplus.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is built up in exactly the same way as the reserve surplus is built up now. In the event of a new bank, it pays in 4 per cent of its capital stock the same as a bank is now required to have a capital surplus. Four per cent is taken into that fund, in the case of a new bank, and that is credited to the installments which the bank must pay toward the guaranty fund. The reason I asked time to-day to call your attention to this is that I believe it should be made known that the sense of this House, in taking up this question of bank stabilization, is that we should first secure the depositors before we go into a plan of providing a sort of receptacle to take care of all frozen assets which the big banks now hold, and some of them may turn out to be anything but desirable.

A great deal has been said about the Federal Credit Corporation. I have an instance right here of a bank in my State, in Middleport, N. Y. A national bank a few weeks ago joined the Federal Credit Corporation and paid 10 per cent of its capital stock, \$5,000. It paid that to the Federal Credit Corporation. A few days ago it got into difficulties and a run was impending. The surplus was impaired by reason of the depreciated value of its holdings, and it went to the Federal Credit Corporation for assistance. I guess this bank, like most of us, thought that was what the national credit corporation was supposed to do.

Assistance was refused, and then the bank asked for the return of the \$5,000 it had paid in, but that was refused. I do not believe for a moment that is typical of the attitude of the Federal Credit Corporation, but if it is then it is not what some of us have been led to believe it is.

Here is another instance I want to give you. Here I have a list of securities, and some of these days before long I am going to read the entire list to the House. It is a list of securities owned by a small country bank. This bank borrowed from a bank in my city—one of the large banks—and you would know the name immediately if I mentioned it. The small country bank borrowed \$67,000, and a few days ago it received a call from the bank in my city asking for the money.

The country bank asked why, and was informed that the bank in my city "did not like their list of securities." The country bank said, "Well, we bought the securities from you and upon your recommendation." Every one of these securities was recommended by this bank in my city. They were sold by them to this country bank and the city bank called the loan because they said they "did not like the list of securities." That is typical, gentlemen, of what is going on.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was the character of those securities? Were they foreign securities or not?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Out of 35 different securities 10 were foreign.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How about the amounts?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is one group of \$47,500, another of \$41,260, and another group of \$65,000. The first group of \$57,000 are railroad bonds; the industrials are \$41,260; public utilities, \$65,000; and foreign bonds, \$54,000. Let me say to the gentleman from Virginia that not only were the securities recommended and sold by the big city bank, but the assortment was advised by this great bank; and you all know the pressure or the influence that one of these large chain banks in my city has on a country bank of this kind. The minute that they were ready to call in

the loan they did so, and they said they did not like their list of securities, and sold some of them that afternoon before the small bank was able to redeem the securities. The small bank is now closed. The Middleport bank I referred to before, which asked for the return of its \$5,000 from the credit corporation, is also closed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask a further question?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Were any of the securities sold foreign securities?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would not think so. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is the gentleman's remedy to meet that situation that the banks be forbidden to have finance company affiliates?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Most of the banks have what they call a finance affiliate, through which they sell their securities.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course I am against that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is being talked about a lot, and many of them are disbanding them themselves.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would not wait for them to disband themselves. As far as the national banks are concerned and as far as the Federal reserve system banks are concerned it is up to us and I think we should carry out the recommendation contained in the President's message and put a stop to that practice immediately. I would let the banks do a banking business and not a pawnbroker's business, and that is what they are doing now.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That may be a very healthful thing to do and I am somewhat in favor of it, but it needs consideration for this reason: Small banks must buy their securities somewhere. Suppose they happened to buy them from a stockbroker. They have to go through the exchange or some such place to buy their securities and they can run into the same situation. They will put up their securities and then be told by the bank making the loan that it does not like the securities and the bank will call the loan.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But you are not going to have a bank selling certain securities and pretending to be back of them and then pull from under when the time comes. I think that when a bond is sold it should be a bond and something more than a piece of paper with a gold seal on it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We read in the papers a few weeks ago about the organization of this banker's credit pool, to which the gentleman has referred. As I remember, the papers stated that some \$500,000,000 was underwritten for the purpose of forming that pool and that the purpose of this organization was to relieve this congested condition of frozen securities, but I have been further advised by a statement recently appearing in the papers that up to date that great pool of \$500,000,000 has only used \$10,000,000 for the purpose of undertaking to relieve this situation. Can the gentleman give us any information about that?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not know. I have the pathetic and sad instance to which I have referred where a small bank went to them after subscribing its quota, and asked for relief and were denied; and when they could not get relief they asked to get their money back, which would have helped them at that time, and were refused.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What I am curious to know is why it is, with this tremendous fund privately secured through the banks themselves, at their disposal for the relief of this distressed situation, they have failed to use it, and at the same time are asking the Federal Government out of the Federal Treasury to provide a fund of \$500,000,000 for the same purpose.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is the very reason I have raised the question here this afternoon, and it seems to me before we rush in and create a so-called revolving fund—and I think this Congress has had some experience with revolving funds in other activities—we should not create such a fund and have on our hands in the next few years a lot of depreciated

and no-good securities. If this is the purpose of it, let us know what we are doing. I say the first step should be to compel national banks and member banks of the Federal reserve system over which we have absolute control, to create this fund in each Federal reserve district for the guaranteeing of deposits, and I invite consideration of this suggestion by the House so that we may be informed before the Federal Credit Corporation bill comes before us.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER and Mr. PATTERSON rose.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield first to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] from whom I have learned a great deal on this subject.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Right on that point I may say that Sir George Paish one of the great financial authorities of the world, who is connected with the Bank of England, recently gave out the three important things that should be done to restore the prosperity of the world, and the first one that he mentioned was the guaranteeing of bank deposits.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to thank the gentleman and I want to here acknowledge that I learned a great deal on the subject from discussions with the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska when he was here several years ago, and I have been trying to follow up the subject ever since.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. And may I add one more thought inasmuch as the gentleman has referred to the bill involved. It was first attacked in the Federal court of Nebraska, and a member of the Supreme Court of the United States now, who at that time was a member of a lower Federal court, declared the original law unconstitutional, but we appealed the case, along with other States, to the Supreme Court of the United States, and that court sustained its constitutionality. It was again recently attacked, since the depression has come on the country, by the banks in Nebraska in our State supreme court and was again sustained, and then was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, where the principle and the law itself was again sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is very reassuring.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three more minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Right in this connection, with respect to the guaranteeing of deposits, I would like the gentleman to confirm this information, if he happens to know about it. One of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, who is a distinguished student of this question, has told me privately that there have been enough profits earned by the Federal reserve system since it has been in operation to more than pay every dollar of deposits that has been lost by national banks since the system was instituted.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would like to have the Federal reserve system use that as a fund to put the guaranty fund immediately into operation.

Mr. PATTERSON. The point I wanted to bring out is that the money is there.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would like to have that used to put the system into operation until my plan could be worked out. When I say my plan, I mean the plan contained in the bill, which would require four payments.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. HARE. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the bill H. R. 5125?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not know it by number, of course.

Mr. HARE. In view of the fact the gentleman has given some study to this matter, I wonder if it is asking too much for him to make a memorandum of it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is it the gentleman's bill?

Mr. HARE. With modesty, I admit it is.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am sure it is a very good one.

Mr. HARE. It brings out this point. It takes \$145,000,000 of excess profits arising from the Federal reserve system

now in the Treasury and uses it as a premium for insuring deposits in all member banks of the Federal reserve system to the extent of 50 per cent.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It would start this fund.

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is a start, but we want to absolutely guarantee the deposits 100 per cent.

Mr. PATTERSON. And this will more than do it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; and it will drive the incompetent and crooked bankers out of business.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman let me make this further observation? The reason it is put at 50 per cent is because statistics show that in all of our bank liquidations and bank failures there have been dividends paid approximating 50 per cent.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understand that, of course.

Mr. HARE. Then if we are going to salvage, on the whole, 50 per cent of the money, it is unnecessary to go ahead and guarantee more than the amount that is lost.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; the gentleman is in error there. Any system, of course, presupposes that the insurance fund would be subrogated to the position of the depositors.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman must realize, of course, that at the present time there are millions of dollars locked up in safety security boxes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; and in stockings and sugar bowls and hoarded all over the country.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The enactment of a guarantee law such as the gentleman has called attention to, in my opinion, is the only way we will ever unlock these safety deposit boxes and put that money in circulation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It will put over \$2,000,000,000 in circulation.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am certainly in accord with the gentleman and I hope he will be able to get the committee having jurisdiction to work out some legislation along this line.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Every Member of this House has exercised a great deal of restraint in talking about banking conditions. There is not a Member on this floor but what has exercised restraint in discussing this subject. We have cooperated in order not to rock the boat, but I want to say that unless the bankers come in and cooperate with us and bring about first this guarantee of deposits, so far as I am concerned, all restraint is off; and we are going to have some very plain talking. Now is their chance to show that they are ready to put their house in order. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the committee has just listened to an explanation of a very important bill that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] has introduced in which all the Members are intensely interested. I desire to avail myself of this brief opportunity to call to the attention of the House a bill I have introduced which provides for the construction of naval vessels in the form of replacement.

I desire to call the attention of the House to a bill that I have to-day introduced to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels for replacements and additions.

I am aware that unusual and abnormal conditions exist both in our own country and throughout the world, but, in my opinion, the duty of Congress with reference to its national defense is plain—to support a replacement program which, when appropriations therefor are approved by Congress, will give to the Nation within a reasonable number of years a Navy of the full strength which the defense and security of the country requires in accordance with the London treaty.

It is evident that a nation that requires a naval force requires one adequate to function efficiently in the hour of need.

The efficiency of the Navy must not be based upon the fluctuation of the stock and commodity markets. A country

does not need a navy of one strength when she is prosperous and a navy of another size when there is an economic depression.

At all times we need a Navy that is strong enough to defend our possessions and to support our policies; to insure the safety of our country and the development of our commerce.

I shall insist at all times that the Navy be administered with rigid economy, but to permit our Navy to get in position where our national safety may be threatened is false economy.

To maintain a navy which is not efficient is the worst form of extravagance. It lulls the people into a false sense of security that may have the most disastrous consequences.

Now, let me call your attention specifically to the bill that I have introduced:

First. The first and foremost point of this bill is that it is a replacement program; with the exception of the two 20,000-ton carriers, every ship called for in the bill is a replacement ship.

Second. There are 120 ships called for in this authorization bill. The total tonnage is about 303,000 standard tons. The estimated cost of this program is about \$616,000,000. The bill proposes laying these ships down over a period of 10 years at an annual cost of about \$61,600,000.

There are building at the present time 16 ships—7 eight-inch cruisers, 3 submarines, 1 aircraft carrier, and 5 destroyers—of a total standard tonnage of about 95,100 tons. The total estimated cost to complete these vessels is about \$91,500,000.

Third. This bill calls for the construction of 3 aircraft carriers, 2 of about 20,000 tons, 1 of about 15,200 tons; 9 six-inch gun cruisers, at least 1 of which is a flying-deck cruiser of about 10,000 tons; 13 destroyers (leaders) of about 1,850 tons; 72 destroyers of about 1,500 tons; 23 submarines.

The total tonnage involved is:

Aircraft carriers	55,200
6-inch gun cruisers	90,000
Destroyer leaders	24,000
Destroyers	108,000
Submarines	25,990
Total	303,190

Fourth. All of the ships are permitted by the London treaty. The times for laying them down as called for in the bill are in accordance with the terms, requirements, and allowances of the London treaty. It is understood that it is not the present policy of the Navy Department to utilize any of the alternatives of the London treaty relative to interchange of tonnage. There is nothing in this bill that is in any way contrary to the letter or the spirit of the London treaty, nothing that is not in accord with the naval holiday.

Fifth. In the authorization program covered by this bill are three aircraft carriers, one of which (15,200 tons) is a replacement for the U. S. S. *Langley*; the other two (20,000 tons each) are the only ships called for by the program that are additions to the Navy. The others, or 118 of the 120 ships, are replacements.

Sixth. In the cruiser program called for, nine 6-inch gun cruisers, particular attention is invited to the fact that there has been stricken from the Navy list since the fiscal year 1929, 117,620 tons of cruisers carrying guns of 8-inch caliber and above. This includes the *Rochester*, which is over age and is to be stricken from the list, and the *Seattle*, which is being converted to a hulk. In addition, there has been stricken from the Navy list during the same period 58,910 tons of cruisers carrying 6-inch guns and below. This list includes the *Olympia*, which Congress has indicated a desire to retain as a naval relic.

The grand total of this cruiser tonnage over age stricken from the list or to be stricken is 176,530 tons, comprising 22 ships.

Seventh. The London treaty allows 150,000 tons of destroyers. There are in this bill 85 destroyers, all of which are replacements. There are 5 destroyers under construc-

tion and 7 authorized by the act of 1916, making a total of 97 destroyers, all of which are replacements for 254 destroyers now carried on the Navy list.

Of these 254 destroyers, 185 are over age at the present time, 53 become over age in 1932, 13 in 1933, and 3 in 1934—all become over age by 1934, well before the expiration of the London treaty.

Of these 254 destroyers, whose standard tonnage is 270,880, 80 are now on the disposal list, 70 are out of commission, 3 are designated as mobile targets, 5 are being used as barracks and for experimental purposes (will be scrapped as soon as they have served their purpose), 5 are assigned to the Coast Guard, 4 are assigned as light mine layers, and 87 are in commission—80, 70, 3, 5, 5, 4, 87 equal 254.

Until replacements are built the London treaty allowance of 150,000 tons is made up as follows:

	Tons
11 destroyers appropriated for	16,500
87 now in commission	99,060
5 assigned to Coast Guard	5,950
4 light mine layers	4,640
19 out of commission at Philadelphia yard	22,610

126      Total      148,760

Fifty-one additional destroyers (57,390 tons) are being retained until cruiser tonnage allowed by the London treaty is built up. These 51 boats, however, must be scrapped in accordance with the London treaty by December 31, 1936: 51—21 out of commission, Philadelphia; 30 out of commission, San Diego—57,390 tons.

Eighth. Attention is invited to the fact that the 85 destroyers in the bill plus 12 authorized in 1916, or 97 destroyers, are all replacements and actually are to replace 254 destroyers all of which are now over age or become over age by 1934. This is a very radical reduction in the number of destroyers in our Navy, but we propose to replace these 254 destroyers with 97 vessels of modern design and construction.

Ninth. The London treaty permits 52,700 standard tons of submarines. There are in this bill 23 submarines, all of which are replacements. We have to-day 84 submarines, 70,050 tons (three under construction—3,800 tons), of which 16 boats (8,030 tons) are over age now, 48 boats (34,950 tons) become over age by 1936: 15 boats, 8,470 tons in 1932; 6 boats, 4,760 tons in 1933; 4 boats, 3,160 tons in 1934; 4 boats, 3,390 tons in 1935; 19 boats, 15,170 tons in 1936.

Of this total of 84 boats (70,050 tons) 64 boats (42,980 tons) become over age by 1936, leaving us 20 boats (11 S class, 9,100 tons, and 9 V class, 17,970 tons), or 27,070 tons of under-age submarines in 1936; 52,700 tons less 27,070 tons, is 25,630 tons which we are short of our treaty allowance, and the bill therefore carries 23 boats of about 1,130 tons standard displacement to take care of this shortage, all of which is replacement tonnage.

It is understood that the department's plan and policy relative to submarines may be summarized as follows:

To be retained—

	Tons
9 fleet submarines, V class, 3 of which are building	17,970
40 submarines, C class	32,420
4 submarines, R class	2,120
53      Total	52,510

(Of the above 28 S class and the 4 R class become over age by 1936.)

Thirty additional submarines are to be retained in an afloat condition:

	Tons
16 R class	8,480
5 S class	3,950
9 O class	4,320
30      Total	16,750

but must be scrapped prior to December 31, 1936. There are 14 submarines, 5,900 tons, on the disposal list to be scrapped when the scrap-metal market justifies, 1 experimental submarine (not included in the above), S-4, over age in 1932, to be scrapped as soon as experiments are completed.

Tenth. Attention is again invited to the fact that the 23 submarines authorized in the bill are replacement tonnage for boats that become over age by 1936. These 23, with the 20 boats under age in 1936, or 43 boats, replace 98 boats now in the Navy, 14 of which are on the disposal list; eliminating these 14, if you choose, and deducting the 20 under age boats, we are replacing 64 submarines now in the Navy by 23 new boats.

Eleventh. The estimated annual cost by fiscal years of this 10-year authorization program (120 ships) is as follows:

1933	\$18,001,000
1934	54,671,000
1935	89,844,000
1936	88,470,000
1937	90,110,000
1938	69,997,000
1939	49,092,000
1940	36,208,000
1941	42,897,000
1942	45,473,000
Carry over to following years	31,987,000
Grand total	616,250,000

Twelfth. Since the Washington conference, February 6, 1922, the following ships have been laid down and completed, or have been laid down or completed—certain aircraft carriers—or are building, or have been appropriated for:

United States, 41 ships, total tonnage	253,640
British Empire, 130 ships, total tonnage (about)	469,363
Japan, 166 ships, total tonnage (about)	464,267
France, 180 ships, total tonnage (about)	472,321
Italy, 133 ships, total tonnage (about)	266,175

Thirteenth. This replacement navy not only will be far more efficient and effective but also less expensive to operate and maintain. This applies both to personnel and to material. It applies both to combatant ships and to auxiliaries.

It reduces the number of ships and the over-all tonnage displacement, at the same time tremendously increasing the fighting strength of our Navy.

It is generally understood but not thoroughly appreciated how far we have dropped behind other countries in naval strength since the World War, and particularly since the Washington treaty.

In ratifying the London treaty it was the general understanding that it was the policy of the country to build up to the naval strength permitted by the treaty. This was not a political understanding but a public understanding. This problem is not a political question but a national problem—namely, an adequate national defense, a first-class Navy for a first-class Nation.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GIBSON. Does the gentleman's bill bring us to the treaty obligations of the London pact?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It does.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. While discussing the supplemental cruisers, having in mind that no cruiser now constructed in the service carries a bombing plane, would the gentleman mind developing what is in his mind about that new type of cruiser?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of the nine cruisers to be built, we are required to build one that will probably be experimental for that work, and if it works out satisfactorily in having a flying deck, the remaining eight will probably all be flying-deck cruisers.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. And the gentleman thinks that if we build cruisers with flying decks it will be possible for each ship to carry its own bombing plane and it will not be necessary to have airplane carriers?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. You will need the airplane carrier.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the gentleman's bill based upon the assumption that there will be no accomplishment at the Geneva Conference?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. My bill is not based upon any future conference at all, because that is not a question that I can deal with or that the House can deal with. That is a question for the Senate and the other end of the Avenue. Of course I trust the time is near at hand when there will be an international agreement to outlaw war, but let me say to this committee that until there is some substitute for war, the first duty of government is self-preservation. [Applause.]

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to commend the strong American stand of the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. I sincerely hope that the program will be carried out. [Applause.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure and honor to follow the chairman of the committee of which I am a member. I rise to discuss to-day a question before this House that I think is of vital importance.

For the past two weeks I have had one of the busiest experiences of my life in taking care of a party assignment which relates to the assigning of patronage to the 171 Democratic Members of the House entitled to the same. During this period my office has been swamped with mail relating to nearly every subject that will come before Congress. However, the one question that seems to occupy the attention of more of our people than any other is that which relates to the Federal Farm Board and its marketing activities.

Soon after I returned to Washington the Oklahoma delegation met in Senator THOMAS's office for the purpose of deciding upon some plan which if adopted into a law would have for its purpose the protection of agriculture and those who follow the same for a livelihood. Therefore, we adopted the following resolution, and a copy of the same was given to the press:

We favor transferring the administration of the marketing act to the Department of Agriculture and revising said act in the interest of the farmers and their cooperative institutions, and safeguarding the Public Treasury, the farmers, and their cooperatives against a recurrence of mistakes, extravagant expenditures, and the payment of enormous salaries made and approved by the Federal Farm Board.

In the Senate hearings it was developed that the present Farm Board had authorized the payment of salaries up to \$75,000 per year which is based on a salary of \$25,000 and a commission of 5 cents on each bale of cotton up to 1,000,000 bales and this amount was paid to E. F. Creekmore, and in a letter sent to some of my friends I called attention to the fact that basing this on 26 working days in a month a person drawing this salary would receive more than \$240 per day. It so happens that the person who received this enormous salary was assigned to the duty of carrying on the speculation for the Farm Board on the different exchanges and places where futures are bought and sold.

In the hearings it developed that millions of bushels of wheat futures were bought for the purpose of putting up the price and then within a few days thereafter millions of bushels were sold, which had the effect of beating the price down, and in my letter to my friends I made the statement that any activity of the Government that speculates in futures on both sides of the market provides the necessary instrumentalities for those on the inside to make huge profits if they so desired. It was further developed in the hearings that seats on the various gambling or stock-buying exchanges were bought or owned or controlled by the Farm Board; and when it is taken into consideration that seats on the New York Exchange cost more than \$100,000, it presented such a peculiar state of facts to the Oklahoma delegation that we felt that the Farm Board had completely fallen down.

I can remember when I was a boy such organizations as the Farmers' Union, the Farmers' Alliance, the Grange, and other organizations in the interest of agriculture, all deplored the fact that the products of the farm were used as an excuse for speculation on the various exchanges of the country, and I dare say that if those who organized such activities and who have now passed on to the beyond could be made to realize that a great Federal activity operating for agriculture had set aside a salary of \$75,000 to pay a person to look after the speculation in futures for agriculture that every one of them would turn over in their graves, as such a policy was as far removed from the thoughts of those who organized these institutions as heaven is from earth.

Soon after the press carried this resolution the members of the Oklahoma delegation received from a farmer, who has always borne a distinguished reputation, a high-class line of propaganda which was intended to severely startle and frighten those who were responsible for this action, and for the reason that the Hon. J. G. H. Windle, the author of this propaganda, was from the district I have the honor to represent, I sent him the following letter:

Mr. J. G. H. WINDLE,  
*Granite, Okla.*

MY DEAR SIR AND FRIEND: I am pleased to acknowledge the receipt of your letter which relates to the attitude of the Oklahoma delegation with respect to their views on the marketing act, and I have carefully noted what you have had to say in this connection.

The last time I talked to you concerning this subject I stated, if my memory serves me correctly, that I was not in favor of abolishing the act but of amending the same. I will stand on that statement.

Eight members of the Oklahoma delegation had a meeting after hearings had been held by the Senate, in which very damaging testimony was given relative to the administration of this act, and the following is the exact language adopted:

"We favor transferring the administration of the marketing act to the Department of Agriculture and revising said act in the interest of the farmers and their cooperative institutions, and safeguarding the public treasury, the farmers and their cooperatives against a recurrence of mistakes, extravagant expenditures, and the payment of enormous salaries made and approved by the Federal Farm Board."

In the Senate hearing it was developed that salaries up to \$75,000 per year were being paid by those in charge of administering of this act. Taking into consideration 26 working days a month, this is more than \$240 per day, and I say without fear of contradiction that there is no one citizen in the United States entitled to this much consideration for making such a record as has been made with respect to the marketing of farm products. In addition, it was proven, and I shall be glad to send you the dates of such transactions, that when a statement was given out showing that wheat was being purchased to keep the market up, in less than seven days thereafter millions of bushels were dumped on the market for the purpose of beating it down. I furthermore wish to say that any activity of the Government that speculates in futures on both sides of the market provides the necessary instrumentalities for those on the inside to make enormous sums of money for their own benefit, if it is so desired. If I was a farmer, unless I had a selfish interest to serve, I could not conscientiously support any such record, being fully convinced that such record is not in the interest of agriculture. I further desire to say that the action taken by the members of the Oklahoma delegation is in favor of the retention of this marketing act with certain limitations, and to place the jurisdiction under the Department of Agriculture in order to prevent the payment of such enormous salaries as have been paid in the past.

Therefore, you may rest assured that the cooperatives, in my opinion, instead of being hurt if the law is amended in the way that our delegation favors will be greatly benefited, as we have specifically used the word cooperatives in our declaration, having in mind that this organization is entitled to every consideration possible.

I sincerely hope that this statement with respect to my attitude will give you the information you desire, as it is my intention always to favor such legislation as will be beneficial to agriculture.

With best wishes, I am, very sincerely,

J. V. McCLINTIC, M. C.

Likewise, the substance of this letter was sent to four or five others in the seventh congressional district of Oklahoma, who wrote me letters which, to my mind, conveyed the idea that they might have some connection with the organization in Oklahoma that is opposed to the stand that the Oklahoma delegation has taken.

As a climax to this controversy, a few days ago I received a communication from a distinguished gentleman with

whom I have been personally acquainted for the past 18 or 20 years, Mr. George Bishop, of Oklahoma City. He is well and favorably known to the farmers of western Oklahoma and one who has always conscientiously performed a service in the interest of agriculture, having the thought in mind that the farmers must receive proper consideration if there is to be prosperity throughout the Nation. He happens to be or was connected with the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association and if there is any one person who knows the facts he certainly should know, being on the inside.

In his letter he calls attention to the communication sent to me by Mr. Windle, stating that copies of the same went to each member of the Oklahoma delegation and to other southern Congressmen. He states that it was full of stereotyped and high-powered appeal and that he thought possibly I might become stampeded to the extent I would not let my shirt tail touch me until Congress had fixed a way for voting a few million dollars more for farm relief.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In a moment I will yield.

In this letter he calls attention to the fact that Mr. Windle is one of the flock of high-powered and well-paid propagandists employed by the American Cotton Cooperative Association in New Orleans, which is the Farm Board's big cotton baby, better known as the A. C. C. A.; also that Mr. Windle is receiving a salary of \$350 per month, with traveling expenses, stenographic help, multigraphing, stationery, postage, et cetera, and that all of this comes out of the members of the cotton growers who obtain 5 cents for their cotton. He gives some other most interesting information, and that is, that this so-called prize baby of the Farm Board has set up a lobbying activity here in the city of Washington under the control of one C. O. Moser, who is paid a salary of \$15,000 per year, plus traveling expenses and other incidentals, which run up into the thousands. He further states that this man Moser is supposed to paralyze any Congressman who may seem not to sympathize with the Farm Board program. Mr. Bishop's letter is as follows:

OKLAHOMA COTTON GROWERS ASSOCIATION,  
Oklahoma City, Okla., December 25, 1931.

Hon. J. V. McCLINTIC,  
House Office Bldg., Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I have been trying for weeks to find time to "drop you a few lines to let you know," but could not get to it till this Christmas Day.

Before it was mailed I had the privilege of reading Judge Windle's letter to you of some weeks ago.

Copies of that letter went to each member of the Oklahoma delegation in Washington, also to several southern Congressmen, and has since gone out over the State.

I meant to follow it with a little inside information and history that you are entitled to, and every Member of Congress needs to know.

