

ing house of misery and agony of their homes. And as to the reason why they were in Nicaragua, and where they were set upon, it must be answered that it was by those who felt they were justified in repelling an aggression from strangers, our people, sir, up to the present time all we get from our Government as explanation—with the expiration of nearly 24 hours—is the fact that these men were engaged in repelling what they claim was an invasion or assault by those of Nicaragua who are charged in Nicaragua with being "irregulars."

In other words—let us be to the point—we, of the United States, have assumed to establish a political administration in a distant foreign country, in Central America, particularly in Nicaragua, in order that one political administration shall be maintained there as against its rivals, because our favorite, chosen as such, is under some pledge that it will guarantee the payment of the debts which have been incurred in Nicaragua in behalf of American private banking interests of the United States. We pledge the lives of our young men and of our soldiers as collection agencies in behalf of these private interests until these American young men are murdered, and their mangled bodies brought back to their loved ones, to whom the only reply America can make—when her American citizens are thus disposed of in such ruthless, cruel, and inhuman manner—is that they have lent their children to sustain an administration of a distant country in power because the officials of that political power have promised to secure the return of money of private interests which has been lent within that land.

Mr. President, I protest against it. I protest in behalf of America. We have made an enemy of nearly every country of South and Central America, by our course. Our Nation has not a friend in any republic of Central or South America. La Prensa, the great publication of Buenos Aires, came out only shortly denouncing what we call our Monroe doctrine, because of these adventures of trespass on our part, which they claim are part of a movement by the United States to take possession by force of these States of Central America.

Mr. President, the distinguished ex-Secretary of State, now the Chief Justice of the United States, had to listen to himself hissed in Habana at a Pan American meet, and before the world, our country was held up as enduring that scorn and contumely because of conduct of the United States that had transpired in Haiti and Santo Domingo similar to this invasion which has been directed in Nicaragua.

We learn no lessons, we profit by no example, we multiply our conduct of trespass and invasion, we inherit the consequence upon America. We have now reached the point where, coolly and calmly, we endure the murder of children of America by foreign forces without even a protest.

Mr. President, if there be no other voice, I lift my own to register the protest of an American official against this affront to the American justice of our land. I ask, sir, that there shall be some course taken from official authority directing our Government and this administration to return to American principles; withdraw the marines, bring them home, let them be in America, let them be used to defend America, where America is assailed, but let our soldiers return to their country.

If these private bankers desire to lend their money to these countries, that is for them. Then let them take such steps to protect their securities as our American bankers are only permitted if they lend anywhere in the United States or Europe—to the courts of the country, or whatever source of help they may seek by private means. But let us end this using the children of America as extra pledges to the security of the private bankers, the forfeit of the pledge being the lives of these sons of our land. Mr. President, thereafter we may move once again toward reviving the friendship of South and Central America and thus justify the policy of the Monroe doctrine and reestablish that friendship which we sought to extend them in the hope that reciprocity might avail, which in trade or in kindness would greatly profit us.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for allowing me this moment, and particularly the assistant leader of the majority, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], permitting displacing the program that I might assert my protest against longer continuing existing conditions such as I denounce. I express my hope and my plea for my country to return to American principles for the preservation of American lives under the just doctrines of an American constitutional government.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 3 o'clock p. m.) adjourned until Monday, April 25, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art the guide of mankind, wilt Thou let Thy providence bring forth in our own beloved land the fruits of righteousness, contentment, and prosperity? Bless us with the wonderful graces of the Master—with His courage, with His forbearance, and with His sympathy for all men. May all nations be united in faith and hope. Take out of every conflict the sting of bitterness, of selfishness, that a true feeling of brotherhood and cooperation may be felt throughout the world. May prejudice flee away, may all suspicion disappear, and may all peoples come to the knowledge of the Lord God as their Heavenly Father upon earth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT OF GRADUATES OF NAVAL ACADEMY, 1932

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8083) providing for the appointment as ensigns in the line of the Navy of all midshipmen who graduate from the Naval Academy in 1932, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. I have consulted the ranking minority member on the committee, and this request is agreeable to him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 8083, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "in 1932."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "until after 1936."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "authorized."

Page 1, line 9, after "officers" where it appears the first time, insert "otherwise authorized by law."

Page 1, line 10, after "computation," insert "and shall be excluded from any computation made for the purpose of determining the authorized number of line officers in any grade on the active list above the grade of lieutenant, junior grade, until the total number of line officers shall have been reduced below the number otherwise authorized by law."

Page 1, after line 10, insert:

"Sec. 2. That all commissions hereafter issued as ensigns in the line of the Navy, second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, and in the lowest commissioned grades of the Staff Corps of the Navy with the rank of ensign, may be revoked by the Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at any time during a period of two years from the dates of such commissions, and each officer whose commission is so revoked shall be discharged from the service with not more than one year's pay. The rank of such officers of the same date of commission among themselves at the end of said period shall be determined by boards of officers under such rules as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, and the recommendations of such boards shall be final when approved by him."

Page 1, after line 10, insert:

"Sec. 3. That after January 1, 1933, the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy for each Senator,

Representative, Delegate in Congress, Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, and the District of Columbia, by the act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 140; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 1032), shall be reduced to two: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall exclude from the United States Naval Academy any midshipman appointed thereto prior to January 1, 1933."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act providing for the appointment as ensigns in the line of the Navy of all midshipmen who graduate from the Naval Academy, and for other purposes."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is impossible for anyone to know just what those amendments mean, except the provision for the reduction of cadets from three to two, with which I am in accord.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I shall explain exactly what the Senate amendments do. They propose to grant commissions to all midshipmen who graduate in future years, irrespective of whether or not we need them, and after they have put them in the fleet, leave discretion with the Secretary to weed them out. The amendments further propose to reduce the midshipmen from 2 to 3 years, to change the law as it is from 5 to 2, and make it permanently 2. The thought in my mind is this: This is a matter which should go to conference, because I am thoroughly of the opinion that there is no justification for Congress at this time going on record as saying that irrespective of whether we need the midshipmen they will get commissions. I think a conference report should be submitted permitting 50 per cent commissions to be granted, and 50 per cent in the years to come, until the number is brought down within the 4 per cent provided by law. That is the reason I am asking that it go to conference.

Mr. BYRNS. As the gentleman knows, I was very much opposed to the bill as it originally passed the House, because I have never believed that it is proper to commission 261 young men who have graduated when the department itself says that it has no need for them. I believe it is an unnecessary and unjustifiable expense and a charge upon the Treasury for the next 30 or 40 years. However, the House has acted upon that, as has the Senate. I do not think we should go any farther, however.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman. If we adopt the Senate amendments as they are, it means that next year and the year after and the year after every midshipman who graduates gets his commission. I am opposed to that. I want only enough midshipmen to be put into the service that the Navy requires, and that is the reason I asked to go to conference.

Mr. BYRNS. With that understanding, I have no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman understands this, that the Senate amendments mean that the present graduating class, every one of them, will get their commissions; but there is discretionary power in the Secretary after probably two years at sea to weed out 50 per cent. The reason for commissioning the whole class now is because it may so happen that a boy who was at the foot of the class this year will develop and be a superior officer to the one who graduates with a higher rank.

Mr. BYRNS. That applies to the class which will graduate in June?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. The House and the Senate have already approved that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; the House has not. It approved the proposition to give everyone his commission and let him stay in the Navy, irrespective of any probationary period.

Mr. BYRNS. Whatever I may think about the fact that 261 ensigns are going to be put into the service when they are not needed, according to the statement of the Navy Department, does not now matter, for that is behind us. As I understand, the Senate amendment to which the gentleman refers will to a certain extent relieve that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNS. By giving the Secretary the right to weed them out.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; and it goes one step farther and commissions future classes irrespective of whether we need them or not.

Mr. BYRNS. And the gentleman is opposed to that?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Has the gentleman ever worked out in his own mind some kind of a provision that when these graduates are commissioned, should they be retired within a period of one year, the Government will not be called upon to give them retirement pay for the balance of their lives?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If they go out under the Senate amendment they will go out with one year's pay and will not be placed upon the retired list.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Reserving the right further to object, is it the gentleman's desire, if this bill should go to conference, to give each one of the conferees the opportunity of sitting in on all of the deliberations?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, it would be no conference unless each Member had a right to participate. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] will be a member of the conference committee, and I assure the gentleman he will have ample opportunity to express his views there and in the House also.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. It has been the policy in the past for two or three to get together and agree upon a report and then notify the other members afterwards.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That does not apply where I serve upon a conference committee.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. Following the question by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], the gentleman, of course, knows that under the McClintic amendment to the House bill these boys graduating from the academy can not possibly go above the grade of ensign no matter how long they stay in the service.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Surely.

Mr. BROWNING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BROWNING. Did I understand the gentleman to say he was in accord with that part of the Senate amendment which permitted the Secretary of the Navy to weed out certain officers?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am; and to prohibit other classes from graduating unless they are needed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON of Georgia, McCLINTIC of Oklahoma, DREWRY, BRITTEN, and DARROW.

PRINTING HEARINGS BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, there is a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) introduced by Senator SMOOT for certain printing that is needed very badly by the committee of the Senate, and I now call up that resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 25

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Finance of the Senate be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed 1,500 additional copies of the consolidated hearings held before the committee during the current session on the bill (H. R. 10236) to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up another concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 18

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Manufactures of the Senate be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed 3,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the committee during the current session on the establishment of a national economic council.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STEVENSON: Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "three" and insert the word "one."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO CERTAIN SOLDIERS AND SAILORS OF THE CIVIL WAR, ETC.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 11290) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to this committee:

H. R. 517. Mary B. Pigg.	H. R. 1591. Christina M. Rockwell.
H. R. 555. Susie Leeson.	H. R. 1592. Wildras Boothe.
H. R. 580. Nancy A. Johnson.	H. R. 1601. Louesa A. Miller.
H. R. 616. Mahala Walter.	H. R. 1608. Sarah E. Fox.
H. R. 628. Sarah E. Huston.	H. R. 1609. Emily G. Van Luverder.
H. R. 629. Rosalie Edwards.	H. H. 1612. Alice J. Schrader.
H. R. 644. Fannie H. Burton.	H. R. 1613. Antoynett Brown.
H. R. 718. Grace V. Lawrence.	H. R. 1614. Emma Corbin.
H. R. 723. Julia A. Griffith.	H. R. 1615. Elizabeth Miller.
H. R. 726. Jane Bowser.	H. R. 1624. Mary J. Mayhew.
H. R. 733. Eliza J. Wilkinson.	H. R. 1633. Mattie Randolph.
H. R. 743. Mary E. Kistler.	H. R. 1676. Sarah E. Hermanstorfor.
H. R. 744. Lizzie Jones.	H. R. 1687. Belle S. McGary.
H. R. 748. Ruth Ryan.	H. R. 1689. Ida Madden.
H. R. 854. Effie T. McElhiney.	H. R. 1691. Helen E. Cushman.
H. R. 894. Achsa Tyler.	H. R. 1692. Margaret Tobin.
H. R. 984. Sarah E. Bradley.	H. R. 1693. Emma Bassett.
H. R. 986. Ellen D. Keck.	H. R. 1708. Susan A. Pitts.
H. R. 991. Elizabeth A. Crum.	H. R. 1736. Julia O. Woodard.
H. R. 993. Nora Dunlavy.	H. R. 1737. Victoria Culver.
H. R. 1003. Mary E. Kelley.	H. R. 1749. Rose J. Towner.
H. R. 1012. Margretta Pelton.	H. R. 1763. Minnie F. Rose.
H. R. 1063. Kate Couch.	H. R. 1838. H. Emma Streepy.
H. R. 1067. Jane Burns.	H. R. 1839. Melinda R. Probasco.
H. R. 1126. Catherine King.	H. R. 1858. Agnes M. Jackman.
H. R. 1150. Jennie Payson.	H. R. 1899. Eliza A. Callahan.
H. R. 1209. Ella I. Parsons.	H. R. 1909. Martha E. Worth.
H. R. 1232. Abigail Stone.	H. R. 1948. Sarah L. Calhoun.
H. R. 1242. Barbara Treuthart.	H. R. 1990. Sylvia I. Whiteman.
H. R. 1246. Ellen Lynch.	H. R. 2005. Julia Lyon.
H. R. 1354. Mary E. Lemmon.	H. R. 2011. Martha Kasinger.
H. R. 1417. Eudora McDonough.	H. R. 2017. Gorda James.
H. R. 1433. Helen F. Brady.	H. R. 2022. Emma M. Webb.
H. R. 1451. Mary C. Wilkerson.	H. R. 2061. Barbara Matthews.
H. R. 1487. Ida Adamson.	H. R. 2112. Mary E. Burchett.
H. R. 1492. Jane S. Murphy.	H. R. 2115. Margaret J. Allen.
H. R. 1504. Jane Salmons.	H. R. 2175. Abbie E. Rhoades.
H. R. 1517. Eliza Hindman.	H. R. 2260. Amanda Riddell.
H. R. 1522. Maria Berghoff.	H. R. 2299. Sarah E. Casebeer.
H. R. 1538. Doris Wehrs.	H. R. 2333. Mary J. Swisher.
H. R. 1539. Jemima Woolery.	H. R. 2335. Ella F. Stewart.
H. R. 1540. Sophia Brackmann.	H. R. 2395. Mary E. DeWitt.
H. R. 1541. Ruth C. Lindsey.	
H. R. 1542. Bettie J. Williams.	
H. R. 1574. Annie E. Santman.	

H. R. 2433. Johanna C. Nightingale.	H. R. 3600. Jennie R. Devoe.
H. R. 2454. Hannah A. Brittain.	H. R. 3650. Alice McCoy.
H. R. 2461. Mary J. Staples.	H. R. 3677. Mary Sage.
H. R. 2487. Abbie A. Rockwood.	H. R. 3684. Annie L. Tucker.
H. R. 2489. Mary E. Stevenson.	H. R. 3743. Agnes B. Smith.
H. R. 2520. Mary C. Hoyt.	H. R. 3749. Clara S. Hopple.
H. R. 2552. Lelia C. W. Lee.	H. R. 3763. Mary E. Riley.
H. R. 2554. Kittie G. Bozard.	H. R. 3823. Cordelia Stiles.
H. R. 2556. Evelyn C. Devereaux.	H. R. 3827. Mary A. Lindy.
H. R. 2557. Candis M. Frank.	H. R. 3829. Emma Sturdevant.
H. R. 2558. Alice Hultberg.	H. R. 3831. Elizabeth W. Barringer.
H. R. 2559. Lizzie S. Reed.	H. R. 3858. Cora Dawson.
H. R. 2561. Addie J. Wheeler.	H. R. 3870. Laura Joles.
H. R. 2562. Hannah M. Widdifield.	H. R. 3887. Katie Ingersoll.
H. R. 2563. Mary L. Wilson.	H. R. 3897. Barbara Burnett.
H. R. 2579. Anna L. Harman.	H. R. 3902. Sarah M. Curry.
H. R. 2590. Mary E. Grange.	H. R. 3914. Augusta E. Cutler.
H. R. 2612. Margaret T. Work.	H. R. 3915. Eliza W. Parkhurst.
H. R. 2615. Mary E. McIntosh.	H. R. 3917. Lucy A. Beckwith.
H. R. 2616. Mary M. McDowell.	H. R. 3946. Bettie A. Reese.
H. R. 2619. Sarah J. King.	H. R. 3983. Emma Zane.
H. R. 2620. Malinda Kane.	H. R. 4004. Clara C. Rogers.
H. R. 2657. Jessie Taylor.	H. R. 4007. Malissa M. Bower.
H. R. 2658. Ellen Wornom.	H. R. 4010. Hester Zegenfus.
H. R. 2659. Sarah E. Priestley.	H. R. 4016. Annie M. Montgomery.
H. R. 2660. Alice Bellville.	H. R. 4029. Anzina L. Harper.
H. R. 2663. Delia Parmentier.	H. R. 4077. Mary Miller.
H. R. 2664. Ruth A. Parker.	H. R. 4083. Charles M. Phillips.
H. R. 2678. Amanda Douglass.	H. R. 4138. Sarah E. Weekley.
H. R. 2718. Lucretia M. Young.	H. R. 4175. Iantha Bohall.
H. R. 2737. Mary L. Kelter.	H. R. 4179. Flora Bailey.
H. R. 2738. Mary A. Brown.	H. R. 4185. Eulise M. Hubbard.
H. R. 2740. Rachel D. Day.	H. R. 4190. Sarah E. Jackson.
H. R. 2742. Elizabeth Fadeley.	H. R. 4202. Jane Mitchell.
H. R. 2743. Carrie A. Eagin.	H. R. 4203. Julia Christison.
H. R. 2745. Martha Weiser.	H. R. 4214. Clara L. Waggoner.
H. R. 2748. Margaret C. Lee.	H. R. 4251. George Brewer.
H. R. 2759. Martha Weisher.	H. R. 4336. Cynthia E. Ball.
H. R. 2806. Gertrude Storck.	H. R. 4374. Mary E. Wray.
H. R. 2845. Mary A. Healy.	H. R. 4381. Addie E. Ray.
H. R. 2851. Julia Dolan.	H. R. 4382. Margaret E. Cowan.
H. R. 2852. Kate Snow.	H. R. 4383. Jane Blakely.
H. R. 2853. Mary E. Parker.	H. R. 4413. Mary A. Widel.
H. R. 2855. Anna King.	H. R. 4414. Thomas N. Burris.
H. R. 2858. Nancy J. Smith.	H. R. 4437. Carrie Stidham.
H. R. 2859. Susan J. Waldo.	H. R. 4442. Rebecca J. Gard.
H. R. 2860. Margaret Smith.	H. R. 4466. Katherine Shaffer.
H. R. 2861. Elizabeth M. Schoonover.	H. R. 4470. Jane Davis.
H. R. 2862. Annie A. Moneypenney.	H. R. 4473. Mary Shipp.
H. R. 2865. Sarah A. Nutter.	H. R. 4477. Rachel J. Carson.
H. R. 2867. Mary E. Hart.	H. R. 4758. Anna M. Reddell.
H. R. 2869. Julia A. Duncan.	H. R. 4759. Mary J. Trallor.
H. R. 2870. Sarah A. Bush.	H. R. 4761. Nan A. Benson.
H. R. 2955. Lucinda Bratcher.	H. R. 4762. Frances E. Newton.
H. R. 2972. Anna E. Thompson.	H. R. 4770. Sherman King.
H. R. 2974. Louisa Reynolds.	H. R. 4808. Barbara Price.
H. R. 2977. Lillian M. Hendrickson.	H. R. 4853. Emma Lillis.
H. R. 2979. Clarisse E. Paris.	H. R. 4879. Mary M. Ball.
H. R. 2983. Sarah J. Austin.	H. R. 4880. Marietta V. Fox.
H. R. 2986. Patience Witherow.	H. R. 4882. Matilda A. Hueth.
H. R. 2989. Harriet B. Slater.	H. R. 4889. Ella F. Bartlett.
H. R. 2991. Hettie A. Reed.	H. R. 4951. Hannah Sims.
H. R. 2995. Sarah Lynn.	H. R. 4979. Hannah D. Warren.
H. R. 2996. Matilda Hensel.	H. R. 4998. Elizabeth Frasher.
H. R. 2997. Margaret J. Duncan.	H. R. 5010. Agnes F. B. Overlander.
H. R. 3004. Carrie S. Kenney.	H. R. 5056. Mary E. Ward.
H. R. 3043. Jennie E. Key.	H. R. 5155. Drusilla J. Tremain.
H. R. 3128. Mary Ebersol.	H. R. 5164. Mary E. Murphy.
H. R. 3406. Etta Noe.	H. R. 5194. Hattie E. Chappell.
H. R. 3408. Annie J. Henderson.	H. R. 5228. Agnes Robertson.
H. R. 3430. Bella J. Roberts.	H. R. 5229. Victoria B. Temple.
H. R. 3437. Roxana M. Woodcock.	H. R. 5237. Sarah S. Lawall.
H. R. 3441. Clara A. DeKay.	H. R. 5243. Silas S. Shepperd.
H. R. 3476. Emma R. Gibford.	H. R. 5376. Nettie Roberts.
H. R. 3477. Eunice E. Wait.	H. R. 5394. Nancy E. Allen.
H. R. 3478. Margaret C. Louthan.	H. R. 5395. Sarah L. Smith.
H. R. 3481. Peninnah Boose.	H. R. 5396. Margaret J. Barnes.
H. R. 3483. Emma J. Kinsel.	H. R. 5404. Sarah H. Porter.
H. R. 3484. Mary M. Keefer.	H. R. 5406. Alice Pulley.
H. R. 3488. Alice Paul.	H. R. 5410. Rosa J. Connolly.
H. R. 3490. Mary C. Spanogle.	H. R. 5412. Adaline Greer.
H. R. 3491. Barbara Weber.	H. R. 5415. Mary Danley.
H. R. 3503. Mary E. Blymyer.	H. R. 5426. Malinda Howard.
H. R. 3541. Elizabeth J. Patrick.	H. R. 5532. Susanah S. Dellinger.
H. R. 3546. Lettie M. Fleming.	H. R. 5570. Julia E. Wilkinson.
H. R. 3576. Ella S. T. Witbeck.	H. R. 5573. Kate Small.
H. R. 3585. Mary Binney.	H. R. 5574. Louise L. Pettengill.
H. R. 3587. Arvilla Holmes.	H. R. 5579. Emma L. Reinhart.
H. R. 3588. Anna M. Hull.	H. R. 5580. Martha Morphy.
H. R. 3590. Mary B. McDonald.	H. R. 5581. Elmira M. Webb.
H. R. 3591. Margaret Palmer.	H. R. 5582. Caroline J. Comfort.
H. R. 3594. Mary A. Graham.	H. R. 5583. Sallie S. Tyler.
H. R. 3598. Amanda Williams.	H. R. 5585. Laura A. Raymond.
	H. R. 5586. Melvina E. Johnson.
	H. R. 5683. Mattie Bumgardner.
	H. R. 5685. Sallie Miller.
	H. R. 5686. Mary Miller.