Judge Windle's letter to you was a very strong piece of propaganda. It was full of stereotyped and high-powered appeal.

I did not know but what you might become stampeded when you read it and feel like not letting your shirt tail touch you until you had fixed a way for voting a few hundred millions more for "farm relief."

But, if I may judge from the Washington news dispatches, it did not make you feel that way.

I say, bully for you. It begins to show that you, along with a lot of others who are sincere in their sympathies and wish to do anything that will help farmers in any way that is economically workable, but who are now coming back to earth about the big idea of legislating and appropriating prosperity into the pockets of us cotton pickers through the medium of farm boards and supersalaried experts.

You and all the Oklahoma delegation need to know that Judge Windle is one of a flock of high-powered and well-paid propagandists, employed by the American Cotton Cooperative Association at New Orleans. That organization is the Farm Board's big cotton baby.

The A. C. C. A., as we call it, is the super set-up the Farm Board has for selling all "co-op" cotton.

The A. C. C. A. assumes and presumes to speak for all cotton pickers and cooperatives.

This is done through a public-relations department, and Judge Windle is the Oklahoma man for preparing and spreading sheets of the kind which you received. He also organizes farm communities into cooperative councils with the understanding they are to cover up Congress with the proper plea at the psychological moment. There is nothing wrong about it, and I would be in sympathy with it if I did not know all about how it comes to be.

I know that all A. C. C. A. expenses of all kinds and for whatever purpose, whether it be to sell cooperative cotton or to protect and perpetuate its present pay roll, have to come out of our member cotton growers' 5-cent cotton.

I know also the money is not being consciously donated but is quietly confiscated.

The head of this public-relations department of the A. C. C. A. gets a salary of \$15,000 a year plus traveling expenses running into the thousands. He is in Washington now with a secretary and a suite of rooms, C. O. Moser. Call him and he will come over with a line of palaver that is supposed to paralyze any Congressman who may seem to not sympathize with his program.

Windle draws a salary of \$350 per month with traveling expenses, stenographic help, multigraphing, stationery, postage, and everything supplied by the Oklahoma association office.

But please, now, do not get me wrong about my reference to Judge Windle. I know him to be a fine, clean man. No better man could have been found for such service in Oklahoma. Windle is as loyal and sincere a believer in cooperative marketing as I am.

I personally know that Windle wishes more than anything else to save the Oklahoma Cotton Growers' Association in Oklahoma. He wants to get it back on its feet for services to Oklahoma cotton growers as it was before we got in bad and had to sign on the dotted line with the Farm Board.

But I also know Windle is hypnotized by this Moser man and seems to fear that we can not have cooperative marketing unless we have the Farm Board and its expensive set-up preserved and paid for regardless of what we cotton growers may have left after all bills are paid.

I also wish you to know that in writing you I have no personal grievance nor prejudice of any kind or color.

I can write here only a little of a lot which every Congressman needs to know.

I speak from the viewpoint of a cotton-grower cooperator who has been a privileged and close-up observer for all the time the cotton cooperatives have been operating.

I have been "among those present" from the very first move that was made to organize in Oklahoma.

All along and up to the present day, I have watched every move. I have participated in most of them, approved many of them, and personally opposed some of them.

I came to know of all the unnecessary and unreasonable salaries with which the old American Cotton Growers Exchange was saddled when it was set up way back in 1921.

I helped to jar a few of them loose or make them take less, but most of them hung on until the Farm Board came along to salvage what was left of the old exchange along with the wrecks it had made of most of the State associations.

I know how Oklahoma lost every penny of her reserve fund with a lot more on top of it, in 1929, and who was most responsible and why.

Also who furnished the inspiration and the information that hypnotized the Oklahoma management into the mismanagement that brought virtual bankruptcy.

How the Farm Board beat the receivers to the door of the Oklahoma association by only a few days; and how it all came about because of supersalaried experts employed to perform miracles in forecasting prices.

All made honest efforts, but horrible failure followed. The key man for this disastrous experiment was borrowed from the United States Department of Agriculture at Washington.

I believe the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association would have been by this time marketing 500,000 bales of cotton and had \$1,000,000 in her reserve fund instead of being in debt near that amount; if she could have escaped the influence of the gang led by this man Moser, who hypnotized our management into speculating with cotton and away from the cooperative marketing of cotton.

Oklahoma did not go bust because of her inability to class and sell cotton at a profit for our members.

Oklahoma got in bad because a majority—only a majority, not all—of the management listened to the pleas and promises of supersalaried experts who sold her on the big idea of making a barrel of money by not marketing cotton, when she should have and could have marketed at a profit.

In setting up the American Cotton Cooperative Association, the Farm Board seems to have fallen for the same line of bunk. So instead of purging the pay roll of such superuseless services, decided to keep them on the pay roll at larger salaries than ever before, as the American Cotton Cooperative Association pay roll will show to-day, to the tune of \$6,000 and \$15,000, plus clerks and everything.

It seems one would be almost justified in saying the Farm Board figured the only way to save cooperative marketing was to pay more and more for less and less, while the price of cotton went lower and lower.

Pardon me. I do not mean to say a harsh word against the Farm Board nor any person in it. Bless their souls, they did the best they knew how—yes, the best they knew how—under the circumstances. There were many circumstances over which they had no control. So many conditions came to be that no one could foresee or forestall.

But in setting up the American Cotton Cooperative Association they fell for the theoretical soundness of a big set-up and listened to and heard and heeded only the supersalaried few, while those who had done the work all these years and knew the details were

kept in the background, weeping, as it were, and wishing they could help to stay on safe ground for the future.

Cooperative marketing of cotton deserves to live on and render all the service cooperative marketing can render to the cotton grower.

If given good business management, there is a good business profit to the cotton grower in the cooperative marketing of cotton.

Cooperative marketing is not and can never be made the cure-all for what ails agriculture.

It is the silliest sort of economic nonsense to think so or say so and worse to try to make cotton pickers and Congressmen believe such stuff.

The economic inequality between agriculture and industry lies a lot deeper than anything cooperative marketing can cure or legislation can correct, unless legislation is willing to remove the protection from industry and put her to marketing against world competition, as farmers are compelled to market all farm products of which a surplus is produced, against world competition.

But 75 per cent of our people are interested in the protection of industry and organized labor, while the 25 per cent farmer minority gets the political play of having the Farm Board and a few hundred millions spent on its "cause" in exchange for higher and still higher tariffs for industry.

The Farm Board was just made the goat in that sort of horseplay. The agricultural marketing act, other than being a medium through which some cheaper money might be had for operating cooperatives, can do nothing toward giving agriculture economic equality with industry.

But it can be made to sound mighty good, and is fine for the supersalaried few who can cash in on it.

But getting back to the case of Oklahoma. It has occurred to me and approved by a few other friends of cooperative marketing in general and Oklahoma cotton growers in particular that, if Congress could manage to take some of the \$1,900,000 set up as a budget for the operating expenses of the Farm Board—see Farm Board Report No. 2, page 80—and use the money to pay off the debts of the State co-ops. and put them back on their feet again, where they could operate in the light of all their experiences both bad and good, I believe it would be the best thing that ever happened to cooperative marketing.

Some little supervision might be provided for the financing. But put them back on their own and let them grow in knowledge and experience before throwing them into the big set-up—let them grow into it.

The worst thing that ever happened to the cooperative marketing of cotton was to begin from the first to try to make it "leap to heights that were made to climb."

The leaping into the big set-up simply makes cooperative marketing the victim of supersalaried positions where it is impossible for the co-ops. to get or anyone to give value received for the money it costs.

If Oklahoma could get back to home rule once more, I believe it would do more to restore confidence and put new life in the memberships than anything that could be done.

But for the pitfalls into which Oklahoma was persuaded, I believe by this year she would have worked out a safe program for cooperative marketing.

Oklahoma was going strong when she got caught in the meshes of cooperative speculation. The future looks dark if we are left under the A. C. C. A. As evidence for that statement, please note the deliveries for the last four years, two of them under Oklahoma management, the second two under A. C. C. A.:

Oklahoma management:	Bales
1928	363,000
1929	327,000
A. C. C. A. management:	
1930	214,000
1931	<sup>1</sup> 116,000

You know figures do not lie, and I have always depended upon the records for information from which to draw conclusions and not upon "dope sheets" like the one I am inclosing, coming from my friend Moser and his bunch of high-powered propagandists.

Please read that "dope sheet," including the margin notes, where I try to interpret, etc.

I talked with Henry Denton about Oklahoma and along the line I have indicated above before he went to the Washington conference.

He said he talked to Senator THOMAS and found THOMAS with thoughts running in sympathy with such a plan. Won't you please get with Senator THOMAS for further conference if this plan appeals to you as workable.

I have none of the stenographic or multigraphing facilities of my friend Windle, or I would send copies to the Oklahoma delegation. But have used this Christmas Day to pound it out, hoping it will help you to see things a little more as they really are. I am prepared to defend any statement I have made and dare anyone to challenge the truth of them.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Faithfully and sincerely yours,

GEO. BISHOP.

If the Farm Board has established a big cotton baby, then there would be insane jealousy if there was not established a wheat baby, a grape growers' baby, and babies to repre-

sent every agricultural industry in the Nation. Therefore, one can visualize the enormous sums of money that are being wasted in paying these high-salaried propagandists in every State in the Union under the present set-up.

Inasmuch as the Farm Board can not plead ignorant to such activities, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that it will only be a matter of time until all of the \$500,000,000 which was set apart for the purpose of aiding agriculture will be depleted to the extent that an extraordinary effort will be made to get Congress to vote another \$500,000,000 in order that these enormous salaries and high-paid propagandists may continue to function. If I am correctly informed, approximately \$400,000,000 of this money has already been exhausted, and the chances are that when the final chapter has been written it will be the greatest record of inefficiency that has ever been applied to any organization authorized by Congress.

The information given in Mr. Bishop's letter was published in the Daily Oklahoman, with the thought that those who till the soil, not knowing of these enormous expenditures, were entitled to have some inside information. Therefore the Oklahoma Cotton Growers' Association, under the management of Mr. A. E. Kobs, immediately sent out the following letter to the cooperatives for the purpose of bombarding the Members of Congress, with the hope that he and the others on the pay roll who either directly or indirectly obtain their funds from the Federal Farm Board might be retained on the same:

*To the local receiver addressed:*

The fight is on. Our enemies, the cotton shippers, have laid down the gauntlet in Congress. Statements of all kinds have been made by them and their friends, all of which if they are not answered will be taken for the truth.

It is the purpose of your association to put up as good a defense as possible against these accusations. We are sending you under separate cover a request from members or farmers who want to have Mr. C. O. Moser, president of the National Agricultural Cooperative Council, who is in Washington looking after the interests of all cooperative marketing permits. We want you to make a drive to get the 100 or more that we are sending you signed and mailed back here Monday to this office. We want you to put them in an envelope or roll them up and send them collectively, not individually, and we will prepare them to be sent to Washington to be used next week when Congress meets.

This is very important, and we want you to be sure and have all signed that we are sending you, if possible, and mailed back here Monday. This fight must be made by the farmers who feel that the agricultural marketing act has been of benefit to the farmers generally, and your assistance will make it easier for those who are fighting for you in Washington to present your cause in your interest. Any farmer or business man can sign this permit.

Yours very truly,

A. E. Kobs,  
General Manager Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association.

Attached to this letter was the following blank:

Date \_\_\_\_\_

*To my Senators and Representatives in Congress:*

This is to advise you that I resent the activities of the cotton, grain, and produce trades, the future exchanges which they control, and other unfriendly business interests in their attempts to repeal, or by amendments, destroy the effectiveness of the agricultural marketing act, and I ask that you, as my representatives in Congress, defend this important and far-reaching farm legislation against their attacks.

I further hereby name C. O. Moser to stand in my shoes to approve or disapprove in my behalf any proposed amendments to this act, and to work with you in carrying out my expressed wishes.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Town \_\_\_\_\_ County \_\_\_\_\_

It will be interesting to those who read an account of this controversy to know that there are many farmers who have a sufficient amount of sense to know that this kind of high-handed finance is only beneficial to a few on the pay roll, and that they are not willing to go any further except to support a policy which will be beneficial to the cooperatives. Inasmuch as Mr. A. E. Kobs, manager of the cooperatives, has asked his supporters to sign a statement approving the policy of retaining Mr. C. O. Moser here in Washington, which is the Farm Board policy of paying enormous salaries and speculating in farm products, I will be pleased to have your views on this subject.

<sup>1</sup> May get 125,000.

Please put an "X" in front of the statement that indicates your views.

[ ] I am in favor of retaining the Farm Board and its present policies, including speculation and the payment of enormous salaries.

[ ] I am against the present policy of the Federal Farm Board and believe that the act should be amended so as to prevent speculation in futures and the payment of high salaries.

Now, as to Mr. Kobs. He is interested in retaining control of an activity that can expend as much money as will be necessary to pay the present high salaries, including his own. Of course, those who are on the pay roll, like Mr. Windle, are being confronted with the situation that they must stand pat in supporting him or they are liable to lose the amount of salaries they are receiving per month.

The Federal Farm Board is bound to know of Mr. Moser's activities. They have a right to know who in the employ of these different kinds of affiliated organizations are receiving salaries and the amount paid each. I now call upon the Federal Farm Board to furnish to Congress the names of these so-called "babies" that are set up to act under their direction and the amount of salaries and expenses that have been allowed to each one of them during the year 1931. Otherwise those who are interested in agriculture will know that there has been more subterfuge, trickery, deceit, and dealing under the table in connection with this organization than any other set-up that has been authorized by the Government.

I wish to say to my friends who are farmers that I am deeply interested in agriculture. I supported the legislation creating the Farm Board, with the thought that something ought to be done to alleviate the suffering of those who till the soil. There was nothing in this measure that permitted speculation. There was nothing in this measure that permitted the kind of set-ups that have brought about the payment of such enormous salaries, and as I view it the only way we can solve this problem in the interest of agriculture is to revamp the legislation, place the jurisdiction back in the Department of Agriculture where it belongs where those who perform service will be regulated in such a way as to cause all of their activities to be the public property of the people of the United States.

As a further exhibit in this controversy I wish to add Mr. Bishop's comment on the circular sent out by the American Cooperative Association signed by C. O. Moser. The language in italics is the explanatory notes of Mr. Bishop.

#### THE AMERICAN COTTON COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

When the agricultural marketing act was passed by Congress, in the cotton South there were 15 independent cotton cooperatives.

As contemplated by the marketing act, a central organization, the American Cotton Cooperative Association, was set up, with headquarters at New Orleans.

This organization is capitalized at \$30,000,000 and is possibly the most powerful cotton concern in the world. Its facilities are ample to handle every bale of cotton produced in the South this year, or any other year, and to finance the operations without inconveniences. The stock in the central organization is held by the State cooperatives, *but not one penny paid by the States*. The State cooperatives are owned and controlled by the farmer members. Hence the American Cotton Cooperative Association is owned and controlled by the members of the Southern cotton cooperatives.

By thus centralizing activities—a perfectly sound theory, *but our experience with it proves that Oklahoma is deprived of the full proceeds of the better sale value of her cotton*. The State cooperatives are taken out of competition with each other, much expensive duplication eliminated, and the use of the most scientific and efficient methods of handling cotton from the producer to the spinner made possible and practical.

#### THE ROYAL MANDATE

The cooperatives under the new set-up have operated one season and have increased their annual business more than 100 per cent. *Oklahoma under her own management, 1929, 327,000 bales; Oklahoma under American Cotton Cooperative Association management, 1930, 214,000 bales; Oklahoma under American Cotton Cooperative Association management, 1931, 120,000 bales.* The cotton shippers' association has decided that the plan is about to work, and for that very reason the cooperative movement must be stopped. So a decree has been issued, spread upon the records, and promulgated commanding that the Farm Board be executed,

the marketing act repealed, and the cooperatives outlawed. Nowhere at any time have I seen anything against cooperative marketing.

#### BIG BUSINESS

We are in an age of big business, and big business is with us to stay. Farmers or other groups that persist in individual action and fail or refuse to organize big marketing machinery of their own may expect to be organized out of business by other organized big business.

#### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COMES TO OUR RESCUE

The Federal Government, through the marketing act, has helped us to set up our own big marketing business—business so big, so well financed, and so efficiently operated as to enable us, in the marketing of cotton, to successfully meet the competition of the other big cotton-marketing agencies. *Yeah; but cotton merchants bought cotton all over Oklahoma this fall, paying from \$1.50 to \$2.50 and \$3 per bale more than the American Cotton Cooperative Association could pay or would pay our members. Plenty of evidence to prove it.*

*Take out your shirt tail—no hankerchief can hold the tears you will shed as you read on. Boo-hoo! Fifteen-cent cotton before the Farm Board—5-cent cotton now! Hurry with a few hundred million more.*

#### THE RESPONSIBILITY IS UPON FARMERS THEMSELVES

Will cotton farmers patronize their own big business and hasten the return of prosperity to the farms and peace, happiness, and contentment to the homes, or will they continue to patronize the marketing system that has wrecked them and made slaves of thousands of their wives and children? Seriously consider your action. *Us cotton pickers would sure have a hell of a time if this supersalaried son of a gun didn't get his 15,000 bucks.*

#### IMPORTANT

Be sure to let your Senators and your Congressmen know, in unmistakable terms, that you protest the repeal of the marketing act, or the passing of any legislation that would impair the services of the cooperatives. (J. G. H. Windle, Oklahoma Association.)

In a recent statement by Mr. William F. Schilling, member of the Farm Board, while at Madison, Wis., he stated that according to the newspaper accounts the Government was in 89 businesses before the creation of the Farm Board, but that nothing was heard until one more was added to help the farmer.

"Whenever the Farm Board is mentioned it is in connection with losses in wheat and cotton and nothing is ever heard of the other services of the board," Mr. Schilling said. He declared that aid was extended to the Land o'Lakes Creamery and that nearly 9,000,000 pounds of butter was put into other than the regular channels. He said that nothing had been said about 210 carloads of turkeys sold through the Farm Board's efforts at prices of 6 cents higher than the producers normally received. *Turkey pools all over Oklahoma—never heard of Farm Board.*

Mr. Schilling further stated that the Farm Board has spent \$14,000,000 to help the dairy and poultry business and that out of more than 900 organizations, only one has failed to meet its obligations.

"Banks, the airplane fellows and the railroads have had a granddaddy at Washington and now you have got one too," Mr. Schilling commented.

"As far as the charge of Government in business goes, Government has been in the newspapers as well as other business," he said. He declared that the Government has lost \$40,000,000 on its second class mailing service. *Sure there is no such thing as Government in business, the Government only takes the place of business.*

C. O. MOSER.

*Vice President, In Charge Membership and Public Relations.*

*This supersalaried servant of the alleged farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperatives sends 16-cent air mail special delivery, full page Christmas greetings to each of his satellites and fellow parasites—All paid out of our 5-cent cotton.*

One of our prominent and influential farmers, by the name of H. T. Summers, wrote a very interesting letter in this connection. He said he was not in favor of the enormous salaries that have been paid; that he was not in favor of the policy that had been put into effect and which has been justly criticized, in my opinion. Instead of sending this back to the president of the cooperative association he sent it to me and I will put it in the RECORD so you may know exactly what is being done in order to influence Members of Congress.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is that the C. A. Moser who appears in the list of officials, on page 296 of the Senate hearings, as drawing \$15,000 a year?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. That is the same gentleman.

Mr. STEVENSON. And the board says they are responsible for him.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am very glad to have that, because I did not know that the Federal Farm Board had acknowledged him as one of their choice selections, but inasmuch as the gentleman from South Carolina has made that statement I know it must be correct.

Mr. STEVENSON. They said they were consulted about the salaries and furnished the money.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. While I am off my subject I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to know whether I understood the gentleman correctly. Did the gentleman say the Federal Farm Board owns a seat on the stock exchange or the grain exchange in Chicago?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am advised that such testimony was given before the Senate committee, and I made the statement that they either owned or controlled their own seats in the different exchanges.

Mr. REED of New York. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate, because we all want correct information. I just called Mr. Stone over the telephone and he says the Farm Board owns no seat on any stock exchange anywhere.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman allow me to answer that?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. While the Federal Farm Board may not actually own it themselves, there is a gentleman by the name of Creekmore, E. F. Creekmore, I believe, who is the head of the American Cotton Cooperative Association, and who pulls down the enormous salary of \$50,000—

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Seventy-five thousand dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Seventy-five thousand. He has a seat not only on the New York Stock Exchange but on the New Orleans Stock Exchange, and the Federal Farm Board, or its stabilization corporation, paid out a half million dollars last year for commissions.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield again? I know we all want accurate information.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. The organization to which the gentleman refers is a farmer-owned and farmer-controlled organization. They fix that salary, and not the Federal Farm Board.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am very glad to have any gentleman ask me questions or interrupt me in order to get the actual facts in connection with any question that might be raised. As to the Farm Board owning seats on the various exchanges, they can technically deny this; but the fact remains these seats are in the name of their agent, Mr. Creekmore, and he did not get them free of charge.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. LOZIER. Does the gentleman think the so-called wheat-stabilization plan was wise in view of the fact that it was not inaugurated until November 17 or 19, 1929, after 80 per cent of all the wheat grown in America had left the farms, and then it was abandoned before the 1930 wheat crop was ready for the market? Does the gentleman think that a stabilization program based upon operation between the time the wheat leaves the farm one year and before the marketing of another crop was ever intended to be effective or that it was ever contemplated it would be effective?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am glad the gentleman raises that question. I want to say I voted for the Federal Farm Board act. There was not a single line in the law that would cause any Member of Congress to have the least conception that they ever intended to speculate on any of the big boards of this country. When they adopted a policy of that kind I sent several telegrams to the Federal Farm Board—and I have them here—for the purpose of finding out if they were actually dealing in futures. Most of the replies to my telegrams were evasive; they apparently did not want the public to know; and so in my letter to Mr. Windle, who has always borne a very excellent reputation,

I said that any activity of the Government which bought and sold futures provided an instrumentality which allowed those on the inside to make huge sums of money, and I defy anybody to contradict that statement.

It seems to me that the Federal Farm Board—and what I have to say about them is not personal—should keep faith with the United States Congress. They know how many of these so-called cooperative associations they have in the country; they are directly or indirectly furnishing them with the money that is being paid to these propagandists, and if they want to deal on what we call the level they will furnish to Congress the names of these so-called lobbyists and the amounts of money they are receiving. If they do not do that, then we can point our finger at them and say they are not on the level, because they are indirectly using the public's money, which does not belong to them, for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, the Oklahoma delegation—and I am sure I voice their sentiments—does not desire to persecute anyone connected with any of the farm organizations. We regret exceedingly that those charged with this responsibility have allowed themselves to be put in a position where they can not safely defend their acts. We regret exceedingly they have not carried out the intent of Congress, because it was not known by any Member of Congress that they intended to organize the kind of instrumentalities that they call now the wheat baby, the cotton baby, and so forth, giving them authority to appoint individuals, many of whom do not perform any kind of service other than to spread propaganda at enormous salaries.

Down in southwestern Oklahoma, where I live, some of the most pitiable conditions exist that I have ever witnessed. Our people down there are getting 5 cents a pound for their cotton and paying these propagandists \$350 a month and expenses to work on the outside. What other duties do they perform than to aid in sending out this information, and what other duty does this man perform who is here in Washington as a lobbyist, Mr. C. O. Moser, than to try to take care of congressional situations and to take care of legislation? It does seem to me that the Farm Board would have to acknowledge its inefficiency if such an agent is maintained.

I thought it was my duty to bring these facts to the attention of the House, because in a little while you are to be flooded with the kind of propaganda that is now being circulated with the hope they can maintain the present set-ups, thereby insuring to themselves enormous salaries and enormous expense accounts and various other kinds of privileges that they are not entitled to according to my point of view.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to reply to the gentleman who lives in the district I have the honor to represent, because I am sure that before he proceeds much further he will find out that the honest-to-God farmer who tills the soil will not countenance and will not approve any such expenditures as he is now the beneficiary of.

#### MORATORIUM

“Deceived,” “duped,” “cold-decked,” “whim-whammed,” “two-timed,” “city-slicked,” “hornswoggled,” are some of the terms that applicably fit that which has happened to the citizens of the United States by the so-called Hoover moratorium policy. This policy excuses the people of Germany and a number of other nations from paying their just debts for a period of one year at a cost of \$252,000,000 to the United States without containing any provision which will be beneficial to our citizens. On June 23, 1931, I received a telegram from the President of the United States stating in substance that he proposed to aid certain countries of Europe to the extent of this amount of money in the way of a moratorium and asking that I agree to support such a policy. In reply I sent the following telegram:

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,

Washington, D. C.:

Replying to your telegram asking for my opinion relative to your proposition in behalf of the American Government to postpone payment of all intergovernment debts for one year, which action, if taken, will specially benefit the people of Europe, will

state I am more interested in the pitiful condition of the farmers and laboring classes in the United States who are not able to meet their obligations with the Government. If the citizens of Europe are to have such benefits through the activity of our Government, I respectfully want to call your attention to the thousands of mortgagors that can not pay their obligations to the Federal farm banks, the distressed lessees of Indian land, the borrower of Government funds who on account of low prices of farm products can not meet their payments, and others in distressed circumstances because of existing condition. I will gladly support your plan to help the people of Europe provided some consideration can be given to the worthy citizens of the United States who are unable to meet their obligations to our own Government.

J. V. MCCLINTIC.

I am sure that if the Members of Congress who were swept off their feet by the President's appeal without taking time to look into the facts had known who the prime movers were behind this proposal they under no circumstances would have cast their vote in favor of such a foreign policy. Let us see who got the money. According to the testimony given to the Senate committee, approximately \$10,000,000,000 have been loaned to the various countries of the world by the so-called international bankers. The loans were refinanced by floating bonds in the United States by certain large institutions in New York and elsewhere. One firm, the National City Bank, made a profit of \$29,000,000 on the sale of \$5,625,000,000 of such bonds. Another banking firm made more than \$24,000,000, and it is estimated that over \$200,000,000 was the amount of profit made by the international bankers in the United States who unloaded these financial obligations on the people of this country in their refinancing or bond-selling plan. Since that date many of the countries that secured these loans have defaulted on the payment of the interest, thereby reducing the value of the bonds held by the people, meaning an enormous loss in the end.

Mr. Mellon, the present Secretary of the Treasury, is rated as one of the richest men in the world. His bank is one of the greatest financial institutions and one that has made some of these huge loans to foreign nations. He and the other financiers realized that unless some method was adopted to enable these countries to postpone the payment of certain amounts to the United States that there would be nothing left to pay the international bankers the interest that was due them and their investors.