- H. R. 5687. Mariah Buchanan.
 H. R. 5729. Margaret A. Secrist.
 H. R. 5735. Myrtle B. Oldfield.
 H. R. 5736. Elizabeth Koonitz.
 H. R. 5750. Mary T. Wilmot.
 H. R. 5757. Maggie L. Adams.
 H. R. 5758. Sarah A. Lofton.
 H. R. 5760. Deillah Taylor.
 H. R. 5772. Alice Ward.
 H. R. 5776. Amanda Hoppock.
 H. R. 5800. Hattie V. Wilson.
 H. R. 5803. Harriet Andres.
 H. R. 5808. Jane Ault.
 H. R. 5812. Mary Spear.
 H. R. 5911. Martha J. Jones.
 H. R. 5927. Sarah E. Boler.
 H. R. 5954. Sylvia Abner.
 H. R. 5958. Lee Rigby.
 H. R. 6066. Hester A. Young.
 H. R. 6067. Elizabeth Dugan.
 H. R. 6068. Susan A. Taylor.
 H. R. 6069. Mary A. Lane.
 H. R. 6072. Addie Blunt.
 H. R. 6108. Ida Bloss.
 H. R. 6118. Anna De Nio.
 H. R. 6119. Emma F. Young.
 H. R. 6122. Mary E. Pritchard.
 H. R. 6139. Mary J. Easley.
 H. R. 6198. Ross C. Ramsay.
 H. R. 6221. Amanda M. Bastian.
 H. R. 6269. Mary J. Jacobus.
 H. R. 6279. Sarah J. Pittman.
 H. R. 6314. Adaline Shuman.
 H. R. 6316. Jennie M. Jenness.
 H. R. 6325. Anna S. Younts.
 H. R. 6331. Sarah A. Wright.
 H. R. 6346. Annie E. Livingston.
 H. R. 6353. Mary E. Adams.
 H. R. 6354. Fanny Branham.
 H. R. 6355. Amanda E. Wilson.
 H. R. 6366. Lucinda E. Hollopeter.
 H. R. 6414. Frederika Bushong.
 H. R. 6423. Minnie M. Davis.
 H. R. 6431. Mary Coombs.
 H. R. 6432. Emogene Allen.
 H. R. 6447. Malinda J. Jacobs.
 H. R. 6452. Mary J. Welch.
 H. R. 6465. Dora Nosler.
 H. R. 6472. Emma Grannis.
 H. R. 6473. Fannie H. Hadley.
 H. R. 6513. Eunice A. Collins.
 H. R. 6514. Nancy Fish.
 H. R. 6533. Sarah C. Kirkpatrick.
 H. R. 6534. Annie A. Riggs.
 H. R. 6535. Elizabeth E. West.
 H. R. 6571. Sylvia A. Dunn.
 H. R. 6603. Annie E. Shannon.
 H. R. 6611. Rhoda A. Ellis.
 H. R. 6615. Margaret E. Stephens.
 H. R. 6620. Mary Lewis.
 H. R. 6621. Amanda Gregg.
 H. R. 6622. Agnes Ireland.
 H. R. 6624. Sarah J. Shepard.
 H. R. 6630. Roxalina Davis.
 H. R. 6638. Athella P. Land.
 H. R. 6641. Della M. Allen.
 H. R. 6642. Sarah A. Bulluck.
 H. R. 6645. Katherine Garrison.
 H. R. 6751. Mary Greentree.
 H. R. 6752. Florence I. Earnhart.
 H. R. 6753. Kate Wallace.
 H. R. 6755. Susan I. Queen.
 H. R. 6761. Addie L. Shugars.
 H. R. 6763. Permelia C. Jefferys.
 H. R. 6764. Sarah A. Feather.
 H. R. 6771. Sarah E. Miller.
 H. R. 6772. Mary Reed.
 H. R. 6806. Sarah E. Westlake.
 H. R. 6807. Amy Barns.
 H. R. 6824. Mary J. Martin.
 H. R. 6849. Antha A. King.
 H. R. 6856. Priscilla Hurt.
 H. R. 6857. Dorinda Phillips.
 H. R. 6858. Rachel Smith.
 H. R. 6882. Bettie L. Lomax.
 H. R. 6894. Marcella J. Hutchins.
 H. R. 6898. Melissa A. Haskell.
 H. R. 6904. Kate M. Farrell.
 H. R. 6907. Hannah R. Byrne.
 H. R. 6908. Maria O. Fowler.
 H. R. 6923. Margaret V. Besa.
 H. R. 6927. Mary E. Peters.
 H. R. 6929. Emma J. Morse.
 H. R. 6972. Mima White.
 H. R. 6977. Lena L. Evans.
 H. R. 7016. Susan T. Ebbecke.
 H. R. 7017. Amanda L. Dare.
 H. R. 7022. Elvira M. Miller
- H. R. 7023. Ermina M. McKinney.
 H. R. 7027. Martha Benner.
 H. R. 7037. Margaret Vandresar.
 H. R. 7039. Mary E. Ferris.
 H. R. 7051. Mary R. Currier.
 H. R. 7058. Sarah A. Gilliland.
 H. R. 7070. Cora A. Cluff.
 H. R. 7100. Barbara Harley.
 H. R. 7124. Maria Stackhouse.
 H. R. 7169. Maggie Pickett.
 H. R. 7171. Margaret Thurman.
 H. R. 7172. Katharine M. DeWitt.
 H. R. 7202. Amanda Estep.
 H. R. 7206. Lydia Woody.
 H. R. 7214. Armenia Magann.
 H. R. 7261. Mary E. Mikesell.
 H. R. 7282. Mary Wilder.
 H. R. 7297. Lury E. Abramson.
 H. R. 7299. Sarah A. Egolph.
 H. R. 7302. Alice Drake.
 H. R. 7311. Mary E. Derrick.
 H. R. 7314. Laura N. Russell.
 H. R. 7316. Mary G. Sherwood.
 H. R. 7331. Martha Knight.
 H. R. 7333. Anna McCormick.
 H. R. 7334. Eliza A. Mercer.
 H. R. 7335. Mary J. Shirk.
 H. R. 7386. William H. Jones.
 H. R. 7394. Eddie Bassett.
 H. R. 7405. Emma Burdge.
 H. R. 7416. Catherine Wyms.
 H. R. 7418. Nancy Kinter.
 H. R. 7480. Cornelia M. Perry.
 H. R. 7482. Mary Krener.
 H. R. 7485. Leticia C. Anderson.
 H. R. 7496. Clara E. Herr.
 H. R. 7579. Louise Hatch.
 H. R. 7586. Amelia Carpenter.
 H. R. 7591. Harriet Brownrigg.
 H. R. 7596. Minnie A. Lacy.
 H. R. 7597. Dora B. Mann.
 H. R. 7640. Hulda J. Simpson.
 H. R. 7653. Winnie Hazard.
 H. R. 7665. Martha J. Carlton.
 H. R. 7667. Alice W. Butts.
 H. R. 7670. Martha J. Anderson.
 H. R. 7677. Mary B. Morris.
 H. R. 7697. Hattie E. Barnett.
 H. R. 7702. Julia Ann Ford.
 H. R. 7705. Eva P. Black.
 H. R. 7736. Maggie A. Daringer.
 H. R. 7749. Mary E. Cahoon.
 H. R. 7753. Lizzie L. Hanchett.
 H. R. 7754. Hannah Boyer.
 H. R. 7765. Elizabeth O'Keefe.
 H. R. 7782. Ann Bennett.
 H. R. 7811. Maggie E. O'fill.
 H. R. 7821. Eunice T. Brown.
 H. R. 7823. Eudora Kightly.
 H. R. 7825. Susan A. Rice.
 H. R. 7826. Nancy A. Clark.
 H. R. 7828. Susan Light.
 H. R. 7832. Sarah Platt.
 H. R. 7833. Nellie R. Pearce.
 H. R. 7835. Nancy J. Littell.
 H. R. 7836. Rachel A. Coats.
 H. R. 7849. Catherine E. DeBussey.
 H. R. 7863. Mary M. Callen.
 H. R. 7864. Emma Moore.
 H. R. 7865. Viannie M. Walters.
 H. R. 7957. Sarah S. Brown.
 H. R. 7962. Lovina Repogle.
 H. R. 7970. Rachel C. Carrico.
 H. R. 7971. Ellen Berry.
 H. R. 7972. Adaline Calton.
 H. R. 7991. Martha B. Ellis.
 H. R. 7992. Anna M. Thompson.
 H. R. 7997. Mary Jane Butler.
 H. R. 8002. Louisa Weaver.
 H. R. 8004. Mary E. Cole.
 H. R. 8038. Florine F. Seaman.
 H. R. 8039. Mary H. Ackley.
 H. R. 8051. Bell D. Qualls.
 H. R. 8053. Martha J. Wilcox.
 H. R. 8060. Agnes G. Smith.
 H. R. 8065. Sarah J. Green.
 H. R. 8104. Amanda A. Sibrel.
 H. R. 8110. Martha J. Blacketer.
 H. R. 8111. Mattie L. Stults.
 H. R. 8118. Matilda A. Barnes.
 H. R. 8133. Louisa F. Corn.
 H. R. 8213. Harriet Seasholtz.
 H. R. 8222. Charlotte B. McWilliams.
 H. R. 8227. Margaret A. Morse.
 H. R. 8252. Eliza J. Holsington.
 H. R. 8254. Mary A. Spain.
- H. R. 8262. Mary E. Roush.
 H. R. 8266. Martha Kellerhals.
 H. R. 8273. Clara E. Bryan.
 H. R. 8298. Mary J. White.
 H. R. 8299. Elizabeth J. Lister.
 H. R. 8301. Carrie Abell.
 H. R. 8303. Mary E. Harper.
 H. R. 8309. Mary M. Davis.
 H. R. 8312. Susanna Rainier.
 H. R. 8313. Lizzie A. Whitten.
 H. R. 8340. Margaret Spitsnagle.
 H. R. 8341. Elizabeth A. Landers.
 H. R. 8354. Sarah E. Martin.
 H. R. 8356. Jane Pelletier.
 H. R. 8365. Lucy A. Farington.
 H. R. 8400. Anna M. Gentgen.
 H. R. 8423. Mary E. Wallace.
 H. R. 8427. Marguerite Sweet.
 H. R. 8430. Ruth V. Foster.
 H. R. 8432. Julia Baker.
 H. R. 8439. Mary C. Abrams.
 H. R. 8455. Julia Mehlman.
 H. R. 8458. Martha A. Lunna.
 H. R. 8461. Ellen Thompson.
 H. R. 8462. Elizabeth Blades.
 H. R. 8464. Eliza J. Hamilton.
 H. R. 8473. Josephine Black.
 H. R. 8484. Margaret Moody.
 H. R. 8486. Jane Stewart.
 H. R. 8491. Sarah A. Herring.
 H. R. 8514. Mary Finn.
 H. R. 8516. Elizabeth M. Blue.
 H. R. 8532. Margaret E. Dubes.
 H. R. 8534. Catharine C. Crippen.
 H. R. 8535. Ida M. Lent.
 H. R. 8536. Lydia Diehl.
 H. R. 8586. Margaret Janes.
 H. R. 8600. Viola V. Buckley.
 H. R. 8646. Sarah Jane Bump.
 H. R. 8657. Eliza Alby.
 H. R. 8670. Antoinette Howland.
 H. R. 8672. McLean W. Terry.
 H. R. 8699. Margaret E. Laidig.
 H. R. 8701. Matilda J. Irvin.
 H. R. 8703. Mary Elliott.
 H. R. 8709. Maime F. Presley.
 H. R. 8713. Nancy A. Williamson.
 H. R. 8721. Mary A. Hayes.
 H. R. 8722. Mary A. Sullivan.
 H. R. 8728. Sarah A. Ten Broeck.
 H. R. 8730. Melissa J. Boggs.
 H. R. 8732. Margret Douds.
 H. R. 8740. Hannah L. Heaton.
 H. R. 8743. Phoebe A. Jennings.
 H. R. 8746. Margaret Adams.
 H. R. 8747. Mary J. Cooper.
 H. R. 8773. Mary E. Alverson.
 H. R. 8774. Emma Frey.
 H. R. 8782. Margaret L. Ross.
 H. R. 8797. Margaret I. Malden.
 H. R. 8829. Mary Vance.
 H. R. 8840. Mary E. Nichols.
 H. R. 8841. Chioce M. Ranbarger.
 H. R. 8865. Jane Richards.
 H. R. 8886. Susie Henley.
 H. R. 8894. Nancy McAllister.
 H. R. 8948. Margaret Walrod.
 H. R. 8956. Maria A. Houston.
 H. R. 8959. Catherine Weltner.
 H. R. 8963. Sevilla A. Boley.
 H. R. 8965. Louisa Conklin.
 H. R. 8966. Jane Smith.
 H. R. 8968. Jenettie E. Evans.
 H. R. 9010. Mary A. Swing.
 H. R. 9028. Harriet B. Gilmore.
 H. R. 9029. Mary J. Whistler.
 H. R. 9036. Margret B. Kerr.
 H. R. 9037. Mary A. Greer.
 H. R. 9038. Margaret Hendershot.
 H. R. 9043. Emeline J. McLane.
 H. R. 9047. Salena Hendrickson.
 H. R. 9048. Anna Trimbur.
 H. R. 9074. Rachel P. Thomas.
 H. R. 9080. Belle Robinson.
 H. R. 9087. Issa Bledsoe.
 H. R. 9102. Emma J. Jones.
 H. R. 9110. Amanda J. Gilliam.
 H. R. 9111. Lucinda E. Fleming.
 H. R. 9112. Anna L. Cowen.
 H. R. 9116. Deillah Banks.
 H. R. 9121. Mary Tuffree.
 H. R. 9123. Elizabeth W. Ravenburg.
 H. R. 9124. Kathryn S. Fishel.
 H. R. 9125. Alice Garland.
 H. R. 9126. Hannah M. Shank.
 H. R. 9153. West Virginia Hayward.
- H. R. 9154. Louisa Turner.
 H. R. 9156. Lydda K. Teats.
 H. R. 9157. Mary Glover.
 H. R. 9159. Margaret E. Cassada.
 H. R. 9160. Sarah E. Harner.
 H. R. 9161. Mary F. Smallwood.
 H. R. 9168. Eliza Stanley.
 H. R. 9191. Laura Chrysler.
 H. R. 9194. Elizabeth Miller.
 H. R. 9209. Susanna Guyer.
 H. R. 9210. Sallie P. Adams.
 H. R. 9224. Louisa Kendall.
 H. R. 9226. Missouri F. Johnson.
 H. R. 9228. Jane Cooper.
 H. R. 9239. Esther Olds.
 H. R. 9244. Almira Westover.
 H. R. 9299. Maggie E. M. Wilcox.
 H. R. 9299. Lillie E. R. Withey.
 H. R. 9323. Mary M. Snyder.
 H. R. 9340. Sarah M. McCullough.
 H. R. 9358. Louisa F. Mansfield.
 H. R. 9371. Mary J. Ferguson.
 H. R. 9372. Mary McCoy.
 H. R. 9399. Sallie Davis.
 H. R. 9405. Lottie M. Haynes.
 H. R. 9414. Julia A. Taylor.
 H. R. 9422. Lena Niemann.
 H. R. 9424. Emma C. Evans.
 H. R. 9461. Margaret Haskin.
 H. R. 9468. Frances A. Kuder.
 H. R. 9469. Mary L. Pease.
 H. R. 9482. Margaret Eicher.
 H. R. 9484. Clara G. F. Kerr.
 H. R. 9501. Mary E. Snyder.
 H. R. 9502. Emma J. Rairden.
 H. R. 9516. Nettie J. Brown.
 H. R. 9517. Sarah A. Cooley.
 H. R. 9524. Martha Sabins.
 H. R. 9526. Georgia S. Bates.
 H. R. 9530. Anna L. Rumsey.
 H. R. 9531. Ida B. Cutright.
 H. R. 9561. Mary Freeland.
 H. R. 9623. Harriet Reynolds.
 H. R. 9634. Julia A. Montgomery.
 H. R. 9635. Antoinette E. Luperh.
 H. R. 9670. Margaret A. Richardson.
 H. R. 9675. Mary E. Anthony.
 H. R. 9676. Susan F. Atwater.
 H. R. 9682. Phebe M. Lamphier.
 H. R. 9683. Sarah J. Ash.
 H. R. 9690. Mary E. Harris.
 H. R. 9722. Virginia Humphrey.
 H. R. 9726. Ella McPhail.
 H. R. 9734. Henrietta C. Schofield.
 H. R. 9735. Mary C. Gilkison.
 H. R. 9846. Ellen Brennan.
 H. R. 9847. Clarinda Oranhood.
 H. R. 9848. Anna LeFevre.
 H. R. 9855. Lizzie Pennington.
 H. R. 9865. Marie Denhard.
 H. R. 9904. Mary M. Adsit.
 H. R. 9906. Eliza Morse.
 H. R. 9960. Mary A. Beers.
 H. R. 9982. Mary Tompkins.
 H. R. 9991. Annie M. Wierman.
 H. R. 10007. Mary H. Thompson.
 H. R. 10077. Lavina Watts.
 H. R. 10117. Burley Van Fleet.
 H. R. 10134. Martha S. Noel.
 H. R. 10163. Jennie E. Little.
 H. R. 10164. Mary E. Jones.
 H. R. 10165. Mary E. Goshorn.
 H. R. 10214. Ellen Bruce.
 H. R. 10235. Ianthe S. Webber.
 H. R. 10263. Sarah C. Burnett.
 H. R. 10309. Margaret I. Reider.
 H. R. 10310. Charlotte Perry.
 H. R. 10311. Abbie Davison.
 H. R. 10332. Eva Shaver.
 H. R. 10344. Mary Singleton.
 H. R. 10355. Mattie Talbot.
 H. R. 10397. Andrew J. White.
 H. R. 10399. Anna E. Frauli.
 H. R. 10402. Sarah E. Carmichael.
 H. R. 10513. Mary E. Schofield.
 H. R. 10538. Mary Diker.
 H. R. 10622. Margaret K. Malers.
 H. R. 10658. Priscilla Swan.
 H. R. 10665. Mary Tippet.
 H. R. 10667. Nancy Consolver.
 H. R. 10687. Margaret Cunneen.
 H. R. 10783. Elizabeth J. Coburn.

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

On motion by Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11452) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11452, the Navy Department appropriation bill, with Mr. FULLER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending which was offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma: Page 42, line 1, after the word "librarian," strike out the figures "\$269,000" and insert "\$200,000."

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I attempted to get some information relative to the number of civilians, the number of instructors, and other information with respect to the Naval Academy in comparison with the amount that is now being expended at the Military Academy. When the House adjourned on yesterday no one present was able to give that information.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. I will be glad to give the gentleman the information as best I can at this particular time.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I have the information here now.

Mr. AYRES. I had the information here yesterday, but it was out of my possession when the question came up.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I have some information that I respectfully wish to bring to the House.

At the present time there are 76 civilian teachers at the Naval Academy and 164 officers in comparison with 8 civilian teachers at West Point and 182 officers.

The appropriation last year for the Naval Academy at Annapolis for teachers was \$290,000 and for West Point \$46,000. Anyone can clearly see that the ratio or proportion is entirely out of line. When we take into consideration the fact that there is strong probability that each Member of Congress will have his number of appointees reduced to two next year, really the amendment which I have offered should have provided for a greater reduction than it calls for.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. I should like to ask the gentleman if he is not aware of the fact that the amount he gave applied to but eight professors or civilian officers at West Point, while the figure he gave for Annapolis applies to 74 civilian instructors?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman is absolutely correct as to the 74 civilian instructors. Page 752 of the House hearings gives the table.

Mr. AYRES. Let me ask another question: Does not that account for the discrepancy in the amounts appropriated for the two institutions?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. No; not in the proper ratio, because you have \$46,000 against \$290,000 without that ratio in the actual number of teachers employed. There are 240 instructors in the Naval Academy as against 185 instructors in the Military Academy.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In a minute.

The point I want to bring out is that the people of the country expect us to reduce expenditures. At the present rate we are appropriating for a sufficient number of teachers and employees to take care of five appointees for each

Member of Congress. The number of appointees has been gradually reduced from five to three, and next year we will probably only have two. Surely the House should be willing to reduce this expenditure in the sum of \$69,000, which would still leave \$200,000 for this purpose.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. AYRES. May I ask the gentleman, when he speaks of next year if he means the fiscal year 1933?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I mean the year to which this conference report will be applicable, the one brought to the attention of the House this morning.

Mr. AYRES. The reduction to two appointments would not be applicable until the year 1934, so that question should not enter into the 1933 bill that we are considering at this time.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. AYRES. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the further fact that 2 of the 76 civilian instructors the gentleman spoke of a moment ago will be eliminated by the department itself, and this bill calls for a further elimination of 5.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am glad to have the information, because I am sure that the chairman is trying to reach the same results I am; but I further want to call his attention to the fact that the present ratio of appropriations to take care of teachers in the two schools is about 6 to 1. In other words, it costs six times more money to maintain the teachers for the Naval Academy at Annapolis than it does to maintain the teachers for the Military Academy at West Point.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask for an additional five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. AYRES. Does the gentleman realize that at West Point there are but 1,200 cadets?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I was about to call attention to that.

Mr. AYRES. While at Annapolis we have 1,900 students.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct. That makes a difference of only 600 in the total, yet the ratio in expenses is vastly over one-third. In other words, we should not be called upon to appropriate for a greater number of teachers than is necessary to take care of the difference in the number of students at Annapolis. Instead of that we are asked to appropriate this year the sum of \$269,000. My amendment proposes that that amount be reduced to \$200,000. It is a slight reduction and not in keeping with the same ratio that applies to West Point.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Since it appears from the statement the gentleman has made that instructors at both of the academies embrace civilian and officer instructors, the officer instructors at West Point exceeding those at Annapolis—

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Only by eight.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think by more than that; it would be about 28.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I should have said 18.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The officer instructors, I am informed, at West Point exceed the officer instructors at Annapolis by 28. However, since the number of boys at Annapolis are about 50 per cent more than at West Point, I think you will find that the costs are fairly well apportioned between the two schools.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I regret exceedingly I can not agree with the gentleman, because the ratio between Annapolis and West Point does not justify an expenditure of six times more money to take care of teachers at Annapolis than it does to take care of teachers at West Point.

That being true, it does seem to me that this House should proceed along business lines and take into consideration the number of students that are at each one of these schools and supply for these students a sufficient number of teachers and no more. That is the reason that I have asked that this appropriation be reduced in the sum of \$69,000, which is justifiable, according to the figures that I have given.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. I heartily agree with the gentleman that the House should proceed along businesslike lines. With that in view, I should like to ask the gentleman which of the professors or instructors at the Naval Academy he would do away with under his \$69,000 reduction?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I shall be very glad to answer that. I am sure if this appropriation is reduced to \$200,000, we have at the head of the Navy Department sufficient brains to equalize matters in such a way as to maintain present efficiency.

Mr. BRITTEN. What does the gentleman mean by equalizing brains at the Naval Academy?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I did not say at the Naval Academy. I said the head of the Navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. How is the gentleman going to determine which professors or which instructors shall be eliminated from the service by this arbitrary deduction of \$69,000?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman knows full well that whenever you reduce expenditures applicable to any bureau or department of the Government that those in charge of it immediately make the necessary readjustments so as to maintain efficiency and at the same time leave the situation in accord with the amount appropriated.

Mr. BRITTEN. I understood the gentleman to say he desired to have a businesslike procedure, but the gentleman does not know which of the instructors or professors he would do away with at the academy, but he would leave that to the discretion of the department.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Certainly; and that is the only sensible way it can be brought about.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. My information is that at West Point we have 1,236 students and at Annapolis 2,003.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. We only have about 1,800 at Annapolis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We have at West Point 192 officers as instructors; at Annapolis 164, making a difference of 28. Officer and civilian instructors at West Point number 198 for 1,236 boys, while the number of officers and civilian instructors at Annapolis is 240 for 2,003 boys.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman's figures are slightly different from those given to me by the department this morning. But regardless of that fact, the gentleman can not justify an appropriation amounting to six or seven times more to take care of the teachers at Annapolis than is being appropriated for West Point.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The error which the gentleman falls into is this: That there are 28 more officers at West Point than at Annapolis engaged in teaching.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Eighteen.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There are 28, according to the statement furnished me by the department.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. According to my figures the number is 18.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It would be well to see what the pay of officers at West Point is and what the pay of officers at Annapolis is, and then you should take into ac-

count the large increase in the number of students at Annapolis over the number at West Point.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman's figures are not exactly accurate, because the chairman of the subcommittee has made the statement that there are only about 1,800 students at Annapolis.

I want to say further to the committee that my only purpose in bringing this to your attention is to see whether or not the House wants to put into effect some economy. If the committee does wish to put some economy into effect, it will vote for this amendment; otherwise, it will vote it down.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma is to reduce the appropriation for the civilian professors at the Naval Academy at Annapolis from \$269,000 to \$200,000, an arbitrary reduction which does not take into consideration the fact that the Budget reduced the amount allowed to the Naval Academy by \$114,000 and following that the Subcommittee on Appropriations reduced the amount by \$28,000, a total reduction of about \$142,000.

The subject brought up by the gentleman from Oklahoma must have been one which was familiar to him because I have before me the hearings of the Committee on Naval Affairs of February 1, 1932, when the gentleman from Oklahoma made this statement, when Admiral Upham, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, was on the stand.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. What page?

Mr. GAMBRILL. Page 751.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I notice the Naval Academy has an appropriation of \$290,000 to take care of professors, and when you compare that with the Military Academy, which uses only \$46,561 to pay instructors, why should the ratio be so much higher at the Naval Academy than at the Military Academy when the number of students is not sufficiently greater to warrant this difference in cost?

At the invitation of the gentleman from Oklahoma, Admiral Upham, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, put in those hearings a statement showing that there were 76 civilian professors at the Naval Academy who receive an aggregate salary of \$290,000, or an average pay of \$3,810. The hearings disclose that at West Point there are six civilian employees, their total pay being \$17,320. Now, manifestly, gentlemen, when you have 76 professors at the Naval Academy as compared with 6 civilian professors at West Point it accounts for the difference between the appropriation made for the Naval Academy of \$269,000 for the pay of civilian professors as against \$46,561, as stated by the gentleman from Oklahoma, allowed for civilian professors at West Point.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBRILL. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman's statement is correct with respect to the hearings; but when the information was given, it was not known to the members of the committee until after the hearings were printed. Furthermore, it is shown that West Point is utilizing officers that are in the pay of the Government to take care of the students, which is a great saving, while Annapolis employs civilians to perform a service which could be performed by naval officers, if they are properly qualified.