So quietly they began to work out this plan, and like the bursting of a bombshell it fell on the Members of Congress in the form of the President's telegram, who were stampeded into going on record for the same without having the least conception of what it meant. Let us see what is wrong with the world, or with the nations affected by this so-called moratorium. According to the figures compiled by the World Peace Foundation in the League of Nations Armament Yearbook, the following table shows the nations affected by this moratorium and the amount they expended the last fiscal year for armaments, it being \$1,986,799,625. Think of it—all of this for war purposes.

#### WHAT NATIONS SPEND ON ARMS

[Expenditures for the last fiscal year, figured at rounded par or in a few cases at the average of exchange, as compiled by the World Peace Foundation from the forthcoming League of Nations Armaments Yearbook]

Austria	\$14,507,320
Belgium	33,303,200
Czechoslovakia	51,189,000
Estonia	5,520,000
Finland	16,457,500
France	466,960,000
Germany	171,923,040
British Empire	726,731,065
Greece	21,340,800
Hungary	20,200,000
Italy	248,946,500
Latvia	7,860,000
Lithuania	5,680,000
Poland	92,072,000
Rumania	53,647,200
Yugoslavia	50,458,000
Total	1,986,799,625

It is further of interest to know that the amount expended by the British Empire, France, and Italy for war purposes

aggregated the sum of \$1,424,627,565. The sum that these nations would pay on their indebtedness to the United States amounts to \$224,227,125. This shows that they are expending approximately seven times this amount in getting ready for war. It seems to me that the more money we give the foreign nations, or excuse them from paying, the more they expend in getting ready to fight some other nation, and that the very object sought by the President's moratorium is defeated, and all of this amount in the end will be an economic loss.

What the world needs at the present time is a reduction of armaments so that the money that is being expended by these nations can be applied on their debts. The United States has always paid dollar for dollar for every obligation incurred with the other nations of the world, and if we are to excuse nations of the world from paying that which is due the United States, it would mean on the basis of the canceling of \$11,000,000,000 that is due the United States that the part that the citizenship of the State of Oklahoma would pay would amount to approximately \$213,725,424. Therefore you may rest assured that as long as the nations of the world are spending eight times more than their indebtedness annually for the upkeep of their fighting machinery I will never vote to cancel a single dollar of their indebtedness or to extend to them consideration that is not given our own people, especially when it is known that our outstanding bonds that were sold to raise this money are a first mortgage on every home in the Nation.

#### THE GOLD STANDARD

Fourteen nations of the world have gone off the gold standard. This means that their currency in the future will be based upon some other metal than gold, principally silver. Prior to the time this action was taken the United States and France either owned or controlled about three-fourths of the gold in the world. England, realizing that she could not meet her obligations in gold went on a silver basis, thereby depreciating the pound sterling from approximately \$4.70 to \$3.50. At the present time England and the 13 countries on a silver basis enjoy a very distinct advantage in trading with each other that in a sense penalize the countries on a gold standard. As a comparison the silver dollar in China has the same proportion of silver in it as an American dollar. Yet because of the fluctuations on the price of raw silver the value of a Chinese dollar by weight is only 23 cents in comparison with the gold dollar. Therefore, while an American silver dollar will buy the same as a gold dollar in the United States, the Chinese if they trade with us, have to put up nearly five times the value of a silver dollar in order to purchase this amount from the United States. Consequently, the exports to China in the period of a year have fallen off approximately 50 per cent, and this is true with a great many other countries who formerly depended upon the United States as a source of supply for the various commodities of life. Silver is largely a by-product of copper, lead, and other metals. When the price of these metals are low the price of silver is affected in the same manner. At the present time the ratio of silver to gold in the United States is approximately 40 to 1. The average for a number of years has been around 14 to 1.

Thus it can be seen that if the other countries of the world continue to abandon the gold standard the United States will be forced to change its monetary system or the penalization will be so heavy that our people can not survive.

#### FEDERAL LAND BANKS

In my telegram to the President I called attention to the very large number of borrowers on their farms that were not only unable to meet their payments but could not pay the interest this year, stating that some kind of relief should be provided so that those who were meritorious would not lose their homes. Prior to returning to Washington I met with the president of the Wichita Federal Land Bank, Mr. John Fields, and the secretaries of the local organizations, at Oklahoma City, for the purpose of discussing certain plans with respect to the Federal land-bank activities. In my short speech I stressed the importance of preserving the Federal land-bank system; also the importance of provid-

ing the kind of aid that would take care of the meritorious borrowers, having in mind that they could not meet their payments and that some provision should be put into effect so that they could be carried over until another year. I voiced the opinion that Congress should authorize the appropriation of a sufficient amount of money to enable the land-bank system to do this; and while I was later advised that Mr. Fields made light of what I said, this did not deter me from performing my duty, and on my return to Washington I conferred with Congressman STEAGALL, the chairman of the Banking Committee, and recommended that a bill of this kind be brought out at the earliest date possible.

Later Mr. Steagall had a conference with the President. Such legislation was introduced and has been passed by the House. In my opinion, the same will become a law, thereby enabling many of the deserving to be carried over without losing their homes. It is pretty tough for those who depend on the soil for a livelihood to have to sell their wheat, cotton and other products of the farm at a price below the cost of production, and unless this Government is willing to provide some kind of relief it means that there will be more suffering in the future than our people have ever been called on to bear.

#### THE TARIFF

The tariff has been a political football as long as I can remember. During the last session of Congress the Republicans put in a power tariff bill that raised the rate so high as to practically give all American manufacturers a monopoly on that which they produced and at the same time making it impossible for many of the countries of the world to carry on commercial activities with the United States. This policy had the effect of building a wall around the United States, and having placed on that wall these words, "Thou shalt not enter." Immediately when the channels of commerce became clogged up and the other nations of the world could not sell us any of their products, then they had no trade balances to buy that which we produced, and a period of stagnation was brought about which has affected every living soul in the United States. The tariff barons unconsciously cut their own throats. They figured with these enormous protective duties it would give them the kind of monopoly that would enable them to take a toll from the citizens of the United States sufficiently high as to bring on a period of prosperity such as they had never enjoyed before.

They did not take into consideration that the people must have some outlet or market for their products and unless the same could be furnished they would not have the means to buy that which was produced in the United States. The foreign nations of the world, not being very friendly to the United States because of their international policies, immediately began to put on reprisals or retaliatory tariff schedules which had a marked effect on our exports and imports, causing the same to fall off more than \$2,000,000,000 during the first year. In other words, the effect of their action was a silent boycott on the people of the United States, which has stagnated the prices to the extent that wheat and cotton and other products have been forced to sell at a price far below the cost of production. Therefore, when the manufacturers realized that they were about to destroy themselves they began hunting an outlet that would produce a profit on their capital by establishing the policy of building factories in other countries.

It was my privilege to visit Canada a week before Congress convened. American manufacturers have established over 1,200 factories in this Dominion, at a cost of over \$1,250,000,000, for the purpose of giving Canadians employment which rightfully belongs to our citizens, and would have been given to them had not this terrible tariff policy been put into effect. As an interesting side light in Canada, during the past two years there has not been a single bank failure, while in the United States over 10,000 have gone to the wall.

In Montreal I rode in a sight-seeing car for nearly half a day and did not see a single vacant building. When it is taken into consideration that there is only an imaginary line

between Canada and the United States, and on one hand they apparently have prosperity and happiness and on the other hand we have desolation, ruin, and millions of people out of employment, this responsibility must be placed on those in charge of the affairs of our Government, as the policies they have put into effect have brought about the worst situation that I have witnessed in all of my experience.

Since Congress has convened England and other nations have put on further retaliatory tariff schedules—some of them as high as 50 per cent—thereby further adding insult to injury, all of which we justly merit because we threw the first stone. The Democrats are now in control of the House of Representatives. My party is confronted with the wreck left by the Republicans. In view of this tariff war and the fact that the present Tariff Commission has jurisdiction only within the United States and the tariff being an international one, I have proposed, in the form of a bill, that Congress authorize and instruct the President of the United States to invite the different nations of the world to participate in an international conference for the purpose of making a study of the tariff question, taking into consideration the population and the amount of products produced by each country, and then work out schedules the same as railroad rates applicable to all of the nations in a fair and equitable manner.

This procedure would have the effect of establishing a more free relationship with the other countries of the world and probably bring about the kind of readjustment, so that the nations interested could proceed in the future in the production of commodities, realizing what they would get for the same in the way of a market.

The Bible teaches us that man can not live alone. The same rule that applies to men must apply to cities or nations, and if the people of the United States are to be prosperous, then the markets of the world must remain unclogged to the extent that it would be profitable to produce a surplus of certain kinds of commodities.

As an afterthought, the Washington Star to-day carries a story that Mr. COLLIER, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, had introduced a bill for an international conference to eliminate high-duty walls and authorize the President to negotiate with foreign governments more reciprocal tariffs. Prior to the convening of Congress I prepared and introduced a bill relating to the subject. Later I had a conference with Mr. COLLIER and urged him to accept my idea as the proper policy for the Democrats to adopt on this subject. My bill is as follows:

#### H. R. 370

A bill authorizing the President of the United States to appoint representatives with the authority to participate in an international conference for the purpose of making agreements with respect to tariff rates.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to invite representatives of the nations of the world to participate in an international conference for the purpose of having a free and full discussion of the tariff and its effect upon the products of the various nations in attendance.

SEC. 2. That the President of the United States shall, when necessary, appoint representatives to participate in such international conference to make a scientific study of all questions in connection with the tariff, it being understood that no agreement made with the other nations of the world shall be binding or have the force of law until the same shall be acted upon by the United States Congress.

#### COMMISSIONS

The policy of appointing commissions to handle nearly every subject under the sun has been put into effect by President Hoover until we now have approximately 40 of such parading around the United States enjoying fine salaries and living in extreme luxury. As I view it, these enormous salaries being paid to the favorite in most cases is purely political pork. I do not believe that a single one of them has performed a service that could not have been taken care of by the various bureaus of the Government or committees appointed by Congress.

The Washington Star, under date of December 29, contains a very interesting article relative to the kind of furniture and the amount paid for the same to take care of some of these commissions. It reveals that the so-called Wick-

ersham Commission purchased a conference table and chairs that cost approximately \$10,000, and when you measure this expenditure with the fact that we have approximately 39 other commissions, it means that if each commission was furnished with such a table to rest their elbows on, the taxpayers have been stung to the tune of approximately \$400,000 for this item alone. This same article calls attention to the new quarters that were furnished for Secretary Lamont, head of the Department of Commerce, stating that the first boxes to be uncrated were those containing two mahogany waste-paper baskets which were invoiced to the Government at \$31.20. I have never in all my experience had anything but a metal or wicker wastebasket that usually sells for about 50 cents, and found that the same was entirely sufficient to hold envelopes and waste paper.

In addition the statement was made that the conference table will only cost \$996, which includes 20 chairs. The two rugs only cost \$2,866.24, being two-tone blue chenille. It is such enormous expenditures as this that completely disgust the taxpayers, and they have a right to be incensed.

According to a newspaper report published in the Washington Post during the month of December, President Hoover apparently has run out of material to appoint as members of commissions, for it contains the information that one Prof. P. H. Hensel, of the University of Western Ontario, has been appointed by President Hoover to act as a member of a special commission to investigate the proposed consolidation of all United States steamship lines. Many have claimed that the President of the United States, because of his long residence in England, has a special affinity for Englishmen, and this may be the reason that he has reached out of the United States to select some one to serve on a commission to adjudicate questions that to me seem to be wholly our own problems. These commissions, in my opinion, ought to all be abolished. There is no excuse, as I view it, for their appointment, and I hope to see the time to come when my party can take over the reigns of the Government to the extent that we can separate a lot of these politicians from the pay roll, thereby reducing the enormous expenditures that are now being paid for the upkeep of this Government.

#### SALARIES

I have received a number of communications calling attention to the enormous salaries paid by the Government, some suggesting that they be reduced and others suggesting that they be let alone. I have replied to each one of these letters that I would not vote to reduce any employee's salary unless I reduced my own the same ratio. I am thoroughly convinced that this Government could be maintained efficiently with 75 per cent of the employees now on the pay roll. I have endeavored, by the introduction of a bill, to stop some of the enormous waste, having in mind that every bureau has its own purchasing agency and that this brings about duplication, deterioration, and waste. My bill would cause the establishment of a board of affairs, which would be charged with the responsibility of making purchases, coordinating, and consolidating all such activities and taking inventories. I dare say some bureaus of the Government have not taken an inventory in 50 years. This is very necessary in order that we may know the amount of supplies on hand and cut out useless purchases, besides reduce the enormous number of employees that are charged with this responsibility. There is a tendency on the part of many borrowers at the end of each fiscal year to utilize all of their balance in any fund by purchasing enough supplies to balance the books. The reason for this is that the bureaus realize that if they had on hand a surplus, the appropriation committee would feel like cutting down their allowance.

There is a rumor floating around the Capitol that on one occasion the Navy, having an unexpended balance of \$500,000 and not knowing what to do with it, suggested or did purchase this amount of lifeboats. Numerous other instances are on record where purchases have been made in order to balance budgets, and as long as these separate buying agencies are maintained duplication, waste, and inefficiency will continue. Therefore, I am hoping that the

committee in charge of this legislation will report favorably on my bill, which would place all of the buying for the Government in the hands of one bureau.

#### LEGISLATION

At this session I have introduced a number of bills. H. R. 221 has for its purpose the regulating of motor trucks and busses, having in mind that States do not have the right to control interstate busses or trucks; and there being no legislation relating to this subject, some kind of regulatory power should be provided by law.

H. R. 360 is a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission act. I have already called attention to the fact that many million dollars of bonds and securities have been sold to the citizens of this country by the international bankers, and many losses would occur because the various nations had defaulted. I have been introducing such a bill for the past 10 years, which, if enacted into a law, would cause every person desiring to offer for sale any kind of a bond or security to be sold in any State other than the one where the company was located would have to file certain reports relative to the character of the investment, and if this measure had been in effect, then those who have made investments and lost their money would have had some kind of a way to know something about the security before purchasing the same.

H. R. 363 is a bill I have offered for the purpose of reimbursing the State of Oklahoma for money paid for the education of restricted Indian children in the public schools. Our schools are having a hard time at present because so many are unable to pay taxes, thereby making it impossible for many of our teachers to receive pay without discounting their warrants. Every time we educate an Indian ward of the Government without receiving pay for the same it takes away just that much more from the funds that should be applicable for the children of those who pay taxes.

H. R. 367 is the bill I have introduced to create an unemployment fund for the State of Oklahoma. It will be remembered that when our land was proved up under the homestead laws a portion of the filing fee was set apart in the reclamation fund. This legislation would cause the Government to return to the governor of each State such amounts of money to give employment to those desiring same on public works.

H. R. 368 is a bill providing that hospitalization of World War veterans may be made in private hospitals. I find that many of our deserving ex-service men have the kind of family ties that make it impossible for them to take advantage of hospitals that are far removed from their homes, and if this measure would be enacted into a law, it would enable our private hospitals to be utilized for such purpose, thereby bringing about the utilization of the same in a way that will be beneficial to those who are in need of this kind of aid.

These are only a few of the bills I have introduced with the hope that this Congress will consider the same and have a sufficient amount of merit to bring about their passage, realizing that if there ever was a time when the people needed help it is now.

#### PERSONAL RECORD

If I may be permitted, I wish to call your attention to the fine treatment which has been accorded to me as your public servant. I also wish to say that the splendid citizenship of the seventh congressional district of Oklahoma is entitled to all the credit, for had they not stood by me during the time that I have served them in a public capacity, I could not have received my present standing in the House of Representatives. At the beginning of this session Congressman HENRY T. RAINY, of Illinois, our splendid majority leader, a man who has served in Congress for 28 years, requested me to temporarily accept the position of secretary of the Democratic caucus, and when the final election was held, I was elected unanimously.

Later when our distinguished Speaker, the Hon. JOHN N. GARNER, who has served continuously in the House of Representatives for a period of 30 years, all of which time he has been ably assisted in his office by his splendid good wife,

requested me to serve as the chairman of the patronage committee for the purpose of taking care of the 171 Members entitled to this consideration. Of course I accepted, and while the duties have been rather arduous, I am gratified that the committee has been able to apportion all of the places assigned as patronage without a single complaint.

My rank on the Naval Affairs Committee is next to the chairman. This is a major committee, and one serving on the same can not be assigned to any other committee. If my information is correct, no Member of Congress west of the Mississippi River has ever served as chairman of this committee, and should I have one more promotion, it will be the first time that a major committee chairmanship has ever gone to any Member of my party in Oklahoma in the House of Representatives.

I have been assigned chairman of the speakers' committee for the Democratic National Congressional Committee, an honor I very much appreciate. Thus I can say that no person has ever received any more cordial consideration than that which has been given to me by my colleagues in the House of Representatives. It is shown conclusively that the districts that reward their public servants when they are faithful make it possible for them to receive the highest positions that are within the party's power to give, and I wish to express my appreciation to all of those who have cooperated with me in the past.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I do not rise to defend the Farm Board. I have frequently criticized it myself. I am not in accord with a good many of its policies, and on the first day of the session I introduced a resolution to provide for an investigation of the board by the House Committee on Agriculture. I think that all the charges which have been made against the board, either on this floor or elsewhere, should be thoroughly gone into. It seems to me, however, that both to-day and on previous occasions a great many loose and inaccurate statements have been made, particularly on the subject of salaries. This comes about, it seems to me, from the fact that Members have confused the stabilization corporations with cooperative associations handling wheat and cotton.

The stabilization corporations, both wheat and cotton, of course, are mere instrumentalities of the board. They are not expected to make a profit. They have both sustained losses, and these losses must be made up out of the Federal Treasury, and whatever salaries have been paid by these corporations to their officers come out of the Federal Treasury. So it is a matter of concern to Congress, I assume, what these salaries are; and, if they are excessive, then I think we have the right to call the Farm Board to account for them; but I conceive it is no particular business of this Congress as to the salary which is paid the manager of the American Cotton Cooperative Association, which is a farmer-owned cooperative owned by 11 Capper-Volstead cooperative associations doing business in 13 States.

As I understand it, the general manager of that corporation receives a salary of \$25,000 per year and a commission of 5 cents per bale on all cotton which is handled up to a maximum of \$75,000 per year. He can receive no more than \$75,000 per year.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am very pleased to have the gentleman put that statement in the Record. My information was based upon the report of the Senate hearings, and I find that the \$75,000 includes a salary of \$25,000 and 5 cents a bale on cotton up to 1,000,000 bales, which is the maximum—which makes \$75,000—because they have handled more than 1,000,000 bales. So in the ultimate, he gets the \$75,000 regardless of whether he is paid the salary in a lump sum or as a commission.

Mr. HOPE. There is not any question about that.

Mr. STEVENSON. If the gentleman thinks the House ought to have accurate information, here is what Mr. Stone

said about that: "That would be a maximum of \$75,000," referring to Mr. Creekmore, at page 74, of the hearings:

Did he receive then, during the time he has been manager of this organization, a salary of \$75,000?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he still working on that basis?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. There is no question about that. He is receiving \$75,000 a year not from the Farm Board or as an employee of it, but as manager of the Cotton Cooperative Organization, which has no connection with the board except it has borrowed money from it, just as the cooperatives down in the gentleman's State of South Carolina have borrowed money from it. It is only proper to say in this connection that Mr. Creekmore testified in the recent hearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture that approximately one-third of his salary was paid by the Stabilization Corporation; so to that extent it is a proper matter for inquiry by Congress.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman permit; I want to correct that statement:

Mr. STONE. In this way, Senator CAPPER: In the beginning when the Stabilization Corporation was organized the board was very anxious to get the very best grain man we could to operate it. We found it was a very difficult thing to do. There were several men we had in mind, but they turned it down. And we came to the conclusion that for a man who had the capacity and the ability to handle an operation involving possibly hundreds of millions of dollars it was not so much a question of salary as a question of ability and honesty and integrity. And with a business of that magnitude a salary of that kind if not out of line in industrial operations.

Mr. HOPE. The statement which the gentleman is reading, as he will note, refers to the Stabilization Corporation and not to any cooperative association. There is no dispute about what the salaries are. The only point I am making is that the salaries of officers of cooperative associations are paid by those organizations and not by the Farm Board. We may have our opinion about these salaries. To me they seem high, and yet it seems to me that they are properly a matter to be settled by the members of the cooperative associations rather than by Congress.

The only thing in which the Members of Congress are interested in the salaries paid to officers employed by the Stabilization Corporation. I can not conceive that it is of any importance to us what salaries are received by the officers of the cotton cooperatives or the wheat cooperatives or the grape cooperatives or the sugar-beet cooperatives, or whatever it may be, as long as these organizations are solvent and owned and controlled by producers.

Now, something was said a while ago about the Farm Board operating on boards of trade. The Farm Board does not own a seat on any board of trade. The Farm Board, as an organization, does not buy or sell any commodity. It has no authority to do so. If the gentleman from Oklahoma will refer to the hearings that were had in the Senate, he will find that the Farmers National Grain Corporation, which is composed of 27 cooperative members, does have a seat on several boards of trade. As an organization which, during the last year, handled over 189,000,000 bushels of grain, it finds it necessary to make use of all the facilities used by the grain trade. Neither the wheat nor cotton stabilization corporations have seats on boards of trade or other exchanges. The Cotton Cooperative Association does not have a seat on the cotton exchange, either at New York or New Orleans, but I understand that Mr. Creekmore, its manager, does own such seats, and by reason of that fact he has been enabled to save the Cotton Cooperative Association \$450,000 during the past year, or several times his salary of \$75,000 a year.

Something has been said about the propaganda being put out by the Farm Board. The Farm Board does not have any agency or any lobbyist appearing before Congress on its behalf.

Mr. Moser, whom the gentleman from Oklahoma mentioned a moment ago, is an officer and representative of the American Cotton Cooperative Association. I can re-

member when he appeared before the Committee on Agriculture before the agricultural marketing act was ever passed. He has been before that committee many times when legislation affecting cooperatives has been considered, and I submit that there is nothing wrong or improper about these cooperative organizations being represented before Congress when legislation in which they are interested is being considered.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman approve of the granting of salaries of \$300 or \$400 per month to farmers who are scattered around indiscriminately in different sections of the State?

Mr. HOPE. I presume the gentleman is speaking of some of the employees of the American Cotton Cooperative Association?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am speaking of men who live on farms and who draw \$350 a month and expenses for sending out certain papers called propaganda. I speak from a personal standpoint, and I have a record here coming from a gentleman who actually is connected with the cooperative association of Oklahoma, which shows this to be a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does not contend that these gentlemen are employees and on the pay roll of the Federal Farm Board?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Oh, no. According to the information I have here which I shall print in the Record, and which comes from a person working for the Oklahoma Cotton Growers' Association, better known as the Cooperative, this organization was practically defunct until it was rehabilitated by the Federal Farm Board, and in my statement I said these organizations received their money either directly or indirectly from the Farm Board and the Farm Board knew about it.

Mr. HOPE. In that case their relation with the Farm Board is simply that of debtor and creditor. They owe money to the Farm Board.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The point I am trying to bring out is the padding of the pay rolls with individuals who do not perform any other service than to spread this kind of propaganda.

Mr. HOPE. I do not care to express my approval of anything which the gentleman has suggested if in fact it is something over which the Farm Board has control. But I say if these are employees of the American Cotton Cooperative Association then it is up to the members and officers of that association to deal with that situation and not with Congress.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am a friend of the cooperatives, I want to help them in every way that I can, but I do not like to see their money dissipated into channels that are tearing down the structure that Congress built.

Mr. HOPE. I am in entire accord with the gentleman on that. I have just one more thing to say and that is in connection with the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER] in which he called attention to the fact that the wheat stabilization operations were not begun until a large part of the 1930 crop of wheat was out of the farmers' hands. That is true, but let me also point out that every farmer who sold his wheat before those stabilization operations began, received a higher price for it than the farmers who sold after the price was stabilized. The price was stabilized by the Farm Board upon the request and suggestion of the wheat cooperatives, of the wheat growers, and Members of Congress in some cases from the wheat States, because they saw that the price of wheat was going down to a point where it would be ruinous to the farmer. The level at which the price was stabilized, however, while from 25 to 35 cents above the world price during that period was lower than the price prevailing before the sharp decline in November which was the immediate cause of the stabilization operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, Judge William Cannon Houston, for 14 years a Representative of the fifth district of Tennessee in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, passed away at his beautiful country home near Woodbury, Tenn., on Sunday night, August 30, 1931, at the age of 79 years.

A large concourse of admiring friends, including many prominent officials, from different sections of Tennessee, attended the funeral rites.

Judge Houston was a widely known jurist and statesman, and for a long time was a leading figure in the political, civic, and social life of middle Tennessee.

Judge William C. Houston was born near Deason, in Bedford County, Tenn., March 17, 1852, the son of William Houston and Elizabeth Morgan Houston. His father died when he was 1 year old, and five years later his mother married Benjamin Fugitt, of Woodbury, Cannon County, Tenn., and he spent his boyhood at Woodbury. He was principally educated under Col. George McKnight at the Woodbury Academy.

His father left him a fine farm in Bedford County, and when about 18 years of age he returned to this farm, where he lived three or four years. He made an exchange of that place for the property where he has since resided, which is a beautiful bluegrass plantation known as Beaver Dam, located half a mile east of Woodbury.

In 1876 he was elected to the general assembly, representing Cannon and Coffee Counties in the lower house. He was admitted to the bar in 1878. He was again elected to the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of Tennessee in 1880, and reelected in 1882. He figured conspicuously in the settlement of the State debt question, being a "low taxer." He was Democratic elector on the Cleveland ticket in 1892.

Judge Houston was actively engaged in the practice of law at Woodbury from the time he was admitted to the bar until his election as judge of the eighth judicial circuit, succeeding Judge Robert Cantrell, in 1894. He was reelected in 1902. He was associated in the law practice for a number of years with Maj. James H. Jones, and later with Hon. Walter Hancock.

He served 12 years as circuit judge, in which capacity he made a splendid record.

Judge Houston was elected to Congress as a Representative of the fifth district of Tennessee in 1906, succeeding Maj. James D. Richardson, who had represented this district in Congress for 20 years. Judge Houston served with distinction in Congress for 14 years. He was a true Democrat in politics as well as in the broadest sense of the term.

Judge Houston was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention at San Francisco in 1920. He was a strong supporter of John W. Davis, with whom he had served on the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives. The Tennessee delegation supported John W. Davis in that convention.

Judge Houston retired to private life in 1919 and spent the remainder of his days on his farm, which he loved so well.

I am sure that you Members of the House who had the pleasure and privilege of serving with him will agree that perhaps no man in public life more fully typified the old-time southern gentleman than did Judge Houston. [Applause.] He looked and acted the part perfectly. Six feet tall and straight as an arrow, he was a man of commanding appearance.