Mr. GAMBRILL. I think a complete answer to the statement made by the gentleman from Oklahoma is to be found in the fact that the ratio of instructors to students at West Point is 16 per cent and at Annapolis 12 per cent.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBRILL. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is well that new Members of Congress understand that the civilian instructors at Annapolis are there because Congress placed them there, and some six or eight years ago there was an annual controversy in the Senate and the House as to how we could retain the civilian instructors at Annapolis. It was thought to be so important that a proviso was carried in every appropriation bill to the effect that the pay of certain administrative

officers should be denied them if the number of civilian instructors were reduced.

Mr. GAMBRILL. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution. That is in accordance with my recollection of the appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] does not prevail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the amount carried in the bill as reported by the committee is \$269,000 for the pay of the civilian instructors and professors at Annapolis.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma proposes to strike out \$69,000 and thus reduce the amount to \$200,000. The gentleman rests the argument for his amendment upon the fact that we are appropriating six or seven times as much as we appropriate for the same purpose at West Point.

The whole question turns upon two factors.

In the first place, at West Point the enrollment is about 1,236 and at Annapolis at this time it is about 1,750. This fact, however, as important as it is, is a small factor.

The other factor is this: We are employing at Annapolis a larger number of civilian instructors because we detail there a less number of officer instructors.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Not at just this moment.

At West Point we have six instructors who are civilians. We have eight officer instructors who have permanent detail as I understand, by act of Congress, to instructional work at the academy. We have 192 officers detailed to West Point for tour duty, or a grand total of 208 members of the faculty. At Annapolis we have 164 officer and 76 civilian instructors, or a total of 240. It will be noted that the ratio of total instructors is less at Annapolis rather than greater than the ratio of enrollment bears to West Point.

The reason we have a larger number of civilian instructors at Annapolis is because of certain types of instructional work that long experience in the Navy has indicated can be handled better by civilian instructors than by officers of the Navy. These instructors are trained educators who are making it their career to follow the profession they are following at Annapolis.

It is because of this, gentlemen, that a mistake would be made if we attempted in this arbitrary manner to lop off about one-third or one-fourth of the instructors at Annapolis and increase—because it would mean this—the number of officers of the Navy detailed for instruction work.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Following the gentleman's line of argument that these men have been placed there to perform a life work, let us suppose that we are going to reduce the number of appointees to two—

Mr. FRENCH. Then we can take care of it next year.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. But the same argument would apply to what the gentleman has just stated. We would then have to maintain the appropriation and keep the same number we have there now or make some other arrangement to reduce the number.

Mr. FRENCH. I am not sure I understood all the gentleman said, because there is so much confusion in the Chamber—

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I carried out the gentleman's argument to apply to a situation where each Member of Congress would only have two appointees. When that situation arises, what would the gentleman do with these civilian instructors, which the gentleman has brought to our attention, and has stated have been trained for a long time and that we can not reduce their number.

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, when that condition arises, if it should arise, we could reduce the number; but not now, and not until the condition shall arise.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am sure the gentleman and myself are trying to reach the same result.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I think this matter has been very clearly and quite fully explained to the committee. The amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma provides for an arbitrary deduction of \$69,000, irrespective of its effect upon the academy. Apparently this is unimportant.

Answering the gentleman's argument that we have a greater number of civilian instructors at the Naval Academy than at West Point, all we have to do is to realize that West Point has 33½ per cent more officers than the Naval Academy, based upon the total number of students in the institutions.

The gentleman's argument about reducing the number of civilian instructors in the event our appointments to the academy are reduced from three to two, is as illogical as for some one to say that for a 4-room school building but two teachers would be necessary, if the pupils in those four rooms were materially reduced.

Mr. Chairman, pursuant to a request for information with regard to the number of officers, enlisted men, instructors, and civil employees at Annapolis and West Point, I hold in my hand a tabulation which has been made up in the Bureau of Navigation and which represents the most accurate comparison to be had.

The information with regard to West Point was obtained from data furnished to Congressman AYRES under date of March 31, 1932, by the Secretary of War, supplemented by information obtained by telephone from the Adjutant General's Department. The data for Annapolis was obtained in part from the data submitted by the superintendent, and which is contained in the hearings on the appropriation bill, in part from the quarterly reports of civilian personnel, and in part from the list of officers who are on duty at the academy. The tabulation includes all civilian personnel who are paid for by the Federal Government, but excludes a small number of civilians who are employed by the Midshipmen's Athletic Association, the midshipmen's store, and the midshipmen's laundry, and so forth. It will be noted that there are a considerably greater number of civilian employees at Annapolis than at West Point, and a considerably larger number of enlisted men at West Point than at Annapolis. This is probably due to the fact that the course at Annapolis is far more concerned with machinery, both steam and electrical, as well as the internal combustion engine, than is the course at West Point. The comparison is given in the table below:

	West Point	Annapolis
(1) Cadets or midshipmen.....	1,236	2,003
(2) Enlisted personnel.....	1,155	640
(3) Civilian employees.....	447	1,029
(4) Total enlisted personnel and civilian employees.....	1,602	1,669
(5) Officers.....	227	246
(6) Officers as instructors or professors.....	192	164
(7) Civilians as instructors or professors.....	6	76
(8) Officers and civilian instructors and professors.....	198	240
(9) Ratio of instructors to students.....per cent..	16	12

The gentleman is entirely in error, and I hope his amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of employees at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy, \$577,387.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee. In lines 4 and 5 on page 42, should not there be included the same amendment to apply to the comptroller's decision regarding the limitation in class 4 (b), I think it is, that appears elsewhere in the bill?

Mr. AYRES. We were not so informed by the Navy Department.

Mr. COYLE. It was my impression from a memorandum from the department that such an amendment should go in, but I got it at a late date.

Now, may I at this time address a further inquiry to the chairman of the subcommittee with reference to the item on page 23, which was amended yesterday in connection with page 25. If the chairman remembers, in the item on page 23 the total amount was increased by about \$7,000, to provide for the increase in the reserve pay that was necessary to take care of the removal of the flight-pay limitation. In addition, the total amount of flight pay was limited to \$1,014,000. It was rather my understanding—I may have been under a misapprehension—that the increase in flight pay was going to be taken out of the total appropriation for pay of the Navy, rather than put in as entirely a limitation of flight pay.

Mr. AYRES. No; I think the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. COYLE. Is the gentleman under the impression that with the omission of the limitation of \$1,100 you can have the same number of active aviators on the list without cutting out a considerable number of them, due to the total limit on page 23 of \$1,014,000?

Mr. AYRES. That is a question for the department.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I somewhat doubt the propriety of bringing up the matter I am about to present to the members of the committee. It is not directly involved in the pending appropriation bill, yet indirectly it is a matter that involves the Naval Academy as well as the West Point Academy.

You all know that the Government, through the appropriations out of the House, and through private subscription in the city, has expended a large sum of money for the bicentennial celebration. It so happens that I have a personal acquaintanceship with the director of the athletic events that are being prepared to entertain the visitors during the progress of the bicentennial celebration.

It has been suggested to me that inasmuch as there has never been an athletic contest between the football teams of the Navy and Military Academy, and inasmuch as in this Capital City of the Nation we are all interested in the personnel of both branches of the service, especially the boys at the two academies, if it could be arranged, it would be an admirable thing to have a football game between the Naval Academy and West Point in the Capital City of this Nation this year.

The director of athletics has advised me that it will be entirely possible, if he can be assured of the funds or part of the funds at least that would be derived from this game, to construct a stadium in Washington, or rather an addition to the baseball stadium, that would seat at least 40,000 people, and he further assures me that arrangements could be made, if agreeable to the directors of those teams, for a fair division of the receipts. He informs me that his committee is very much in need of funds to carry out the program and that no further demands will be made upon the Congress for appropriations. He also has in mind, if this scheme can be carried out, to arrange to bring to Washington, after their contests in the West, all of the contestants of the Olympic games to be conducted in the West. It seems to me, if it meets with any favorable reaction on the part of the Members of Congress, it would be a fine thing in some way for individual Members to suggest to those in authority that this arrangement might be made, and I have taken the liberty of speaking out of order to bring the suggestion to your minds for your consideration and, I trust, your cooperation.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman know anything about the proposed memorial to Theodore Roosevelt? Is not that to be in the form of a stadium?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I can not give any information about that.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is being suggested.

Mr. FISH. I am in hearty sympathy with the suggestion made by the gentleman. I think Washington is the proper and logical place to hold the football game between Annapolis and the Army. Of course, it should be done in a stadium of twice the capacity suggested by the gentleman. You could fill a stadium with a capacity of 80,000 people.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; but it costs a tremendous sum of money to construct a stadium of that size. This is a practical suggestion that I think could be carried into effect. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] is interested in these matters, as are the chairmen of the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs. I am making this suggestion in an entirely informal way, because I thought that possibly if it captured the attention of the House the personal influence of the Members might be used with those who will have the final say in arranging the matter.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, we have read only two lines of the bill so far this afternoon. Many Members of the House are very anxious to get through with the bill this afternoon; and I want it distinctly understood that we are going to complete the bill to-day if it takes until midnight.

Mr. BRITTEN. I hope the gentleman will permit me to speak for five minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Then some other gentleman will want five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to object.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma: Page 42, line 5, strike out the figures "\$577,387" and insert "\$500,000."

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am earnestly interested in effecting economies wherever they can be accomplished without destroying efficiency. The amendment I offered a few moments ago was voted down because those in charge of the legislation stated to the House that that sum was needed based upon the figures that then existed with respect to teachers. I find in making a comparison between the two academies that there are 518 civilians at the Military Academy and 1,029 at Annapolis. In other words, there are practically twice as many at one school as at the other. The Navy last year appropriated \$629,000 and in this bill this has been reduced to \$577,000. Taking into consideration the fact that there are 40 per cent more students at the Military Academy than are at Annapolis, if you use that same ratio to take care of the civilians, we would be called upon to appropriate something like \$400,000 to take care of the number; so, if there is anything in ratios and figures based on the actual number employed, it does seem to me that my position can be justified in asking for a reduction of \$77,387 in this particular item.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. Has the gentleman taken into consideration the fact that there are 1,155 enlisted men at West Point and only 640 at Annapolis?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. That may be true.

Mr. AYRES. It is true.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I admit it. It certainly ought not to require civilians to look after these enlisted men. Whenever we come to the point where we have to be a wet nurse for the men enlisted in the Army or the Navy it seems to me that something ought to be remedied.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman knows that 1,185 enlisted men must be doing some work that is being performed by civilians at Annapolis.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I assure the gentleman that I am interested in economy, and I can not understand why it requires \$577,387 to take care of 1,029 civilian employees at Annapolis, in comparison with \$276,139 to pay 518 civilians at West Point. There is something wrong somewhere.

Mr. AYRES. I am inclined to feel that if all the factors were analyzed there would not be a wide discrepancy.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. We appropriate nearly three times as much to take care of one school as another when there are only twice as many employed. It seems to me this House is justified in reducing expenditures. Therefore I feel it my duty to present it to the House, and the House can do as it pleases.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC]. The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance and repairs, Naval Academy: For necessary repairs of public buildings, wharves, and walls inclosing the grounds of the Naval Academy, accident prevention, improvements, repairs, and fixtures; for books, periodicals, maps, models, and drawings; purchase and repair of fire engines; fire apparatus and plants, machinery; purchase and maintenance of all horses and horse-drawn vehicles for use at the academy, including the maintenance, operation, and repair of three horse-drawn, passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes; seeds and plants; tools and repairs of the same; stationery; furniture for Government buildings and offices at the academy, including furniture for midshipmen's rooms; coal and other fuels; candles, oil, and gas; attendance on light and power plants; cleaning and clearing up station and care of buildings; attendance on fires, lights, fire engines, fire apparatus, and plants, and telephone, telegraph, and clock systems; incidental labor; advertising, water tax, postage, telephones, telegrams, tolls, and ferrage; flags and awnings; packing boxes; fuel for heating and lighting bandmen's quarters; pay of inspectors and draftsmen; music and astronomical instruments; and for pay of employees on leave, \$940,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to Group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$23,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

This paragraph dealing with the Naval Academy provides certain expenditures that naturally include athletics. I desire to follow as nearly as possible what has been said to the House by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Let me present the ridiculous situation with regard to athletics between the two academies. No corporation on earth dominated by a set of men sitting together occasionally would permit the present condition to exist for five minutes. I am thinking not only of football, but there are no track events, no contests on the track or in the field or in the gymnasium that have taken place for a number of years between the two branches of the service, the Army and the Navy, because a former superintendent at the Naval Academy got rambunctious one day and put on a high, stiff, white collar and could not see himself or anybody else around him and offended the sensibilities of the West Point men. Since then it has been impossible to bring them together. Congress can bring those two academies together. I think they ought to row against each other; they ought to box against each other; they ought to sprint and run against each other; they ought to wrestle against each other; they ought to play baseball against each other; they ought to play football against each other; and because one superintendent says, "No; not by a long shot; let them come to us," and the other superintendent says, "No; we are not going over there; let them come to us," the attitude of the two institutions is the laughingstock of the country.

We have the greatest athletes in the world at Annapolis and West Point, and I agree with what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] said. They ought to play a game of football every year. They ought reasonably to play it in Washington during the bicentennial celebration.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. I suggest that the Committee on Naval Affairs take that up. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRITTEN. That is the first time in 10 years that the Committee on Appropriations has granted anything to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, and it is a thankless job.

Mr. AYRES. We think they are fully capable of doing that.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman does not know our weakness. We have been trying for four years to do the very thing the gentleman suggests.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This is one time the gentleman will find the hearty cooperation of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRITTEN. But they will not appropriate a dollar for it, I know. Now, I believe the Members of Congress, by persuasion, by calling upon the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, can bring about a resumption of athletic contests between those two academies. I think it ought to be done in the interest of the morale of the two academies. There is nothing that will promote esprit de corps more than having those youngsters meet in boxing, wrestling, rowing, and swimming contests. It makes them the finest kind of friends. There is nothing I would like to see more than to see a young Navy middleweight knock the spots out of an Army middleweight from West Point. It would be a pleasure. It would make good friends of those two boys.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GOSS. And nothing gave me greater pleasure than last fall see the Army mule kick the Navy goat.

Mr. BRITTEN. I knew somebody would say that. But I am certain if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations will speak to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and aim to show them the unwisdom of the obstinacy of both of those academies at this time we can bring about a football game between the two academies in Washington this year. Why not? We dominate everything that is done at both of the academies. It is silly for us to say that the athletic events of the academies are out of our jurisdiction and we will not interfere and let the academies take care of the matter themselves. They are taking care of the matter in a most foolish way, and the Congress or somebody, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, can bring them together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Let the President of the United States do what Calvin Coolidge did in 1926, when it was suggested that Soldiers' Field in Chicago be dedicated by the Army and Navy football game. We could not get those teams together. They would not play elsewhere than on the Atlantic coast. President Coolidge publicly announced that he thought it would be a good thing for the Army and for the Navy if they would play in the mid-West, and they played. Those teams will play in Washington if President Hoover will say he thinks it will be a good thing for them and for the country for them to play here this year.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. May I ask the gentleman if he would use his good influence with the athletic managers so that Members of Congress might get a seat occasionally at these games instead of getting letters saying, "We regret to say that the demands of the athletic association are such as will preclude the possibility of our selling you any tickets this year"? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRITTEN. I agree with the gentleman. At the last Army and Navy game I had a seat in the fifty-seventh row.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman know anything about the purpose of the Roosevelt stadium?

Mr. BRITTEN. In a general way I do. Tentative plans are under way.

Mr. FISH. What is it?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAY, MARINE CORPS

Pay of officers, active list: For pay and allowances prescribed by law for all officers on the active list—pay and allowances, \$3,602,277; subsistence allowance, \$493,116; rental allowance, \$648,063; in all, \$4,743,456; and no part of such sum shall be available to pay active-duty pay and allowances to officers on the retired list: *Provided*, That no person shall be commissioned as an officer in the Marine Corps prior to June 1, 1933: *Provided further*, That hereafter additional pay for making aerial flights shall in no case be at a rate in excess of \$1,100 per annum.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

Mr. GOSS and Mr. BRITTEN reserved a point of order on the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: Page 44, line 5, after "\$3,602,277," insert "including not to exceed \$122,018 for increased pay for making aerial flights."

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment limits the amount of flying pay to that estimated by the department, \$138,148, less the amount taken off by the committee of \$16,130, and is offered in conformity with the policy announced yesterday.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield for a question?

Mr. AYRES. Certainly.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman be good enough to inform the committee whether or not the enlisted strength of the corps has been reduced?

Mr. AYRES. We provide for the Budget number.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But does not the gentleman necessitate a reduction by reducing the amount of money?

Mr. AYRES. No; I do not agree to that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman's committee in its report states that there is no reduction in the Marine Corps, there being approximately 15,343 men; but when you reduce the appropriation that supports that organization by the amount suggested, do you not fail to make provisions for some 500 or 600 men? Is not that correct?

Mr. AYRES. I believe there will be enough slack in the appropriation for pay of the Marine Corps to maintain the present enlisted strength.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But is not my statement correct that while you have not reduced the strength of the Marine Corps you reduce the money necessary to maintain it, and what the committee has done is indirectly to reduce the Marine Corps by about 500 or 600 men?

Mr. AYRES. As I said before, I think within the total sum proposed for pay of the Marine Corps, which is all one fund, sufficient funds will be found to avoid a reduction in enlisted strength.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have reserved a point of order. I will yield to the gentleman, however.

Mr. COYLE. Does the gentleman raise the point of order now?

Mr. GOSS. Yes; I will raise it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GOSS. That the proviso in lines 8 to 10 is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield.

Mr. COYLE. The substitute to the committee amendment, which I have introduced, provides for the striking out of those two lines among other things. Unless the gentleman

wishes to argue the point of order, I am willing to go to a vote on the amendment.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not think there is any question, or that there should be any question, but that the language—

Provided, That no person shall be commissioned as an officer in the Marine Corps prior to June 1, 1933—

is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. What page is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. BRITTEN. I am reading from page 44, lines 9 and 10.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYLE] reserve a point of order?

Mr. COYLE. I am not making the point of order, but the gentleman from Connecticut is.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. AYRES. No; I think not. All I can say is that it is in order under the Holman rule. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman from Kansas point out under what portion of the Holman rule it comes?

Mr. AYRES. No; I can not.

Mr. BRITTEN. Neither can anybody else.

Mr. BYRNS. It simply reduces expenses.

Mr. TABER. It reduces the number of persons that can be placed upon the Government pay roll.

Mr. BRITTEN. What number does it reduce?

Mr. TABER. It prevents them from being put on.

Mr. BRITTEN. No; it does not prevent that at all.

Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that this comes within the Holman rule. It has also been suggested that it reduces the number of men in the corps. It has also been suggested that it reduces the appropriations. It does not do any of those things. The language is very clear.

It says:

Provided, That no person shall be commissioned as an officer in the Marine Corps prior to June 1, 1933.

That no person shall be commissioned prior to June 1, 1933. That is certainly subject to a point of order. It is brand-new legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNS. The very language as read by the gentleman shows that it will result in a saving of money to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BRITTEN. How much money?

Mr. BYRNS. Because it is perfectly clear that if even one man is commissioned between now and the date named, it will involve an additional charge upon the Treasury of the United States, and it does not matter whether it is one or a dozen; if it saves one copper cent to the Treasury, it comes within the Holman rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this matter, it is very uncertain, and, further, the law provides a specific number of officers to be on the list, and no one can be added to it without retiring some one whose place is to be taken. Therefore I can not see where there would be any actual saving.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GOSS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. Does the gentleman anticipate there will be some officer commissioned, if this language is carried, between now and the date named?

Mr. GOSS. You can not tell.

Mr. BYRNS. But does the gentleman believe it is possible for some officer to be commissioned between now and the date named?

Mr. GOSS. Only if some one is retired or resigned.

Mr. BYRNS. Absolutely, and when that is done, Mr. Chairman, you have increased the charge upon the Treasury of the United States to that extent.

Mr. GOSS. How?

Mr. BYRNS. By granting him a commission. That means an additional officer in the service whose salary will have to be paid.

Mr. GOSS. He is not an additional officer.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will permit, in the Marine Corps we are at the present time 60 short of the number of officers that the law permits. Therefore it is very natural and reasonable to expect that unless this provision is in the bill the number of officers will be increased prior to June 1, 1933.

Mr. GOSS. That is not at all reasonable.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FULLER). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair concedes this is a very close question, but in view of the Holman rule, and considering the circumstances and the policy being pursued to reduce expenditures, the Chair believes the Holman rule would apply. The Chair is supported in his opinion by a decision made by Chairman Towner on April 18, 1922, which may be found in Cannon's Precedents, section 8581. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the Chair desire to have the committee understand that if the present depression did not prevail, this language in the bill would be subject to a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overruled the point of order.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my substitute be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COYLE as a substitute for the committee amendment:

On page 44, beginning in line 5, strike out "\$3,602,277" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,766,211."

In line 6, strike out "\$493,116" and insert in lieu thereof "\$516,731"; strike out "\$648,063" and insert in lieu thereof "\$678,319"; and strike out "\$4,743,456" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,961,261."

Strike out the proviso beginning with line 8 and ending in line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The Parliamentarian calls the Chair's attention to the fact that this is not a substitute because it contains a great deal of matter that is too broad to be a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. The gentleman has too much in his substitute.

Mr. COYLE. It is all one subject matter and in one paragraph. It relates to the paragraph affected by the committee amendment. The thing I do not desire to do is to lose my parliamentary rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that he can offer his amendment later, but the gentleman's amendment is not proper as a substitute amendment for the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, may we have the committee amendment again read?

The Clerk again reported the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COYLE: Page 45, line 5, strike out "\$3,602,277" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,766,211"; in line 6, strike out "\$493,116" and insert in lieu thereof "\$516,731"; strike out "\$648,063" and insert in lieu thereof "\$678,319"; strike out "\$4,743,456" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,961,261"; and strike out the proviso in lines 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, will put \$217,000, in round figures, back into this paragraph "Pay, Marine Corps."

The bill at the present time provides, theoretically, for a certain maximum number of officers and men in the Marine Corps but does not provide the money necessary to pay the number of men which the bill states, or the hearings state, will be provided for under the bill as reported. As a consequence, since it is not possible to shoot existing officers,

since it is not possible to put them on the shelf, the entire reduction in this item plus an item on the next page of \$100,000 for the enlisted force is bound to come out of the enlisted pay of the Marine Corps, which means that the total number of marines will be reduced at least 600 below the number stated in the bill.

This bill does appropriate, not for 17,400—the original enlisted strength of 1931—but, theoretically, for 2,057 less than 17,400. It also reduces the present number of commissioned officers by 53 by not providing sufficient funds to pay them.

In order to take 53 officers off of the active list of the Marine Corps it is necessary to expend them in some way or other; and since the law provides that pay of enlisted men and pay of officers be administered as one fund, the only way in which they can possibly cut their cloth to make it go around is by cutting off entirely on enlistments. They can not cut off on reenlistments because that is a part of a man's right.

This leaves the Marine Corps underofficered and undermanned. I very sincerely hope that the Committee of the Whole House will go along with me on this increase of \$217,000, and one which I shall introduce subsequently on the next page calling for \$100,000 for the enlisted men.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman state why the Marine Corps is underofficered? In the first place, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the authorized number of officers of the Marine Corps is 1,096, based upon an authorized enlisted strength of 27,400. The enlisted strength, as a matter of fact, has been under 20,000 for a number of years, and the Budget figure was upon the basis of 15,340 men, which is what we have for 1932. The committee is committed to the idea that a reasonable surplus of officers is justifiable but questions the wisdom of further expanding the officer strength of the Marine Corps in the face of the reduction, actual and prospective, in the enlisted strength of that organization. The bill is drawn for the sole purpose of preventing any expansion prior to June, 1933, and the funds proposed are based upon an average of 977 commissioned officers, instead of 1,030.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this time for five additional minutes in order to answer the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Kansas, my thought about the Marine Corps being underofficered and undermanned is pretty well demonstrated by a little news item in the paper this morning. I think perhaps most of you got it. It is typical of the Marine Corps. In the jungles in Nicaragua one young marine officer, a noncommissioned officer, and a warrant officer of the Navy lost their lives in the protection of American rights and American property, and lost their lives because they were ordered there by the United States Government.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. I suppose the gentleman knows that it is the plan of the department completely to withdraw from Nicaragua by the 1st of next January. It does not seem to me that Nicaragua should be brought into this matter.

Mr. COYLE. The gentleman did not get my point. The number of officers in proportion to the number of men needed abroad on active service is very much larger than is necessary in barracks in the United States.

Mr. AYRES. We have practically the same officer personnel for a Marine Corps of 15,333 enlisted men as we had when there were 27,000.

Mr. COYLE. That is perfectly true; and if we were to provide in this bill only for no increase until 1933, I could go along with him. But the trouble is that this bill requires a reduction in the personnel of the Marine Corps by about 53 officers and 600 men, because there is not money

enough to provide the pay for the present number and you are providing a money limitation against any increase. The service that this corps performs is vital to America. Once before, under some pressure, we took the marines out of Nicaragua, and it cost nearly \$20,000,000 to make up for that mistake.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Does the gentleman think there is any common sense in taking the marines out of Nicaragua?

Mr. COYLE. The gentleman knows the necessity for having trained officers there.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Yes; I have been down there, and we saw the disaster that occurred by bringing them out of Nicaragua before.

Mr. COYLE. It cost us a lot of money and immeasurable loss of lives.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. And it will cost us immeasurable loss again if we take them out of there, for they will have to go back again in a few months.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me to ask a question of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. COYLE. I will.

Mr. KELLER. Does the gentleman from Oregon think these extra officers are necessary?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I do.

Mr. KELLER. Then I am for it.

Mr. FISH. Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania give us any information how long we are to keep the marines in Nicaragua?

Mr. COYLE. I am sorry, but I can not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the efforts of the subcommittee to reduce these appropriations. But, in a study of the report, as issued by the committee, I am convinced the committee has made a statistical error.

I want, first, to call attention to what is said in the report on page 25. It says:

Pay and allowances of 53 fewer commissioned officers on the active list, \$217,805.

Now, I gather from that statement the committee contemplates reducing the number of officers in the Marine Corps next year to the extent of 53. I conclude, further, that there is no way of reducing the number of men and officers except by failing to appoint additional ones. There is no way whereby you can retire the men by operation of law in this bill. The only way a reduction can follow, the only way you can get a fewer number of officers in the Marine Corps next year, is by refusal or failure to appoint additional ones.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman overlooks attrition. Assuming that the attrition will be about the same next year as it was in the fiscal year 1931, vacancies will occur to the number possibly of 46, and we provide that such vacancies shall not be filled.

Mr. HARE. Thereby there will be a reduction in the total number. The only persons that could be appointed would be appointed at the lowest salaries. They will be appointed as lieutenants. Their salary is \$1,500. The committee acted upon the assumption that a reduction of \$217,805 would be at the average rate of pay for officers in the Marine Corps, which is approximately \$4,109.53. If the committee is going to reduce the appropriation equivalent to the reduction that would follow from the failure to appoint 53 additional officers, and there is no objection to that provision, it should have taken into consideration the fact that the lowest salary should be applied to the 53 men and not the average salary of all officers.

If every one of these appointments were to be filled, what would it take? Not \$217,805 but 53 multiplied by 1,500, which would be \$79,500. If the committee had been statistically correct in its operations, in place of \$217,805 it would have said \$79,500, leaving in the balance of \$138,305.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. In case there should be a vacancy, for instance, in the higher grades, will the vacancy be automatically filled by promotion from a lower grade or will the place be left vacant as it may occur, whether in the higher or the lower grades?

Mr. HARE. My impression is, from the report of the chairman of the committee, that there would be no change. If I should retire, for instance, as an officer, at a salary of \$5,000, the appropriation would be reduced to that extent, because it is included here and there would be no chance for promotion.

Mr. TILSON. If the vacancies occur among the higher officers and the places are not filled by promotion, then I presume the statistics of the committee may be correct; but if the grades are to be immediately filled by automatic promotion, then the gentleman from South Carolina is correct in making his figures based on the lowest grade only.

Mr. HARE. The committee takes into consideration the average salary for all officers and assumes all vacancies will appear on July 1, 1932, whereas these 53 men who are going to die or retire will not all retire the 1st of July. Some of them will be in August, some in September, some in November, some in December, some in February, and March, and June, but the committee has gone ahead and reduced the appropriation as if they were all to be retired the 1st of July. The point I am making is that if no officers are appointed in the Marine Corps, and this purported reduction is made in the total appropriation, the Marine Corps will of necessity be compelled to reduce its number of enlisted men to offset the \$138,000, and there is no way around it. If the committee does not want to reduce the number of enlisted men of the Marine Corps, I think it should agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania or else amend the amendment so as to make the difference, \$138,305.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. FIESINGER. As I understand it, there has been provision for all of the graduates at Annapolis this year in the Navy.

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. FIESINGER. Some of those graduates desire to go into the Marine Corps.

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. FIESINGER. If we do not adopt this amendment, then those boys who want to go into the Marine Corps can not get into it, but must go into the Navy.

Mr. HARE. Yes; and you simply shift the appropriation from the Marine Corps to the Navy Department, and there will be no saving in that.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman is in error about that. As the bill is drawn, no appointments may be made to the Navy either in excess of possibly 26.

Mr. HARE. But you provided in another bill that went to conference this morning that all graduates from the Naval Academy in June will be commissioned, but you simply say here that they shall not be appointed in the Marine Corps.

Mr. AYRES. That is true; and we did so deliberately.

Mr. HARE. And these men who are to be graduated from the Naval Academy in June will all have to go into the Navy Department and will all have to draw their pay from this appropriation; and instead of reducing the appropriation as you would have us believe, you are simply eliminating from the Marine Corps and reinstating it in the Navy. Simply taking it out of one pocket and putting it in another. Consequently, there will be no real reduction in the final

appropriation, but an added reduction in the number of enlisted men in the Marine Corps, with an increased number of officers in the Navy after July 1, or just as soon as the 400 young men graduate from the Naval Academy.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MARTIN] may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, with the present disturbed conditions on the American Continent, I believe this is no time to chee-separe on the Marine Corps, because I think that serious business is ahead of them during the year 1933, in view of the present unsettled conditions in Central America. In August, 1925, a great patriot from Nicaragua came down to Panama on a transport which brought out those hundred marines who had brought great peace and prosperity to that country for 14 years. This great patriot said:

This is the happiest day of my life. Now the foreigner is off our soil. Now Nicaragua is free. Watch us grow. Watch us prosper. Now I have control of my fortune.

My friend went back to Nicaragua. A year later he was in Panama, stripped of everything he had, and he was fortunate to escape with his life. He said—

My God, we must have the marines back there, because our people are killing each other off. Unless we get American protection I do not know what is going to happen to my country.

I do not care what is said about drawing the marines out of Nicaragua, when we see conditions which prevail there to-day, civilization demands of us that we keep the marines down there. The same thing is true of Haiti. I have been in Haiti and I know the conditions there. It is unthinkable what would happen to that country in the present unsettled and distressed condition of the world if the marines were taken out of Haiti. It will not be done and, therefore, if this work for the marines in Nicaragua and Haiti is necessary, we must make liberal appropriations for them and keep up their present high state of morale.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I have been in sympathy with sending the marines to Nicaragua in the past. They were not there to exploit Nicaragua, but to preserve law and order, generally at the request of the Government.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Yes; to save Nicaragua.

Mr. FISH. About how long will it be necessary to keep the marines there? Are they to be there indefinitely?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. No.

Mr. FISH. Can the gentleman give us some information on that point?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. They certainly should be kept there as long as the present disturbed conditions prevail. The gentleman must realize that all of the Latin American countries—all of South America now is in a most deplorable state.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman want us to police all of South America and Central America?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. No; but we do not want to pull out at this time.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. COYLE. The gentleman would agree with my idea that if we take most of the marines out we should take them all out? Our danger has been in leaving a few unprotected in hostile countries?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Yes. At this time I would not disturb them at all.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. I should like to remind the gentleman that the question before the committee is not a question of enlisted personnel. It is a question of officers.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Well, we must have officers if we have the men.

Mr. AYRES. We provide—and I think adequately—for all of the enlisted personnel that is being asked for—that is, some 15,500 men. Now, as to the reduction of officers, when the enlisted strength was 27,000 marines we did not have more than 1,096 officers, as I remember. The enlisted strength has now been reduced from 27,000—not by this committee—down to a little over 15,000 men, and yet they are asking for substantially the same officer personnel. We now have at this time practically the same number of officers as we had when the enlisted strength of the corps was 27,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Now, I will say to the gentleman from Oregon, attrition among these officers should take out at least 46 officers during the next fiscal year. That was the number in 1931; so we are simply reducing the appropriation in anticipation of a similar ratio of attrition and are providing for 977 officers to officer a force of a little over 15,000 men, whereas the legal maximum number is 1,096 on the basis of 27,400 marines. The question of details in Haiti and Nicaragua is not involved here. It is a question as to whether or not we are going to maintain the same officer personnel in a more nearly reasonable proportion to the enlisted strength.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I will not have time to go into the refinements of the gentleman's argument; but the amendment offered by the gentleman calls for the amount recommended by the Budget, which the committee has cut down; and I do not think that should be done. That Budget was cut to the bone with reference to the marines to preserve them in their present state of efficiency. With the work ahead of them, I would not disturb that one penny.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman referred to the marines in Haiti. Are they not practically all out of there?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There are marines in China, in Haiti, and Nicaragua.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But we have no considerable force in Haiti, have we?

Mr. AYRES. I have forgotten the exact number; about 800, I should say.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I will say to the gentleman that if they are all out, they will be back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we ought to confuse this proposition with the question of whether or not the marines should be kept in Nicaragua or whether they are needed in Haiti or in any other country in South America or in any of the islands. This is plainly a proposition of whether or not we are going to add, in the last analysis, the sum of \$318,000 to this bill, and make an additional charge upon the Treasury at this time. That is all there is to it.

As the gentleman from Kansas has told you, the proposal of this amendment is to allow the same number of officers for the Marine Corps consisting to-day of something like 15,000 men that there were when its enlisted strength was 27,000 men.

Gentlemen, next week some of you are going to vote to cut the salary of every employee of this Government receiving over \$1,000 a year; and in view of that fact and the effort to cut expenses in other directions, I appeal to you that we should not vote it upon the people of the United States merely because some one proposes an amendment carrying \$318,000.

I want to tell you, gentlemen, and I say it from the bottom of my heart, if something is not done to reduce the expenditures of the Federal Government, of State govern-

ments, of municipal governments, I am very apprehensive of what may happen. We have just passed a tax bill which is now under consideration in the Senate, in which we are loading additional burdens upon the people of this country. You are now asked to vote \$318,000 additional upon this bill. You voted an additional \$1,000,000 upon this bill yesterday for a hospital that is not needed.

The marines are not going to be hurt. Let me say to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MARTIN] that were a million dollars voted upon this bill, it would not keep the marines in Nicaragua, because we have here the statement of Admiral Pratt in which he states that the marines will be withdrawn after their next election. Why vote this money when there is no necessity of maintaining marines in Central America, and when the taxpayers of this country are suffering?

I plead with you in the name, and in the interest, of the people of this country not to adopt an amendment to provide additional officers when you are cutting down everybody else, and when we are told that the action of the body at the other end of the Capitol, if it is persevered in, is going to mean the elimination from the Federal pay roll of thousands of civilian employees. Yet it is proposed by this amendment to place additional officers in the Marine Corps!

Gentlemen, I am opposed to it. I am opposed to it in the first place because the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee after the fullest investigation decided that it is not necessary. I am opposed to it in the second place because I do not wish to place additional charges upon the people of this country. If you are going to reduce, then in the name of high Heaven reduce! [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, ought to receive the hearty accord of every Member of the House. [Applause.] The attitude of the subcommittee was not the attitude merely of the majority members or the Democratic members, it was the attitude of the entire subcommittee, and the attitude that we recommended to the full committee, and the position that was approved by the full Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman is quite right when he again calls the attention of the House to the importance of reducing the Budget. If every time an item is reached wherein some Member of the House feels that some friend is involved, or some institution is involved that he admires more than any other, we are not going to reduce the Budget at all, because we are all pulled and torn by personal admiration toward individuals and toward groups, and no gentleman has higher regard for the Marine Corps than I. I realize and applaud the fine service of this institution, but that is not the problem here. The problem here is whether or not we have carried enough money to care for the number of officers that we are planning to have next year. We have not reduced, or taken steps to reduce, in proportion, the number of officers to the number of enlisted men who will be withdrawn during the next year under estimates from the Budget. This number is 53. The reductions to which we have had reference to-day are the reductions based upon the normal way of figuring money reductions from the standpoint of allowances for subsistence, pay, and rent computed upon the number of officers.

Again, it must be remembered that the entire amount we are carrying in this bill for the Marine Corps will be handled as one lump sum, and if it should be deficient as to one particular factor there are many other factors that make up the sum total and needed money can be found within that sum total to meet the situation. Therefore, I urge the Members of the House to sustain the recommendation of the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. It is proposed to reduce by 53 officers. How are you going to reduce those officers? There is no basis in law for discharging those officers.

Mr. FRENCH. There will be normal attrition, and I should say to the gentleman that the estimate that we made was based upon normal attrition which will, we believe, take care of this situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFFER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Chairman, I may not use my entire five minutes. We have just listened to eloquent speeches in the name of economy delivered on the floor of the House by two distinguished colleagues, one a Republican member and one a Democratic member of the Committee on Appropriations.

When they talked about the Budget tears rolled down their faces and rolled down the faces of other Members who heard their eloquent pleas in favor of reducing the appropriations for the Navy Department and balancing the Budget. But, my friends, they are not always consistent. They are not always looking out for the interest of the taxpayers and the Budget which is so dear to their hearts to-day. It is not always their holy of holies. I recollect that they were not here pleading for the taxpayers and the Budget when one of the appropriation bills was pending in the House and several of us attempted to help balance that Budget by paring a measly \$1,000,000 from the appropriation for the enforcement of the unenforceable prohibition law. Where was the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] and where was the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], who made these eloquent pleas to-day, when that attempt was made? They were on the opposite side of the fence, aligned with those Members of the House who bitterly condemned us as being un-American for having the temerity to offer and support an amendment to reduce the Prohibition Bureau appropriation. Now, my friends, if you are really interested in the taxpayers and balancing the Budget, particularly my friend from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] and my friend from Tennessee, the chairman of the great Appropriations Committee [Mr. BYRNS], I ask you to step up to the Clerk's desk and sign the petition to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the 2.75 per cent beer bill, which will bring about \$500,000,000 into the Federal Treasury each year. These gentlemen should stop making these demagogic pleas in the name of economy and get down to bedrock and practice some real economy and render some real service to the taxpayers' Treasury.

The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on the tax bill, page 26, indicates that the Secretary of the Treasury testified that in 1919 we had an income to our Federal Treasury of \$483,000,000 by reason of excise taxes on beverages containing more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol. That stupendous figure does not even take into consideration the great amount, running into the millions of dollars, in income taxes paid by reason of the legal manufacture of these beverages.

To-day in these days of prohibition prosperity we do not have this stupendous annual revenue but, on the other hand, are spending \$40,043,313.50 annually from the badly battered Federal taxpayers' Treasury to enforce the unenforceable prohibition law. This is the actual cost of prohibition enforcement by the Prohibition Department, Bureau of Industrial Alcohol, and the Coast Guard. I ask that you stop talking about economy—which you do not practice—and sign the petition on the beer bill, which if enacted will bring about \$500,000,000 into the Federal Treasury each year and also result in a reduction in the cost of beer to the consumers. Of course, the enactment of this bill will also reduce the incomes of bootleggers, rum runners, and racketeers.

If you really believe in economy and have a sincere desire to serve the taxpayers, sign the petition and practice it; but if you are not sincere, then for goodness sake do not try to fool the American people by making them believe you are for economy and for relieving the American people of burdensome taxes when you really are not.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. How many gallons of this beer would we have to consume to raise \$500,000,000?

Mr. SCHAFER. We would not have to consume many more gallons than will be consumed under the wort and malt tax provision in the revenue bill, which was merged in the amendment with the oil-tariff tax for Oklahoma. If you are going to tax wort, which is prohibited by the Volstead Act, that means that you are going to approve the use of wort in the manufacture of 9 per cent beer, which is made by the racketeers and sold to the public at outrageous prices. If we are going to get the revenue from that source in the amount claimed by the Ways and Means Committee, we will have to tax 8,000,000,000 pints of wort beer. I think that will answer the gentleman's question. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds, will he yield to me for a question? I am wondering if the gentleman will yield me two minutes of his time so that I may talk on the amendment, or does the gentleman contemplate using the five minutes that are left?

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS] is a member of the committee, and I suggest the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, at the time I made my pro forma motion it had slipped my mind that debate had been limited. I am willing to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. BYRNS], I think, rather confused the House when he suggested that the amendment now pending intended to add additional officers to the Marine Corps as well as additional men. The amendment does not do anything of the sort.

The gentleman also said that we had added \$1,000,000 to this bill on yesterday, which would come out of the Treasury of the United States. We have done nothing of the sort. We added \$1,000,000 for a hospital, which amount will come out of a special fund called the hospital fund of the Navy.

Mr. BYRNS. It comes out of the Treasury.

Mr. BRITTEN. It comes out of the Treasury, but the money is in a special fund and can not be used for any other purpose.

Mr. BYRNS. But the money comes out of the Treasury; and may I ask the gentleman if this amendment does not specifically undertake to cut out the language prohibiting the appointment of commissioned officers? So I was absolutely correct.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will answer the gentleman very frankly.

In 1931-32, the present fiscal year, there were 17,400 enlisted men in the Marine Corps. The Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Navy and the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, all trying to practice economy, as suggested by the chairman of the committee itself, reduced their appropriation so as to provide for 15,343 men in the Marine Corps. This is what they desired. This is what the Navy desired. This is what the Navy expected Congress to appropriate for.

Mr. BYRNS. If the gentleman will allow me to correct him now, because I know the gentleman wants to be accurate, the gentleman made the remark a while ago that the \$1,000,000 added to the bill comes out of the hospital fund. I am reminded that the provision with respect to the hospital fund was stricken out on a point of order and that the money comes directly out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BRITTEN. I apologize to the gentleman. Evidently I was not in the room when that language was stricken

from the amendment that was adopted. I believe that was done on a point of order made by a member of the committee. The money could have come from the hospital fund, but I agree it was subject to a point of order.

As I said a moment ago, the Marine Corps and the Navy Department expected Congress to appropriate for the minimum of men and officers required to successfully and properly run the corps. This minimum number was 15,343.

The chairman of this distinguished subcommittee said to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] a little while ago that he was arbitrarily attempting to slice \$69,000 from an appropriation with no apparent grounds for it. This same committee, gentlemen, has arbitrarily sliced \$100,000 from the estimates sent up here by the Director of the Budget so that while the number does not appear any different on its face, the 15,343 men required by the Marine Corps will be reduced by 600 men through an arbitrary slice in the appropriation of \$100,000. The provision goes farther than that and provides not for economy, but provides for waste, and I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYLE] will prevail.

Mr. Chairman, the Marine Corps had an enlisted strength of 17,400 men in 1931, which was appropriated for in the fiscal year of 1932. The Bureau of the Budget reduced the funds in its estimates for 1933 to an amount sufficient for 15,343 enlisted—a reduction of 2,057. The present bill, by reducing the number of officers by 53, and an arbitrary cut of \$100,000 in "Pay, enlisted," will require a further reduction of 600 enlisted, although the bill states that appropriation is being made for 15,343.

The bill does not point out how a reduction of 53 officers is to be made, but it appears that an erroneous assumption has been made that by preventing any officers being commissioned during the fiscal year 1933, the attrition during the year will take care of this reduction in strength. However, this is not the case. In order to arrive at the amounts shown in the bill, it will be necessary for this reduction to be made immediately at the beginning of the fiscal year, and whereas the saving will be on the pay of second lieutenants who are not appointed to fill vacancies, the deductions have been made on higher rates of pay. It is obvious then that the deficiency created in the pay of officers will have to be made by a reduction in the enlisted ranks.

The restriction imposed by lines 9 and 10, page 44, preventing the commissioning of any officers in the Marine Corps in the fiscal year 1933 will cause irremediable damage, as it will prevent the normal flow of young officers into the corps, such as the 30 graduates from the Naval Academy, which it was planned to commission, and a small class of meritorious noncommissioned officers, who it is expected to promote from the ranks.

The cost of the 30 graduates from the Naval Academy is not additional cost to the Government, as these officers will be commissioned as ensigns in the Navy with the remainder of the graduates of the class of 1932, and will be in excess of the number of ensigns which the Navy expected to receive from this source. The small number of meritorious noncommissioned officers have earned the right to promotion and it is one of the rewards which is held out to young men in the ranks, which has been a great factor to morale. To close the door to these young men would be a great blow to the enlisted personnel and would militate against the spirit which actuates the enlisted personnel.

Mr. Chairman, the Marine Corps performs various and arduous duties, such as guarding naval stations, furnishing detachments for duty on vessels of the Navy, and expeditionary forces in Haiti, Nicaragua, and China, and being ready at all times to meet such emergency calls as may arise for the protection of lives and property of American citizens in disturbed countries.

The strength of 17,400 was barely adequate to perform these duties. The reduction which has already taken place has been keenly felt, and the efficiency of the Marine Corps has been correspondingly reduced. It is now below the limit of safety. A prospective reduction of 600 more enlisted personnel, which is inevitable if this bill is enacted

in its present form, will be a blow to the efficiency of the corps, and it will be unable to carry out the present demands that are made on it, and will, moreover, be unable to meet any emergencies which may occur in the future. To correct this condition the following amendment is proposed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COYLE) there were—ayes 34, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: Page 44, lines 10, 11, and 12, strike out the following: "Provided further, That hereafter additional pay for making aerial flights shall in no case be at a rate in excess of \$1,100 per annum."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay and allowances of the Marine Corps Reserve (a) excluding transferred and assigned men, \$237,620; (b) transferred men, \$281,696; (c) assigned men, \$65,750; in all, \$585,066: *Provided*, That hereafter no enlisted man of the Marine Corps shall be assigned to the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve as provided for in section 22 of the act of February 23, 1925 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 783).

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk to the paragraph at the top of page 45 that has been cut out of a previous amendment and marked as a separate amendment to lines 7 and 8. I ask unanimous consent, in view of the vote on the last amendment, to go back to lines 7 and 8.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. AYRES. I would like to accommodate the gentleman, but under the circumstances I can not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$15,151,089, and the money herein specifically appropriated for pay of the Marine Corps shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 2, after the word "constitute," strike out the words "one fund" and insert "separate funds for the regular reserve division of the marine service as appropriated herein."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for the purpose of preserving the Marine Reserves. It has been stated on the floor that the reduction in the number of officers can not be made; that is, it has been made clear that it can not be made unless a law is passed removing from the corps officers besides those removed by usual attrition.

It has been stated that the money could be gotten only from the enlisted men's pay. That is not true; it could be taken from the allowances for the Reserve Corps.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Is the gentleman aware that this appropriation has been carried in this way for the last 10 years?

Mr. WHITE. I am.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There has been no abuse of it?

Mr. WHITE. I do not know whether there has been an abuse of it or not. I hope the gentleman is correct.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. These are matters that must be left to the administrative head.

Mr. WHITE. If I was assured that there would be no abuse of it I would not press the amendment.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This appropriation has been carried in this language for the last 10 years, and this method is very helpful in the economical administration of the fund.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to call attention to what happened here yesterday when the Naval Reserve was voted out. A man on the Great Lakes, Capt. Anthony Nicklett,

who served from 1899 to 1917 without pay, was shorn of his position without consideration. There was no good reason for it. He brought 343 officers and men into the service in 1917, including an air unit. That man is still at work. I do not want the same thing to happen to the Marine Reserves. That is the reason for offering this amendment. If the fund is not to be absorbed for other purposes, I see no reason for not putting the provision in the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The President, the Congress, the press, and the legitimate banking institutions of the United States are all in a fine spirit of patriotism free from partisanship or other prejudice, doing everything in their power to restore confidence and faith in this country. We can not succeed in our present difficulties except that in the minds and hearts of the American people there is confidence and faith in our common country and its institutions. Yet in the face of this fine cooperation on the part of patriotic leadership in this country, we find a class of people who are doing everything within their power to wreck the confidence and faith of the American people in America, and are endeavoring to capitalize upon the distress of the people. This class of people, who are at this moment practicing little less than treason to this country, are composed of a band of conspirators of some citizens of this country and of foreign countries.