Judge Houston was a true sportsman; he was an ardent fisherman and hunter. He had brought down no less than half a hundred deer during his life. He was a lover of good horses and rode his saddle horses to the last with the ease and grace of a young man.

Judge Houston was devoted to his friends, who were legion. His home was an open house where he frequently enter-

tained his friends. It was beside the Memphis-to-Bristol Highway, the main highway from Washington to the Southwest, and his old congressional colleagues frequently stopped to visit him, en route to and from Washington.

He was first married to Miss Lura Kittrell, daughter of Maj. Marion Kittrell, in 1878. Six children were born, of whom three survive. They are Frank K. Houston, vice president of the Chemical National Bank of New York; William C. Houston, jr., vice president of the Federal Land Bank of Louisville; and Simp F. Houston, of Murfreesboro, Tenn. His first wife died in 1894.

He married Miss Elizabeth Minor McLemore, daughter of Judge William S. McLemore, in 1899. Of this marriage four children survive. They are Sidney Houston, of Houston, Tex.; Albert Houston, of New York City; George Houston, of Woodbury; and Miss Betty Houston, of Woodbury.

All of the children were with their father during his last illness. His devoted wife survives him.

Judge Houston was a brother-in-law of Judge John E. Richardson, of Murfreesboro, who succeeded him and who still serves as circuit judge of that district.

Judge Houston was an active member of the Christian Church at Woodbury, where the funeral services were conducted.

On leave granted, I insert editorials on Judge Houston which appeared in the Nashville Banner and the Nashville Tennessean following his death:

[Editorial in Nashville Banner, August 31, 1931]

JUDGE W. C. HOUSTON

Judge William C. Houston is dead, full of years and honors, and the fact that he has passed from life has brought the finest tribute anyone might wish, a quick, spontaneous acknowledgment from all who knew him that he lived well. Judge Houston lived well in every sense of the word, for he played a constructive part in the civic, political, and social activities of his times and as he did so enjoyed his contacts and relationships with his fellows.

Judge Houston was nearing 80 when he died, and his life had been useful in proportion to its extent. In his early days he was a successful farmer and never relinquished his holdings of land or his interest in its cultivation and improvement. Many years ago he was admitted to the bar and practiced law in such manner that he attained success in his profession and gained the respect of his fellow practitioners and the general public. In the early eighties he began to take an active concern for political matters, and after valuable service to Tennessee as a member of the State legislature he went to the House of Representatives in Congress to serve for 14 years. He retired voluntarily with a record of fine service to his constituents and the Nation.

In spite of his keen appreciation of his obligations to serve the public as circumstances warranted and occasion demanded, it was on his splendid home place that Judge Houston found his greatest pleasure. He was an ardent sportsman in the best sense of that word and devoted to hunting. His family life was ideal and the best indication of the manner in which he discharged the duties and responsibilities of a father is found in his children and the success and usefulness that mark their careers. As a lawyer, a judge, a State legislator, a Member of Congress, and above all as a man in his discharge of the duties and tasks of citizenship, Judge Houston ranked deservedly high. It was possible to say of him, too, the most revealing thing of all, that those who knew him best admired him most, respected him most deeply, and were fondest of him.

[Editorial in Nashville Tennessean, September 1, 1931]

JUDGE HOUSTON

Judge William Cannon Houston, whose death occurred Sunday night at his home, Beaver Dam, in Cannon County, represented the highest type of the southern gentleman.

Successful operator of his plantation, he was a lover of fine horses, an honored political leader and officeholder, a generous host, a wise jurist and lawyer, an ardent hunter and fisherman, an active churchman, and a beloved father and husband.

His public service had included 14 years as Congressman from the fifth district of Tennessee, 3 terms in the State legislature as representative from Cannon and Coffee Counties, service as Democratic elector on the Cleveland ticket in 1892, and 12 years as circuit judge.

So highly was he respected and so valuable was his service considered by his fellow citizens he was successful every time he sought election during his long political career, his retirement from Congress in 1920 being voluntary at a time when he was approaching the allotted 3 score and 10.

Since his retirement he had lived at Beaver Dam quietly, yet active in those pursuits he enjoyed despite his 79 years. His passing will be widely mourned, not only by those of the older generation who have been his friends, but by those of the younger generation as well, who found in him an example of conduct and a wise counselor.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York was a little exercised to-day about some things I said about the Farm Board some days ago, and especially about his constituent, who I have no doubt is an estimable gentleman. I do not think he is much of a member of the board, but the gentleman undertakes to establish an alibi for that board, and for all of the salaries that have been criticized, and that I criticized the other day. If the gentleman had waited and read to-morrow what I have to say now it would not have been necessary for him to say what he did say, but I call attention to the record made in the hearings, to the statements of the men themselves in the hearings before the Senate committee.

First, as to the personal employees of the board direct, their general counsel, for instance. This appears at page 21 of the Senate hearings:

What was the salary of your general counsel fixed at originally? Was it as high as \$20,000 a year?

Mr. STONE. No; it was not as high as \$20,000. It was originally, I think, \$10,000.

The CHAIRMAN. It was originally fixed at \$10,000, and now it has reached \$20,000?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

I do not question that some lawyer is worth \$20,000 a year, but, nevertheless, that is a considerable salary, to have jumped from \$10,000 to \$20,000 in as short a time as that board has lived. Mr. Stone can not make any alibi of that, because he is one of the personal appointees of the board. He says that they were not appointed by this board. Let us look at that a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Inasmuch as the Farm Board supplies the funds and is responsible for the management of that corporation as you have described, you have fixed the salaries of those associated with Mr. Milnor, have you not?

Mr. STONE. We have been consulted about salaries.

Of course, they were consulted. The board was furnishing the money, and if the men had fixed a salary that was at variance with the ideas of the board, the board would have stopped the money, and that is all. It was a simple proposition, and they can not make an alibi out of that.

Now we will go over to page 26. I put that in once before, but I will put it in here.

Senator CAPPER. I want to hear something about that salary of \$50,000 a year. How does the Federal Farm Board justify such a salary?

My friend from New York says they have absolutely nothing to do with it; they are managed by a set of underlings, but they could not run 24 hours without the money of the board, and they know that.

Mr. Stone says:

In this way, Senator CAPPER: In the beginning, when the Stabilization Corporation was organized, the board was very anxious to get the very best grain man we could to operate it. We found it was a very difficult thing to do. There were several men we had in mind, but they turned it down. And we came to the conclusion that for a man who had the capacity and the ability to handle an operation involving possibly hundreds of millions of dollars, it was not as much a question of salary as a question of ability and honesty and integrity. And with a business of that magnitude a salary of that kind is not out of line in industrial operations.

Now, the gentleman from New York says they have nothing to do with it. They frankly admit, as Mr. Stone was bound to admit, that they were the ones who dictated the appointment and who agreed to the salary and who justified it before the Senate committee. That is a kind of alibi that I do not think alibis.

Now, we will turn over to page 74 of this record. The record is full of it, but I am just reciting two or three places.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, returning to cotton and other major products, did you organize a stabilization corporation to handle cotton?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir; we did.

The CHAIRMAN. When was it organized?

Mr. STONE. You mean under what law?

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, I know what law. I don't care what law, but when was it organized under the provisions of this act?

Mr. STONE. Mr. Williams is more familiar with that, Mr. Chairman, than I am.

MR. CARL WILLIAMS. That was June 5.  
The CHAIRMAN. Who is the manager of the Cotton Stabilization Board?

Mr. STONE. Mr. E. F. Creekmore.

The CHAIRMAN. What salary does he receive?

Mr. STONE. He receives \$25,000 a year and 5 cents a bale up to a million bales receipts.

The CHAIRMAN. What quantity of cotton did the stabilization board handle?

Mr. STONE. They handled about 1,320,000 bales.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you made that calculation?

Mr. STONE. That would be a maximum of \$75,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he receive, then, during the time he has been manager of this corporation, a salary of \$75,000?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he still working on that basis?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Now, that is Mr. Stone. He justifies the salary of both of them.

Now, let us look a little further and see whether these cooperatives were controlled, the cooperatives which are now being held up as a kind of shield between the Farm Board and the people. Let us see what he says about what those cooperatives could do and how they dealt with them.

When you fixed this 90 per cent, being the amount, as I understand it, that you loaned on cotton—that is, you would not loan to exceed 90 per cent—how did you reach that figure?

Mr. WILLIAMS. First we required the cooperatives to borrow all that they consistently could, either from Federal intermediate or from commercial banks, on cotton. Those loans approximate 65 per cent of the market value at the time the loan was made. We agreed to supplement those loans by such amounts as were necessary to bring the advance to the farmer up to 90 per cent of the market value of his bale of cotton on the day and at the place of delivery.

Senator NORRIS. Your mortgage, then, is a second mortgage?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Our mortgage is a second mortgage.

Senator NORRIS. In every instance?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Practically so. There are outstanding first liens against almost all of that cotton.

Senator NORRIS. The loans that you made were made from time to time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Now, that shows you that the cooperatives were required by the board to do certain things and then they loaned them on a second mortgage, and according to the statement here the loss was \$70,000,000 to the Farm Board.

Now, suppose the cooperatives paid these salaries without the consent of the Farm Board. If they did that the Farm Board would refuse to make the loans to them and the inevitable conclusion must be that the Farm Board was consulted about these salaries and consented that they be paid. There is no escape from that whatever and it is absolutely ridiculous to believe that the board did not approve of these salaries. It would be hard to believe that a board like this would do otherwise, a board which was clothed with the most remarkable powers ever vested in a board since I have been in Congress. That board had the right to draw on the Treasury of the United States to a greater extent than any board ever created since I have been here.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. It is reasonable to suppose that they approved of these salaries or they would have refused to make loans to them.

Mr. STEVENSON. They must have approved of the payment to Creekmore because the Stabilization Corporation, their creature, paid half of his salary. If the Farm Board had said to the Stabilization Corporation that it could not pay Creekmore \$75,000 that corporation would not have paid him that amount.

Therefore, I stand by the statements I made the other day that the very facts which came out in this Senate hearing demonstrated the want of capacity on the part of that board to handle any such great proposition, and it is no wonder the board came to grief and is now facing bankruptcy. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a part of a bill which I introduced to-day dealing with mortgage foreclosures.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I could not hear the gentleman's request.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. I asked unanimous consent to include in my remarks a few sections of a bill which I introduced to-day and which I desire to discuss at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I will not take any considerable time of the committee at present. I shall put in the RECORD a part of the bill which I introduced to-day for the purpose of stopping, if possible, the orgy of foreclosures that is taking place throughout the country.

First, I wish to make some general observations, then I wish to discuss very briefly the provisions of my bill I just mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, so far, the organization of the House, perfected by the Democrats, is the only high spot in the record of the present Congress.

Before Christmas the House passed two measures recommended by the President, each of which brings about greater centralization of financial and political power and further extension of heartless, cruel bureaucratic government at the expense and to the destruction of the common people.

The foreign debts moratorium, to my mind, is only an additional step toward total cancellation of all foreign debts and therefore not only unjustified but politically criminal in the extreme. The voting of \$100,000,000 to the Federal land banks, unless amended in the Senate so as to stop the present wild stampede of loan foreclosures, only gives a stronger strangle hold by this cruel system on the throats of the helpless farmers of the Nation.

I am sorely disappointed with the record of this Congress to date and must say that nothing has been recommended by the President for our future consideration except methods and means for our people to dig larger, more dangerous holes to fill smaller ones and make larger and more oppressive debts to pay smaller and less burdensome debts.

We can not solve the serious financial problems of the laboring men, farmers, railroads, or anyone else by such makeshift methods.

Loans at best only constitute temporary relief to those able to borrow. The greatest suffering is among those who are unable to borrow and who are begging and praying for the relief which will only come from profitable employment and a fair price for their products.

The farmer needs a better price for his products, the laborer a job and better pay; the railroads need more business, and so on, and so on. None of these need to borrow more money except as a temporary expedient, forced by an extreme emergency.

The emergency seed, feed, and fertilizer farm loans heretofore granted should be provided before the end of the present month of January as temporary relief. It is only temporary. In no sense can it be construed as permanent relief. Last year this relief was wrung from the unwilling hands of the present administration. This year there will be no fight, as this relief is being heralded as part of the relief program of the President.

I am glad this semblance of temporary farm help is to be granted at once. None of the other boasted relief plans offer any help to those who are in dire need of assistance, and at best are only temporary flimsy palliatives for those most able to help themselves.

The American people will surely have every cause for condemning the record made during these months, and no one will have a just reason to urge in its behalf, if this Congress drags through to adjournment next summer without improving the record already begun and without doing more—yes, much more—than has been suggested by the President.

Mr. Chairman, most of the relief suggestions offered so far only tend to lessen the agony of the disease without any bona fide effort to cure the awful cancer that is gnawing at the very vitals of our Nation and, like a dose of morphine, only relieves the suffering of the patient for a few brief

minutes, later leaving him in as bad or worse condition than ever.

Even the temporary remedies are designed for those who least need help and not for the people of our Nation where there is real suffering. Relief is being suggested on every hand for the very wealthy and the really large bankers, but none for the man whose home is being sold under foreclosure. Some one will say that some of the measures favored by the administration are for these unfortunate people. I do not think so, and am therefore to-day introducing a bill containing provisions which, if made into law, will stop the orgy of loan foreclosures that is a disgrace to our country. If there are sufficient friends of the farmers here to pass my bill, this awful warfare on the farmers of the Nation will stop, and that at once.

Here are sections 8 to 13 of my bill which deals with this particular matter. I read as follows:

SEC. 8. In furtherance of the purposes of this act, to stop the foreclosure of loans on farm lands, return to original owners farm lands already taken over under foreclosure proceedings and reclaim farm lands generally, it is provided that the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to (a) purchase past-due interest coupons, or notes from any and all persons, firms, or corporations holding same against farm lands; (b) either purchase outright or insure the payment of any and all such interest coupons or notes as shall become due on or before November 1, 1933; and (c) enter into such negotiations, perfect such transactions, and make such expenditures as may be necessary to reclaim and return to original owners any and all farm lands now held, owned, or possessed by any person, firm, or corporation as the result of a foreclosure proceeding, suit at law, equity, or exercise of a power of attorney, wherever the original owners of such farm lands, taken over during the years 1929, 1930, and 1931, wish to repossess or recapture same and such arrangement can be reasonably perfected.

SEC. 9. In all cases where farm lands are recaptured, repossessed, or resold to original owners, the terms and rate of interest must be as lenient and reasonable, or more so, than the original foreclosed loans, and the Secretary shall pay or purchase all interest coupons or notes due or to become due on or before November 1, 1933, by such repurchase as the result of the new transaction.

SEC. 10. All money expended under this section shall be evidenced by a series of notes of equal amount falling due each year for 10 years, beginning November 1, 1934, drawing interest from date at 4 per cent, signed or executed by the original borrower, his heirs, executor, administrator, or assigns, and constitute or be secured by a lien second only to the balance or amount due on the original loan.

SEC. 11. In connection with the transactions herein provided for, arrangement shall be made for the preservation of the security, the payment of taxes, and any payment or curtailment the borrower may be able to make before November 1, 1934, whether on money advanced hereunder or in anticipation of interest or installments to become due after November 1, 1933.

SEC. 12. The Secretary shall make such payment of taxes now due, or to become due, and take such transfer of tax liens as may be necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this act, and shall extend the same privileges of payment as to money expended for this purpose as is herein provided for money spent in connection with interest.

SEC. 13. No money shall be expended under this act for the purchase of any interest coupon or note or for the repurchase of any land, or in any way whatsoever, where, taking into consideration the prevailing market prices of farm land at the time of such loan transaction, the original loan connected therewith, when negotiated, was not amply secured.

Mr. Chairman, if these provisions are enacted into law, real relief will come not only to the farmers of the Nation but to everyone who holds loan papers to the lands of the farmers. The Federal land banks, the joint-stock land banks, the intermediate credit banks, the life-insurance companies, the long-term loan companies will all come in for their part of the benefits. Even the counties and State governments will be helped.

The Government will be safe, if this depression is only temporary and if land values are to return to the level occupied when these loans were made. Certainly this will be real relief and will not only help the farmers but, as is always the case, will inure to the benefit of the whole country.

Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to fight not only for the adoption of my bill but I shall use every available parliamentary tactic to get these provisions engrafted as an amendment on some of the other so-called relief measures that will be coming up from time to time. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to extend my remarks in the Record by incorporating an interview given by Hon. John Ostlind, a former member of the Kansas Legislature, stating his views regarding the tariff and as to whether it benefits agriculture. It is a short statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

WHAT STARTED THE DEPRESSION?

A United States Senator says that the high tariff of this country is to blame. Well, sir, if you read the figures as he gives them from records kept, maybe you will agree with him. The following is taken from his article. He says that on May 28, 1929, the House passed the last tariff act proposing over 800 increases of duty on the already existing high tariff wall. Within 30 days, according to the Census Bureau, new orders for factory goods dropped 16 per cent; unfilled orders for transportation equipment, including automobiles, declined 23 per cent in 60 days; unfilled orders for steel dropped 640,000 tons in 90 days; cotton consumption by textile mills fell 17 per cent in one month; factory pay rolls dropped from 111 in May to 106 in July; automobile productions dropped 38 per cent from April to October.

On September 4 the Senate Finance Committee reported the tariff bill to the Senate. The following day the stock market started its swift decline, developing into a panic. The following June the tariff bill was sent to the White House, and at the same time also the official protest of 36 foreign countries, who the year before had purchased \$4,000,000,000 worth of farm and factory products in the United States, produced by American farmers and American laborers.

In the year following the House vote on the tariff bill 1,100,000 factory workers alone lost their jobs. The President signed the bill on June 17 and by November 1,600,000 more workers had lost their jobs, and industrial share values had lost forty-four billions since September 5, 1929, or the day after the Finance Committee had reported the bill.

Twenty-three countries have raised retaliatory tariff walls against our products. One hundred and seventy manufacturing plants have been built in foreign countries by American capital, to hire foreign labor and buy foreign raw material, because retaliatory tariffs would not permit us to send them from here. The depression started four months earlier in the United States than in any other country.—John Ostlind, McPherson, Kans.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, that concludes the requests on this side. I understand the gentleman from Indiana wishes to make some remarks to-morrow.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. I am hopeful that after those remarks have been concluded we will be able to read the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOREHEAD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6660) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES  
INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF AERIAL LEGAL EXPERTS  
(S. DOC. NO. 33)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing an annual appropriation in the sum of \$5,750, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of participation by the Government of the United States in

the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and/or of the commission established by that committee.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 4, 1932.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF STATE (S. DOC. NO. 34)

Also, the following message from the President, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending the enactment of legislation for the purposes described therein.

The recommendations of the Secretary of State have my approval, and I request the enactment of legislation for the purposes indicated in order that this Government may carry out the projects and meet the obligations outlined in the report.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 24, 1931.

STRENGTHENING OF THE FEDERAL LAND BANK SYSTEM AND RELATED SUBJECTS

Also, the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

At the convening of the Congress on December 7 I laid proposals before it designed to check the further degeneration in prices and values, to fortify us against continued shocks from world instability, and to unshackle the forces of recovery. The need is manifestly even more evident than at the date of my message a month ago. I should be derelict in my duty if I did not at this time emphasize the paramount importance to the Nation of constructive action upon these questions at the earliest possible moment. These recommendations have been largely developed in consultation with leading men of both parties, of agriculture, of labor, of banking, and of industry. They furnish the bases for full collaboration to effect these purposes. They have no partisan character. We can and must replace the unjustifiable fear in the country by confidence.

The principal subjects requiring immediate action are:

1. The strengthening of the Federal land bank system to aid the farmer and to maintain at the highest level the credit of these institutions which furnish agriculture with much-needed capital. This measure has passed the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate.

2. The creation of a reconstruction finance corporation to furnish during the period of the depression credits otherwise unobtainable under existing circumstances in order to give confidence to agriculture, industry, and labor against further paralyzing influences. By such prompt assurance we can reopen many credit channels and reestablish the normal working of our commercial organization and thus contribute greatly to reestablish the resumption of employment and stability in prices and values.

3. The creation of a system of home-loan discount banks in order to revive employment by new construction and to mitigate the difficulties of many of our citizens in securing renewals of mortgages on their homes and farms. It has the further purpose of permanent encouragement of home ownership. To accomplish these purposes we must so liberate the resources of the country banks, the savings banks, and the building and loan associations as to restore these institutions to normal functioning. Under the proposal before the Congress the most of the capital of these discount banks would be subscribed by the institutions participating in their use and such residue as might be necessary for the Federal Government to supply temporarily would be repaid in time by such institutions as in the case of the farm-loan banks when they were first organized.

4. The discount facilities of our Federal reserve banks are restricted by law more than that of the central banks in

other countries. This restriction in times such as these limits the liquidity of the banks and tends to increase the forces of deflation, cripples the smaller businesses, stifles new enterprise, and thus limits employment. I recommend an enlargement of these discount privileges to take care of emergencies. To meet the needs of our situation it will not be necessary to go even as far as the current practice of foreign institutions of similar character. Such a measure has the support of most of the governors of the Federal reserve banks.

5. The development of a plan to assure early distribution to depositors in closed banks is necessary to relieve distress among millions of small depositors and small businesses, and to release vast sums of money now frozen.

6. Revision of the laws relating to transportation in the direction recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission would strengthen our principal transportation systems and restore confidence in the bonds of our railways. These bonds are held largely by our insurance companies, our savings banks, and benevolent trusts, and are therefore the property of nearly every family in the United States. The railways are the largest employers of labor and purchasers of goods.

7. Revision of banking laws in order to better safeguard depositors.

8. The country must have confidence that the credit and stability of the Federal Government will be maintained by drastic economy in expenditure; by adequate increase of taxes; and by restriction of issues of Federal securities. The recent depreciation in prices of Government securities is a serious warning which reflects the fear of further large and unnecessary issues of such securities. Promptness in adopting an adequate budget relief to taxpayers by resolute economy and restriction in security issues is essential to remove this uncertainty.

Combating a depression is indeed like a great war in that it is not a battle upon a single front but upon many fronts. These measures are all a necessary addition to the efficient and courageous efforts of our citizens throughout the Nation. Our people through voluntary measures and through State and local action are providing for distress. Through the organized action of employers they are securing distribution of employment and thus mitigating the hardships of the depression. Through the mobilization of national credit associations they are aiding the country greatly. Our duty is so to supplement these steps as to make their efforts more fruitful.

The United States has the resources and resilience to make a large measure of recovery independent of the rest of the world. Our internal economy is our primary concern and we must fortify our economic structure in order to meet any situation that may arise and by so doing lay the foundations for recovery.

This does not mean that we are insensible to the welfare of other nations or that our own self-interest is not involved in economic rehabilitation abroad which would restore the markets for our agricultural and other commodities. But it is our duty to devote ourselves to the problems of our own internal economy not only as the first necessity to domestic welfare but as our best contribution to the stability of the world as a whole.

Action in these matters by the Congress will go far to reestablish confidence, to restore the functioning of our economic system, and to rebuilding of prices and values and to quickening employment. Our justified hope and confidence for the future rests upon unity of our people and of the Government in prompt and courageous action.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 4, 1932.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing the statement of Gov. Eugene Meyer, of the Federal Reserve Board, before the Banking and Currency Committee with regard to the bill

H. R. 5060, being the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill.

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

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,  
Washington, D. C., Friday, December 18, 1931.

The committee met at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, Capitol, Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will this morning consider H. R. 5060, which is as follows:

"H. R. 5060, Seventy-second Congress, first session

"A bill to provide emergency financing facilities for banks and other financial institutions, and for other purposes

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there be, and is hereby, created a body corporate with the name 'Reconstruction finance corporation' (herein called the corporation). This act may be cited as the reconstruction finance corporation act.

"SEC. 2. The corporation shall have capital stock of \$500,000,000, all subscribed by the United States of America, payment for which shall be subject to call in whole or in part by the board of directors of the corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at such time or times as may be deemed advisable. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500,000,000, for the purpose of making payments upon such subscription when and as called. Receipts for payments by the United States of America for or on account of such stock shall be issued by the corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be evidence of the stock ownership of the United States of America.

"SEC. 3. The management of the corporation shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the governor of the Federal Reserve Board, and the farm loan commissioner, who shall be members ex officio, and two other persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each director shall devote his time not otherwise required by the business of the United States principally to the business of the corporation. Before entering upon his duties each of the two directors so appointed and each officer of the corporation shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office. Nothing contained in this or in any other act shall be construed to prevent the appointment and compensation as a director, officer, or employee of the corporation of any officer or employee of the United States in any board, commission, independent establishment, or executive department thereof. The terms of the two directors so appointed by the President of the United States shall be five years from the date of the enactment hereof, and thereafter the term of each director so appointed shall be five years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed. Whenever a vacancy shall occur among the directors so appointed the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of the director whose place he is selected to fill. The two directors of the corporation appointed as hereinbefore provided shall receive salaries at the rate of \$12,000 per annum each: *Provided*, That any director receiving from the United States any salary or compensation for other services shall not receive as salary from the corporation any amount, which, together with any salary or compensation received from the United States, would make the total amount paid to him by the United States and by the corporation exceed \$12,000 per annum.

"SEC. 4. The corporation shall have succession for a period of 10 years from the date of the enactment hereof, unless it is sooner dissolved by an act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal; to make contracts, to purchase or lease and hold or dispose of such real estate as may be necessary or convenient for the transaction of its business; to sue and be sued, to complain and to defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal; to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the corporation, without regard to the provisions of other laws applicable to the employment and compensation of officers or employees of the United States; to define their authority and duties, require bonds of them and fix the penalties thereof, and to dismiss at pleasure such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, by-laws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted and the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed, including the selection of its chairman and vice chairman, together with provision for such committees and the functions thereof as the board of directors may deem necessary for facilitating its business under this act. The board of directors of the corporation shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid. The corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government. The corporation, with the consent of any board, commission, independent estab-

lishment, or executive department of the Government, including any field service thereof, may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this act. The corporation shall have such incidental powers as its board of directors shall deem necessary or expedient in carrying out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 5. The corporation is authorized and empowered to make loans, upon such terms and conditions not inconsistent with this act as it may determine, to any bank, banker, savings bank, trust company, clearing house, or other association of banking institutions, building and loan association, insurance company, or other financial institution in the United States (herein referred to as financial institutions). All such loans shall be fully and adequately secured in such manner as the corporation shall require. The corporation, under such conditions as it shall prescribe, may take over or provide for the administration and liquidation of any collateral accepted by it as security for such loans. Such loans may be made directly upon promissory notes of such financial institutions, or by way of discount or rediscount of obligations tendered by them for the purpose, or otherwise, in such form and in such amount and at such interest or discount rates as the corporation may approve. Each such loan may be made for a period not exceeding three years, and the corporation may from time to time extend the time of payment of any such loan through renewal, substitution of new obligations, or otherwise, but the time for such payment shall not be extended beyond five years from the date upon which such loan was made originally. The corporation may make loans under this section at any time prior to the expiration of one year from the date of the enactment hereof; and the President may from time to time postpone such date of expiration for such additional period or periods as he may deem necessary, not to exceed two years from the date of the enactment hereof. Within the foregoing limitations of this section, the corporation may also make loans to or aid in the temporary financing of steam railroads engaged in interstate commerce, when in the opinion of the board of directors of the corporation such railroads are unable to obtain funds upon reasonable terms through banking channels or from the general public, and the corporation will be adequately secured.

"SEC. 6. Section 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 2, sec. 82), is hereby amended by striking out the words "War Finance Corporation act" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Reconstruction Finance Corporation act."

"SEC. 7. All moneys of the corporation not otherwise employed may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, subject to check by authority of the corporation, or in any Federal reserve bank, or may, by authorization of the board of directors of the corporation, be used in the purchase or redemption of any notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations issued by the corporation. The Federal reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositaries, custodians, and/or fiscal agents for the reconstruction finance corporation in the general performance of its powers conferred by this act.

"SEC. 8. In order to enable the corporation to carry out the provisions of this act, the Treasury Department, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal reserve banks, and the Interstate Commerce Commission are hereby authorized, under such conditions as they may prescribe, to make available to the corporation in confidence such reports, records, or other information as they may have available relating to the condition of financial institutions and/or railroads with respect to which the corporation has had or contemplates having transactions under this act, or relating to individuals, associations, partnerships, or corporations whose obligations are offered to or held by the corporation as security for loans to financial institutions or railroads under this act, and to make through their examiners or other employees for the confidential use of the corporation examinations of such financial institutions or railroads. Every applicant for a loan under this act shall, as a condition precedent thereto, consent to such examinations as the corporation may require for the purposes of this act and/or that reports of examinations by constituted authorities may be furnished by such authorities to the corporation upon request therefor.

"SEC. 9. The corporation is authorized and empowered, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue, and to have outstanding at any one time in an amount aggregating not more than three times its subscribed capital, its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations; such obligations to mature not more than five years from their respective dates of issue, to be redeemable at the option of the corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations, and to bear such rate or rates of interest as may be determined by the corporation: *Provided*, That the corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may sell on a discount basis short-term obligations payable at maturity without interest. The notes, debentures, bonds, and other obligations of the corporation may be secured by assets of the corporation in such manner as shall be prescribed by its board of directors. Such obligations may be issued in payment of any loan authorized by this act or may be offered for sale at such price or prices as the corporation may determine with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. In the event that the corporation shall be unable to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or interest on notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations issued by it, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not

otherwise appropriated, and thereupon to the extent of the amounts so paid the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations. The Federal reserve banks shall have the same powers (1) to discount notes, drafts, and bills of exchange secured by obligations issued by the corporation under this act, (2) to make advances to member banks on their notes secured by such obligations, (3) to use all paper so acquired, and (4) to purchase and sell such obligations, as they have with respect to bonds and/or notes of the United States: *Provided*, That the rate at which any such discount or advances shall be made by any Federal reserve bank shall be 1 per cent per annum above its discount rate on 90-day commercial paper then in effect.

"Sec. 10. Any and all notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations issued by the corporation shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. The corporation, including its franchise, its capital, reserves, and surplus, and its income, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the corporation shall be subject to State, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

"Sec. 11. In order that the corporation may be supplied with such forms of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations as it may need for issuance under this act the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prepare such forms as shall be suitable and approved by the corporation, to be held in the Treasury subject to delivery, upon order of the corporation. The engraved plates, dies, bed pieces, etc., executed in connection therewith shall remain in the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury. The corporation shall reimburse the Secretary of the Treasury for any expenses incurred in the preparation, custody, and delivery of such notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations.

"Sec. 12. When designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury, the corporation shall be a depository of public money, except receipts from customs, under such regulations as may be prescribed by said Secretary; and it may also be employed as a financial agent of the Government; and it shall perform all such reasonable duties, as depository of public money and financial agent of the Government, as may be required of it. Notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations of the corporation shall be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security, for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States or any officer or officers thereof.

"Sec. 13. Upon the expiration of the period of one year within which the corporation may make loans, or of any extension thereof by the President under the authority of this act, the board of directors of the corporation shall, except as otherwise herein specifically authorized, proceed to liquidate its assets and wind up its affairs. It may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, deposit with the Treasurer of the United States as a special fund any money belonging to the corporation or from time to time received by it in the course of liquidation or otherwise, for the payment of principal and interest of its outstanding obligations or for the purpose of redemption of such obligations in accordance with the terms thereof, which fund may be drawn upon or paid out for no other purpose. The corporation may also at any time pay to the Treasurer of the United States as miscellaneous receipts any money belonging to the corporation or from time to time received by it in the course of liquidation or otherwise in excess of reasonable amounts reserved to meet its requirements during liquidation. Upon such deposit being made, such amount of the capital stock of the corporation as may be specified by the corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury but not exceeding in par value the amount so paid in shall be canceled and retired. Any balance remaining after the liquidation of all the corporation's assets and provision being made for payment of all legal obligations of any kind and character shall be paid to the Treasurer of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Thereupon the corporation shall be dissolved and the residue, if any, of its capital stock shall be canceled and retired.

"Sec. 14. If at the expiration of the 10 years for which the corporation has succession hereunder its board of directors shall not have completed the liquidation of its assets and the winding up of its affairs, the duty of completing such liquidation and winding up of its affairs shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, who for such purpose shall succeed to all the powers and duties of the board of directors of the corporation under this act. In such event he may assign to any officer or officers of the United States in the Treasury Department the exercise and performance, under his general supervision and direction, of any such powers and duties; and nothing herein shall be construed to affect any right or privilege accrued, any penalty or liability incurred, any criminal or civil proceeding commenced, or any authority conferred hereunder, except as herein provided in connection with the liquidation of the remaining assets and the winding up of the affairs of the corporation, until the Secretary of the Treasury shall find that such liquidation will no longer be advantageous to the United States and that all of its legal obligations have been provided for, whereupon he shall retire any capital stock then outstanding, pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the unused balance of the moneys belonging to the corporation, and

make the final report of the corporation to the Congress. Thereupon the corporation shall be deemed to be dissolved.

"Sec. 15. The corporation shall annually make a report of its operations to the Congress as soon as practicable after the 1st day of January in each year.

"Sec. 16. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever wilfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferral of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the corporation, under this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

"(b) Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, in imitation of or purporting to be a note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued by the corporation, or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, any false, forged, or counterfeited note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, purporting to have been issued by the corporation, knowing the same to be false, forged, or counterfeited, or (3) falsely alters any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the corporation, or (4) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, as true any falsely altered or spurious note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purported to have been issued by the corporation, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"(c) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misappropriates any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise intrusted to it, or (2) with intent to defraud the corporation or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the corporation, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"(d) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation,' or a combination of these three words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$1,000, or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

"(e) The provisions of sections 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 5, secs. 202 to 207, inclusive), in so far as applicable, are extended to apply to contracts or agreements with the corporation under this act, which for the purposes hereof shall be held to include loans, advances, discounts, and rediscounts; extensions and renewals thereof; and acceptances, releases, and substitutions of security therefor.

"The Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department is authorized to detect, arrest, and deliver into the custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction any person committing any of the offenses punishable under this section.

"Sec. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered."

MR. STRONG. With the kindness of the committee, House bill 5060 is to be taken up this morning. I have laid before the chairman and each member a statement that was issued when the bill was introduced, giving the general provisions of the bill. I thought perhaps you might want to read or take this with you when you gave further consideration to the bill. Therefore, with the consent of the chairman, I have invited Governor Meyer of the Federal Reserve Board to be here this morning to present an argument in favor of the bill and to discuss it generally.

THE CHAIRMAN. I am sure every member will be glad to have that material before him.

MR. STRONG. I call attention of the committee to the fact that by the understanding we had yesterday in our committee meeting, Mr. Meyer is to present his views on the bill without interruption until he has completed his statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. EUGENE MEYER, GOVERNOR FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

THE CHAIRMAN. We will hear Mr. Eugene Meyer, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. Mr. Meyer, we have called you this morning for the purpose of giving you the time until the hour of meeting to make such statement to the committee as you may see fit, in your own way. We thought we would be able to let you do that without interruption. Your statement will have to do with H. R. 5060, which we know as the Strong bill, to provide emergency financial facilities, etc.

MR. GOODWIN. Mr. Meyer, we have in our State of Minnesota a rural-credit bureau, organized and operated by the State and

under authority of the State. Would this bill cover an institution of that character?

Mr. MEYER. I do not know. Is it a financial institution?

Mr. GOODWIN. It is, entirely.

Mr. MEYER. I could not say whether it is a financial institution within the meaning of that term as used in the bill. I am not a legal authority, and I would not want to express a definite opinion, offhand, or until I have had an opportunity to study the question in the light of all the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Meyer, unless some gentleman has something else we are going to permit you to proceed without interruption.

Mr. MEYER. I am glad of the opportunity to appear before the committee in connection with your consideration of this bill. In approaching a measure of this importance it is necessary to have some fundamental and philosophical background, in my opinion, and I will refer to a meeting which I attended here in this committee room some ten years ago, when we had a critical situation which involved particularly the country banks and the agricultural interests. I then advocated some temporary emergency work by the Government to meet an extraordinary and emergency situation. I said then, and I feel now, that it is a sound principle of government in exceptional conditions involving the national interest to depart from the ordinary rules of governmental activity and provide exceptional and temporary institutions and measures for dealing with temporary and unusual conditions.

I feel, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the present situation is one of those exceptional occasions where unusual action is required and justified and that I would be failing in my duty as governor of the Federal Reserve Board if I did not recommend and support a measure of this character. Even if I were a private citizen I would also feel it my duty, as I once did. I will not say that the bill before you is perfect in every respect, and, of course, in your deliberations you will consider it in detail. I have a few minor amendments to suggest later on myself. But on the broad principle of the Government entering into this situation on a temporary basis, as contemplated by the bill, and with powers that are unusual but, I think, justified by the unusual character of the situation, affecting, as it does, the mass of the people of this country, I believe the bill is sound.

If I may, I will review briefly the experience of the War Finance Corporation—not so much in connection with its war activities but in connection with what we may call, I hope, with no offense to our friends of the South—its reconstruction work—for the benefit of the light it throws on the possibilities of this kind of an institution under present conditions. As you will remember, the War Finance Corporation was organized during the war and had as its primary purpose the support of financial institutions and of industries that were necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war. I think it was extremely valuable throughout the war period, during which period Governor Hardinge, of the Federal Reserve Board, was managing director.

In the war period the amount of money loaned industries and financial institutions was not very large, but the support given to them by the existence of the corporation, with large resources and readiness and ability to lend as and when necessary, was very important. It was a confidence-inspiring institution, and the statistics of its loans do not and could not adequately reflect its effective value. There were occasions when industries needed financing, and the support of the War Finance Corporation back of the industries and their bankers enabled them to finance their requirements through the investment market. I remember that one of the activities at that time was to finance the railroads, which were then under Government control. In many cases the railroads and their bankers thought that issues maturing or other requirements could not be taken care of in the investment market, but when the corporation agreed to take care of the situation in case the investment market and the bankers did not there was no difficulty and no call made for the funds of the corporation. Such cases, of course, are not reflected in the loan statistics, because no money was actually advanced, but the corporation's action was more effective than it would have been if the money had been loaned.

I mention the effectiveness of the work in support of such situations, entirely apart from those cases where funds were actually used, because I should anticipate that, with proper administration, the main value of an institution organized substantially along these lines would lie in the availability of its funds if and when they should be needed. There would be lending, of course, but the main value of an institution of this kind is the availability of funds if needed.

We have a situation, gentlemen, where it is a fact, as is commonly stated, that fear is a dominant factor. We had a similar situation in 1921, when the agricultural relief act expanded the loan powers of the War Finance Corporation for a period of a year, which was extended finally until December 31, 1924. It is important to analyze what that fear is. It is now, as it was then—I am sure I am right as to 1921 and 1922 and I believe it is true at this time—it is not, in the case of banks, a fear of a borrower of good standing and character, or of his security, so much as it is a fear of a weak neighbor or of a general situation. It is not the weak fearing the strong; it is the strong fearing the weak. We will take a concrete example in the agricultural relief work in 1921, because specific cases are always almost convincing. There was a small town in the Middle West with three good, strong banks and one bank that was small and weak. As long as that small, weak bank was in danger, the three strong banks would not renew loans if

they could help it; they would extend no new credit, or very little; and they pursued, perhaps rightly under the circumstances, a contraction policy in their operation. You hear, and you hear truthfully as a matter of fact, of strong banks afraid to function actively and normally. It is the fear of some neighbor, or the situation in some neighboring town, or something else, or maybe the fear generated by events such as the Bank of England going off the gold basis and the conditions in Europe and South America, but that fear has become a dominating factor in the financing of the regular business of the country.

In 1921 the War Finance Corporation removed, in that small town in the Middle West, the fear on the part of the three strong banks of that small, weak bank. The amount of money required in that particular case was not important; the most important thing was that a small amount of money directed to the weak spot released, through the removal of fear from the strong banks serving the agricultural interests of the community, a very large amount of money which otherwise would not have been available and which, of course, does not appear on the books of the War Finance Corporation.

Now, with the strength and resources of this great Nation, I believe that there is the possibility of important remedial work of the greatest benefit to agricultural, commercial, and industrial interests through a measure with broad powers along the lines of this bill. There is a great deal of talk about frozen assets. Some of these assets that are called frozen are among the best in the country. Our most fundamental businesses have been financed by notes, mortgages, and other forms of indebtedness which, at the moment are called frozen. Perhaps they are in a sense. It was my experience, however, in the work of the War Finance Corporation that many so-called "frozen assets" thaw out with considerable speed if they are properly handled.

I took the occasion this morning to look up in one of the old reports of the War Finance Corporation the amount loaned to banks under the 1921 amendment. Altogether the corporation made loans for agricultural purposes to 4,317 banks—mostly country banks—and the largest amount outstanding to banks at one time was about \$134,000,000, in April or May, 1922. The active lending had begun in the latter part of October, 1921. The aggregate amount loaned to banks was \$172,000,000, but the peak of such loans outstanding at any one time was, as I have said, \$134,000,000. In May, 1923, in spite of the fact that a great many new loans were made during the year, the amount outstanding had been reduced to \$60,000,000, and a year later, in spite of more new loans, to \$37,000,000. In addition to the loans to country banks, one of the biggest problems that confronted the corporation was the livestock situation.

There it was a problem of developing machinery through which loans on livestock, cattle and sheep particularly, could be made on an adequate scale. While some banks were willing to carry livestock loans, it was necessary, in order to reach the situation effectively, to bring about the formation of a number of new livestock-loan companies with adequate capital. A company was organized in Texas with a capital of \$1,000,000; another in Cheyenne, Wyo., with a capital of \$1,000,000; another in Colorado with \$500,000 capital; another in Utah with \$250,000 capital; another in Montana with \$250,000; and so on. The aggregate amount of livestock loans—cattle and sheep—was somewhere between \$85,000,000 and \$90,000,000.

The largest amount of such loans outstanding at one time was sixty million, in May, 1922. In spite of the fact that many additional loans were made in the following year, the repayments brought the aggregate down to 40,000,000 in May, 1923, and a year later down to 26,000,000. I am giving you these figures to show so-called frozen assets thaw out where the character of the credit is suitable to the situation. There was nothing more frozen in the country than a cow loan in the breeding area of the United States in 1921. Sheep and cattle were unmarketable in quantity. Prices were demoralized. When corn gets down, as it did in 1921, in western Iowa and Nebraska, to 16 or 18 cents on the farm, why, of course, the note of the farmer in the Corn Belt may be "frozen." The War Finance Corporation made loans to 529 banks in Iowa and put them in a position not only to carry their farmer borrowers until their products could be marketed in an orderly way but also to make new loans. The country banks, I may say, were not eager borrowers. They were very reluctant borrowers in the beginning, but when they saw it was a different kind of credit they became more active. More cattle and hogs were bought to feed, and, of course, the feeding operation provided a market for the corn. Now corn is one of our great crops, in fact one of our greatest crops.

There has been an average of some 2,600,000,000 bushels of corn for the last seven or eight years, although the production dropped to 2,000,000,000 bushels one year when there was a crop failure. Feeding operations in the Corn Belt are not going on now as they did formerly. The real reason is that the country banks are reluctant to borrow. Some agricultural credit corporations have been organized to discount feeder paper with the intermediate credit banks, and are, I imagine, doing good work in stimulating feeding operations, but the banks apparently have not been making feeder loans in the usual volume because they fear the situation at home and abroad and feel it necessary, on that account, to strengthen their position.

I believe a bill of this kind would be vital in restoring confidence in many areas where confidence is now lacking and that it would be of tremendous value from an economic standpoint. I would not want to predict what might happen to price levels if this bill is passed and properly administered. I did not make

any prediction in 1921, but, according to the Bureau of Labor statistics, at the time of the passage of the amendment to the War Finance Corporation act in 1921, the average of agricultural prices was 85 compared with 100 in 1926. In January, 1925, which was three and a half years later, the price level on the same average basis was 112, not a sensational advance, but still a very material one. So far as forced liquidation affects price levels, and so far as knowledge on the part of people and markets that there is forced liquidation affects price levels, credit under this act would, in my opinion, be helpful and possibly might be important in connection with price levels. The situation, of course, is quite different from 1921 in some respects.

I would not like to have you think that I am taking a pattern of that period and saying that present conditions are a replica of those of 1921, that treatment should be applied in the same way, and that if it is so applied the same results will necessarily follow. At that time, just after the war, there was a most acute collapse in the prices of all kinds of commodities. Cotton, you will remember, dropped from around 40 cents to about 8 cents on the farm in a year. The prices of mineral products and manufactured goods had more or less similarly declined. While the price decline in the last two years has not been as great as that in 1920-21, it started from a lower level and dropped to a lower level, and is a major factor in the situation. In a period of declining prices people become reluctant to carry stocks. The carrying of stocks is a normal operation, and when it is hampered by lack of confidence or lack of credit or derangements such as now exist in the European markets an abnormal situation is created. The principal effect on agricultural and other producers of a reduction of stocks due to lack of confidence or inability of the financial machinery, particularly abroad, to function in a normal way, is to force on the producers and the banks that finance them the burden of carrying a larger part of the total supply than ordinarily would be the case. Of the visible supplies of wheat and cotton at the present time it is probable that a larger proportion is being carried by the producers than has been the case at any time in the last 10 years.

In 1921 currency fluctuations and unsettled conditions abroad were important factors in the situation, and that is also true at the present time. Under normal conditions England and Germany buy large amounts of our products for further distribution either in raw-material form or in partly manufactured form, and both are accustomed, as manufacturers and jobbers, to give under normal conditions long-time credit to the buyers of their products. Manchester, for instance, in connection with cotton goods, normally is accustomed to extending credit to South America and China, and Germany to the countries of central Europe and elsewhere. Present conditions in Europe, however, effectively limit that, because, with the fluctuating pound, and the difficult situation in Germany, although its currency is not fluctuating greatly, the granting of credit is necessarily hampered. A burden of an exceptional and unusual character, therefore, is thrown on the producing country, with the result that the whole distribution of our production is changed, altered, and hampered, and that calls for the most serious consideration.

When the War Finance Corporation made loans to livestock-loan companies, cooperative-marketing associations, and country banks, beginning in 1921, it not only loaned a total of some \$300,000,000 but it set in motion other funds which revolved and liquidated many times that amount of indebtedness. At that time member banks were borrowing heavily from the Federal reserve banks. When the War Finance Corporation took over from country banks, and indirectly perhaps from the Federal reserve banks, notes of farmers which they then thought were frozen, and it was known that quick repayment was not demanded or expected, the pressure on the commodity markets was relieved to such an extent that the price level responded and permitted a liquidation and thawing out of frozen assets on a scale that nobody could have promised, but which was the most effective thing, I believe, at the time in easing the whole credit situation throughout the country.

In the past easy money has always acted as a business reviver; that is, easy money for any considerable period. The reason for that has been that before the war, with our steady growth of population, we had a more or less normal building development, and if it were interrupted for a year or two, there would be a demand for new construction which easy money made it possible to meet quickly and effectively. The construction activity, of course, is one of the most important and fundamental in our whole business situation. Even where there was overbuilding it existed only for a limited period, and the overbuilding did not, after a period of temporary suspension, interfere with the resumption of building activity after a couple of years. One of the notable features in the 1922 comeback and the comeback of subsequent years was that we had had a period of eight years of subnormal construction in this country.

I happen to have a chart here which will appeal to the eye very quickly. As you will recall, 1913 and 1914 were inactive years in business and, of course, during the war construction was almost forbidden, except for the most essential purposes. A deficiency in housing and office space and all kinds of construction developed, compared with the normal requirements based on the growth of the country. This chart, as you will see, is based on the per capita value of building permits in 50 cities on the 1913 cost basis and shows the great deficiency in building, which, with the return of normal money-market conditions in 1921 and 1922, and the ability to get money on mortgages again, permitted a revival in construc-

tion that really was the basis of what proved to be a period of prolonged upward swing. In other words, the construction activity had in 1921 a very solid basis, a very solid foundation, meeting the legitimate requirements of the people of the country. In the spring of 1922 building started on an extensive scale; mortgage money was available freely; and, on account of rental increases and the rise in the cost of building, values of old buildings were raised to a new level, creating a good deal of speculative activity in all kinds of real estate—homes, apartments, office buildings. And, of course, the expansion in building activity brought about a tremendous expansion in production in order to take care of it.

Nothing increases the movement of goods and the employment of labor more than the construction activity. It affects the mine and the forest; it employs great quantities of labor; it adds to the gross revenue of railroads. It seems to have had a most general stimulating effect, and I think it was in providing of space to meet the deficiency of construction that the so-called real-estate boom had its origin, a perfectly legitimate foundation, but unfortunately carried on too far, too long, and in the end, during the later stages of the activity, on a very unsound and dangerous basis, with dangerous valuations and a good deal of very weak and unsound financing.

Now, I think it is a question whether or not, even taking the facts and figures as they are, there has been such an enormous overexpansion of space in this country, taking it as a whole on the normal basis of growth. I would not like to pass on that, but I feel personally that the situation is more characterized by weakness in financing than by actual overprovision of space, although, of course, it can not be denied that there has been a great deal of overbuilding in certain areas. However, it must be remembered that space for housing or offices or any purpose is not liquid and movable. You may have overbuilding in the suburbs of Chicago, you may have overbuilding in certain areas of New York, and you may have it in the Twin Cities, down in the South or in the West, and then there may be still a demand for space in other areas. Even now in the suburbs of the larger cities generally throughout the country there is some building going on, and that is due to the fact that people more and more are moving from the town to the suburbs with the good roads and with the automobile and bus transportation.

I believe that the prompt liquidation of the unsound financing in the real estate field is most important, because as long as mortgages are being foreclosed on properties which have been unsoundly financed, as long as soundly owned or operated properties are suffering from the competition of bankrupt properties, it is detrimental and confidence destroying. That is going on, but it is somewhat slow and in some States the laws make it necessarily slow, but the real estate situation is one of the big situations in the country. The building and loan associations, which serve a very useful purpose where they are well managed, are suffering from the depression and demoralization in values, which, I will not say in every case but I believe in many cases, has gone to an extreme.

This building activity, as I suggested, is one of the most fundamental factors in the situation and the very extensive decline has affected the employment of labor, commodity prices, consuming power, and the volume of goods transported on the railroads, so that it is, as far as this country is concerned, I believe, the most important single economic factor of an unfavorable character.

Of course, foreign conditions are a major factor. Without going into them at this time, because they are large and complicated, with many ramifications, and without undertaking to analyze them for you gentlemen, because I am sure you will all have your own views and thoughts on the subject, I think we have to recognize that the political and financial situation in Europe is a fundamentally important factor, entirely apart from the question of the investments or bank loans that this country has made there and the relationship of debts or reparations. We have in Europe a disturbed financial situation, a disturbed political situation, and particularly, from the point of view of the consideration of this bill, we have disturbed exchanges which materially interfere with the marketing of our agricultural, mineral, and commercial products.

I believe that in many situations experience will prove that under careful and sound administration results will come more from a moderate amount of lending and the strong support that a corporation organized along these lines can give than from the actual loans made, although they should be made in sufficient quantity, and they may be necessary in a very considerable quantity. The ability to support the weaker situations will, I believe, do more than anything else to encourage and enable the stronger institutions to function in a normal manner.

If I may at this point, I should like to go over some of the details of the bill as written. The capitalization of the proposed corporation and the authorization to borrow is the same as it was in the War Finance Corporation under the 1921 amendment—five hundred million capital and authority to borrow a billion and a half.

The board of directors will consist of three ex officio members and two others to be nominated by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It seems to me that perhaps there ought to be four to be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and possibly it might be well to consider the advisability, in view of the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury is already an ex officio member of so many boards, of inserting some general provision which would permit the Under Secretary to serve in lieu of the Secretary. I mean he might be an alternate,

or in some other way substituted for the Secretary. I think it would be better to include the Under Secretary, because Mr. Mills is not an ex officio member of several boards like Mr. Mellon.

Now, then, leaving a great deal of authority and judgment to the directors the bill authorizes the corporation "to make loans, upon such terms and conditions as it may determine, to any bank, banker, savings bank, trust company, clearing house, or other association of banking institutions, building and loan association, insurance company, or other financial institution in the United States." You will note that clearing houses or other associations of banking institutions are included. In connection with the National Credit Corporation, as you know, local associations of banks have been formed, and such associations might serve as a type. Somewhat similar associations, you may recall, were provided for by the Aldrich-Vreeland bill. Whether or not they will be used under this bill I do not know.

Mr. LUCE. May I ask if Mr. Meyer would like to have questions asked of him as we go along?

Mr. MEYER. I think that before you came in it was agreed that I might go along without questions, although I enjoy being questioned by you, Mr. LUCE.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman made that announcement, Mr. LUCE, before you came in.

Mr. MEYER. All loans must be fully and adequately secured in such manner as the corporation shall require, and they will be made at such interest or discount rates as the corporation may approve. It is hard to anticipate what particular situations such a corporation, if authorized by you gentlemen, would have to meet, and I rather think these provisions with reference to security and interest or discount rates, and the reliance on sound administration rather than on restrictions in the law, are, as a matter of policy, justified by the exceptional conditions with which we are confronted. I think the whole bill is written with the view of attacking the problem in a big way, with very broad powers and large resources. In that respect I can heartily support the bill. You as a committee may undertake to work out some amendments that could not be earlier anticipated and that might be helpful in some respect. The bill as written places an extraordinary amount of authority and responsibility on the board of directors, and rightly so I think, because the main reliance, it seems to me, must be upon administration, which is synchronous with the accomplishment of the greatest result for the benefit of the people, and the saving of the Government from ultimate loss.