Unfortunately, the people of America have become so stock-market minded that they look too greatly to the stock market for the information as to the condition of the United States rather than to legitimate business. These American and foreign conspirators are taking advantage of this situation, doing everything they can to destroy security values and thereby to destroy public confidence. They are endeavoring to reap their profits which are to be measured by the extent they can destroy the faith and confidence of the people of this country.

The hearings now going on before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate disclose clearly that certain American citizens in league with certain foreign institutions are carrying on a concerted and organized effort to destroy the security values of American institutions and thereby further impoverish the American people, who have their life earnings invested in American institutions.

There can be no question but that the conduct of these people is shameful, dishonorable, and disloyal. The hearings before this committee have disclosed that American brokerage houses are carrying upon their books customers under assumed names who are selling short American institutions. One brokerage house in selling short for a customer under the assumed name of Sadie Silk, another under the assumed name of Stella Stitch, another under the assumed name of Watt & Watt, another under the assumed names of Mr., Mrs., or Miss G. Oka, another under the assumed name of Lilly Schiff, and another under the assumed name of Rose Sheer. There are literally scores of these fictitious names who are selling short the securities of the United States. Any brokerage house which would permit a customer to operate under an assumed name and any customer who sells under an assumed name is obviously carrying on a program which is shameful, dishonest, and disloyal. The people who are operating under these assumed names and thereby endeavoring to destroy the confidence of the people of this country are confessedly doing a shameful thing and are endeavoring to hide their identity as highwaymen try to hide their identity with masks.

Not only are American citizens engaged in this program which is so shameful that they seek to disguise their identity but foreign interests are likewise engaged in this raid against American securities. The hearings before the Senate committee disclose that the Travellers Bank of Paris and the Bank of France are either lending the name of their institutions or are directly engaged in this conspiracy to destroy

American values. Three different banks of Holland were uncovered as being in this raid against American finance. One of these Holland banks is the government institution which corresponds to the Federal reserve in the United States.

Aside from this shameful effort to destroy American values, the Senate committee has uncovered something else which is nothing less than disloyalty to country and treachery to the American people. This committee has brought to light that in June, 1930, J. P. Morgan & Co. bought \$9,200,000 of German reparation bonds on the stock market. Mr. Whitney, president of the stock exchange, and a member of the brokerage firm which bought these bonds for the Morgan Co., testified that the buying of these bonds by the Morgan Co. contributed to the sustaining of the market of that issue of German bonds at \$90 per unit, while international bankers were palming \$98,000,000 worth of these German bonds on to the American people at this sustained and fictitious price of \$90. Mr. Whitney was compelled to admit and testify that after \$98,000,000 worth of these bonds had been sold to the American people at the rate of \$90 a unit and after this Morgan syndicate stopped buying these bonds on the market, these bonds went down to as low as \$23 and are now selling for \$35.50. Here we find an American citizen buying \$9,200,000 worth of bonds on the open market and keeping up a fictitious value on them in order that American citizens could be tricked into buying \$98,000,000 worth of them. Here was an American institution deceiving the citizens of the United States in order to milk them of their money to be given over to a foreign country. It is always reprehensible for one to deceive and rob his neighbor, but when it is done on a commission basis for the benefit of foreign countries, this is reprehensible and low beyond belief.

International bankers in conspiracy and in league with foreign interests have floated billions of dollars of these bonds upon the American people. How many were floated in the manner here described no one knows. As these private bonds were floated, foreign government bonds due to the United States Government became less valuable. Now we find that the people who were tricked into buying these bonds are the victims and the Government of the United States has likewise been victimized.

When the moratorium was under consideration these international bankers testified without an exception that they no longer owned the foreign bonds, but that they were out in the hands of the American people. They admitted that they took their commissions and that it was a closed incident so far as they were concerned.

In the hearings before the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee of the House, of which I am a member, we have found that foreign countries indebted to the United States have willfully and deliberately debased and debauched their silver money. In doing this they accomplished what was inevitable from the experience of the centuries, and that is with the destroying of the value of silver commodity prices are likewise destroyed.

From the hearings before this committee, I am firm in the conviction and I believe every member of the committee is firm in the conviction that these foreign countries debauched their silver with the designed purpose of completely destroying the American manufacturing industry and American agriculture for the purpose of forcing the United States to cancel the war debts which are justly due this Nation from these foreign countries. I am firm in the conviction that it has been their designed purpose to force the people of the United States to pay for a war which they never started.

Foreign countries that owe this Nation, with their budgets balanced, are making up their budgets for the coming year totally ignoring their debts to this country. The time has come for the Congress and the people of this country to realize that Europe is waging an economic war upon the United States and that there are traitors within our own citizenship, in the form of international bankers and speculators, who are destroying security values with the designed purpose of forcing this country to cancel the war debts and

to heap upon the shoulders of the American people the expenses of a war in which they had no interest except to serve the true interests of humanity and to save some of the nations that are to-day carrying on this conspiracy against this country. Realizing these facts, I believe that it is time for the Congress and the people of the United States to serve notice on Europe that we expect these countries owing the United States these debts to pay their interest this year.

I am ready for a joint resolution by the House and the Senate declaring that we will not cancel the war debt, that we will not consent to an extension of the interest this year and call upon these countries to pay us the interest which they owe us for the coming year. Further realizing these facts, I think it is time for the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States to take the stock exchange and the international bankers in hand and just as nearly as possible accord to them the same consideration that is always accorded to one who is a traitor to his country. So far as I am concerned, let it be said that any institution or any American citizen, who practices the program of that which the J. P. Morgan & Co. practiced in selling these bonds to the American people, stands in the same light before the American people of this and future generations as does any common traitor to the American people.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Quartermaster, \$126,560; in all, \$305,030: *Provided*, That the total number of enlisted men on duty at Marine Corps headquarters on May 7, 1930, shall not be increased, and in lieu of enlisted men whose services at such headquarters shall be terminated for any cause prior to July 1, 1933, their places may be filled by civilians, for the pay of whom, in accordance with the classification act of 1923, as amended, either or both the appropriations "Pay, Marine Corps," and "General expenses, Marine Corps," shall be available: *Provided further*, That neither this nor any other Marine Corps appropriation shall be available for the employment in a civil capacity of any transferred member of the Marine Corps Reserve at a rate of compensation which, in conjunction with his reserve pay, would exceed the sum of his pay and allowances as a transferred member of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I have a committee amendment which I offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee amendment will take precedence. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AYRES for the committee: Page 46, line 18, after the word "available," strike out the colon and all of the proviso down through the word "duty" in line 25.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of that amendment, it has come to the notice of the committee in the last day or two, that this would be a discrimination against the Marine Corps, and not wishing to do that in favor of any other activity, we ask that this amendment be adopted and that the proviso be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, that is the amendment that I intended to offer, and I withdraw my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALTERATIONS TO NAVAL VESSELS

Toward the alterations and repairs required for the purpose of modernizing the U. S. S. *New Mexico*, *Mississippi*, and *Idaho*, authorized by the act entitled "An act to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels," approved February 28, 1931 (to be completely accomplished within a total cost of \$27,000,000), \$14,000,000, this sum, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the same purpose contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1931, to be apportioned, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, among the aforesaid ships and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of the amount available for expenditure under this head for the fiscal year 1933 for employees in the field service assigned to Group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$30,000.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the language on page 50, line 7, after the comma, "in the

discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, among the aforesaid ships." It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. GOSS. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. I would be glad to know why the gentleman wants to strike that out. I admit that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. GOSS. It is subject to a point of order. The authorization act which passed August 17, 1923, Public Act No. 746, and also in the second deficiency appropriation bill provided that approximately an equal amount should be expended on each ship. That was the legislation passed by the Committee on Naval Affairs. This language does away with that authority and provides that under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy the money may be apportioned out in any way at all. Inasmuch as it is legislation on an appropriation bill, if it is desirable, no doubt the Committee on Naval Affairs can bring in a bill to do this very thing.

Mr. AYRES. I admit it is subject to a point of order, but I think that taking it out will cripple the Navy to a very great extent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I disagree with the gentleman from Kansas. I think the gentleman from Connecticut is correct, because this expenditure was allocated for certain purposes.

Mr. AYRES. I have nothing further to say, if the gentleman wants to insist upon his point of order. I admit the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a few questions of the chairman of the committee. By what authority does the Committee on Appropriations reduce the original authorization of \$30,000,000 for modernizing three battleships to \$27,000,000?

Mr. AYRES. Because we felt in view of the fact that material and everything else has gone down in price that we could easily reduce the amount to \$27,000,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did any individual representing the Navy Department come before the committee and request this reduction?

Mr. AYRES. Not at all.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, to show the further inconsistency of the Committee on Appropriations, they have arbitrarily, because they say the depression is on and that living is cheaper, reduced this amount from \$30,000,000 to \$27,000,000, without any expert advice, without any authority in the Navy Department requesting it. They have just taken 10 per cent off this on the theory that probably they may be right. The truth of the matter is that this reduction of \$3,000,000 in the authorized cost, which has been approved by the Congress and appropriated for at various times by the Committee on Appropriations in the House and in the Senate, was an irreducible minimum. In fact, it will cost a little more than \$30,000,000 to modernize those ships. Now, by stringing the construction out they will increase the overhead and increase the cost and incidentally waste in that way several hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. In a moment. If the committee of which the distinguished gentleman from New York is a member had taken the slightest expert advice, the slightest expert testimony, had asked for the slightest information from the department itself as to whether this reduction could be reasonably made in the interest of economy, they would not have brought in such a provision. These \$3,000,000 will eventually come in a deficiency appropriation bill later on after we have wasted \$100,000 or \$200,000 in extended time and delays in an endeavor to meet the \$27,000,000. I pledge my judgment against the gentleman's judgment that that is what will happen. I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. The gentleman does not believe that prices have gone down and that the Government of the United States should pay any attention to that sort of thing?

Mr. BRITTEN. Of course, I believe that prices have gone down. Everyone with an ounce of brains in his head knows that, but nobody from the Navy Department has said a word about the cost of these ships going down.

I am sure the gentleman from Kansas would not place his judgment against the judgment of the Navy Department as to how much was necessary to complete the modernization of a battleship. No one can foresee the various costs that are met in modernizing a great battleship. The gentleman's committee had no expert advice. It arbitrarily cut \$3,000,000 on the idea of the gentleman from New York, who thinks that bananas and coconuts and cabbages are going into this construction rather than steel and highly specialized labor.

Mr. Chairman, on page 50 of the bill, explained on page 26 of the report, the authorized limit of cost for modernizing the *New Mexico*, *Mississippi*, and *Idaho* is reduced from \$30,000,000 to \$27,000,000, and \$1,000,000 has been deducted from the Budget estimates for 1933, changing that item from \$15,000,000 to \$14,000,000.

The modernization of these three ships can not be completed for less than the present authorized limit of cost of \$30,000,000 without deferring items of work which are considered necessary for satisfactory completion. The original authorization of \$30,000,000 was based upon careful estimates of the cost of individual items which were considered necessary in the modernization of these vessels. This amount was authorized after extended hearings by the Naval Committee; plans were prepared for modernization along these lines; the ships have been stripped and much of the work has already been begun.

The original estimates aggregating approximately \$30,000,000 were made with the expectation of completing the work within 21 months. Owing to the economic conditions the modernization of all of these vessels has already been extended from 5 to 15 months, notwithstanding the fact that it was realized that this extension of time limit would, by increasing the overhead, increase the total cost of the project. Due to this cause the total cost of the originally contemplated project has already gone beyond the limit and in order to absorb this within the original limitation, arrangements have already been made for deferring work which was originally contemplated to the extent of \$913,000. At the time of the compilation of the estimates for 1933 this entire matter was very thoroughly considered. It was desired to reduce the estimate for 1933 to a minimum, but a careful survey showed that \$15,000,000 was the absolute minimum for that year which could be appropriated and still permit the vessels to be completed within the \$30,000,000 limitation without abandoning projects which were considered essential and which could not be deferred.

It is, therefore, considered very necessary that the original limitation of \$30,000,000 imposed by Congress be restored and that the appropriation for this item for 1933 be increased to the Budget estimate of \$15,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, unless this limit is restored the ships can not be put back in a satisfactory condition for service since they have been stripped and the work has been laid out and is being prosecuted for eventual completion in accordance with the limit originally stated in the authorizing act.

In case it is impossible to restore this \$1,000,000 without a similar reduction in some other appropriation, though it is undesirable further to reduce the appropriation, "Increase of the Navy, construction and machinery," it now appears that delay in the progress of the work on the cruisers under construction in the Navy yards will make it possible for a further reduction in this appropriation to be made without serious interference with the work as it will progress during 1933. For that reason, if this \$1,000,000 must be taken from some other appropriation, it is recommended that it be taken from "Increase of the Navy, construction and machinery," as shown on page 41, column 6, of the report, making

the total reduction under that item \$3,637,000 instead of \$2,637,000 therein contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: Page 50, line 4, strike out the figures "\$14,000,000" and insert the figures "\$15,000,000."

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is not an increase of a dollar, because when we come to the next section, if this amendment is adopted, I shall ask that the next section be reduced by the same amount.

The reason I am doing that is that the Navy Department says they can save that million dollars on these new vessels, or not use that this year, without crippling the efficiency of the work, as the work on these is just beginning, but these battleships are now in dry dock. They have been there several months longer than is necessary. Every day they are there it costs between fifty and a hundred dollars additional. The Navy is asking that simply as a matter of economy and efficiency. They can save the loss on one, and they can not on the other.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman explain why his amendment does not increase the appropriation \$1,000,000?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes. Ten million of this has already been appropriated. This provides \$14,000,000, which only makes \$24,000,000. There are \$3,000,000 more to be appropriated before reaching the reduced appropriation of \$27,000,000.

Mr. AYRES. But \$14,000,000 is the appropriation we are proposing for 1933.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is true. But that does not take up all of the authorization of \$27,000,000. Ten million dollars was appropriated last year.

Mr. AYRES. But there is no other way of figuring it than that it adds just \$1,000,000 to the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It will enable them to complete the ships that much sooner.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. It will enable them to complete the ships that much sooner and on time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The total amount of the appropriation for the modernization of the vessels is \$27,000,000.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And \$10,000,000 has already been appropriated.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. So there is the difference between \$10,000,000 and \$27,000,000 to be spent?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And the gentleman is asking to increase it \$1,000,000 now to enable them to finish the ships that much sooner?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is true.

Mr. AYRES. Is the gentleman from Georgia in favor of increasing this appropriation \$1,000,000?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am in favor of every retrenchment possible, but I would not have the nerve or temerity, in the modernizing of a ship, to sit around a board and say, "We will arbitrarily reduce it," without the advice of experts who have to do the construction of it.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think I must not have made myself clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, what amendment does the gentleman oppose?

Mr. TABER. The one that is before the House.

Mr. BRITTEN. Well, what is it?

Mr. TABER. I know what it is. Does the gentleman from Illinois not know what it is?

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, regular order.

Mr. TABER. Other Members of the House have been here and they know what is going on, and the gentleman from Illinois apparently does not. I observed the gentleman was here, but he does not know, apparently, what is going on. Everyone else in the House knows what is going on.

The proposition is just this, whether the membership of this House has enough common sense and enough knowledge of current conditions to know that most of the things connected with the modernization of a battleship are materials that are bought by the Navy Department to put into them. They know that the price of steel has gone down. They know that the price of labor in private plants has gone down, and they know that almost everything that is needed can be bought from factories for one-half to two-thirds what it would cost when this authorization bill was passed.

Now, in sitting around the board and agreeing to a cut in this authorization and in this appropriation, your committee did not have in mind that the work should be slowed down but that the department should take advantage of the savings which can be made as a result of that drop in prices, and that we should promote efficiency in the department. You know and I know that if they are compelled to do it they can adopt efficient methods, and they can save 10 per cent on the cost of these items, and they can get the job done just as quickly as they planned to do it at the start.

I know that a department always, when it has an authorization and when prices go down, wants to use it all by adding additional things to be done. That is the way they get by. That is the way those things work. With the present condition of the Treasury, it is up to the Congress to stick by those things which we originally had in mind when we reported this bill and stick to what the committee has done. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto shall close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, were it not for the overstatement of my colleague from New York, I would not take any time of the committee. His justification for the decrease in the modernization item, I suppose, is based on efficiency methods of workmanship, and perhaps from past experience in modernizing other battleships. But when the gentleman from New York takes the floor and states that the price of material, the price of living, the price of labor has gone down from 50 per cent to two-thirds since the time this act was passed, I must take exception to that and clear the record of any such wild statement.

The act was approved February 28, 1931, and surely there has not been a decrease of 50 per cent or 75 per cent in the cost of material. There has not been a decrease of that extent in the wages of labor. We are not going to permit any such decrease in the cost of labor to be brought about in this country. So I say to my colleague from New York that I am with him in voting against this amendment, but I am sorry that he made such a rash statement not based upon any facts.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Is it not true that since this act was passed there has been a reduction in the price of basic materials entering into the modernization of these vessels?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; and let me say just a word to my colleagues, which I hope they will bear in mind between now and next Wednesday or Thursday: They can not think

of cutting wages and think of inflating currency and increasing commodity prices at the same time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: Page 50, line 2, after the figures "1931," strike out the parenthesis and the remainder of line 2, all of line 3 and line 4 to the figures \$14,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE OF THE NAVY

Construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and machinery of vessels heretofore authorized, \$23,063,000, and, in addition, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy, to make transfers during the fiscal year 1933 from the naval supply account fund to this appropriation of sums aggregating not to exceed \$6,000,000, and the total sums hereby made available shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of the amount available for expenditure under the head of "Construction and Machinery" for the fiscal year 1933 for employees in the field service assigned to Group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$790,000: *Provided*, That of the appropriations contained in this act under the head of "Increase of the Navy," there shall be available such sums as the Secretary of the Navy may from time to time determine to be necessary for the engagement of technical services, including the purchase of plans, and the employment of personnel in the Navy Department and in the field, in addition to those otherwise provided for, owing to the construction of vessels heretofore authorized and herein or heretofore appropriated for in part.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: Page 51, at the end of line 15, add the following: "*Provided further*, That the President of the United States be requested to instruct the American delegates to the Disarmament Conference at Geneva to propose, on the basis of the 5-5-3 existing treaty ratio, a further reduction in the number of battleships and battle cruisers of over 10,000 tons."

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Yesterday Admiral Kittelle, of the Navy Department, spoke before the Daughters of the American Revolution and said that the United States Navy was now second in strength and was rapidly becoming the third in point of view of strength in comparison with the navies of Great Britain and Japan. Some years ago a very distinguished Member of this House, Mr. Bourke Cockran, of New York, informed the House that a second-best navy was like a second-best hand at poker, that it was not worth a darn. We are now informed that we have a second-best navy by an admiral of our Navy, and that it is rapidly becoming the third-best Navy.

I suggest, and suggest in all seriousness, that if the Members of the House want to economize and save a hundred million dollars annually without reducing the efficiency of our national defense, or of our Navy in any respect, the number of battleships and battle cruisers over 10,000 tons could be reduced just as was done in 1921 at the Washington conference. I ask any member of the committee if it is not a fact that should we reduce our battleships and battle cruisers from 18 to 10, and if Great Britain and Japan should reduce theirs proportionately, we would not have the same identical naval defense? I submit that we would have a better national defense, because at the present time we are not living up to the 5-5-3 ratio.

I am willing to vote appropriations now to live up to the big Navy on the 5-5-3 ratio, both for battleships over 10,000 tons and light cruisers under 10,000 tons; but see no sound reasons why we should not offer through our delegates at Geneva to further reduce the number of battleships and battle cruisers over 10,000 tons. If we really mean what we say about economy and balancing the Budget, I know of no better, easier, or more equitable way of reducing Federal expenditures without loss of efficiency or security.

We would have a better national defense if we agreed to reduce our battleships to 10 and the same number for Great Britain and 6 for Japan, because then the Appropriations Committee would probably be willing to recommend appropriations to maintain that ratio, at least, to maintain 10 battleships in the most modern and highest degree of efficiency. At the present moment the leaders of the House are sitting up at night and spending sleepless nights in trying to find ways and means to economize and to reduce appropriations. If my proposal were put into effect, we could reduce appropriations over \$100,000,000 annually and still have exactly the same efficiency in the Navy, the same national defense, and the same proportional naval protection for the United States. I do not refer to the 10,000-ton cruisers and below. They are used for the protection of commerce, and we have far more than most nations, but the big battleships in war time are generally held in the ports, kept there by fear of submarines.

I say to you that Great Britain and Japan ought to welcome a proposal to further reduce the number of their battleships and battle cruisers over 10,000 tons on the 5-5-3 basis because they are more debt-ridden and more burdened with taxes than we are, and the Lord knows our taxpayers are burdened enough. So it seems to me to be simply sound common sense to at least have our delegates at Geneva make such an offer or proposal at the present time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I made the point of order against this amendment because it instructed our representatives at the disarmament conference at Geneva to follow a course without having in mind the military aspects or the military properties or values to the United States of the different classes of ships of the fleet.

The representatives of our admiralty have told us time and again that it is absolutely necessary that we have battleships because we have not fuel stations and all that sort of thing all over the world. I personally am not an expert on fighting battleships and I can not testify along that line; but I believe that when we go into a conference to pass on what our Navy needs and what we should have to defend America our best fighting men should be the judges of the types of ships that we keep and the types that we permit others to keep and build by treaty.

We have at that conference representatives of the Navy Department and of the State Department. I believe it is for them to judge what we should do.

Now, with reference to our battleships, we are keeping our battleships right up to the mark. They are up to the 5-5-3 ratio, and that is the best judgment of our naval experts.

With reference to cruisers and the other supplementary ships, we are bringing in this bill appropriations to carry our Navy along as fast as it can be carried within the limitations of the treaty and just as fast as our department says they expect to be able to go.

We have not any authority to begin the building of the smaller grade of cruisers.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is authority, is there not, to provide for the construction of destroyers, as provided for in 1916?

Mr. TABER. There were some provided for last year and there is a provision for carrying along the construction of

those on which work has commenced. More could be provided; but it is better, in my opinion, to go ahead and establish a policy of building some and letting our designers get into shape so they can do a good job on building a destroyer and not go ahead with mass construction and perhaps make a mistake and have a lot of poor tonnage. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Secretary of the Navy, \$200,520.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 54, line 24, strike out "\$200,520" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$191,500; and section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith,' approved June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 767, 768), be and the same is hereby repealed as of June 30, 1932."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I may state to the committee that the object and purpose of the amendment is to abolish the position in the Navy of Assistant Secretary for Aeronautics, a similar provision having been unanimously reported by the Naval Affairs Committee.

When we created the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Aeronautics we all felt that aviation was in its infancy and needed the strong arm of some civilian to support that branch of the service, but to-day aviation is an integral part of the Navy and there is absolutely no need or necessity of having an assistant secretary for aviation any more than you would have an assistant secretary for battleships or for cruisers or submarines.

The matter was heard in the Naval Affairs Committee a few days ago, and met with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

Understand, there is no reflection intended upon the person who has occupied this office in the past or now. We have been fortunate in having two very able Assistant Secretaries of the Navy for Aeronautics, Professor Warner and the present Assistant Secretary, Mr. Ingalls. They are very distinguished aviators, but the Navy Department does not need them and they do not need a similar office in the War Department, and a similar bill has already been introduced with respect to the War Department dealing with that office.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. By what authority does the gentleman say the position is not needed in the War Department? Is the gentleman acquainted with military affairs?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I was a member of the Morrow Board that authorized this office. He thought then it was necessary to harmonize the friction that was existing in the two branches of the service and to dovetail aviation into them. That need no longer exists. You can not run an army without aviation, and you can not run a navy without aviation. Every officer now knows the necessity of aviation, and there is no need of a separate establishment or a separate chief at the head of such service.

Mr. GOSS. I think the gentleman has answered the question—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOSS (continuing). When the gentleman says there is need for aviation and that you could not run a navy or an army without it. Therefore I think we must have a head to this department.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, you could not run an army without the infantry or the artillery, but you would not, therefore, think for one moment of having an Assistant Secretary of War for artillery or for infantry.

I was a member of the board that recommended this to the Congress, and the very reason we did this in 1926 was to stimulate aviation and to make the older officers see that Congress was going to legislate to take care of aviation. Since they have put aviation officers on the general staff

in the Army, there is no need of having a separate civilian secretary just for aviation alone, and that has been his sole jurisdiction in the Army and in the Navy.

So the Committee on Naval Affairs has unanimously reported this bill, and, of course, what I am now seeking to do refers entirely to the Navy Department. We will cross the bridge with respect to the Army when we come to it.

Mr. GOSS. I thought the gentleman was referring to the Army.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With pleasure.

Mr. FRENCH. Ordinarily, it would seem that legislation of this kind should not be considered on an appropriation bill—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me say to the gentleman that this is in order under the Holman rule.

Mr. FRENCH. I think it is in order, but, on the other hand, it does involve a very large principle. May I ask whether or not the gentleman's committee had hearings upon the subject?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The committee last Monday had the distinguished Secretary of the Navy before it, and, after some inquiry of him, the Secretary said he had no objection to the favorable consideration of this bill, and upon a roll call the committee voted unapimously to abolish the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Aeronautics. It is a useless office.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think all I need do to point out the danger of this amendment is to recall to the older Members the condition in the Air Service of the Navy prior to the enactment of the law which created the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Aeronautics.

Aviation is still in its infancy, and every Member of the House will recall the scandal that took place in the Army and the condition in the Navy, the conflict between the line officers and fliers. If the gentleman of the House will stop to consider that we are spending millions of dollars for new flying equipment, and now that we have the Air Service of the Navy in good condition, with good morale, by reason of having established a separate bureau, at the head of which is now an able executive and a distinguished flier that men have confidence in, the procurement of material has been under proper supervision, economies have been made, the equipment is better, the personnel is better, and I say that we should not at this time, on the spur of the moment, with only a few Members present, abolish this office.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This proposition was investigated by the Naval Affairs Committee, and the committee had the Secretary of the Navy before it, and the Secretary of the Navy said that there was absolutely no need or necessity for this office.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And the gentleman knows that before the Morrow investigating committee the then Secretary of the Navy made the same argument, and next year or 10 years from now whoever is Secretary of the Navy will repeat the same argument.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We established this office for doing what has been accomplished; that is, to stimulate and give aviation its right place in the Navy.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman wants to destroy all the good that has been accomplished, if he wants to put aviation back under the control of persons who are not in sympathy with it, who do not understand it, then abolish this office.

It is a fact that the Secretary of the Navy appeared before the committee, and did indorse it, and what he says is nothing new. We know that the great Committee on Naval Affairs is susceptible to the influence of the department—it always has been; it is a tradition of the committee, and I have no fault to find with it. But let me say to the gentleman from Georgia, and he is a student of the history of the

Navy, that every new invention has been resisted and fought by the admirals of the Navy—the ironclad, the Ericsson propeller, the Whitehead torpedo, and the Lewis machine gun—every new invention or weapon has been resisted and fought by the admirals of the Navy. I would like to have Members read the life of Ericsson, published a few years ago, which will disclose the stand-pat attitude of the officials of the Navy Department to anything that is new.

The position of Assistant Secretary of Aviation is something that Congress has established, and I submit, gentlemen, that having gone through with two investigations, and having written the law, and having created the separate office for that branch of the service, we ought not to dispense with it in this summary manner. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those hard-boiled members of the Appropriations Committee who hates to spend a cent, and I guess the gentleman from New York will tell you that I am probably the worst one. Am I right?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman is right. [Laughter.]

Mr. TABER. I believe in keeping appropriations down, without impairing the national defense. I do not believe in spending anything that we do not absolutely have to spend.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] told you, this office was created for the purpose of seeing that aviation got a chance to develop in the Navy.

Now, I think we all must realize that aviation, properly developed and properly looked after, is perhaps the most important military branch of our Government. I believe that if we are going to keep it to the mark, if we are going to keep up the work in the development of aviation, we should see that it goes along to the very best advantage, and we ought to have a civilian over our military men who will give us the best development in aviation that any nation can have. For that reason I am going to vote against this proposition. The salary is a minor item compared with what one who gives his time, with considerable business experience back of him, can save to the country in the manner in which contracts are let and in the manner in which the appropriation is administered. I believe we really save many times the salary that the aviation secretary gets if we keep him there and he continues to follow the thing through like a good civilian business man would follow them all along the line.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I notice the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia is to change the sum in line 24, page 54, in the office of the Secretary of the Navy, and that on page 55 there is a provision for the Bureau of Aeronautics to the amount of \$290,400. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Bureau of Aeronautics is not tied up in any way with the Secretary of Aviation?

Mr. TABER. The Bureau of Aeronautics expenditures are different than those of the Secretary.

Mr. ARENTZ. Does the gentleman not think that is duplication?

Mr. TABER. I think it is a proper classification to have the Assistant Secretary directly under the Secretary's office rather than under the Bureau of Aeronautics.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with every effort to effect wise economies, but since this amendment is not in order on this bill, and since all Members of the House are in agreement that if this action is taken in respect to the Navy similar action should be taken in the Army, and since the committee has been told that legislation looking to this end will be submitted to the House in a regular and orderly way, I hope the House will not adopt this amendment. It would be improper to seek by an amendment, which is not in order on this bill, to eliminate a position that has served in a most helpful way the Air Service of the Navy, and likewise in a helpful way the Air Service of the Army. Whether the House should later decide that these two places could be dispensed with it is not now necessary to discuss. The gentleman from Georgia states that a bill from his committee, which has authority to legislate on such matters, will be presented

seeking to accomplish what is proposed in the pending amendment. The House will then have full opportunity to discuss the matter in an orderly way, and I hope the gentleman from Georgia, evidencing his accustomed spirit of fairness, will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

For professional and technical books and periodicals, law books, and necessary reference books, including city directories, railway guides, freight, passenger, and express tariff books and photostating, for department library; for purchase of photographs, maps, documents, and pictorial records of the Navy, photostating and other necessary incidental expenses in connection with the preparation for publication of the naval records of the war with the Central Powers of Europe; for stationery, furniture, newspapers, plans, drawings, and drawing materials; purchase and exchange of motor trucks or motor delivery wagons, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor trucks or motor delivery wagons; garage rent; street-car fares not exceeding \$500; freight, expressage, postage, typewriters, and computing machines, and other absolutely necessary expenses of the Navy Department and its various bureaus and offices, \$80,000; it shall not be lawful to expend, unless otherwise specifically provided herein, for any of the offices or bureaus of the Navy Department in the District of Columbia, any sum out of appropriations made for the naval service for any of the purposes mentioned or authorized in this paragraph: *Provided*, That any unexpended or unobligated balances under appropriations for salaries in the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1932 may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, be expended for the purchase, exchange, or rental of labor-saving devices during the fiscal year 1933.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the proviso on page 57, line 23, down to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, in order to save time I admit the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRINTING AND BINDING

For printing and binding for the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment executed at the Government Printing Office, \$550,000, including not exceeding \$103,000 for the Hydrographic Office and \$2,800 for the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to briefly state to the committee that I have read the bill and the report most carefully and wish to go on record expressing my general approval of the work of the subcommittee in bringing the House the bill in its present shape. In my judgment the committee has rendered great service to the country in making reductions, and at the same time doing no great injustice to this arm of our national defense. Of course there are a great many items in the bill which if I were a member of the subcommittee I would not have inserted the language contained in the bill, but in the main the committee has done a great service and deserves the thanks of the House for making these reductions and at the same time not impairing the general efficiency of the Navy.

I call the attention of the committee and that of the country to the fact that the country has an idea that the Army and the Navy are two extravagant branches of our Government and that many millions of dollars are wasted in that way. I want to place in the RECORD some facts to show how the money we appropriate from year to year is allocated and what per cent goes to the Navy and what per cent to the Army. The legislative appropriation bill for the last six years has been increased by 59 per cent. The Veterans' Bureau appropriation has been increased in that time by 114 per cent, the independent offices in the same years by 242 per cent, the Agricultural Department in the same years has been increased by 115 per cent, the Commerce Department by 77 per cent, the Justice Department by 101 per cent, the Labor Department has been increased 61 per cent, the Post Office Department in the last six years has been increased 14 per cent, and the Treasury Department increased 62 per cent. The District of Colum-

bia has been increased in its appropriations 34 per cent in the same time and the War Department in that time has been increased by 29 per cent.

The Navy Department, the arm of national defense which must be ready at all times to meet any and all national emergencies, has only been increased 11 per cent. This bill has reduced the Budget estimate about \$14,000,000, and yet, with the distribution of the \$326,000,000 carried in the bill, the committee has so distributed it as not to seriously impair the efficiency of the national defense. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. No appropriation under the Navy Department available during the fiscal years 1932 and/or 1933 shall be used after the date of the approval of this act (1) to increase the compensation of any position within the grade to which such position has been allocated under the classification act of 1923, as amended, (2) to increase the compensation of any position in the field service the pay of which is adjustable to correspond so far as may be practicable to the rates established by such act as amended for the departmental service in the District of Columbia, (3) to increase the compensation of any position under such act through reallocation, (4) to increase the compensation of any person in any grade under such act through advancement to another position in the same grade or to a position in a higher grade at a rate in excess of the minimum rate of such higher grade unless such minimum rate would require an actual reduction in compensation, or (5) to increase the compensation of any other civil position under the Navy Department: *Provided*, That from the date of this act to and including June 30, 1933, payment for personal services made in accordance herewith shall constitute payment in full for such services. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by the operation of this section shall not be used for any other purposes, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and a report of the amounts so impounded for the period between the date of the approval of this act and October 31, 1932, shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LaGUARDIA: Beginning on line 1, page 61, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was called to the attention of the subcommittee in advance, and we have discussed it with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Since this provision was omitted from the Interior Department appropriation bill as it passed the House, and since we are informed it will be later offered under a rule making it applicable to all of the departments, we have felt it could be omitted from this particular bill. The House was assured, when this provision was inserted in the first bill, that if passed it would be made to apply to every other appropriation bill. For that reason, and knowing that it will be presented so as to give the House an opportunity to determine whether it shall affect all departments and other Government agencies alike, the committee will not oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman will also recall that the House did express itself once on a record vote on the Post Office Department-Treasury bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to strike out section 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may change the section numbers.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the section numbers will be changed by the Clerk.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for maintaining, driving, or operating any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle not used exclusively for official purposes; and "official purposes" shall not include the transportation of officers and employees between their

domiciles and places of employment except in cases of medical officers on out-patient medical service and except in cases of officers and employees engaged in field work the character of whose duties makes such transportation necessary, and then only as to such latter cases when the same is approved by the head of the department. This section shall not apply to any motor vehicle for official use of the Secretary of the Navy, and no other persons connected with the Navy Department or the naval service, except the commander in chief of the United States Asiatic Fleet, Marine Corps officers serving with expeditionary forces in foreign countries, and medical officers on out-patient medical service, shall have a Government-owned motor vehicle assigned for their exclusive use.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goss: Page 62, in line 18, after the word "Navy," insert "and the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to allow official automobiles for the assistant Cabinet members, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy in charge of air. They are allowed automobiles to-day to go to their official work in Washington, and it seems to me, in view of the many calls upon them, they should be allowed motor transportation the same as the Secretary of the Navy. They take the place of the Secretary of the Navy when he is not able to go on official business, and I trust the committee will adopt that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FULLER, 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. 11452) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the amendments and the final passage of the bill be deferred until a later date.

Mr. SCHAFER. Reserving the right to object, what is the future date? I intend to offer a motion to recommit, and I want to be present when the vote is taken.

Mr. AYRES. I will say to the gentleman for his benefit that we have not yet decided on that later date, but that I will notify the gentleman when that date will be.

Mr. SCHAFER. With that assurance, so that I can offer the 10 per cent reduction in a motion to recommit, if I can obtain recognition for that purpose, I shall not object.

Mr. AYRES. I will notify the gentleman.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are quite a number of Members who would like to have the time limit indicated, within which it will not be voted upon.

Mr. AYRES. I will state to the gentleman that it will not be before Thursday of next week.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to understand the situation. When the previous question is ordered on a bill and the vote is not taken on that day, under the rules of the House it would come up on the next legislative day. That would be on next Monday. The understanding of the Chair is that there was a virtual agreement among the gentlemen in control of the bill, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Ayres] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr.

BYRNS], that the consideration of this bill would be postponed until next Wednesday. The Chair would like to know whether or not that agreement has been changed to Thursday?

Mr. AYRES. I will state that it has been changed, Mr. Speaker. My understanding was that next Wednesday would be Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Calendar Wednesday business under the special order heretofore agreed to will be considered next Tuesday instead of on next Wednesday. Ordinarily the time to take up this bill would be on next Wednesday. That was the understanding which the Chair had.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, after the conference with the Speaker, there were further conferences held, and it was found wholly impracticable for Members of the Pennsylvania delegation to return by next Wednesday. These Members had come to Washington to-day upon a wire request from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW] expecting to vote to-day upon the Darrow amendment, only to find that the vote will not be had to-day.

These Members find that it will be impracticable, on account of the fact that Tuesday is primary election day in Pennsylvania, to be here by Wednesday. Therefore it will be necessary for them to have the vote deferred until Thursday if they are to be accommodated. It is my understanding that this arrangement is agreeable to the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. It is perfectly agreeable.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will interpret the unanimous-consent agreement to be that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] shall control the time as to when he will call up the bill for consideration.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the subject of vocational education, and to include some excerpts from a statement made by President Hoover.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, vocational education is one of the important activities in which our public-school system is engaged. Now, it is sought by the Economy Committee to eliminate the appropriation for this work and thus throw 1,250,000 boys and girls out of our public schools. This it is proposed to do under the guise of economy. The mere intimation has surprised and stunned the parents of this vast army of boys and girls who are now in the midst of their vocational courses. The mere suggestion that this important phase of public-school work be suspended even for one year has alarmed the people throughout the country and aroused their bitter opposition to it. This is not strange, for if there is any one institution in this country that has the confidence and the whole-hearted support of the American people it is our public-school system.

Those who are at present urging and insisting that the pupils now enrolled in vocational education be set adrift ought to know that such a move is not economy but national calamity.

How great will be the economic loss to the Nation if these boys and girls are deprived of the opportunity to complete their courses? Let us keep in mind that there are 1,250,000 now enrolled in vocational courses. The most exhaustive survey made by heads of industry and by educators has shown that, based upon the future earning capacity, the return to each child for each day spent in school is from \$9 to \$10 a day. The time spent by each student in a vocational school each year is about 200 days. It is obvious that, based upon \$9 a day for each child that attends school for 200 days, the return will amount to \$1,800. On the same basis it follows that 1,250,000 vocational students will earn a future return for each school year the sum of \$2,250,000,000. To destroy this potential earning capacity of a generation of boys and girls is to great an economic loss to

the Nation to justify the suspension of public-school work even for one year. Aside from this, the injustice to the children and the parents would be deplorable.

The result achieved in industrial and agricultural education under Federal legislation has been characterized "an impressive tribute to the wisdom of Congress."

Even during the time the students are in school, the money appropriated by the Federal Government for vocational agricultural education is a paying investment. A survey covering a period of five years shows this. For example, a boy who elects to take vocational agriculture is required to devote six months in some practical work on the farm under the supervision of his teacher. Accurate cost accounts have been kept for the 5-year period to ascertain the labor income from this practical work. The total labor income from this source during a period of five years amounted to \$23,637,924.25. The total amount appropriated by the Federal Government and utilized for this worth-while activity during this 5-year period was \$10,418,460.

With the assurance that the Federal Government would perform its legislative commitments, the States have set up vocational programs. In many communities new buildings have been erected at local expense, and in many instances at considerable local sacrifice in order to provide the necessary facilities to properly teach vocational agriculture. This has been done because the local people have felt that the Federal Government would keep faith with them.

Legislatures in many States have now adjourned. They had no warning of this proposal of the Economy Committee to disrupt the educational program of the States; therefore, the States are powerless to come to the rescue.

Now that the opposition to the suspension of Federal aid for vocational education in the States has developed into a veritable storm of protest, I understand from press reports, that the Economy Committee is considering an alternative proposal equally objectionable. The plan now contemplated by the Economy Committee is to continue the allotment for vocational education for one year and then suspend or curtail it. This is an attempt to quietly and gradually strangle vocational education rather than destroy it at this time by direct action. It is an effort to accomplish indirectly that which it dare not do directly. The motive is now clear and unmistakable.

The chief objective is not Federal retrenchment to meet a present emergency. It is an effort to destroy vocational education in the public schools. Even under the latest proposal, the children in those States where the legislature meets only once in four years, would suffer through the closing of the vocational schools at the end of one year. The schools in other States would be placed under a cloud of uncertainty. This new proposal is more reprehensible than the first, because its purpose is not economy but rather an attempt to commit Congress to a policy of hostility to a phase of public education that has proved most beneficial to the masses. It is sought to achieve this reversal of our national educational policy under a gag rule that will afford no opportunity whatever for the friends of education to protect the rights of the public schools. I feel that the issue is too vital to the country to warrant such hasty and ill-advised procedure.

Should the Economy Committee succeed in its proposal, it is not the children of the rich who will suffer. The blow will fall upon the children whose parents are of modest means. It will hit hardest those parents who are without work. The chief comfort and the only hope that now comes to such parents is the assurance that their children are able to continue in school. This comfort and this hope should not be ruthlessly destroyed.

In 1922, President Hoover, when a member of the Cabinet, made this statement:

Clearly, if economic waste is reprehensible, waste of child life, whether viewed economically or in terms of common and universal betterment, is a blight that in its measure is more deplorable than war.

It may be worth recounting that our system of individualism can only stand if we can make effective the supreme ideal of America. This ideal is that there shall be an equality of opportunity for every citizen to reach that position in the community

to which his intelligence, abilities, character, and ambition entitle him. I am a strong believer in this progressive individualism as the only road to economic, social, and spiritual safety and to human progress. Without this tempering ideal that America has evolved, individualism will not stand.

There is no equality of opportunity where children are allowed by law and compelled by parents to labor during the years they should receive instruction; there is no equality of opportunity unless this instruction is made compulsory by the State.

There is no equality of opportunity for children whose parents are not restrained by law from exploiting them, and compelled to give them participation in the beneficial privileges that the State provides for them.

Progress will march if we hold an abiding faith in the intelligence, the initiative, the character, the courage, and the divine touch in the individual. We can safeguard these ends if we give to each individual that opportunity for which the spirit of America stands. We can make a social system as perfect as our generation merits and one that will be received in gratitude by our children.

Again in 1923, while a member of the Cabinet, President Hoover expressed his attitude with reference to vocational education in these words:

My attention has been called to comments in the press on the increasing cost of education, and more particularly of vocational education in our public schools * * *. This cost can not be regarded as constituting a serious financial burden upon the community. It is approximately the cost of a medium-sized battleship. Certain indirect costs of this form of education can not be accurately estimated, but in the aggregate they are relatively to our wealth and population insignificant. If vocational education is worth while, certainly as a nation we can afford the price of such education. Our only concern is to know that it is worth while. If it is, expenditure on account of such education is in the nature of an investment which will yield large dividends from year to year through the progressive increase of labor skill and industrial efficiency.

As a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, I have for the past two years been brought into close contact with those who are administering the Federal vocational education act, providing for cooperation of the Federal Government with the States in the promotion of vocational education in our public schools.

The essential purpose of this act is to extend public-school education to provide for the needs of our youth who do not enter our higher technical and professional educational institutions. We are accustomed to large expenditures for the maintenance of these higher educational institutions. In some of our State universities the cost of providing education for the professions runs well into the thousands of dollars per student graduated. Vocational training for the commoner wage earning pursuits and skilled trades is equally as essential as is training for the professions. The humblest worker equally with the youth who proposes to enter the professions has a right to the sort of training he needs for the occupation by which he proposes to earn his livelihood and support his family, and through which he will render his service to the community in getting the community's work done. For him the cost of vocational training is relatively small, and is in fact a cost in appearance only, since the result of his training will be increase in efficiency and economy in production during the life period of his economic productivity.

We in this country believe that education in general pays for itself and is worth while; and if this is true of any sort of education, it is certainly true of vocational education. * * *

Men of affairs the country over are being impressed with the fact that the cost of training labor on the job is one of the great industrial costs, but they know that the cost of inefficiency and lack of training is very much greater, and that labor must be trained whatever the cost. If they or the community do not provide such training, they can not compete with the foreign producer whose labor is vocationally trained at public expense, nor can we as a nation adequately supply our own needs for the product of labor if we neglect to provide for the training of labor.

The cost of providing this training is just as properly a charge upon the public revenue as any other form of education. In the interests of labor itself such training can not be devolved upon the employer. Organized labor is perfectly right in insisting that vocational education shall be under public supervision and control, so that the interests and welfare of the worker as well as of the employer will be taken fairly into account. The cost of such training certainly should not be put upon the individual worker unless we are prepared to abandon our traditional policy of providing free education and equality of opportunity for our youth. We can not in fairness continue to provide specialized education free to the few who propose to enter the professions, while denying education to the many for the commoner vocations.

A community must pay either for the cost of training labor or for the much greater cost of inefficiency of labor, and inefficiency of labor means inevitably general industrial and commercial inefficiency.

Further, it may be noted that in so far as the products of American labor come into competition with the products of foreign labor, either in our own domestic market or in foreign markets, unemployment for American labor is bound to develop in proportion as foreign labor is better trained and more efficient. No American employer can hold his markets and continue to

employ labor, if his labor is relatively unskilled or if his costs for training labor greatly exceed those of his foreign competitors.

Every important foreign country, European and American, is providing for the vocational training of its citizens. Some of these countries are developing programs which contemplate very large expenditures of public money. They are relying in a large measure upon vocational training in their effort to master the commerce of the world in competition with the United States. Several of these countries have, during the past two years, sent delegations to this country to investigate and report upon our system of vocational education. Such delegations have come also from Japan, China, India, and Australia.

Can we expect to maintain our commercial standing in the world's markets if we neglect to train our labor, and if we permit other countries to take over the competitive advantages that superior vocational training will give them?

* * * There is, in fact, no better economy than the economy of adequate training for the pursuits of agriculture, commerce, industry, and the home. Our youth must enter into these pursuits and it is in the public interest that they be well trained for them.

To provide such training is clearly a public responsibility. Education in general, including vocational education for the youth, is democracy's most important business. Democracy in education means that in the field of education opportunity shall be extended equally to all—to give all a fair start. This is the educational ideal inspiring those who are administering the Federal vocational education act; it is the ideal which inspired Congress in passing the act; and it is traditionally the ideal of education in our democracy.

I want to urge each Member of the House of Representatives to register his disapproval of this attempt to destroy the effective and constructive work that is now being carried on by the vocational schools throughout the United States.

Let us remember the words of Webster:

If we work upon marble, it will perish; if we work upon brass, time will efface it; if we rear temples, they will crumble to the dust; but if we work on men's immortal minds, if we imbue them with high principles, with the just fear of God and love for their fellow men, we engrave on these tablets something which no time can efface and which will brighten to all eternity.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ADJOURN

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the present economic condition of the country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 1929 I was in several countries in Europe. I found that if the tariff bill then pending before the Senate should become law, American trade would be almost destroyed. What I found has come true. In 1929 our total exports were about \$5,000,000,000, and in 1930 less than \$4,000,000,000, and in 1931 only about two and one-half billion dollars. In two or three more years our exports will vanish, if the present conditions are allowed to prevail. Unless the Democratic Party comes into power, led by a man with brain and nerve to attack and destroy the strangle hold that the selfish and monopolistic interests have now got upon the throats of the producers of America, and unless the Congress elected at the same time will follow the leadership of such a President, the future of America is indeed dark.

It is idle to hope for any relief if Herbert Hoover is re-elected President. The first thing that he did after being inaugurated in 1929 was to call Congress into extra session to revise upward the Republican tariff law of 1922, and with his leadership and approval they built a Chinese wall around America.

Even to-day the farmers of the South could buy sulphate of ammonia at \$20 a ton to fertilize their cotton crops, except for this iniquitous tariff law, which is holding cargoes at Charleston and New York, loaded with sulphate of ammonia, until the importers shall give bond to pay \$10 a ton additional as duty. Thus the \$10 a ton will be passed to the farmer, if he is able to buy, and will be taken out of his pocket and put into the pocket of the United States Steel Corporation, and other smelters and producers of pig iron and steel, who produce sulphate of ammonia as a by-product of their coke ovens. This sulphate of ammonia probably cost them as a by-product 10 or 12 dollars a ton, and yet, due to the tariff, they will make the farmers who buy it pay them nearly \$30 a ton.