Now, then, the period during which the corporation will be authorized to lend is one year, with authority in the President to extend the period for any part of an additional year, making a maximum of two years. I think that is wise. It is hoped that one year will be enough, but some leeway is desirable in case of need. The loans of the corporation may be made for periods not exceeding three years, with authority to grant additional time up to a total of five years from the dates on which the loans are originally made. I think that loans on so-called slow or frozen assets, or any other kind of assets, for periods up to three years will be ample, but if not the authority to extend ought to cover the requirements.

The railroads are specifically mentioned, and I think that has to be considered from this point of view: To-day the buying power of the railroads is hampered by their financial condition, and the railroads, perhaps next to the construction industries, represent the most important single buying power in the country. If they could be put on a better basis financially, and their buying power restored, it would probably be very helpful in restoring business. But entirely apart from that, we recognize the fact that the railroads to-day are owned by the people of the country to an extraordinary degree. Railroad bonds, which are held by trustee institutions all over the country rather than by individuals, or certainly to a greater extent than by individuals, are a matter of important interest to the holders of life-insurance policies, depositors in savings banks and, in fact, depositors in all banks, and many others.

That is a matter, gentlemen, for you to consider; and it would seem that the interest of the people of the country as a whole in the soundness of railroad bonds is very considerable.

The capital of the corporation will be \$500,000,000, provided by the Treasury as and when needed. The corporation is authorized to issue its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations having maturities not in excess of five years, and also to sell short-term obligations on a discount basis. These securities will be exempt from all kinds of taxation, as is the case with respect to farm-loan bonds and debentures of intermediate credit banks.

The Treasury is made liable for the obligations of the corporation if they can not be met when due out of the corporation's funds. That provision is, of course, very important from the point of view of marketability of the corporation's obligations in the first place; and, in the second place, it will add to the assurance that the corporation will be able to command the funds which it is authorized to borrow.

Under the bill as drawn the Federal reserve banks would have the same powers to discount notes, drafts, and bills of exchange secured by the obligations of the corporation; to make advances to member banks on their notes secured by such obligations; to use all such paper so acquired; and to purchase and sell such obligations as they have with respect to bonds and notes of the United States. That provision, of course, recognizes the fact that under the bill the corporation's obligations are ultimately Government obligations, and makes them eligible, so far as the Federal reserve system is concerned, in the same way and to the same extent that Government bonds are eligible. The matter

is one that will, no doubt, be discussed a great deal and should be carefully considered.

It is only fair to say in this connection that this whole question of eligibility has been under discussion in recent months, and many who are sincerely interested in the welfare and protection of the Federal reserve system feel that it would be undesirable to make these securities eligible; but it is to be noted that the bill provides that the rate on discounts for, or loans to, member banks secured by the corporation's obligations shall be 1 per cent above the discount rate for 90-day commercial paper. In other words, a penalty rate is prescribed which would, I believe, tend very strongly, if not quite effectively, to restrict the amount of paper secured by the corporation's obligations that will be presented to the Federal reserve banks. However, the question is one that I would not want to undertake at this time, in this first discussion of the measure, to explore with you gentlemen in all of its ramifications. I merely wish to direct attention to the matter for your consideration and for further discussion with me later on if you desire.

There is a provision in the bill which amends section 5202 of the Revised Statutes and excepts borrowings of national banks from the corporation from the limitations imposed by that section upon the liabilities that may be incurred by national banks. Then the Federal reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the corporation, and pertinent reports and records of various agencies of the Government are to be made available to the corporation in confidence, under such conditions as they may prescribe. The agencies referred to also are authorized, through their examiners, to make examinations, for the confidential use of the corporation, of institutions with which the corporation has, or contemplates having, transactions under the bill.

The moneys of the corporation not otherwise employed may be deposited with the Treasury or may be used in the purchase or redemption of the corporation's obligations; and the corporation is required to act as depositary of public moneys, except receipts from customs, and may be employed as a financial agent of the Government. This is done to remove any doubt as to the constitutionality of the act. The obligations of the corporation will be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which is under the authority or control of the Government or its officers.

Broad penalty provisions are included in the bill, and the procedure by which liquidation will be accomplished after the corporation's lending activities are terminated is prescribed.

Now, as I have stated heretofore, the resources are very large and the authority is very broad. This bill, if passed, will have an important effect, I think, by virtue of its large resources and breadth of powers, even before any loans are made. I think at this particular time the knowledge of the existence of such a corporation, with flexible powers and large sums at its disposal, would do more to reassure people who are in fear as to what might happen than any other one thing. A great many steps, many of them very useful and constructive, have been taken in the last two years and previously, but the conditions at the present time are, in my opinion, such as to justify the Congress in creating, for a temporary period and for an exceptional purpose, an institution of this strength and power.

There must be flexibility in the institution because conditions fluctuate greatly, and while we may, and very properly should, at the proper time carefully examine the mistakes that have been made in banking and business and in our foreign investments during the past five years, and seek to prevent a recurrence of them, I think the essential thing in considering this bill is to recognize that we have a condition confronting us and determine what we can do about it now in the interest of the people of the country as a whole. I hope that that will be the attitude of the committee and of the Congress. I think it is the right attitude in approaching the consideration of such a measure. There are other bills that also attempt to deal with the situation in a large way, but I have not had opportunity to read all of them. There may be good suggestions in some of them. There may be better provisions in some of them, but I believe this bill is entitled to the most serious consideration and to the support of Congress on the very broad basis that it proposes to create a temporary and an exceptional governmental organization to meet, so far as it is possible to do so here at home, what certainly we hope will be a temporary and emergency financial and economic situation.

I think, gentlemen, that I have given you an outline of my thoughts which prompt me to support this measure. I believe the ability of the banks of the country, member and nonmember, to serve the agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests will be greatly strengthened and enhanced by a measure of this character. While the bill authorizes the corporation to make loans to financial institutions and the railroads, the real aim, and I believe the real result, will be the benefits that will be made available, through these agencies, to the people in all parts of the country. The situation is not, as it was in 1921, concentrated peculiarly in the agricultural districts. It is a general situation. It exists in the town as well as the country, and only a measure drawn on a very broad basis will meet the situation effectively on an adequate scale. There may be certain details wherein this bill can be improved; there may be things to be changed, left out or added, but a general proposition of this kind I feel I can properly support and commend to your very favorable consideration.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Are you now ready to answer questions?

Mr. MEYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Governor Meyer, I am very much in sympathy with the general purposes of this bill. In my concept of the situation it is necessary to do something which will produce an inflation—that is, to raise in general the price level—and my conception of it is that only in that way can the frozen assets of the country become liquid. Have you anything you can say as to the effect of this bill on creating an inflation in the price level—in other words, a raising of the price level?

Mr. MEYER. I believe the work of the War Finance Corporation had a very material effect on the price level. We are getting now into a very controversial field, Mr. Congressman, and the subject of the price level is one that I could talk about, not for the remaining half hour that is available, but for several days and nights without interruption. You are interested in the subject and you are, no doubt, familiar with what they call the monetary theory. The monetary theory is supported by many well-known writers and economists. The way to attack the situation at this time, it seems to me, is to direct through this agency a flow of credit to the weak spots and to affect the price level by a general strengthening of these spots and of the entire structure.

There is quality to credit as well as quantity, and the quality of this credit is designed, as I read the bill, to be particularly valuable because of the direction that will be given to it. It is quality in addition to quantity.

There is an exaggerated notion about the ability of the Federal reserve banks to control the volume of credit in use in various businesses. There are times when they can do a great deal, and, of course, the facilities of the Federal reserve banks are freely available for borrowings by member banks, within the limits prescribed in the law, at what must be considered very reasonable rates, 3 1/2 per cent for the most part. They buy bills at 3 per cent. They hold as many Government securities as they have ever held in their history, and they have held them for a longer time than they ever held them in their history.

While foreign countries have substantial deposits in this country, the amounts are not nearly as large as they were. Even before the gold exports, following the suspension of the gold standard by England in September, liquidated some of them, the balances had been withdrawn to some extent; in fact, they were reduced by several hundred million during the spring and early summer. You are, of course, familiar with the fact that as a consequence of bank failures and the fear that developed in some parts of the country, there has been a good deal of currency withdrawn from circulation.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Do you feel you are in position to express an opinion as to whether the effect of this bill will be to raise the price level? Do you believe that will be the effect of this resolution?

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Congressman, I have not made any predictions since I assumed my present position. I would prefer not to predict. I would be hopeful, however, that a better state of affairs in the financial structure would result from the operations of the corporation, and that, of course, should be helpful in connection with the price level. Of course, the present prices of many of our commodities and of other kinds of properties are ridiculous.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Now, may I ask this one further question: Do you not believe that unless the effect of this proposed legislation will be to raise the price level that it will be largely ineffective and almost entirely ineffective?

Mr. MEYER. The question whether this would raise the price level or do the things generally—

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. That is the same thing.

Mr. MEYER. Yes; I would expect the price level of commodities, properties, and goods generally to advance under a better ordered condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you finished your general statement?

Mr. BEEDY. The question was whether this would not be altogether and wholly ineffective if it did not result in raising the price level.

Mr. MEYER. This does not pretend to be the only factor in the world. Price levels are affected by many conditions, over some of which we have no control.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. We are going to be confronted on the floor of the House with that specific inquiry, and unless we can answer it with some degree of clarity.

Mr. MEYER. I would say it should contribute strongly in that direction, but we have a general situation, with a great many ramifications, and I will not say that it will alone increase price levels. Price levels would be affected by many other considerations, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Of course.

Mr. MEYER. I will not say that, if this bill is passed, the price level is going to advance because other things may be done by other people, at home or abroad, which may very materially offset the effect of anything that is done under the bill.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. My question was not based on the theory this bill was propounded as a cure-all at all.

Mr. MEYER. Yes. I do not want to get into the position of pretending it is or that I think it is.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Nobody would so consider it. What I am anxious to know is whether or not, in your judgment, unless this bill crystallizes in legislation which contributes toward the raising of the price level, would it not be entirely ineffective?

Mr. MEYER. You put it a little differently than I like to. I say if this bill is passed and is successfully and intelligently administered it should result in an improvement in conditions on such a scale that the price level should reflect that improvement.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. That is all.

Mr. MEYER. I will go as far as that with you.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you finished your general statement?

Mr. MEYER. Yes; Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The purpose of the meeting this morning was to permit you to make a general statement. You have consumed the time of the morning. Under the plan agreed to by the committee yesterday, we have now finished with the morning work. We will, of course, expect to have you before us again in order that we may discuss this matter with you further.

Mr. LUCE. May I inquire if I can ask him some questions?

The CHAIRMAN. I will say this; he is coming back, and, under the procedure we agreed on, we were going to let him make his statement uninterruptedly. The House meets in a few minutes. They are going to discuss plans for the remaining days of the preholiday sessions, and I think the members would like to be there. In the mean time, the photographers want to take a picture of the new committee.

(Thereupon at 11:50 a. m. the committee adjourned.)

#### FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the speech of the Secretary of War recently delivered at the New York Chamber of Commerce.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address of Hon. Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War, delivered at the one hundred and sixty-third annual banquet of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York:

Mr. President, Sir Henry, members of the chamber of commerce, I am delighted to be here on this occasion, and while I still have your good will, while I still have courtesy upon my lips and gratitude in my heart I would like to thank this organization and your president for your splendid hospitality.

This afternoon coming down on the train I read my speech to my better nine-tenths. When I finished she said, "It is really too bad that you could not have gone to night school one more night to learn to read." [Laughter.]

Because of my general incapacity along that line, I will take advantage of this opportunity, as my friend Senator COPELAND does frequently, to extend my remarks in the record [handing speech to the stenographer]. [Laughter.]

That document, your grace [turning to Bishop Manning, bishop of the Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine], contains the gospel according to—St. Patrick. [Laughter and applause.]

I was moved by the splendid tribute paid by Sir Henry to the celestial forms in the gallery. I believe that a man's success in life depends upon his capacity to take advice. In fact, the good book saith, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make ye whole."

Now, along that line, I had a mother and three sisters. I now have a wife, three daughters, and a mother-in-law. [Applause.] If I don't know the truth, I alone am to blame.

I hardly know how to begin this address. I was asked to inform this gathering what the Federal administration of the Government has done during the past two years and is doing now to assist labor, commerce, and industry during this period when the whole world is involved in a depression.

Due to many causes, some of them of our own making, most of them of foreign origin, we have been passing through a period of financial unrest which challenges the stability of our whole economic structure and the strength of our political institutions. These times call for individual responsibility, public leadership, and the cooperation of all the American people. No one party, no single faction, no one patriotic organization has the power in its own hands to put our economic house in order. The depression is gradually giving way. It can be entirely overcome only by the united action and the unfaltering courage of all the people under wise leadership. Many who were shouting for leadership in high places seem to forget that a little leadership in their own organizations might have greatly contributed to the welfare of their own establishment and the general situation. [Applause.] Those who shouted most loudly for leadership usually showed the least of that quality themselves, and even worse than their lack of leadership was their failure to cooperate.

America has passed through 15 depressions in the past century. Some of them have been extremely severe. In all of them there has been intense human suffering, widespread bankruptcy, and total dislocation of industry, from which it took years to recover. During all our past history it has never been considered the duty of the Chief Executive of our Government to undertake the direction of the Nation's commerce, banking, and industry; to provide funds for the care of the unemployed; to lead in the mitigation of the effect of the depression or to mobilize the economic forces of the Nation for its recovery. All of these things have been done and are now being done by the Chief Magistrate of this Nation. [Applause.]

We should bear in mind that this depression has arisen only in small degree from domestic causes. It has resulted in large measure from influences which have swept over us from abroad. It is a direct inheritance from the Great War. If there had been no World War, there would have been no world-wide depression.

Since the first signs of the depression the President of the United States has courageously and intelligently faced each emergency and has taken logical steps to mitigate its effects. The President has met each emergency by emergency action in strengthening the fabric of our economic system at points of weakness, in building up and maintaining the confidence, hope, and courage of the people.

The first result of the depression was unemployment. Provision had immediately to be made for the unemployed. The first action of the President was to assemble the national leaders of industry and labor. By agreement with both of them he prevented industrial strife and warfare, which have been the universal accompaniment of all our previous depressions. We have been practically free from acrimonious controversies between the employer and employee during the past two years. Employers have been induced to divide the work they have available among all their employees. In all previous depressions the employees have been discharged and turned out of the community without resource and without hope. In this depression, where they are turned out, each community has been mobilized to feed and clothe them while they are unemployed. As a result no one went hungry or cold during the past winter. Of course, there are objectors. There are those who would have done it otherwise. But there is now in progress everywhere in the Nation, under the direction of the President's committee (here in the city of New York you know all about it), a drive for funds that is proving successful and will unquestionably insure against hunger and cold in the coming winter.

Having accomplished the agreement between the employer and employee, the President at once touched the one point at which employment could be expanded. That was by anticipating the future in public and private construction. It would not have helped the situation to accelerate the production of consumable goods. We already had an overproduction. Through the acceleration of Federal construction—the improvement of rivers and harbors, construction of public buildings and public roads—more than 750,000 people have been directly and indirectly employed. The President called upon the municipalities, State, and private enterprises, to join in this program. The result is that during the so-called period of depression the greatest public improvement program in our history is in progress.

The President immediately stopped immigration by Executive order, thereby excluding at least 300,000 people who would have increased our unemployed to that extent.

Working with the leaders of both parties, mobilizing executives and public-spirited citizens in all walks of life, marshaling the forces of public opinion, he has unified the country in its determined effort to prevent, and where that is impossible to mitigate, the ravages of deflation. At the very time when the fiscal system of a great Nation was being destroyed by a system of doles there was a persistent demand that the dole system be adopted to provide for the unemployed in the United States. The President of the United States with great courage and brilliant leadership attacked that idea with such vigor that he completely defeated it. The dole system, in my opinion, would have been adopted if it had not been for the efforts of the President of the United States. [Applause.] Instead of the dole system he called upon every community to cooperate through individual enterprise to care for its own unemployed. Through these efforts he has saved many of the most precious assets of the American people. The sense of individual and community responsibility has been awakened and made effective. A majority of the wage levels have been maintained. The cost of living has diminished. It is true that many people are unemployed; that many more do not have a full week's work. But the President has never ceased to strive to maintain both the standard of wages and the standard of living.

#### AGRICULTURE

Agriculture was next to labor in suffering the first effects of the depression. Agriculture is dependent, to some extent, on foreign markets. This depression has been far more acute abroad than at home. Our export trade in farm products fell immediately. The result was that the surplus was left in the United States. In addition to that blow to exports there came a great drought that almost completely destroyed the livelihood of the farmers in 21 States of this Nation. The President immediately suggested a form of loans to the drought-stricken farmers that enabled them to again plant crops, with the result that they have recovered. A great portion of these loans have been and are now being repaid. The effect on the American farmer would have been complete disaster but for the emergency actions by the Federal Government. You hear opposition to the Farm Board's policy in steadyng the price of agricultural products. Yet this has saved the farmer billions of dollars and prevented the failure of thousands of banks dependent on agriculture for their stability. The recent rise in the price of wheat is due in large measure to the success of the President's efforts in reestablishing confidence in some of the Governments of Europe, and also to the fact that the Farm Board has been able, through its cooperative agencies, to withhold a large portion of the surplus from the world's market until consumption increases.

At the President's suggestion, banks in the South were mobilized to join the Farm Board in a plan for the more orderly handling of the cotton surplus. This action has already resulted in great benefits to the cotton growers.

#### FINANCES OF THE GOVERNMENT

The President is now confronted by a serious fiscal situation of the Government itself. There has been a decrease of approximately 40 per cent in tax receipts. The tax system of the Federal Government is largely based on profits. That is a serious weakness in the stability of the finances of the Government in periods of stress and depression. Notwithstanding this great decrease in income, the Government has greatly expanded Federal expenditures on public works as an aid to employment.

The present deficit in the Treasury was not created by the expansion in public works alone. Measures vetoed by the President and passed over his veto by Congress contributed their share. There will be more attempted raids on the Treasury. The President is opposing these raids with clear-minded determination. The only way to meet the present deficit is to reduce appropriations and expenditures of the Government and to evolve a more equitable and reliable basis of taxation. As your president, Mr. Smull, has told you, most anyone can suggest a plan for taking money out of the Treasury but no one has suggested a plan for putting more money in the Treasury except by taxes. Now, you gentlemen talking about raids on the United States Treasury and increasing of taxes—you will forgive me if I say to you that while the President had his back to the wall, fighting that thing, you did not make a very vociferous noise in his favor. [Applause.]

From all parts of the country we hear of impending raids on the Federal Treasury. Fantastic dreamers urge expenditures on the Government bureaus, increase of Government employees, expansion of Federal aid, all of which are designed to increase Government expenditures. Proposals of this character involving billions will be presented to the coming Congress. The duty to defeat them will devolve upon the President. The condition of the Treasury is rather serious. The President is curtailing appropriations. Mr. Smull has just now told you that these curtailments are infinitesimal so far as the general amount of the appropriations are concerned. And that is largely true. But there are only two ways to balance that Federal Budget. One is by a curtailment of Federal appropriations and the other is by the increase of taxation. I realize that it is a very pleasant thing both to a public official and his constituents to be able to spend Federal money and thereby obtain public favor. But there is something higher and nobler that can come to a public official, and that is his sense of duty honorably performed and efficiently and intelligently carried into effect regardless of the effect it has upon his own political future. [Applause.] The highest satisfaction that can come to a conscientious public official is the sense of having intelligently, courageously, and faithfully performed a public duty.

In my own opinion our system of taxation on incomes is unsound, because in periods of depression, when the Government most needs funds, its revenue is decreased. In periods of affluence it collects more money than is necessary. There must be a reformation of our system of taxation. There will have to be more taxes, gentlemen, before that Federal Budget is balanced.

The business conditions of every nation of the world has followed the credit of the nation itself, and the President does not propose to have the credit of this Republic impaired.

I was told this afternoon that if the President of the United States proposes revision or increase of taxes during the next session it will mean his defeat for reelection. I want to say to you now, my friends, that my answer to that is that the President is far more concerned in the welfare of this Republic and its 123,000,000 inhabitants than he is in his own political future. [Prolonged applause.]

We should all understand that the Government can not by itself overcome the depression. It may lead and assist but the depression can be overcome only by the efforts and courage of all the people. The people will have to have courage. They will have to fight back to normal. The success of the United States represents the sum total of the achievements of individuals that compose its citizenship. [Applause.]

We are sometimes prone to forget that government is not an end in itself; but a means to a richer and more secure life for individuals. The government is merely that system of ordered social arrangement which releases the energy and the genius of the people for living, building, working, and growing; for invention and discovery, for the development of the mind and the enlargement of the spirit. Our Government was established to serve free men and to protect them in their individual rights, to promote education, to overcome intolerance and crime, to eliminate as far as is humanly possible material poverty, to maintain equality of opportunity, and to provide for a just distribution of the Nation's wealth. They began on this coast, struggling colonies. They built a government. They followed out the great river valleys cutting their way through the forest, across the deserts, over the Rockies, down the slopes to the Pacific. Under that system of individual enterprise and individual courage they carved out and conquered a new continent.

There are those who say that our economic system is obsolete, that it should be discarded. It has served in the last 150 years to build the mightiest economic community on earth. It is as vital to-day as it was when our forefathers started across this continent. It is true that it is not perfect. There is nothing human that is perfect. But on that system for 150 years the Nation has grown and prospered. The problem has been to preserve it, not by theorizing, not by panaceas, but by meeting emergencies as emergencies.

There are weaknesses in our economic system. The system has been improved from time to time by the sober thought and will

of the American people. The system is worth saving. The President has sought to prevent its destruction in time of stress.

One of the weaknesses of the system is the overconcentration of wealth in the hands of a few individuals. The preponderance of the Nation's wealth is, of course, still in the hands of the people whose income is \$4,000 per annum or less. Notwithstanding all this, we have concentrations of wealth and continuances of great estates that to some extent weaken our economic structure.

We have yet to devise a plan that will provide for a more equitable distribution of the Nation's wealth; but in dealing with it we should be careful not to destroy the initiative of the American people, not to dampen the hopes and aspirations of the individual. We should bear in mind that the success of the United States is the sum total of the achievements of its individual citizens. Changes may be necessary, but is the time to make them during a period of stress where you are likely to destroy the foundation of the whole system? The changes should be made only after the sober thought and the well-considered expression of the will of the American people. In making changes we should remember that we are great because of the individual achievements of our citizens, and no change in our economic system should be made that will destroy the hope or the aspirations of the individual.

Some opponents of the administration have said that the measures proposed by the White House are all emergency measures. That is true. The depression itself is an emergency. The President has sought to meet it as an emergency, rather than by sacrificing in times of stress the fundamental principles of the American system of economics and the American Government.

We are about to have another Congress. Chimerical as it may seem, there will be proposals presented to draw billions of dollars from an already depleted Treasury. The President will stand with all the force of his personality and office against these raids [applause], and in his position he will not have partisan support alone; intelligent Democrats and Republicans from all over this Nation will support him in the defense of stability of the Nation. Appropriations will have to be reduced.

Then we hear the argument, "Are you going to stop all this Federal construction at a period when employment is so needed?" The appropriations for 1931-32 for that construction program have already been made. The fight now is to curtail appropriations for 1933. Our hope of revival may be chimerical or real, but at any rate we should wait to see what business does in 1932 before we organize a spending spree of Federal funds for 1933. [Applause.]

Now, like Sir Henry said about this prophesy business, I have never known of any of these modern prophets who guessed what was really going to happen. The only thing certain about a modern prophecy is that it is not correct. On the depression a friend of mine from down the Klamath country in Oklahoma expressed about the condition of the minds of all of us. We were having a helpful general talk and he said, "Pat, we haven't overcome this depression as quickly as I thought we would, but I didn't think we would." [Laughter.]

You know, there are so many people who actually believe what they are saying. I think it was Josh Billings—or was it Bill Nye or Will Rogers—who said, "It isn't what people don't know that makes them ignorant; it is what they do know that ain't true."

I should not have started out on that line just now, because we have in this room a great executive, a great counselor, an outstanding character of this Nation, a man who, in addition to his business capacity and his leadership and wisdom, has made history on the battlefields of France as a combat officer. This is just to show you what men think they know. The other night I went to a picture show and I saw General Harbord [applause], that unparalleled leader, that splendid soldier, who led the Marines and the Second Division to victory after victory in France. I saw with him on the screen my old friend Floyd Gibbons, and they took the First and Second Divisions up to a spot on the Soissons-Chateau Thierry Road, and Floyd said, "I want to show the audience the turning of the tide in the World War." In other words, in a polite way Floyd was saying, "I want to tell you now who won the war." He went out to General Harbord's place out here on Long Island somewhere and the General very modestly said, "Well, Floyd, you were with the First and I was with the Second, but you know there was some of the other boys present when this thing was done, but I will show you how the First and Second Divisions crossed the Soissons-Chateau Thierry Road." He took his cane and marked in the sand and Floyd then threw on the screen a picture of the Crown Prince's army as it came forward to the attack, and he took General Harbord's Division and General Summerall's Division and he showed that mighty thrust with the American force and the spreading out and the crossing of the road, the tearing in on the hill above Soissons, and the gaining of a brilliant victory. He showed a graphic picture of the driving of the spearhead into the base of the Soissons-Rheims salient. Floyd said, "There, my good friends, is the turning point of the war. There is where the Allies won;" and three of us from the Third Division got up and walked out of the house. [Laughter.] Floyd thought he was telling the truth. He just didn't know who really won the war. [Laughter.] Who does?

I have been speaking about domestic conditions, and you know, again, I remind myself of a story of the war. I have been jumping from place to place trying to paint the picture for you. I am reminded of the captain who had a colored company, and he sent Sam out on listening post and gave him his instructions.

He said, "Sam, if the Germans come you fire a shot or shots to give us the alarm and come back to this trench as fast as you can. Don't run in a straight line, run zigzag. They can hit you more easily running in a straight line than if you run zigzag." Sure enough, the Germans came. Sam shot and ran. He rolled over in the trench, and groaned, and the captain said, "What is the matter, Sam? Did they hit you?" Sam said, "Lord's sake, Captain, they just shot me all to pieces." The captain said, "Well, did you run zigzag as I told you to?" Sam said, "Yes, sir, Captain, I most certainly did, but I must have zigged when I should have zagged, zagged when I should have zigged." [Laughter.]