While Herbert Hoover was in a hurry to revise, upward, the Republican tariff of 1922, and called the special session of Congress for that purpose, yet in the early fall of 1931, when Members of Congress of both parties importuned him with tears and prayers to call an extra session of Congress in order to provide against the catastrophes and calamities that seemed to be crowding upon our people as winter approached, he turned a deaf ear to such application. He took into his own hands the unconstitutional authority to postpone the payment by foreign countries of their installments due on December 1, 1931, and then induced Congress to ratify his unconstitutional and illegal act, by claiming that he had saved the world from chaos, and had rescued America, along with the rest of the world, from common and universal ruin. If Congress had met in special session in the fall of 1931, and had passed the Glass-Steagall banking law, for loosening the frozen assets of banks, and to pass a law guaranteeing bank depositors against losses, and to authorize and require the Federal Reserve Board to use its vast powers to raise commodity prices, then there would have been no need for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. But due to his hesitating, faltering, shilly-shallying policy, the structure of American business has grown weaker day by day.

Now we are frankly told by the German Government that it will never pay another cent of war reparations and indemnities to our allies and associates, and England, one of our chief allies, has left out of her budget any item for the payment of her annual installment on her debt to America. Doubtless France and Italy and Belgium and the other nations will follow the same course. In December, 1931, there were \$252,000,000 in gold in New York banks, deposited by those European nations to pay their December installment. But they would not pay because of Herbert Hoover's unconstitutional and illegal promise that they need not pay. He and his big-business associates bastinadoed a timid Congress into ratifying his illegal action. We let slip the \$252,000,000 in gold, which was our last chance at a single cent of European repayment. It seemed to Herbert Hoover fine policy to play favors with international bankers who wanted our Government to forego collection of money due her, in order that these international bankers might collect that same \$252,000,000 on debts due them.

It seemed statesmanship to Herbert Hoover for the American Congress to authorize \$2,000,000,000 for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to save big business, and especially to put cash into the hands of the big investment international bankers. The records will show that practically all the money lent to insurance companies, railroads, and mortgage investment companies has found its way into the hands of these investment bankers. But when a proposition is advanced that will help and relieve 95 per cent of the 123,000,000 people who do the labor and fight the battles for America, Herbert Hoover and his allies, including the chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, use their "damns" and other forms of profanity to stigmatize it as uneconomic and dangerous.

God in His mercy and goodness has sent us two winters of mild weather. The suffering of the people was greatly minimized by that mildness. Dare we approach another winter with confidence and belief that such third winter will also be mild? If we dare not, then this Congress dare not adjourn until the first Monday in December, 1932. Herbert Hoover would not call Congress into session, whatever the public disaster might be and however many millions of people might be starving and freezing and dying, as has been demonstrated by his conduct in the fall of 1931.

This Congress should recess about the 1st of June, to be reconvened the middle of September, and if conditions are favorable, it can recess for 30-day periods until the 1st of December, but it dare not adjourn. If it does, Herbert Hoover will repeat his unconstitutional and illegal conduct in the management of international and national affairs, and the people will stagger on into a terrible winter of unemployment, with no prospect of improvement nor betterment.

Just a word of warning. And I deliberately use conservative language. I dare not express fully, in words to be printed, what is in my mind. If Herbert Hoover and his advisers, consisting of selfish and narrow investment bankers, continue to stand in the way of every proposition to increase commodity prices and to make it possible for the farmer and the small business man and the small banker to save his home and his business, and support his family, then upon their heads will be the consequences of such conduct.

If this coming winter should be severe, and if unemployment is not materially reduced, the people whose reserves have been exhausted and whose patience is well nigh exhausted will not endure what they have endured. Let those who have garnered to their selfish souls the greater part of the fruits of the labor of the people of this Nation for the last generation take warning from the lessons of history. Let them read the history of France from the year 1775 to the year 1800. It was that 25 years of French history that brought about a change that in turn changed the face of the civilized world. Let them read English history. Let them read Italian history. Yea, let them read German history. If they do not learn history, they will thereby unwittingly help to make some unfortunate history for this beloved America, that has given them their countless wealth and has given them their exalted stations.

THE PHILIPPINES AND THE CRISIS OF FAITH

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to re-visit and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address by myself at the annual banquet of the Organized Bible Class Association, Washington, D. C., April 22, 1932:

My presence here this evening as your guest of honor and speaker is largely due to Congressman ALLEN, of Illinois, whose kind words of presentation I greatly appreciate and whom I shall remember as the first man to congratulate me and extend the glad hand of fellowship after my speech on the floor of Congress closing the debate on the Philippine independence bill. In that memorable session my good friend and colleague and 305 other Members voted in favor of the passage of that bill. My people are earnestly praying that the bill, H. R. 7233, will be favorably acted upon soon by the Senate and approved by the President. That act will strengthen the faith of 13,000,000 people in themselves and in the people of the United States.

It is refreshing to be in the company of representative men and women who are interested in the higher and nobler things of life and in all that contribute to a revival of confidence in a world suffering from the present crisis of faith. I selected "The Philippines and the Crisis of Faith" as my theme for my brief speech.

The history of the Filipino people demonstrates the persistence of their faith in a sublime ideal. It likewise shows their faith in culture and religion as necessary and essential in the realization of that ideal.

The Filipinos have had an experience that is unusual and unique. They inhabit a country that lies at the crossroads of the great streams of cultures and religions. They have received the influences of the main currents of the civilizations of both the East and the West.

The Philippine question being one of the pressing contemporary problems before the Government of the United States, it is well that the people of this country should acquaint themselves with the nature of the people with whom they have to deal to solve this question.

My people have a rich inheritance of culture. They had early relations with the peoples of Malaysia, of China, of Arabia, and of India. Through such contacts there naturally arose an interplay and interaction of customs, practices, cultures, and beliefs.

Besides the influences of the cultures of the Orient, ours has been the unique experience of having received in a very direct manner the impacts of two main streams of occidental civilizations, the Latin and the Anglo-Saxon; the Latin because of our association with Europeans, especially after the opening of the Suez Canal and with Mexico and other countries influenced by Spain in the Western Hemisphere, and the Anglo-Saxons because of our contacts with the British and during the last three decades with the Americans. From these bare statements you can appreciate the significance of my statement when I say that we not only have had an unusual experience as a people but a unique opportunity, if permitted to lead a life unhampered and untrammelled, to evolve a civilization which shall represent a happy blending of the best in the Orient and the Occident.

As a group of Christians banded for this organized Bible movement, you must be interested in the religious beliefs of the Filipinos. As I have stated, we as a people are devoted to education

and religion. We have a deep and abiding faith in the necessity and value of spirituality.

Our primitive religion was what I have often called "Anitism." It was a simple religion analogous to the Animism of other primitive peoples. It consisted of a belief in and worship of "anitos," or spirits of various sorts. From our dealings with other oriental peoples, that early religion was influenced and modified by Brahmanism, Buddhism, and Islamism. Later, through the implantation of Spanish rule and the coming of missionaries from Europe, Christianity was introduced. It found ready acceptance among the islanders. For centuries we have had the benefit of the Christian religion as exemplified by the Roman Catholic Church. With the establishment of American rule, the door was opened to the evangelical faiths. Various communions took advantage of the new field of opportunity for service.

There also developed in the Philippines a Filipino Independent Church, with liberal tendencies. At present, of the 13,000,000 inhabitants of the Philippines, about 4 per cent are pagans, 4 per cent Mohammedans, and 92 per cent Christians. This fact should be a challenge to the Christians in America. Citizens like those who are here gathered should have a very deep interest in the future of my country, for when we shall have been made a republic, independent and free, that Philippine republic will be the first Christian republic in the Far East.

If I may be permitted to make a little personal reference, let me state that I was born and reared in youth a Catholic. My parents and relatives were Catholics. I have since become a Protestant. I have been actively identified with the Y. M. C. A. and with the evangelical churches. I am not very strong for denominationalism. I am strong for the united Christian church movement. I believe that above all denominations is Christianity.

Of course, we can hardly speak of the Christian religion without reference to the Bible, which is the textbook of Christianity. One of the greatest achievements in the field of religion during the last few decades has been the popularization of the Bible in the Philippines and its translation into the vernaculars. This was a necessary sequel to the historic triumph achieved by the Filipinos when they approved the principle of the separation of the church and the state and freedom of religious worship in the constitution which their representatives approved for the short-lived Philippine Republic established in Malolos. Needless to say, this principle was carried out and strengthened during the 30 years of American-Filipino relationship.

It would be presumptuous, in a company of people like you, to discuss the importance of the Bible. I shall merely say that the Filipinos appreciate the Bible as the Book of Books, abounding in wealth, historical, biographical, literary, and religious.

May I not, however, express to you the conviction that the peoples of the world, in these trying and difficult times of distress and depression, are suffering not so much from an economic crisis as from a crisis of faith? Now, of all times, the world has sore need of a restudy and reinterpretation of the Bible to crystallize new life values and to reemphasize life fundamentals; it has great need of a revival of faith.

I have been privileged in my own life experience to witness several movements and events that give cause for belief rather than disbelief. I shall cite just two or three instances. It was my rare fortune to participate at a world gathering held not long since in Toronto, Canada, attended by men and women from all over the world interested in Sunday school and religious education. Then it fell to my lot to head the Philippine delegation to the World Y. M. C. A. convention recently held in Cleveland. When I see gatherings of this sort, when I rub elbows with men and women in various religious conferences, when I meet laymen interested in advancing the frontiers of spirituality, I can not help but admire the heroism, the courage, and, above all, the faith of Christian men and women, Christian leaders, and Christian statesmen.

In the midst of a world crisis men and nations need to be steeped in the crystallized wisdom and idealism of the Bible, for out of such wisdom and idealism must come a chastening of the spirit and a renewal of faith. In a world of constant flux we must be on our guard against those who put the "I" in god and seek to substitute the rule of gold for the reign of God, who alone is unchanging and unalterable, elemental and eternal.

I find joy in associating myself with movements calculated to deepen spirituality and strengthen faith in a world surcharged with the spirit of doubt, suspicion, and intolerance. It is inspiring to know that not only professional religionists but laymen are taking a firm stand for Christianity, seeking to arrest the tidal wave of materialism. It is inspiring to know that there are movements throughout Christendom, that there are Christian men and women everywhere who are concerning themselves with revitalizing faith.

What a glorious thing it would be if men and nations would subscribe to the platform that there be no moratorium in character preparation, no holiday in moral reparation! The world can ill afford to entertain the possibility of spiritual bankruptcy. But in order to make these ideals and principles living and dynamic forces we must have faith in the validity of ideas, in the primacy of ideals, and in the all-pervading, ever-victorious power of Christ and of God.

In my own particular mission in the United States, that of laboring to secure the independence of my beloved Philippines, there are those who oppose me or discourage me by pointing out the possible risks and dangers. My invariable answer has been

and is this: We are aware of the consequences and the difficulties; but we are undaunted, for we have faith. We have faith in ourselves. We have faith in our potentialities. We have faith in the essential goodness of the human race. We have faith in the all-conquering power of the principles enunciated in the Bible, especially the Golden Rule, which has been tested upon the anvil of human experience under all sorts of conditions, in all climes, and for centuries.

The world must be saved from this crisis of faith. Christianity is the way out. There must be a renewal of faith—that faith that can move heaven and earth. Without faith, people stagnate.

SOLDIERS' ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, John Doe was a private soldier during the war. He holds an adjusted-service certificate for \$1,000, which is the average; it is dated January 1, 1925, and the \$1,000 is payable at death or January 1, 1945. Doe claims the Government owes him \$1,000 for adjusted pay at this time and he should therefore not be required to die or wait until 1945 before it is collected. Congress passed a law in 1924 acknowledging that all veterans of the World War were entitled to \$1 a day extra pay for home service and \$1.25 a day extra pay for service overseas. Doe was entitled to the following:

210 days' home service, at \$1 a day extra.....	\$210
200 days' service overseas, at \$1.25 a day.....	250
Total.....	460

The question is, When was the money due? If it is paid as of 1925, that would be equal to a payment of about 60 or 70 cents as of the time the services were rendered in 1917 and 1918. If the money is paid as of the time the services were rendered and a reasonable interest is calculated from a date representing halfway between the beginning and ending of the emergency period during the war, or June 1, 1918, Doe was entitled to the full \$1,000 on October 1, 1931. How much interest should Doe be allowed? For many years the Government caused Doe to pay 6, 7, and 8 per cent interest, compounded annually, for his own money. Therefore, the Government should invoke the same principle for Doe that it has always invoked for others under similar circumstances and pay him at least 6 per cent, compounded annually. The following table represents what he is entitled to:

Table to show the amount of \$460 at 6 per cent compounded annually from June 1, 1918, to June 1, 1932, and also the amount as of October 1, 1931

	Interest	Total amount
June 1—		
1918.....		\$160.00
1919.....	\$27.60	487.60
1920.....	29.25	516.85
1921.....	31.01	547.86
1922.....	32.87	580.73
1923.....	34.84	615.57
1924.....	36.93	652.50
1925.....	39.15	691.65
1926.....	41.49	733.14
1927.....	43.98	777.12
1928.....	46.62	823.74
1929.....	49.42	873.16
1930.....	52.38	925.54
1931.....	55.53	981.07
1932.....	58.86	1,039.93
Total.....	579.93	

NOTE.—The amount at October 1, 1931, would be \$1,000.69.

Instead of Doe receiving the \$460 as of the time the services were rendered he was given an adjusted-service certificate for \$1,000. When Doe was discharged he was given \$60 for the purpose of purchasing a civilian suit of clothes, he having given his civilian suit to the Red Cross to be sent to Belgium and France to relieve distress there at the time of his entry into the service. This left \$400. Congress declared that he should have 25 per cent added to his credit for waiting until January 1, 1945, for his money. This increased his credit by \$100, or to \$500. Five hundred dollars was a sufficient amount to pay a single premium on

\$1,000 insurance policy similar to his adjusted-service certificate, and instead of the cash settlement he was given the \$1,000 certificate.

WHAT CHANGES ARE TO BE MADE FOR DOE'S BENEFIT

Doe in asking for full payment is merely asking that his certificate be dated back to the time the services were rendered, the interest rated computed as above mentioned, the \$60 not to be deducted and the \$100 credit for waiting be eliminated.

WHY THE \$60 SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN DEDUCTED

The \$60 payment at discharge was given to the soldier who had served only one day and to the general who was drawing \$8,000 a year. Neither the 1-day soldier nor the \$8,000-a-year general has been required to pay the \$60 back to the Government, so why make those who served longer than 60 days pay it back?

SHOULD THE \$100 OR 25 PER CENT FOR WAITING BE COLLECTED?

Although the veterans have waited 14 years for their money and the Congress has declared that 25 per cent extra should be added for waiting 20 years, the extra amount is not being asked but is eliminated in arriving at the amount due.

THE CERTIFICATE SHOULD BE DATED JUNE 1, 1918

If the certificate is dated June 1, 1918, which is a date half way between the beginning and ending of the emergency period or November 11, 1918, the date of the armistice, Doe is entitled to the full \$1,000 at this time. It is not right to commence the computation of interest seven and one-half years after the services were rendered, or January 1, 1925.

THE WAR PROFITEERS RECEIVED INTEREST FROM 1913

The corporations that profited so much by reason of this country's misery and misfortune during the war received huge settlements for their war services many years after the war was over, and in the form of adjusted pay. Hundreds of millions and billions of dollars were returned to them by the Government. A large part of this money was refunded or given back to them on the theory that the taxpayers did not charge off a sufficient amount for depreciation of their war facilities from 1917-1919.

The United States Steel Corporation, the concern that made a profit of \$1,500,000 a day during the war, received a refund of \$15,736,595.72 for the year 1918. The refund was made about 11 years after the war and interest at 6 per cent was paid by the Government on this refund. The interest amounted to \$10,099,765. The Government allowed the 6 per cent interest on the theory that the taxpayer would have been charged 6 per cent interest on any amount assessed and collected that should have been paid but was not paid in 1918. That is the same principle we are invoking for the veterans. They were charged 6, 7, and 8 per cent interest, compounded annually, for their own money; therefore the Government should not object to paying them the minimum rate of 6 per cent, compounded annually. The Aluminum Co. of America submitted a claim for amortization of war facilities in 1919 for \$6,852,697.36. December 1, 1921, or a few months after Mr. Andrew W. Mellon, the principal owner of this company, became Secretary of the Treasury, a supplemental claim was filed for \$18,124,339.28. The amount finally granted was \$15,589,614.39. Interest on the amount refunded was allowed at the rate of 6 per cent from the year 1918—not from January 1, 1925. We are asking that the same principle be invoked for John Doe.

THE AMOUNT OF MONEY VETERANS IN EACH COUNTY WILL RECEIVE

February 18, 1932, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement showing how much money the veterans in each county in the United States will receive if the bill to pay the adjusted-service certificates becomes law. It will be found on pages 4289 to 4299 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the above date.

AMENDMENT OF RULES XIII AND XXIV

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, there has been pending a report from the Rules Committee on House Resolution 150, to change the rules for the consideration of bills on the

Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar. I think, in view of the fact that it has been pending so long, I shall ask the Speaker to call up the rule at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana calls up a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 150

Resolved, That clause 3 of Rule XIII be amended to read as follows:

"After a bill has been favorably reported and shall be upon either the House or Union Calendar, any Member may file with the Clerk a notice that he desires such bill placed upon a special calendar to be known as the 'Consent Calendar.' On the first and third Mondays of each month, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the Speaker shall direct the Clerk to call the bills in numerical order which have been for three legislative days upon the 'Consent Calendar.' Should objection be made to the consideration of any bill so called, it shall be carried over on the calendar without prejudice to the next day when the 'Consent Calendar' is again called, and if again objected to by three or more Members, it shall immediately be stricken from the calendar, and shall not thereafter during the same session of that Congress be placed again thereon: *Provided*, That no bill shall be called twice on the same legislative day."

That clause 6 of Rule XXIV be amended to read as follows:

"On Saturday of each week, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House to consider business on the Private Calendar. In the Committee of the Whole House the Chairman shall direct the Clerk to call the bills in numerical order that have been upon the Private Calendar for three legislative days. When the Clerk shall have read the bill the same shall be considered unless objection or reservation of objection is made to immediate consideration. Should objection or reservation of objection be made there shall be 10 minutes' general debate to be divided, 5 minutes controlled by the Member offering the objection or reservation and 5 minutes controlled by the chairman of the committee reporting the bill, or, in his absence, by any Member supporting the bill. If, after such debate, three objections are not forthcoming, the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule: *Provided, however*, That the total debate under the 5-minute rule shall not exceed 20 minutes. After the debate hereinbefore referred to, or when the bill is first called, if objection is made by three Members to the consideration of the bill, then the same shall be passed over and carried to a list designated as 'deferred.' It shall be in order for the bills on the 'deferred list' to have the first call in their numerical order when the Private Calendar is called on the last Saturday of each month. At this time the bills on the 'deferred list' shall be considered under the general rules of the Committee of the Whole House with 10 minutes' general debate to be divided equally, with 5 minutes controlled by the chairman of the committee reporting the bill or other Member supporting the bill and 5 minutes controlled by any Member objecting or opposing the bill. After the debate the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule: *Provided, however*, That the total debate under the 5-minute rule shall not exceed 20 minutes. If, however, after such consideration the Committee of the Whole House acts on the bill adversely, it shall be laid aside until the committee arises, whereupon it shall be reported back to the House with the adverse recommendation. Any bill under this rule reported back to the House with an adverse recommendation shall automatically be recommitted to the committee reporting it, and said bill shall not again be reported during the same Congress."

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reach some agreement limiting the time for debate.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not know just what time we will require, but we would like the usual 30 minutes, although it may not be necessary.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Does the gentleman mean 30 minutes on the side?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; if it should be necessary. I do not think it will be necessary.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I do not think we need that much debate. I will ask unanimous consent that debate be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes on the side.

Mr. MICHENER. It is not a question of unanimous consent. The gentleman has one hour. He can yield it as he sees fit. I am asking for the privilege of using 30 minutes of that hour in case we so desire.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana has control of the time and is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 30 minutes, which he may use as he desires.

Mr. Speaker, there has been demand for a change in the consideration of the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar. For two years I have been one of those selected by the floor leader to appear here to consider the bills and offer

objection to such bills as should be objected to. With many other Members of the House I have been impressed by the fact that in the consideration of bills on these calendars there has not been proper decorum, proper debate, or proper consideration of the bills on their merits.

The amendment of the rules that is being presented at this time is the result of consideration of several of these propositions and deciding upon rules that would lead to decorum and speedy consideration of bills on these two calendars.

The first part of the resolution deals with the Consent Calendar. It does not change the former rule in any fundamental way. On line 9 of the first amendment to clause 3 of Rule XIII we have inserted the word "numerical," making that clause read "the bills shall be called in numerical order."

This has been the procedure in the past.

That has been the procedure in the past, but the word "numerical" does not appear in the old rule. In the next line, line 10, we have inserted the word "legislative," bills "which have been for three legislative days upon the Consent Calendar." That conforms to the ruling of the Chair that the three days which have heretofore been considered should be legislative days.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. The gentleman has referred to the bills being called in numerical order. Suppose we should get half way down the calendar or two-thirds down the calendar? Would the next call begin where the call left off on that particular day, or would the call start at the beginning of the calendar? If the call should start at the beginning of the calendar each time that would result in certain bills being repeatedly called while those at the end of the calendar would not have that privilege.

Mr. GREENWOOD. That has always been the rule. The rule has been to start at the beginning of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, while on the Private Calendar they have always started at the star. So we are simply following the old rule in that respect.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does the gentleman think it is fair, when there is a long calendar, to permit certain bills to repeatedly have the call while the bills at the end of the calendar will not have any opportunity of call?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Usually the Consent Calendar is not a very long calendar. It is not a long calendar like the Private Calendar. It rarely happens that the Consent Calendar is not called in its entirety.

Mr. JONES. If I may be permitted, as I understand it, under the rule they can only be called twice anyway, and then they go off the calendar?

Mr. BRIGGS. Certain bills can be repeatedly called while other bills at the end of the calendar will not be reached. Usually when an objection is reserved a bill is passed over without prejudice, and it retains its place on the calendar, but under the rule, as proposed, as I understand, certain bills will be repeatedly called.

Mr. JONES. They usually go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Under the rule as now written, there is no such thing as a bill going over without prejudice, because we provide that when a bill is objected to, it does go over without prejudice. It is different from the old rule in that respect. In line 11 it is provided that—

Should objection be made to the consideration of any bill so called, it shall be carried over on the calendar without prejudice to the next day when the Consent Calendar is again called, and if again objected to by three or more Members, it shall immediately be stricken from the calendar.

Under the old rule a Member asked that it go over without prejudice. Under this rule, if objection is made, it automatically goes over without prejudice, and it goes off the calendar if three or more objections are made to it. Those are the only changes with reference to the Consent Calendar. The rule provides that if three or more objections are made to a bill it shall be stricken from the calendar and shall not thereafter during the same session of that Congress be placed again thereon, and the rule provides that no bill shall be called twice on the same legislative day.

The second part of the rule changes entirely the rule as formerly written for the Private Calendar. Friday was the day which was provided under the old rule. We are asking now that Saturday be made the day because Saturday is not a general legislative day. We make it in order on every Saturday to call the Private Calendar. This is in order to expedite the business of this calendar, which is constantly growing.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Does not the gentleman think that Saturday is a very bad day, because usually we adjourn from Friday until Monday? By providing that Saturday shall be the day, you are treating the Private Calendar like an orphan. You are going to make the Private Calendar in order when there may be no possibility of going into it at all.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Very often Friday has been taken for general legislation and the Private Calendar is not called at all, so it was deemed better to make it Saturday, so as to give the Private Calendar a better opportunity to be called. When the Private Calendar is called, ordinarily the only Members present are those who have bills on the calendar or those who have been appointed to look after the consideration of bills. So Saturday is utilized. Every Saturday can be utilized for the Private Calendar, and that will give the Private Calendar a better opportunity to be called than under the old rule.

Mr. BOYLAN. What will be the status if the House adjourns from Friday until Monday? What will happen to Saturday?

Mr. GREENWOOD. That is up to the House. If the House does not want to consider the Private Calendar the procedure will go on as it has in the past. You can not prevent the House from adjourning or recessing if it wants to.

Mr. BOYLAN. I think that is a bad feature. You ought to make it Friday instead of Saturday.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. Will this prevent the House, by unanimous consent, from setting aside any evening or any other day for the consideration of the Private Calendar?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I do not think so, and I do not so understand it. In changing the rule for the consideration of the Private Calendar we have substituted Saturday of each week, but we do not make it compulsory.