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

We come now, my friends, to international affairs. I have said that the whole world is involved in this economic debacle. Its origin lies in the World War—political instability, tremendous debts, wasteful expenditures on armaments, and a thousand other causes outside of the control of the United States Government. Whatever the causes may have been, they have been sufficient to bring many countries to political revolution and nearly all of them to economic instability. It has brought some of the greatest nations of the world to the very threshold of social and economic destruction.

To help in the international situation, the President brought about an international debt moratorium. He directed a plan that saved the economic structure of more than one nation in Europe. He intervened in European matters, not only in the interests of the world and humanity at large, but for the benefit of some of those at home who objected to his action. May I point out that his intervention was also for the selfish interest of the United States. No great nation of the world can collapse without bringing its repercussions of more unemployment, more hardship on the farmers, and more bankruptcy of business in the United States. Someone has said that we are becoming entangled in Europe. It is true that the President of the United States suggested a debt moratorium to save the economic structure of certain of the nations in Europe. [Applause.]

It is true that he provided a plan of credit that has sustained others, but this administration has made not one political commitment to Europe and will make none. [Applause.]

We are entangled in the economic welfare of Europe to the extent that the prices of wheat and cotton and the employment of our citizens at home and the stability of our banks depend to some measure on the reestablishment of confidence and the economic stability of Europe.

May I call attention to another accomplishment of these last few years that has been little noticed in these times of difficulty and personal distress. That is the steady rise of the United States in the esteem and respect and good will of the entire world. No man could read the press of the foreign countries or even the journals of our own Nation a few years ago without recognizing the almost universal criticism of the United States. Immediately upon his entry into office the President directed our policies toward Latin America, so as to allay their alarms and fears and restore the confidence of those people in the good intentions and the friendliness of the United States. In this he has succeeded.

He brought about the London naval treaty, designed to stop competition in arms and allay the suspicion of nations.

He settled the debt question with France and removed the friction between us and one of our greatest neighbors.

He intervened to save Germany from catastrophe.

In all of this he has not made to any nation a single political commitment. He has reestablished the prestige of the United States abroad. The leaders of the South American Republics, the President of Mexico, the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and of France, and at present the representative of the Italian Government, have all made their way to the White House to seek the views and counsel of the President. These visits have not been made for the purpose of military honors or political agreements. They have been made for the purpose of seeking an understanding for common action in the maintenance of peace and the reestablishment of the economic stability of the world.

I mention these international matters to indicate to you that all the world over the leadership of the United States is recognized as the most powerful for the promotion of peace and good will and in pointing the way to economic stability and happiness. All of this must be a background to the future welfare and prosperity of our workmen, our farmers, our captains of industry, and leaders of commerce.

#### BANKING

The business of the world is dependent for its livelihood on a reasonable flow of credit. As a reflection of the shocks received from Europe, of panics, monetary dislocations and unreasoning withdrawals from American banks, a most serious fiscal situation was created. Every banker, to protect his own institution, necessarily began to curtail loans, to require payments, and this caused further stagnation of every form of business.

The President again led the way by mobilization of banks in the United States in a common credit pool of \$500,000,000. Someone has said that while President Hoover is attending to the finances of Europe he might direct his attention at home. In reply may I say that the President of the United States went personally to the bankers of this Nation and succeeded in creating the pool of \$500,000,000 to release the slow assets, to release the flow of credit, to restore confidence, to stop runs upon the banks and to give a market for the legitimate securities of banks who are in distress.

This pool is not a Government institution. It was formed by the joint action of the banks. Its purpose is to protect sound institutions from runs and to reopen many banks which have been closed because of inability to borrow on their legitimate assets. The success of this enterprise has tended to return confidence to the banks and to encourage the legitimate flow of credit. There has not been in the history of this Republic a more successful operation than the President's pooling of credits.

Let us again consider this talk about political entanglement with Europe. If the opponents of the administration would criticize intelligently, they would say that we became entangled with Europe about 15 years ago; that the purpose of the present President of the United States has been to disentangle us. His first step in that direction was the settling of the French debt to remove a controversy between us and one of our greatest neighbors and friends. That debt successfully settled, we have moved on in harmony with the nations of Europe to try to disentangle us from the entanglements into which we were thrown by a great catastrophe. You say, what has all this got to do with the depression in the United States? I have answered that already. The fact is that if we are going to prosper, if we are going to have a market for our surpluses, if we are going to have trade with the world to support our great industrial development, we must live on terms of peace and amity with all mankind. There is no intention on the part of anyone in the administration to procure any political entanglements any place. The President has had all this in mind when he suggested aid to nations of Europe; when he provided a smoother flow of credit; when he established a basis of confidence.

All of these things mean that to-day the Federal Government of the United States has at its head a man who is familiar with the intricacies of national and international economics. He has the patience of Job, the determination of Napoleon, and proceeds fearlessly and quietly to carry on in such a way as to protect our fundamental institutions; to keep all those theorists with all their panaceas from impairing the foundations of our institutions—to bring about peace, goodwill, economic stability among the nations of the earth and restore to our own citizens that happiness and well-being to which they are entitled. [Prolonged applause.]

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—  
Mr. SCHNEIDER, at the request of Mr. FREAR, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

Mr. MALONEY, indefinitely, on account of important official business.

Mr. FERNANDEZ, from December 19, 1931, indefinitely, on account of important official business.

Mr. CELLER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. LANHAM, for three days, on account of sickness in family.

#### JOSÉ RIZAL, FILIPINO PATRIOT

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the extension of my remarks by inserting in the RECORD two addresses delivered to commemorate the anniversary of the death of José Rizal, the greatest Filipino patriot and martyr.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses commemorative of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the death of the greatest Filipino patriot, José Rizal:

#### REGAINING OUR EDEN LOST

[An address by Hon. CAMILO OSIAS delivered at the exercises in commemoration of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the death of José Rizal, the Filipino reformer and martyr, held in Philadelphia, Pa., December 30, 1931]

There is genuine timeliness at this particular stage of American-Filipino relationship that I, as a representative of the Filipinos' emancipatory struggles in the United States, should speak in this city of brotherly love, renowned as the cradle of American independence, the birthplace of this great Republic.

To the Filipino people December 30 is more than a national holiday. It has become an annual holy day. It is commemorative of the tragic event that took place at the Bagumbayan field in Manila 35 years ago, when on a beautiful morn, calm and bright, "the bridal of the earth and sky," the cruel hand of tyranny snatched from our midst the greatest Filipino patriot, José Rizal, one of the world's martyrs to the sacred cause of liberty.

One of the best loved figures of modern American politics, Henry Allen Cooper, of Wisconsin, in 1902 rising in defense of the Filipinos when the denunciations in Congress against my people were extraordinarily virulent and vitriolic, paid a tribute to the martyred Filipino. He said:

"It has been said that if American institutions had done nothing else than furnish to the world the character of George Washington, that alone would entitle them to the respect of mankind.

So, sir, I say to all those that denounce the Filipinos indiscriminately \* \* \* that this despised race proved itself entitled to their respect and the respect of mankind when it furnished to the world the character of José Rizal."

Who was Rizal to whom we pay homage? He was one of a family of 11 children born in Calamba, Laguna, on June 19, 1861. He learned to read when but a babe, taught by a talented mother, Doña Teodora. Underdeveloped in infancy, he became a robust boy through the influence of his Uncle Manuel, who instilled in him a love of play and exercise and of the great outdoors. Under a private tutor he acquired much youthful knowledge and a passion for education. In the Manila schools and colleges to which he was sent he distinguished himself by his conduct, for his industry, and in his studies. In the Old World, where he pursued his advanced studies, he had a brilliant record as a student of medicine, of philosophy, and of languages.

Rizal became a novelist and a poet. He became a doctor and an oculist. Former Governor General Harrison has paid him honor "as a patriot, author, and scientist." He was a sculptor and an artist. Tavera, the scholar, has written of Rizal's sterling character and presented him as a thinker and a philosopher. He was an educator and a reformer. He was a hero and a martyr. Russell wrote admiringly, saying:

"It is certain that from whatever point of view we come to examine this life, or by whatever tests we care to apply to it, here was one of the most extraordinary persons in human annals. Of other men that the world has reason to honor, it is to be said that they excelled their contemporaries in one respect, or in two or in three. Of this man the versatility was so great and the genius so many-sided and real that they seemed so incomprehensible and one would be puzzled to cite from any other country, in any time, an equal prodigy." (The Outlook for the Philippines, p. 109.)

One of Rizal's contemporaries, Apolinario Mabini, often referred to as the brain of the Philippine revolution of 1896, left this injunction to each of his countrymen:

"Love thy country next to thy God and thy honor more than thyself, for it is the only paradise that God hath given thee in this life."

To Rizal love of country was a dominating quality of his nature. It was a life passion. He felt, thought, labored, lived, and died for his country. To make the Philippines free that it may become a veritable paradise to his people was the overwhelming purpose of his life.

His fervent love of the fatherland led him to undertake prodigious enterprises.

His all-absorbing love of country made him achieve heroic deeds.

His all-consuming passion for the Philippines prompted him to give the last measure of sacrifice.

In his immortal poem, *My Last Farewell*, Rizal began with these patriotic lines:

"Adios, Patria adorada, region del sol querida,  
Perla del mar de Oriente, nuestro perdido Eden!"

"Farewell, dear fatherland, clime of the sun caress'd,  
Pearl of the Orient seas, our Eden lost!"

The Philippines, the land adored, was his constant theme. As a boy he came to love with adoration her plains and valleys, her hills and mountains, her lakes and her streams. With a poetic heart and the soul of an artist, he depicted in his writings the wondrous beauties of the pearl of the Orient seas.

The thought of the subjugation of the Philippines made him melancholy. That our rightful paradise should have become "our Eden lost" caused him indescribable gloom and grief, sorrow keen, and mental anguish.

What didn't Rizal do that our Eden lost may be regained? What wasn't he willing to give that our Philippines may be independent? He did everything and gave his all. Yet in transport of patriotism he still exclaimed:

"Gladly now I go to give thee this life's best,  
And were it brighter, fresher, or more blest,  
Still would I give it thee, nor count the cost."

José Rizal lived in a different epoch. But many of the conditions and problems of the present are analogous to those of his time.

The Eden of his day was lost to Spain. The Eden of our time remains unredeemed, though the sovereignty is different.

The Eden of Rizal suffered from the cancer of foreign rule dominated by bigotry and fanaticism. The Eden of ours suffers from uncertainty and anomaly, made worse by apathy and cynicism.

The people of Rizal's Eden groaned under the double lash of militarism and ecclesiasticism. The people of our Eden are groping in the dark under a dual governmental responsibility, not knowing what the morrow may bring.

The government of Rizal's Eden had to contend with monarchical power. The government of our Eden has to contend with the power of the dollar.

The obstacle to the aspirations of the people in Rizal's Eden was the covetousness of a monarchical empire. The obstacle to the aspirations of the people in our Eden is the greed of the empire of business.

Then, as now, we suffer from a lack of orientation because of our dependent status. Under Spain royal authority was imposed by God and resistance to it was unpardonable impiety. Under the present régime the rule imposed was dictation by providence and to agitate for the withdrawal of authority, despite a formal promise, is interpreted as ingratitude in certain quarters.

Then and now confusion reigns. The old colonial dogma, *divide et impera*, has not made its exit. The people of the past era lived in continual danger from the forces of reaction frustrating every endeavor toward reform. The people of our era are beset with impending danger from those designing territorial dismemberment and the other danger from those who are ever thwarting our people's birthright to freedom.

Must the lot of dependencies continue to be sad and bitter? The uncertainty of the Philippine situation is paralyzing in its tendency. Both Americans and Filipinos who are familiar with present conditions are agreed that inaction will only prolong the numbing effects of uncertainty and that its removal is absolutely necessary.

We have for years petitioned America to redeem her pledge "to withdraw her sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and grant their independence."

Under one pretext or another we have been hearing the elusive answer, "Not at this time."

An entire people now renew their plea. They would like a categorical answer. Thirteen million people across the sea anxiously await definite action. The imperative need of an immediate remedy is a test of the validity and sincerity of the promise which we believe America made in honor and which she will not directly or indirectly repudiate in dishonor.

We appeal most earnestly to the people of this city, and of the whole country, to reflect upon the conditions of the American colonies and the spirit of their patriots of 1776 the better to understand the doubt and the uncertainty engendered by a government without the consent of the governed.

Tragic though our past has been, and dangerous though our future may be, I want to continue to view the present with optimism. Our immortal idol, Rizal, has blazed the trail that leads to our redemption. We must profit by his example. Dependent peoples must not be dismayed. They must not permit themselves to be plunged into the abyss of despair and desperation.

Rizal met terrible odds. He was undaunted. He faced difficulties, risked the "inescapable," dared the "impossible" like a man. We must do likewise.

Let us find hope in America's historic struggle for freedom. Let us find inspiration in the American Declaration of Independence, the "chart and compass" of human liberty.

Secure in the thought that our cause is just, obedient to the urge of our better nature, and prizing our Eden more than life itself, let us—

"Pray for all those that hapless died,  
For all who have suffered the unmeasur'd pain;  
For our mothers that bitterly their woes have cried,  
For widows and orphans, for captives by torture tried;  
And then for thyself that redemption thou may'st gain."

Rizal's precious legacy is his great yearning for liberty. His glorious contribution is his spirit of sacrifice. Since his death we, as a people, have set the ideal of liberty upon a high pedestal. We have enshrined it on high. We have made it our goddess on earth. We have placed a halo on her head. We must earnestly worship at her feet.

Our hero, our patriot, our martyr gave his all to the mission of regaining our Eden lost. To that unfinished task we must consecrate ourselves wholeheartedly with resolute courage, with unflinching determination, and unswerving faith. If we do victory must and shall be ours!

\* \* \* \* \*

RIZAL DAY ADDRESS

(By Mrs. Camilo Osias at the anniversary program held in Washington D. C., December 30, 1931)

One of the greatest triumphs of humanity is the exaltation of womanhood by Christianity. One of the sources of strength of the largest branch of Christianity is the institution of Maryology. One of the strongest pillars of Philippine society is the prominent rôle played by woman in the life of the nation and of the family.

While the spirit of the greatest world's festival is still fresh let us not overlook the glory that came to Jesus because of the influence of women upon his life, especially the love and devotion and suffering of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The Bible is rich in instances of Christ's miraculous deeds, humanitarian service, and beautiful sacrifice prompted by his thought of woman's worth. As we celebrate the greatest Filipino holiday, let us not forget that Rizal became great in a very true sense because of the guidance, the inspiration, and the influence of womankind, especially his mother, Doña Teodora Alonso.

If José Rizal learned his letters while still an infant, it was because of his mother's teaching. If he had a good start in his early education, it was because of the help given by his sisters and the constant thought of Doña Teodora for the well-being of her son beloved. If he possessed good physique, it was due in great part to the solicitous care of the woman to whom he owed his very life. If he loved the out of doors and all that is beautiful in man and nature, it was due in a great measure to woman's influence. For the greatness that was Rizal's and for the goodness of his character much credit is due to woman's influence.

In my modest participation at this Rizal day celebration far from the land of our birth I shall not long dwell on Rizal's biography, for volumes have been written on it and are accessible

to anyone who is interested. I shall not speak of his work and service, for I realize that others could have been chosen better to deal with these. What I do want to emphasize is woman's contribution to his whole life full of inspiration and teaching, rich in patriotism and sacrifice.

Let us catch a glimpse of the mother of the great Filipino patriot and martyr. She was the daughter of Domingo Morales and Joaquina Quintos. When less than a week old she was baptized in a Catholic church and christened Teodora.

Teodora was reared in the Morales home, well ordered and hospitable. While young she was taught to read and write by her mother. She completed her education at the Colegio de Santa Rosa in Manila.

Teodora Alonso Morales was married to Francisco Rizal Mercado. Out of that wedlock 11 children were born—9 girls and 2 boys. José Rizal was the seventh child.

From a character sketch of Doña Teodora I quote the following excerpts: "Her good home and her excellent school training made her one of the best-educated women of those days. She was not only well trained, but she was a very kind and industrious woman. It is no wonder, therefore, that she became a woman greatly admired, a very good wife, and a model mother.

"After her marriage she lived at Calamba, Laguna, where the Rizal family had a large farm. She helped her husband to manage the affairs of the household and of the farm. As is the custom in our country, Mrs. Rizal handled all the money of the family, watching over the expenses and practicing wise economies.

"Mrs. Rizal was always noted for her kindness. She was kind not only to her relatives and friends but also to many who had no claims upon her. To rich and poor alike she was ever the same. The hard-working laborers on the farm loved her devotedly, for when any of them were sick or in need Mrs. Rizal was ready to give them help and cheer. On Christmas especially she remembered her helpers and neighbors and gave them presents.

"The Rizal home was noted for its hospitality. To strangers and friends alike the house was open. The lowly workers found as ready a welcome there as the highest official. Hospitality was one of the most notable virtues of Mrs. Rizal." (Philippine Readers, Book 5, p. 208.)

José Rizal's mother suffered as few women in the world have suffered. During the troublous Spanish rule of the Philippines, Mrs. Rizal was accused by a lieutenant of the cruel *guardia civil*. By the aid of false witnesses, she was convicted and sent to jail. She was compelled to walk all the way from Calamba to Santa Cruz, the capital of Laguna, where the provincial jail was located.

The same official later brought other charges against her. The good woman suffered with fortitude. The family fortune was used to get lawyers in her defense. José Rizal, himself, writing of the incident, said: "My mother was finally acquitted and found justified in the eyes of the judges, of those who accused her, and even her enemies; but how long after that incident? After two years and a half!"

In the hope of escaping further indignities the Rizals moved from Calamba to Manila. But the wrath of the unjust officials pursued the family. It was not long before she was again the victim of cruelty and injustice. Suffering seemed to be the lot of that noble woman. She suffered mental anguish when her son José was maltreated as a student. She was in tears when he had to depart for Europe for a better education and for a better opportunity. Her sorrow was keen when José Rizal, now become a man, was exiled by the government to Dapitan, Mindanao. The climax of her suffering came when on December 30, 1896, Rizal was executed in Manila at the famous Bagumbayan field.

The mere recital of these few incidents are sufficient to inspire us, the living, to suffer and sacrifice for our country and her liberty, even as Rizal and his mother suffered and sacrificed. Her example is an eternal sermon. It must have been a powerful inspiration and a constant urge for José Rizal to live, suffer, and die for country, for duty, and for a great ideal. It should convince all that the women of the Philippines are ever ready to bear their full share of burden and responsibility.

The yearly commemoration of Rizal's death should constantly remind us of our duty to our people and country. Now as in the days of old Filipinos must labor and fight for the liberation of our country. We must let our American friends know that the women as well as the men of the islands are anxious to see the Philippines free.

The United States can not teach the Philippines lessons of dependency. Our country has been dependent for a longer period. What the United States can teach us is independence, for she has long been independent. And as America loves freedom for herself she should no longer withhold the independence of the Philippines.

The women and mothers of the Philippines know that independence may mean suffering. We do not mind. Suffering is nothing if it brings happiness. And we shall be happier when our country is independent like the United States.

As a mother of children myself, I desire for my children the blessings of freedom while I live. I know that my Filipino sisters feel as I do. I wish I could touch the hearts of American women and mothers so that they may exert their influence on their officials, on their Congressmen, on their Government to grant us the independence we have been promised.

We, the Filipino women, have been glad to suffer and sacrifice in the past. We shall be more glad to suffer and sacrifice in the future when our mother Philippines shall be free at last.

Inspired by the thought of his mother and the love of his motherland, Rizal penned these touching lines:

"Sweet are the hours in one's native land,  
Where all is dear and the sunbeams bless;  
Life-giving breezes sweep the strand,  
And death is softened by love's caress.  
  
"Warm kisses play on mother's lips,  
When on her tender breast we wake,  
While round her neck the soft arm slips  
And fond eyes in her love partake.  
  
"It is sweet for one's own land to die,  
Where all is dear the sunbeams bless;  
Dead is the breeze that sweeps the strand,  
Without a home, a mother, or love's caress."

José Rizal set the example to his countrymen. They should gladly follow in his footsteps. Rizal's mother showed the way to her countrywomen. Like her we shall live, suffer, and sacrifice. It is thus that we can best honor the memory of Rizal and his mother.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois a question? When we adjourned for the Christmas vacation it was understood that one of the first major pieces of legislation would be the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill. Can the gentleman give me any information as to when he expects that bill to come before the House?

Mr. RAINY. Hearings will commence to-morrow. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] to further answer the gentleman.

Mr. STEAGALL. I will say to the gentleman that we began hearings on that measure before the holiday recess, and we are resuming the hearings to-morrow morning. We have no thought, of course, except to expedite consideration of the bill just as much as we can and at the same time give it the consideration which its importance demands.

Mr. SNELL. Of course, the situation in the country is so critical that it is of vital importance that it be considered as soon as possible. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman's committee should give it careful consideration, because we do not want any undigested legislation passed, but I believe it is very important and in the interest of the entire country that we should rush the measure as fast as possible and I would hope we could get it out this week.

Mr. STEAGALL. I am in hearty accord with all the gentleman has to say, and our actions both heretofore and in the future will bear out my statement; and I will say to the gentleman in this connection that if there could be any complaint against the Banking and Currency Committee of the House as to the speed with which it has gone about its work during this session, it would have to be a complaint that we have gone too fast. Before the Christmas adjournment the committees were organized on Tuesday, we met on Wednesday and commenced hearings on the bill for relief of the Federal land banks, and on Thursday we reported that bill, and Friday we wrote the report while the moratorium resolution was under consideration, and Saturday we passed the measure.

Mr. SNELL. I am not complaining of the work done so far.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not think that can be beat for hard work and quick action.

Mr. SNELL. I simply want to impress upon the gentleman the importance of getting out the bill as quickly as possible. I think the gentleman appreciates this as much as I do and is as much interested in it.

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; and I assure the gentleman the committee is moving just as rapidly as it can to give the bill the consideration which its importance demands.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 194. An act for the relief of Jeff Davis Caperton and Lucy Virginia Caperton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 241. An act for the relief of Donald K. Warner; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 243. An act for the relief of S. F. Stacher; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 258. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of H. E. Hurley; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 468. An act for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Braznell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 551. An act for the relief of Blanch Broomfield; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1214. An act to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in the claim of Elizabeth B. Eddy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1306. An act to provide for the incorporation of the District of Columbia Commission, George Washington Bicentennial; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1357. An act for the relief of Nancy H. Rouse, Clara H. Simmons, W. H. Hays, Hallie H. Hamilton, and Bradford P. Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2077. An act to relieve the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of certain ministerial duties; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAINY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 5, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

325. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a bill to amend section 1223 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and the act entitled "An act to define the terms child, and children as used in the acts of May 18, 1920, and June 10, 1922, approved February 21, 1929"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

326. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a bill "To authorize payment for printing and binding reports on examination and surveys of rivers and harbors from the appropriation maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbors works"; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

327. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a bill "For the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

328. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1932 in the amount of \$164,780 (H. Doc. No. 197); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

329. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting report and recommendation concerning the claim of Joseph E. Bourrie Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

330. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting report and recommendation concerning the claim of Lewis O. Wick; to the Committee on Claims.

331. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting recommendation for the enactment of legislation excepting Federal civilian employees continuously employed from the taking of a renewal oath on a change of status; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

332. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting report showing the officers of the Government who on June 30, 1931, were delinquent in rendering their accounts or were in debt to the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

333. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report that there is in this department an accumulation of documents and files which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business and appear to have no historical value; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

334. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a bill "to amend an act entitled 'An act to author-

ize payment of six months' death gratuity to dependent relatives of officers, enlisted men, or nurses whose death results from wounds or disease not resulting from their own misconduct; approved May 22, 1928"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

335. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a bill "To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to fix the allowance for enlisted men of the Navy"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

336. A letter from the president of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, transmitting statement of all expenditures of appropriations made by Congress by this institution for the fiscal year 1930-31, together with rates of pay of superintendent and teachers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

337. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report that there is in this department an accumulation of documents and files which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business and have no value or historical interest; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

338. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1932, in the sum of \$3,000 (H. Doc. No. 198); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

339. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1932, in the sum of \$12,000 (H. Doc. No. 199); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

340. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1932, in the sum of \$110,000 (H. Doc. No. 200); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

341. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report on preliminary examination and survey of inland waterway from Delaware River to the Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md., the Delaware City Branch, with a view to securing a depth of 12 feet, authorized by the river and harbor act approved July 3, 1930 (H. Doc. No. 201); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

342. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report dated December 31, 1931, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Wrangell Harbor, Alaska, authorized by the river and harbor act approved July 3, 1930 (H. Doc. No. 202); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

343. A letter from the chairman of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission, transmitting the third annual report of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission (H. Doc. No. 203); to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed.

344. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting dispatch from the Governor of Guam recommending maintenance of the agricultural experiment station in Guam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BYRNS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6660. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5341. A bill to provide for the incor-

poration of the District of Columbia Commission, George Washington Bicentennial; with amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 554) for the relief of Henry C. Perrine; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 3950) to place Jesse C. Harmon on the retired list of the Marine Corps; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 3955) authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the city of Eagle Pass, Tex., certain land in Maverick County, Tex., comprising the abandoned military reservation of Camp Eagle Pass; Committee on the Public Lands discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 4017) granting a pension to Margaret E. Lackey; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4320) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Springster; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4321) granting an increase of pension to Catherine E. De Wolfe; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5566) granting a pension to Jess L. Chapman; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5753) for the relief of Michael S. Spillane; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 6660) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 6661) to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels for replacements and additions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 6662) to amend the tariff act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 6663) to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Skull Valley Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 6664) to extend the time of payment of loans made by Federal land banks for withholding foreclosures, providing for redemption of mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 6665) to establish a public works administration and transfer to and consolidate and coordinate therein all the public-works activities of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 6666) to reduce salaries, pay, and wages received from the United States during the calendar year 1932; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 6667) to establish a national military park to commemorate the battles fought around Atlanta, in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 6668) to authorize the erection of a 200-bed addition to the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at St. Cloud, Minn.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 6669) to relieve unemployment by providing for the building of check dams and other structures to prevent soil erosion, gullying, floods, and drought by retarding the run-off on watersheds and causing the waters to soak into the ground in order to replenish springs and wells and to restore subsoil moisture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6670) to accelerate public construction in periods of business depression through the creation of an administration of public works and to provide for a more effective coordination and correlation of the public-works functions of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 6671) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Sulphur, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6672) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Purcell, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6673) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Pauls Valley, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McGUGIN: A bill (H. R. 6674) providing for an emergency decrease for a period of two years in the salaries paid for certain offices and places of employment with the Government of the United States of America; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 6675) to amend section 91 of the Judicial Code, as amended, so as to create a new division in the western judicial district of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 6676) for the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 6677) to prevent fraud, deception, or improper practice in connection with business before the United States Patent Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6678) amending section 1 of the act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. L. p. 751), providing for the method of selling real estate under an order or decree of any United States court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ: A bill (H. R. 6679) granting certain public lands to the State of New Mexico for the use and benefit of the Eastern New Mexico Normal School, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 6680) to provide for the restoration of forfeited rights under the World War veterans' act, 1924, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CHAVEZ: A bill (H. R. 6681) providing for the issuance of patents, upon certain conditions, to lands and accretions thereto determined to be within the State of New Mexico in accordance with the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States entered April 9, 1928; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 6682) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CHAVEZ: A bill (H. R. 6683) to provide for the erection and operation of public bathhouses at Hot Springs, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 6684) to amend the act of June 25, 1910, entitled "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposal and sale of

allotments of deceased Indians, for the lease of allotments, and for other purposes," so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the terms of certain contracts when in his judgment it is in the interest of the Indians so to do; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. QUIN (by request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 6685) to regulate the conduct and administration of military arsenals, Air Corps depots, and other War Department activities and property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 6686) to authorize the leasing of the Muscle Shoals properties upon certain terms and conditions, to provide for national defense, manufacture of fertilizer, fertilizer ingredients, other chemicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ: A bill (H. R. 6687) to provide for payments to certain property owners in New Mexico for losses caused by the floods in the Rio Grande Valley during 1929; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6688) to fix the rates of postage on certain periodicals exceeding 8 ounces in weight; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. EATON of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6689) to authorize appropriations for the construction and installation of a water-supply system at Fitzsimons General Hospital, Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6690) providing for the promotion of the public health and the relief of coal miners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 6691) to divert lands unsuited for profitable agriculture to productive forestry uses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6692) for the relief of farmers in drought and/or storm stricken areas of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 6693) to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, the elimination and refunding of interest on said certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6694) to provide for the establishment of the Yakima Indian Forest; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 6695) providing for the licensing, bonding, and regulation of private employment agencies; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6696) to extend the powers of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6697) to amend an act approved May 1, 1906, entitled "An act to create a board for the condemnation of unsanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6698) to amend section 115a of an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6699) for sale of certain lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6700) to amend the act of June 19, 1912, by providing for a 5-day week on all Government works and on all supplies and materials purchased by the United States Government; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 6701) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 6702) authorizing refund of 50 per cent of the duties collected upon certain carillons and parts thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6703) to provide for the care of unemployed American seamen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 6704) providing for an emergency circulation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6705) to guarantee bank deposits in national banks and member banks of the Federal reserve system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 6706) to provide for the acquisition by the United States of the Studley estate where Patrick Henry was born; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HORN: A bill (H. R. 6707) for the relief of American industry, production, and growth from the premium accruing to certain foreign countries because of depreciation of their currency from legal parity and/or because of said foreign countries changing their monetary standard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6708) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6709) to amend the act of August 24, 1912, and to close the post offices on Saturday; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 6710) to repeal certain laws providing that certain aliens who have filed declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States shall be considered citizens for the purposes of service and protection on American vessels; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 6711) granting the Legislature of Porto Rico the power to enforce the prohibition of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 6712) to establish a bimetallic system of currency, employing gold and silver, to fix the relative value of gold and silver, to provide for the free coinage of silver as well as gold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 6713) for estimates necessary for the proper maintenance of the Government wharf at Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CHAVEZ: A bill (H. R. 6714) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6715) to provide for a 5-day week for all departments of the United States Government, Federal reserve banks, and to encourage a 5-day week in all industries and business in the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6716) to provide relief for unemployed itinerant workers having no permanent residence; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 6717) for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the ninth judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 6718) to transfer the administration of the affairs of Federal intermediate credit banks to the Department of Agriculture and the establishing of a revolving fund to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture for agricultural-credit purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEA: A bill (H. R. 6719) to authorize the Secretary of War to donate two bronze cannon to Fort Humboldt Post, No. 212, American Legion, Eureka, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 6720) to provide that for certain purposes under the Federal reserve act all United

States bonds shall bear the circulation privilege; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 6721) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with certain public works at the United States naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 6722) to provide for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in alleys in the District of Columbia, and for the replatting and development of squares containing inhabited alleys, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, safety, and welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6723) amending the Webb-Kenyon Act, divesting liquors and beverages of certain alcoholic contents of their interstate character in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6724) to provide for a 5-day week for certain Government employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 6725) to incorporate the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 6726) to grant additional legislative power to the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Alaska to conserve, protect, and manage the salmon and other fisheries in said Territory, the game, fur-bearing, and other wild animals, and game and other wild birds therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6727) to authorize the leasing of the Muscle Shoals property upon certain terms and conditions to provide for the national defense and for the regulation of interstate commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 6728) fixing the salaries of United States commissioners in Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6729) providing for the improvement and extension of the game-breeding and refuge areas in the Wichita National Forest and Game Preserve in the State of Oklahoma, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 6730) to extend the time within which suits may be brought on yearly renewable term insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6731) to amend section 19 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 6732) to extend the facilities of the Public Health Service to seamen on Government vessels not in the Military or Naval Establishments; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6733) for estimates necessary for the proper maintenance of the flood-control works at Lowell Creek, Seward, Alaska; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 6734) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize payment of six months' death gratuity to dependent relatives of officers, enlisted men, or nurses whose death results from wounds or disease not resulting from their own misconduct," approved May 22, 1928; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6735) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to fix the clothing allowance for enlisted men of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 6736) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Cushing, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOGG of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6737) to provide dependency allowances for widows, children, and parents of

certain deceased World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6738) granting a pension to widows and dependent children of World War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 6739) to amend the authorization contained in the act of Congress approved March 4, 1929, for the acquisition of site and construction of building in Jackson, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 6740) to authorize the creation of organized rural communities to demonstrate methods of reclamation and benefits of planned rural development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 6741) to authorize the coinage of silver 50-cent, 25-cent, and 10-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HOGG of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6742) to amend section 25 (e) (3) of the revenue act of 1928 (U. S. C., Sup. V, appendix, title 26, section 25 (e) (3)), by providing for portion of credit of deceased spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6743) to authorize the purchase by the city of Myrtle Point, Oreg., of certain lands formerly embraced in the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and revested in the United States by the act approved June 9, 1916; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6744) to provide for the Government purchase of American goods; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 6745) to protect labor, granting assistance to old and disabled persons, for the payment of old-age pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6746) for the protection of the public health by providing clothing for unemployed and destitute citizens; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 6747) to repeal and reenact with amendments section 315 of Title III in the tariff act of September 21, 1922, known as the flexible provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGUGIN: A bill (H. R. 6748) providing for an emergency decrease for a period of two years in the salaries paid for certain offices and places of employment with the Government of the United States of America; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6989) creating the Federal farm-loan trust; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FISH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 166) to establish a commission to be known as a commission on a national museum of engineering and industry; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 167) to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of the Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, to authorize the letting of the Muscle Shoals properties under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CABLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 168) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by giving the President authority to veto distinct items of appropriation of money in any act passed by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 169) against any foreign interference in our internal affairs through the creation of centers to inculcate foreign ideals and allegiance in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 170) authorizing the President to appoint a nonpartisan board of 25 members to study and report conclusions upon ways,

means, and methods to rehabilitate business conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOSS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) proposing an amendment to Article V of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULMER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 172) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned cotton by the governors of the various States through the Red Cross and other organizations for the relief of people in distress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 8) to provide for an inquiry with regard to procedure in impeachment cases; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) providing for the distribution of hours of employment during the present business depression; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 85) to abolish the custom of appropriating money from the contingent fund of the House in connection with funerals of deceased Members of Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FISH: Resolution (H. Res. 86) authorizing an investigation of the activities of Fascists and anti-Fascists in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLLIER: Resolution (H. Res. 87) providing for the consideration of H. R. 6662, a bill to amend the tariff act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 6749) for the relief of Howard Donovan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 6750) granting an increase of pension to William E. Lytle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6751) granting an increase of pension to Mary Greentree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6752) granting an increase of pension to Florence I. Earnhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6753) granting an increase of pension to Kate Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6754) granting a pension to Albert J. Simmons, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 6755) granting an increase of pension to Susan I. Queen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 6756) granting a pension to Della Dabbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 6757) for the relief of William T. Murphy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6758) for the relief of Matthew Grady; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6759) for the relief of Jacob Durrenberger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 6760) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Eberly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 6761) granting a pension to Addie L. Shugars, widow of Samuel McC. Clingan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 6762) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Shillenburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6763) granting an increase of pension to Permelia C. Jefferys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6764) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Feather; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 6765) for the relief of Charles W. Eaton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 6766) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Arthur A. Klein to the position and rank of second lieutenant in the United States Army and immediately retire him with the rank and

pay held by him at the time of his discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 6767) to reimburse Dr. Philip Suriani; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARTER of Wyoming: A bill (H. R. 6768) for the relief of William Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 6769) granting a pension to Henry Knight; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6770) granting a pension to Ida M. Varble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 6771) granting an increase in pension to Sarah E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6772) granting an increase in pension to Mary Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAVEZ: A bill (H. R. 6773) authorizing the reimbursement of Edward B. Wheeler and the State Investment Co. for the loss of certain lands in the Mora Grant, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6774) to authorize amendment of the act of February 25, 1927, for the payment of damages caused by reason of the overflow of the Rio Grande on August 17, 1921; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6775) for the relief of Arthur B. Hastie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6776) for the relief of John W. Harvey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6777) granting a pension to Andrew M. Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6778) granting a pension to Charles Cerny; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6779) granting a pension to Elmer Gilbert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6780) granting a pension to William D. Kershner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6781) for the relief of Albert Gonzales; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6782) for the relief of Sigmund Lindauer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6783) for the relief of Thomas F. Cooney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6784) for the relief of S. F. Stacher; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6785) for the relief of Jose Ramon Cordova; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6786) for the relief of Martin E. Riley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6787) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Holden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6788) for the relief of Howard S. Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6789) for the relief of Lester E. Uppmeyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRALI: A bill (H. R. 6790) granting a pension to Charles Pettis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6791) for the relief of John A. Watson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6792) granting a pension to Meyer George Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6793) for the relief of Joseph McRay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6794) granting a pension to Percy F. Mott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 6795) granting a pension to Anna T. Walsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6796) granting a pension to Marcus M. Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROSSE: A bill (H. R. 6797) for the relief of Samuel Weinstein; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6798) to authorize the President to reinstate Guy H. B. Smith, formerly captain, Fourth United States Infantry, in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6799) granting a pension to Pearl A. Pearson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 6800) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin C. Longist; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 6801) to compensate Grace Venable; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 6802) granting a pension to John W. Dilts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6803) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to enroll on the tribal rolls of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations all Choctaw and Chickasaw claimants whose names appear in the citizenship cases hereinafter mentioned and who were duly and legally enrolled by the Federal court, and the heirs now living of all such claimants, born prior to the closing of said tribal rolls by an act of Congress; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6804) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6805) granting an increase of pension to Jessie D. Wheat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6806) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Westlake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6807) granting an increase of pension to Amy Barns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6808) granting a pension to William R. Barrett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6809) for the relief of Sheldon R. Purdy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 6810) for the relief of Clayton Fuson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6811) for the relief of Howard Henderson Richardson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, A bill (H. R. 6812) granting a pension to Marion Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6813) for the relief of William Solomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6814) for the relief of Rosco C. Baird; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6815) granting a pension to Angeline Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6816) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wooton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 6817) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 6818) for the relief of David W. Shuler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6819) granting a pension to Walter T. Rekling; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAREER: A bill (H. R. 6820) granting a pension to James B. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLEN: A bill (H. R. 6821) for the relief of Nicholas Sevaljevick (now known as Nicholas Hornacky); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6822) granting an increase of pension to Mary Clifton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6823) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Gasaway (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6824) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Martin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILCHRIST: A bill (H. R. 6825) for the relief of Harry E. Blomgren; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 6826) granting a pension to Sarah E. Henry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FIESINGER: A bill (H. R. 6827) granting a pension to Joseph Dickens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAINES: A bill (H. R. 6828) for the relief of Caroline H. Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 6829) granting a pension to Celia E. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6830) granting a pension to Alice Payton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 6831) granting an increase of pension to Ida L. Von. Harten; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H. R. 6832) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 6833) granting an increase of pension to Marion M. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6834) for the relief of Walter C. Arnold; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (6835) to authorize the presentation to E. T. Banks of a distinguished-service cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6836) granting a pension to Joseph Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6837) for the relief of Walter Conley Arnold; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6838) granting a pension to Marion T. Winters; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HESS: A bill (H. R. 6839) granting a pension to Irene Wilkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6840) for the relief of Harvey K. Meyer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOGG of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6841) granting an increase of pension to Hester Zegenfus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6842) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6843) granting a pension to Drusilla Merchant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6844) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Weldon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6845) granting an increase of pension to Alice McLeod; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 6846) for the relief of T. W. Kirkman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6847) for the relief of Oda Herbert Plowman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 6848) granting a pension to Ella V. Zeluff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6849) granting an increase of pension to Antha A. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HORR: A bill (H. R. 6850) granting an increase of pension to John S. Monahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6851) to reimburse Gottlieb Stock for losses of real and personal property by fire caused by the negligence of two prohibition agents; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 6852) to enroll on the citizenship rolls certain persons of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations or Tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6853) granting a pension to Jennie Parker Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 6854) for the relief of the heirs of O. M. Dodgen, alias C. M. Dodgen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6855) for the relief of Sam Echols; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6856) granting an increase of pension to Priscilla Hurt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 6857) granting an increase of pension to Dorinda Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6858) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Smith, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 6859) granting a pension to Mary E. Moen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6860) for the relief of Florence Northcott Hannas; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6861) for the relief of the Jewish committee for personal service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6862) for the relief of John E. Erwin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6863) to correct the naval record of William G. Dingley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6864) for the relief of Forrest D. Stout; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 6865) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 6866) granting a pension to George N. Longfellow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 6867) granting a pension to Charles E. Morris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6868) granting an increase of pension to Catherine J. Cupp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 6869) for the relief of George W. Allison; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6870) granting a pension to Alice Coe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6871) granting a pension to Hattie G. Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6872) for the relief of Elbert L. Grove; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6873) for the relief of James W. Currie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON: A bill (H. R. 6874) granting an increase of pension to Alice L. Havis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LARRABEE: A bill (H. R. 6875) granting an increase of pension to Nora A. Kitchen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LICHTENWALNER: A bill (H. R. 6876) granting a pension to Daniel Z. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 6877) granting Clarence M. Dow the privilege of filing application for benefits under the emergency officers' retirement act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LICHTENWALNER: A bill (H. R. 6878) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus G. Fox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6879) for the relief of Herman C. Mentzel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 6880) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Calfee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6881) granting an increase of pension to Telitha A. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6882) granting a pension to Bettie Lee Lomax; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 6883) granting an increase of pension to Mollie B. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6884) granting an increase of pension to Lena Many; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 6885) granting an increase of pension to Addie Bryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEST: A bill (H. R. 6886) granting a pension to John A. James; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McGUGIN: A bill (H. R. 6887) for the relief of Frederick Roland Hickey; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 6888) for the relief of Patrick J. Solon, lieutenant, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6889) granting a pension to Leroy Bolton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 6890) for the relief of the Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6891) granting a pension to Levina E. Starks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6892) for the relief of Cretia Downing; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 6893) granting an increase of pension to Edith Stickels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6894) granting an increase of pension to Marcella J. Hutchins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6895) granting a pension to Lorella Roller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6896) granting an increase of pension to Henry Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6897) granting a pension to Laura Slotterbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 6898) granting an increase of pension to Melissa A. Haskell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6899) granting a pension to Mary L. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6900) granting a pension to Arthur S. Poulin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6901) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth O'Keefe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6902) granting an increase of pension to Abigail J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6903) granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 6904) granting an increase of pension to Kate M. Farrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6905) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. De Silva; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 6906) for the relief of Frasier Matthews Porcher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 6907) granting an increase of pension to Hannah R. Byrne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6908) granting an increase of pension to Maria O. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 6909) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Thornton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 6910) granting a pension to Agatha O'Brien; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 6911) granting a pension to James A. McMasters; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 6912) granting an increase of pension to Jane Battin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 6913) granting a pension to Eddie Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6914) granting a pension to John Mienkowski; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6915) granting a pension to Blaine Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6916) granting a pension to Hakon B. Duee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6917) for the relief of Kaid Ahmad; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6918) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Noltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEIBERLING: A bill (H. R. 6919) granting a pension to Sarah Penberthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHANNON: A bill (H. R. 6920) granting a pension to Edward A. Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6921) granting an increase of pension to Waldo A. Chapman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6922) granting a pension to Mary A. Shull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 6923) granting an increase of pension to Margaret V. Besa; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6924) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Ann McNiece; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKS: A bill (H. R. 6925) granting a pension to Emma Colt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6926) granting a pension to Phoebe D. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6927) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6928) granting a pension to Adda Leslie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6929) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6930) extending the provisions of the pension laws relating to Indian war veterans to Capt. H. M. Hodges's company, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6931) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ann Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6932) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hathaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 6933) for the relief of Zoe A. Tilghman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6934) for the relief of Caesar F. Simmons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 6935) to reinstate Robert D. Ross as midshipman in the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 6936) granting a pension to James H. Wright, Jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6937) granting a pension to Andrew J. Cross; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6938) granting a pension to John A. Helms; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6939) granting an increase of pension to Sterling G. Hunter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6940) granting a pension to Conrad A. Bell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6941) granting a pension to Ross Huston Horner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6942) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Guy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6943) granting a pension to Asa J. Lutes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6944) granting an increase of pension to James M. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6945) granting an increase of pension to Mary Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6946) granting a pension to Reatha Reneau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6947) granting a pension to Allie M. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6948) granting a pension to Ott Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6949) for the relief of Minnie Adsmond; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6950) granting an increase of pension to William C. Hagelgans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6951) granting a pension to W. W. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6952) for relief of Albert Harron; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6953) granting a pension to Hiram M. Graves; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6954) granting a pension to Zubie Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6955) for the relief of M. E. Parmelee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6956) for the relief of Clark Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6957) granting a pension to Hannah E. Koontz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6958) granting a pension to John J. Rosier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6959) granting a pension to James A. Riggs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6960) granting a pension to Ben Harrison Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6961) granting a pension to Charles Farris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6962) granting a pension to Nancy Lewallen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6963) for the relief of Thomas Green; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6964) for the relief of Samuel H. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H. R. 6965) granting a pension to Hattie House; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6966) granting a pension to Nicholas O'Connell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6967) granting a pension to Robert S. Marshall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6968) granting an increase of pension to Margaret R. F. Newell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 6969) granting a pension to Osep N. Ruben; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6970) granting a pension to Lewis Stamper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6971) granting a pension to Dicey Terry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6972) granting a pension to Mima White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 6973) for the relief of Anna L. Auchenbach; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 6974) granting a pension to John V. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6975) for the relief of Rufus Hunter Blackwell, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6976) for the relief of Edna Broome; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEST: A bill (H. R. 6977) granting a pension to Lena Leota Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6978) granting a pension to Susan R. Baughman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6979) granting a pension to Florence J. Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6980) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Stough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 6981) granting a pension to Isabel Warner, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 6982) for the relief of C. H. Hoogendorn; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6983) for the relief of Erik Nylen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6984) granting a pension to Charles Thornton Newhall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6985) granting a pension to Mary Miller Rans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 6986) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN: A bill (H. R. 6987) granting a pension to James R. M. Ash; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON: A bill (H. R. 6988) granting a pension to Rose Harkin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 165) providing that the last will and testament of Nathan Rounds be declined by the Government of the United States and the estate be discharged from obligation; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

198. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of the soldiers of the World War of Haywood County, N. C., for paying off the adjusted-service certificates in full; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

199. By Mr. WATSON: Resolution passed by the Pennsylvania Committee for Total Disarmament, urging immediate passage of the proposed constitutional amendment, Senate Joint Resolution No. 3; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

200. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of the Crate-Havelock Farmers Union, Local No. 144, Chippewa County, Minn., protesting against the repeal of the agricultural marketing act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

201. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Evansville, Minn., opposing a referendum on the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

202. Also, petition of Release Lodge, No. 579, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Montevideo, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 1197; to the Committee on Agriculture.

203. Also, petition of Renville County (Minn.) farm bureau, urging enactment of Senate bill 1197; to the Committee on Agriculture.

204. Also, petition of Osakis (Minn.) National Farm Loan Association, urging a moratorium on farm loans for three years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

205. Also, petition of Hector (Minn.) unit of the Farmers Union, urging passage of Senate bill 1197; to the Committee on Agriculture.

206. Also, petition of Chippewa County (Minn.) division of the Farmers Educational Cooperative Union of America, urging retention of the Federal farm act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

207. Also, petition of Release Lodge, No. 579, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Montevideo, Minn., urging payment of balance of the soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

208. By Mr. HALL of Mississippi: Petition by I. S. Dixon and other citizens of Mississippi, requesting that Congress enact legislation immediately calling for the payment in cash of the balance of the adjusted-compensation certificates of the World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

209. By Mr. NELSON of Maine: Council order and resolutions of the governor and council of the State of Maine, submitting the joint resolution of the executive committees of the Maine State Grange, Kennebec Valley Protective Association, and Maine Lumbermen and Landowners Association, urging legislation to protect the pulpwood industry from foreign competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

210. By Mr. SNOW: Petition of W. L. Stadig and many other citizens of Wallagras, Me., favoring a duty on pulp and fire wood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

211. By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial by William D. Martin Post, No. 15, Sandpoint, Idaho, favoring immediate payment in full of adjusted compensation to World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

212. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, urging the enactment of legislation for the disposition of the Muscle Shoals properties in accordance with the said intent and purpose of the original legislation with reference thereto, as proposed by Senator NORRIS, and that, in the disposition of said properties they be devoted primarily to the manufacture of fertilizer in completed form to be sold to the farmers of the Nation and thereby result in some relief to distressed agriculture; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

213. Also, petition of the metropolitan section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, approving such revisions of the wording in the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1933 as will effect a more equi-

table allocation of funds to the several States and which will provide for the complete utilization of the funds made available by Congress for mapping purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

214. Also, petition of members of the New York Produce Exchange, recommending to the Congress of the United States that the eighteenth amendment should be promptly and unconditionally repealed, and that Congress shall submit to conventions of the peoples of the various States an amendment to the Federal Constitution repealing said eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

215. Also, petition of the New York Academy of Medicine, voicing its disapproval of those portions of the Volstead Act which invade the right of the State of New York to regulate the practice of medicine within its own borders, and which deprive the physician of his right to the free exercise of his judgment in the practice of his profession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

216. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of Howard W. Hinman, major, Infantry Reserve, Oklahoma City, Okla., protesting against contemplated reductions in military appropriations for the coming fiscal year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

217. Also, petition of delegates at the Western Governors' Conference in Portland, Oreg., petitioning Congress to levy a tariff on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

218. Also, petition of the board of directors of the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association, urging opposition to any effort to place the administration of the agricultural marketing act under the supervision and control of the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

219. Also, petition of the Printing Industry of Oklahoma City (Inc.), protesting against suggested postal rate increase on first-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

220. Also, petition of the Ponca City (Okla.) Automobile Dealers' Association, protesting against imposition of a 5 per cent tax on the sale of automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

221. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Kay Halsell, of Bryan, Tex., opposing a sales tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

222. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of Sheep and Goat Raisers' Association of Texas, for the designation by the United States Government of substation No. 14 at Sonora, Tex., as a southwestern Federal experiment station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

223. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of De Witt C. Wynn and a number of other ex-service men of Polk County, Ga., asking for the payment in full of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

224. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Western Governors' Conference, through its secretary, George C. Sutherland, Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring a tariff on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

225. Also, petition of Simons-Stewart Co. (Inc.), New York City, opposing further tax on automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

226. By Mrs. KAHN: Petition of California Farmers' Convention, urging an adequate tariff as the foundation of farm relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

227. Also, petition of California Farmers' Convention, urging the continuation of the activities of the Federal Farm Board; to the Committee on Agriculture.

228. By Mr. HORN: Petition of Snohomish County Pomona Grange, No. 12, of Arlington, Wash., against the proposed sales tax, and in favor of an income tax based on earning power; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

229. By Mr. O'CONNOR: Resolutions of the board of managers of the New York Produce Exchange, and ratified by the members of the exchange by vote of 617 to 14, calling for repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

230. Petition of delegates at the Western Governors' Conference in Portland, Oreg., urging Congress to levy a tariff on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

231. Also, petition of Henry Strauss, Manila, P. I., urging a subsidy to help American industries and a discriminating tariff on Japanese manufactures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

232. Also, petition of Wisconsin Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, Ripon, Wis., urging the passage of House Joint Resolution 320, proposed constitutional amendment to prohibit sectarian appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

233. Also, petition of Tri-Cities Central Labor Council, Muscle Shoals and vicinity, Sheffield, Ala., urging that final legislation be enacted for the disposition of Muscle Shoals properties; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

234. Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, urging legislation to grant to members of the National Farm Loan Associations a 3-year moratorium on mortgage indebtedness; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1932

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou before whose all-searching sight darkness dissolveth like a dream; breathe on us now with lucid morning's fragrant breath the spirit of Thy calm as we embark upon uncharted seas, empurpled and begloomed by clouds of doubt arising from the mists of our own thought. Be Thou our chart and compass in this great emprise on which the destinies of nations now await, that by Thy presence we may know that Thou in whom we live and move wilt bring us to the haven of our hopes, molding to consummation where we fail, crowning with benediction every faithful deed. Lift from our hearts the heavy burden, the bewildering care that weighs us down, that we may feel the pulsing tenderness of God in each faint heart clasp of our human world. We would not ask for more, we dare not ask for less; yet what we ask is only in the Savior's name and for His own dear sake. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. FESS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Couzens	Hull	Sheppard
Austin	Cutting	Johnson	Shipstead
Bailey	Dale	Jones	Shortridge
Barbour	Davis	Kean	Smith
Barkley	Dickinson	Kendrick	Steiner
Bingham	Dill	Keyes	Swanson
Black	Fess	King	Thomas, Idaho
Blaine	Fletcher	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Frazier	Logan	Townsend
Bratton	George	McGill	Trammell
Brookhart	Glass	McKellar	Vandenberg
Broussard	Glenn	McNary	Wagner
Bulkeley	Gore	Metcalf	Walcott
Bulow	Hale	Morrison	Walsh, Mass.
Brynes	Harris	Moses	Walsh, Mont.
Capper	Harrison	Neely	Waterman
Caraway	Hastings	Norbeck	Watson
Connally	Hatfield	Norris	Wheeler
Coolidge	Hayden	Nye	White
Copeland	Hebert	Robinson, Ark.	
Costigan	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	

MR. KENDRICK. My colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] is necessarily absent on official business. I ask that this announcement may stand for all roll calls during the day.