We provide that it is in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House to consider business on the Private Calendar. I think this will give bills on the Private Calendar a better opportunity to be heard. The present rule is vague about this. It sets aside Friday, but Friday is never used. Then the old rule gives certain priority to bills from the Claims Committee and private pension bills, but private pension bills are now included in an omnibus bill, and there is absolutely no attention paid to the wording of the rule in that respect.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. When the gentleman gets through will he yield me 10 minutes on the resolution?

Mr. GREENWOOD. If the gentleman is in opposition to the resolution, I shall grant him 10 minutes or ask the gentleman from Michigan to yield time to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. We are not opposing the resolution.

Mr. GREENWOOD. We will see that the gentleman from Texas has time.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Is there any change in the rule in reference to bills on either the Private Calendar or Union Calendar that may or may not have been objected to, that may come up under the call of a committee?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Bills can always be called up on Calendar Wednesday by the committee that reports them. This simply provides another opportunity.

Mr. GOSS. Referring to the language at the bottom of page 3, when you go into Committee of the Whole House

and the bill is reported back adversely, that bill can not again be reported to the Congress. That is not the practice to-day, is it?

Mr. GREENWOOD. It is not intended that this rule shall take the place of the regular Calendar Wednesday. This is to give this particular calendar preference on this day, so that the bills may be called in regular order regardless of the committee from which they come.

Mr. GOSS. And regardless of the calendar they are on?

Mr. GREENWOOD. They will have to be on the Private Calendar in order to be called. No bill on the Union Calendar goes on the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. As I interpret the rules that have been offered here, there is very little change in the rule governing consideration of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Practically no change.

Mr. PATTERSON. Except inclusion of the word "numerical," which is practically a technical change.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I have already explained that there is practically no change in the rule with reference to the Consent Calendar.

There have been those who believe that when a committee considers a bill, like the Claims Committee or the Military Affairs Committee to correct a military record, there ought to be an opportunity for such bills to be heard on their merits at some time and that no one man or group of three men ought to have the power to dislodge that bill, strike it from the calendar, and send it to a place where it can never again receive a hearing or be considered on its merits.

As I have said, this rule with respect to consideration of the Private Calendar has this in mind. It will obviate the objection I have stated and permit bills to be considered on their merits, even though they are objected to, when the bills are called under this rule. Therefore we have provided that if a person objects to a bill he shall have five minutes in which to explain his objection, and then the chairman of the committee reporting the bill has five minutes in order to discuss the bill upon its merits and show the reason the committee reported the bill favorably. After 10 minutes of orderly debate, 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against, then if the single objector has been able to persuade two other Members to sustain him in his objection the bill is taken off that calendar and goes to the deferred list provided in the rule, and on the last Saturday of the month bills that have been objected to by three objectors and have been placed on the deferred list are brought up in numerical order and considered upon their merits. The House then has the opportunity of disposing of the bill finally upon its merits.

This is fair to the committee reporting the bill. The committees, like the Committee on Claims and the Committee on Military Affairs, appoint subcommittees, and they go into the evidence before reporting the bill, and it seems to me it is not treating the committee fairly and it is not proper deliberation by a legislative body to allow one man to lodge an objection and send a bill off the calendar, where it will never again, perhaps, receive a hearing.

The Federal Government is constantly going into new activities. There are a thousand agencies of the Federal Government in our land to-day with Government trucks and airplanes, and so forth, that are maiming people by carelessness and negligence, and even destroying life, and there is no opportunity in the Federal courts to present a tort case. There may be actions brought on contracts in the Court of Claims, but the only place claimants have to seek redress or to secure justice in matters of tort is the Claims Committee of this House. To have the Claims Committee report a bill favorably and then have it dislodged by one objector seems to me entirely unjust.

This rule is written with the idea of allowing the person who has a private bill to have his day in court and have it disposed of on its merits. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Is this a unanimous report of the committee, or was there a minority report?

Mr. GREENWOOD. It is a unanimous report. There was not a single objection in the Rules Committee. Furthermore, we know that when bills have come up in the past a Member has reserved an objection, and he rises and discusses that objection, then some one else interposes, and then a group begins an argument, and the general membership of the House does not know anything about the discussion that is going on. This rule provides for orderly debate of five minutes for the one who reserves the objection and five minutes for the one in support of the bill. Then, after the one who has objected, if he secures two or three other objectors to vote with him, the bill goes off to the deferred list. That is the way these bills are to be handled. Now, if there are any questions, I will be glad to answer.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. I take it that this change in the rule, this provision, is somewhat equivalent to what we have on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Only certain bills can go upon this list. Bills on the Union Calendar or on the House Calendar can not go on the Private Calendar. It must be a private bill, whether from the Committee on Military Affairs, or the Claims Committee, or any other committee; they go on regardless of the committee, and are taken up in numerical order.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. This is to shear the professional objectors of some of their power?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Not altogether.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. With one man tying the whole thing up?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Well, they are entirely within their rights.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. They have too much rights. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREENWOOD. In giving them their rights, the House ought to be the tribunal to determine the questions on the merits of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. It is to prevent one man controlling 435.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, during the last few years there has grown up a demand for the liberalization of the so-called unanimous-consent and Private Calendar rules. This demand was so insistent that before the Congress convened the Republicans held a conference at which consideration was given to the proposed changes. The Republican conference directed the Republican members of the Rules Committee to submit to the House the proposed changes as suggested by the conference.

That was done. The suggestions were referred to the regular Rules Committee, and the so-called Crisp amendments were also submitted to the Rules Committee.

After consideration and study the rule that is now before the House has been reported by the Rules Committee. While it is not exactly in harmony with the proposed Republican rule, neither is it in exact harmony with the proposed Democratic rule; but it is a liberalization of the existing rule, and on the whole I think complies in a general way with what the House wanted. Personally, I happen to be one of those who did not favor much liberalization in these particular rules; but, yielding to the majority of the membership of the House, I shall not oppose but shall support the rule.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE].

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, eight years ago I shared with a few other Members of the House in discussing before the Committee on Rules the matter of the Consent Calendar. Our argument led to the requirement that there should be three objectors upon the second day the calendar is called. My recollection is that at that time I suggested five objectors upon the second day; and had that been looked upon with favor by the Committee on Rules, I am inclined to think it might have been a gain; but I accept the situation and am

pleased to see that the procedure is to be improved after the fashion presented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD].

I would speak particularly, however, of the change in the matter of the Private Calendar. Eight years ago I gave some thought to the possibility of rearranging the program of the House so that we might be sure of a Saturday off in every week of the session, but since then the growth of business has continued, and year after year we find more burdens upon our shoulders, so that it is altogether probable we shall be unable to have a full Saturday to ourselves regularly unless we open our eyes to the situation in the matter of little measures. For the time being anyhow, I see no way of escape from obligation for almost continuous week-day attendance save that now suggested by the Committee on Rules, which permits Saturdays to be used for business that interests and concerns only a small part of the membership. Of course, in theory there ought to be no business here which does not demand a full attendance; but, as a matter of fact, the Private Calendar can be just as well handled by a small part of the Members as by the full membership. This jury of 40 or 50 is likely to reach just as accurate and wise conclusions as if the 435 were present. Therefore, if we devote Saturdays to this class of business that calls for but a few of us to be on hand, it seems to me that there can be no injury to the public welfare.

I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House the fact that in the calendar at this moment there are 30 pages of private bills, almost 600 cases where a committee has believed that the justice or the equity of the Nation ought to be dispensed, involving nearly 600 citizens of the United States who believe they have been wronged. In so far as partnerships or corporations are concerned, of course the total of the individuals' interest is larger. Here are at least 600 instances where our committees have said that justice or equity ought not to be denied. This thing is growing in most astonishing degree. So far as my observation goes, never before has there been a calendar with 30 pages devoted to these neglected claims. My colleague, Mr. UNDERHILL, of Massachusetts, serving on the Committee on Claims, feeling the gross wrong of the present situation, secured by the exercise of many hours and days of labor the passage of a bill through the House and through the Senate that would to some degree have lessened what I can not help calling this disgrace to the Congress of the United States. When his bill reached the Executive chamber, unfortunately something in the way of constitutional or technical objection appeared, and the President felt constrained not to sign the bill. Therefore, no progress was made.

Mr. Speaker, new brooms sweep clean. Now that the control of the House has gone to the party which through a dozen years did not have the power to remedy this situation, I wish it might awake to its opportunity and see if it can not secure the reform so greatly needed under which the decision on small claims shall be left to the departments and the decision on larger claims shall be turned over to the Court of Claims, in order that we may be relieved of a duty burdensome in itself, a duty that no legislative body is fitted to perform, because of all instrumentalities that mankind has yet devised none is worse for the dispensing of either justice or equity than a legislative assembly.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. HARLAN. Is the gentleman aware that there has been passed by a subcommittee, and is now pending before the Committee on Claims in the House and also in the Senate, a bill to carry out the very provisions the gentleman just referred to, to allow the departments to settle minor claims and to refer larger claims to the Court of Claims?

Mr. LUCE. I am thankful to be informed of that. I did not know it. I wish Godspeed to that bill, and I hope he can avoid the pitfalls which previous attempts have met with, and I assure the gentleman I shall be delighted to contribute what little I can to its passage.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. I believe that when considering a bill of that nature in the past, the other body which talks about economy did not want these private claims tried in another tribunal, because for political purposes they desired to be the jury and the judge themselves. They do not practice their 10 per cent general economy reductions when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money with reference to such meritorious legislation.

Mr. LUCE. Once, nevertheless, we were able to get such a bill to the White House, and I recall the copy book maxim, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORTON D. HULL].

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say what was said by the gentleman from Massachusetts—that if the difficulty arises out of a tort case, and there is inability to give proper consideration to tort cases, and there is no right on the part of any other tribunal to settle those cases, it seems to me the imperative thing is to pass some act of general character that will permit of the proper trial of these cases before a proper tribunal and not before a legislative body. This proposition of having 10 minutes for a private claim, whether it involves a large amount or a small amount, does not seem to me to be the proper thing.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. Can not that time be extended by unanimous consent in the event more time is necessary?

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Does the gentleman mean under this rule?

Mr. KVALE. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. I do not know whether it could or not. I would not undertake to answer that question.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would not have the approval of my conscience if I allowed a rule like this to pass at this time without a word of protest.

I realize that with just 60 Members present there is not a chance in the world to stop it. If I had one hour to speak against it, I could not stop it, as our colleagues have determined that they are going to have a rule making it easy to pass their private bills; but I want to register this protest.

For 15 years back I have fought a bill that is over a hundred years old, and helped to kill it thus far. It is the old Sevier heirs' claim against the Government. It was for over \$100,000,000, counting the claim for interest.

I once saw a Committee on Claims when I first came here take up that bill one morning, and after 15 minutes' consideration, with 21 members of the committee present, pass that bill; and I was the only Member who voted against it. It was thus favorably reported out practically unanimously. By digging up the records down in the department and showing that old Governor Sevier had received everything that was due him from the Government and that they had his signed receipts down there, we finally stopped that bill. But it is still in expectancy. They are still hoping some day to get it through the committee. If a few of us who have been fighting it should happen to die off, they will get it introduced again; and that 100-year old, \$100,000,000, unmeritorious bill will come up under this new rule and there will be 10 minutes' debate—five minutes on each side. How can a Member convince his colleagues in five minutes that that \$100,000,000 claim is unjust? It can not be done. The bill will pass. And another hundred million dollars of the people's money will be unjustly taken out of the Treasury.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I only have 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. This bill was not considered by the present Committee on Claims.

Mr. BLANTON. No; it was not. They are not going to bring it up any more as long as a few of us are here who know all about it and who under the present rules could stop it, but they will bring it up again some day after we pass this proposed rule that will make its passage easy.

I would like to remind my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] of what one of his distinguished colleagues once said at that table. I refer to our former colleague from Massachusetts, Hon. Joe Walsh, who now adorns the Superior Court of Massachusetts. The gentleman will remember one night, when such private bills were being passed in bunches, almost faster than you could say "without objection, this bill is considered to have been read a third time, and is passed, and a motion to reconsider is laid on the table," the gentleman heard Joe Walsh get up at that table and say, "You might as well take the hinges off the doors of the Treasury and throw the doors away, because you have passed so many bills to-night that we can not stop the public money from being taken out and given away."

Under such a rule as this we can not stop any bad bills. You will find that Members who have been working to save the money of the people will give up in disgust and quit doing the hard, grinding work that is necessary to stop them, and they will say, "Just let them all pass."

On this private bill day Saturday, who will be here? A few Members who have claims? Who else will be here? Who else is here this afternoon when this important rule is being passed and is about to be passed? Our friends who have bills on the Private Calendar are all interested in this rule. How will you get them to object to a bill?

Policy will keep them from it. Naturally they know that if they are one of the three who object to a bill that when one of their bills is called Members whose bills have been objected to will be resentful and will object to their bills.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The gentleman indicated that the House could not consider some of these small claims bills in 10 minutes. Is it not a fact that within the last few days the House considered and passed the \$45,000,000 Interior appropriation bill with 20 minutes allotted to those in favor of the bill and 20 minutes to those in opposition?

Mr. BLANTON. I want the gentleman to get that out of his system. I have seen him sit here and have crammed down his throat by his Republican organization bill after bill of importance. I have seen him stand up to the lick log and vote on important measures with only 20 minutes' debate.

The gentleman sits over here and he is getting some of his own medicine. When it is important to pass a measure, and pass it now, the Democrats know how to function. Those amendments reduced appropriations, and were approved by practically the entire membership, hence we acted under a suspension of rules.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am about through. I wanted to register my protest against this rule. I want to predict that under this rule it will be absolutely impossible to stop many bad bills. The Consent Calendar part of the rule is good. I have no objection to the provision of the bill with regard to the Consent Calendar; it is all right; but with respect to the Private Calendar there could be collusion, and you see that here once in a while. You saw the gentleman from Minnesota claim the time in opposition to such an important measure as the Philippine independence bill, and then you saw him vote for it. After he had controlled the time against the bill, he voted for it. You could have such collusion under this rule when the real opposition to a bill could not get recognition and could not get any time to give their views on it.

But I will not require a quorum. I will sit here and watch you pass a rule that will take the money out of the Treasury, because you would pass it anyway on Monday when a quorum is present, so I will not delay matters. I will watch for more deficits in the Treasury. If you keep

it up, you never will balance the Budget. This is a very unwise rule you are passing. That is all I have to say.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG.]

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have served for eight years on the War Claims Committee of this House. I have seen the several subcommittees of our committee hold hearings and spend a great amount of time carefully preparing a report favoring a bill, only to have the bill objected to when called on the calendar. I have gone to the objector and asked if he would withhold his objection, but the reply was, "No; I am against that." The result is a lot of hard work thrown away because some Member's supper has not agreed, or because some other Member had objected to his bill.

I looked into this practice at one time. I found that it originated about this way: A man now passed from us, who spent a great deal of time going into this Private Calendar, used to rise, reserve the right to object, and then cross-examine the man who had the bill in charge. If after that cross-examination he thought the bill was good, he withdrew his objection; but if he thought the bill was bad, he insisted upon his objection. This man passed on. During the time he was in this House, he trained a good woman to go over the bills on these calendars and make a synopsis of the reports on the bills and paste it upon the bill. Then there came on a lot of objectors appointed by the management of both sides of the House. They got these bills with a synopsis prepared by this good woman telling what the bill contained.

I found that if the report was carefully prepared she only gave the facts; but if somebody made a mistake, or if somebody failed to elaborate upon the report, she said it was objected to by the War Department, and down the bill went. These men gathered the approbation of the House under the idea that they had gone into these bills, that they had studied them; but not at all. All they had was this memorandum taken from the report and pasted on the bill.

Talk about collusion. I have seen bills that required three objections. One Member would go to another and say, "Will you object?" "Yes." "Will you object?" "Yes." Then they would turn down a bill without a particle of consideration by this House, a bill that had been passed upon by a committee which had studied the facts.

I do not want you to believe that I desire to pass all the bills that come to the committee. I have a pretty good record. During the last few years in every session of Congress bills calling for over \$200,000,000 have come to my committee, but never in any session of Congress did that committee report but a little over 2 per cent of the bills that came to it. We beat the Volstead Act. We reported out less than one-half of 1 per cent, and yet these objectors have tried to lead the House to believe that we were trying to pass unjust bills.

I think the people of the United States who have claims against the Government have the right to have them considered somewhere and have the right to have somebody consider the facts. After a committee has done so and made a favorable report, certainly the Members of this body should give the report of their committees proper consideration.

I hope this resolution will be adopted.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFFER].

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, one listening to the talk of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] would reach a conclusion that the standing committees of this House report out bills on the Private Calendar without any consideration whatever. I have been a member of the Claims Committee for a number of years, and I assure the Members who are going to vote on this resolution that when a bill is referred to the Claims Committee the first thing that happens is to have the department make a report upon the bill, and evidence is required to be submitted by the author of said bill. The bill is then referred to a subcommittee, which carefully considers the entire facts, the equi-

ties and legal principles involved. Then the subcommittee makes a report to the full committee on the regular committee meeting day. The individual members of the full committee carefully consider the report of the subcommittee; and if any of you believe, after hearing the gentleman from Texas talk, that these private bills are not considered in the Claims Committee, I would suggest that you come into the Claims Committee meeting some Friday. If you do that, you will find the gentleman from Texas has given you some unreliable argument.

Although the gentleman from Texas tries to picture himself as the only man in this House who stands between the ruining of the taxpayers' Treasury, let me say that a private claims bill is fully considered by a subcommittee, then considered by the full committee, and if a favorable report is made on a bill by the unanimous vote of the full committee the entire membership of the House should have an opportunity to consider it on the floor of the House as provided in the pending measures. Such a bill should not fail to be considered because one Member, even though he be from the great State of Texas and is the self-styled Member who stands alone as guardian over the taxpayers' Treasury, objects to its consideration.

Is that justice? Is that liberalization of the rules that the Democrats have talked about and the Republicans have talked about? I guess it is not.

You do not vote for any unwarranted raids on the Treasury if you pass this resolution, as suggested by the gentleman from Texas, who voted to suspend the rules on the \$45,000,000 Interior Department appropriation bill, with 186 Senate amendments in it, where the opposition had only 20 minutes to oppose it and where those in favor of the motion had only 20 minutes in which to present their case. And yet the gentleman from Texas comes before us and says you should not consider a bill on the Private Calendar which involves \$2,000 or \$43, as some of them do, in 10 minutes, after the Claims Committee has reported it by a unanimous vote.

I hope this resolution will be passed, the objections of the conscientious objector from the State of Texas to the contrary notwithstanding. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield to me to ask a question of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, if his logic is correct, why he does not suggest that as soon as the Claims Committee reports a bill it be ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table? If the action of the committee is so perfect and reliable, why have Congress look it over at all? Why not let the committee pass all bills?

Mr. SCHAFER. That is an indefensible argument by a man who is confronted with the fact that his speech was wrong, because when a bill has been favorably reported by a committee after careful consideration, under the proposed rule the Members will have a committee report and have an opportunity to vote intelligently after 10 minutes' discussion, which can be extended by unanimous consent.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that I do not agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] on some of the matters, there is no one here who can deny that he has been of great service in many instances to the people of his State and to the people of the Nation. [Applause.] That he is absolutely wrong, however, on the question of prohibition is generally known and recognized, but we are still hopeful that we may be able to have him realize that he has been mistaken, and that he will, in the near future, come and vote with us for the modification of the Volstead Act, for which the country has long been clamoring.

As to this resolution, I think it is legislation in the right direction, and I am mighty glad to see some gentlemen on

the other side rise and say that they have been in favor of and have advocated the liberalization of the rules.

Of course the Republicans have been in control for many years. They have had a number of opportunities to bring in such a rule but have failed, yes, have refused, to do anything to liberalize the rules; and it remained for us Democrats to do so.

This rule is in the interest of procedure that will be helpful and beneficial; but, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the bill, which provided that these small private bills be handled by a bureau instead of by Congress, that has been passed by Congress and vetoed by the President will be passed again in such an amended form that it will be embarrassing for President Hoover to veto it. But, Mr. Speaker, if the President should again veto it, I am satisfied that in the near future, yes, in the next Congress, we shall have a Democratic President, who will not veto any such meritorious measure that tends; yes; will help the House to legislate more efficiently. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman withhold that a moment so that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I withhold it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on page 2, line 2, the second word "again" being superfluous and confusing the meaning, I think the gentleman from Indiana will not object to my asking unanimous consent that the second "again" in line 2 of page 2 be stricken out.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed that matter with the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I agree with him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KNIFFIN, from April 25 to April 28, on account of official business.

To Mr. FERNANDEZ, for April 25 and 26, on account of official business.

FEDERAL ESTATE TAX

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of the Federal estate tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, I read a copy of a letter to an Indiana gentleman who was misled by misrepresentations appearing in a front-page editorial of the Chicago Journal of Commerce, dated April 9, 1932, and entitled "Soak-the-Rich Taxes and Your Job." This article urged the defeat of 98 Middle-West Congressmen, mentioned by name, who recently voted for the pending revenue bill, which included the estate-tax increase under the Ramseyer amendment. These 98, by the way, included the entire Indiana delegation of both parties.

The letter follows:

APRIL 19, 1932.

Mr. C. W. MARTIN,

American Zinc Products Co., Greencastle, Ind.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I appreciate your letter inclosing editorial clipping from the Chicago Journal of Commerce of April 9, with reference to the Federal estate tax. Nevertheless I disagree with your letter and the views expressed by Mr. Hanna. One of the chief difficulties in this country to-day has been the tremendous concentration of wealth in a few hands, which has taken purchasing power out of the consumer classes, which in turn is affecting your business and every other business in the country. If mass production in modern civilization is to go on, it can do so only by the wider diffusion of wealth and not from its concentra-

tion. Mass production means mass consumption. There must be wealth in the hands of the consumers to exchange for wealth in the hands of producers. Otherwise there is no exchange. There is stagnation. And producers suffer along with consumers. Think this over.

Mr. Hanna's editorial is misleading in at least the following respects:

First, that estate taxes were raised from 20 per cent to 45 per cent, and that in case of death it is "necessary immediately for the estate of that owner to raise 45 per cent of the value of the estate for the Federal inheritance tax."

This is as false as it can be. The 45 per cent applies only to the higher brackets. The total tax to the total estate would be a much smaller percentage in any case. In no case would it be necessary for the owner to raise 45 per cent of the value of the estate to pay the tax. The 45 per cent rate applies only on the excess over \$10,000,000. This is always on the "net" estate, after first deducting \$50,000 which is not taxed at all, and also after deducting all debts. The creditors whom Mr. Hanna worries about are all paid before the Government gets a penny.

He also states that unless a million-dollar estate can raise \$450,000 "in a hurry" the property must go under the hammer. This contains two false statements. First: There is no \$450,000. A million-dollar estate would pay a Federal tax of only \$125,000. As against \$450,000, Mr. Hanna is wrong by \$324,000. This is a poor batting average for a gentleman who criticizes, and by his misstatement leads you to criticize, 98 Middle-West Congressmen who did know what they were voting for. The highest per cent that a million-dollar estate runs into is only 17 per cent, and this applies only on the bracket between \$800,000 and \$1,000,000; second, there is no hurry about it. Ample time is given under the law and the regulations for an orderly liquidation of the tax. Any executor can make a showing and ask for additional time, and it will be granted to him. If sufficient time is not granted, I certainly would be in favor of giving whatever time is necessary, so that the property need not be sacrificed "under the hammer" for the purpose of providing money to pay the tax. Further, as you know, the owners of large properties which might be affected by estate taxation are protecting themselves by life insurance, so that a fund will be available to pay the tax without either selling or mortgaging the property.

Furthermore, Mr. Hanna's article is misleading in that it implies that in the average case one single individual owns a factory or office building or business, and that the factory or office building would have to be sold to pay the tax. The truth of the matter is, as you know, that with few exceptions, all large business enterprises are corporately owned. There are few of the larger businesses of this country which would run into the 45 per cent rate in which one individual owns as much as 10 per cent of its stock. It is the stock that is sold, if anything is sold, to provide funds to pay the tax, and not the factory or railroad. There is no way in which the Government could levy against the factory when it is corporately owned. We have stock exchanges for selling the stock, and it would very rarely happen that the Federal Government could levy upon a physical property for the purpose of enforcing payment of Federal estate taxes in an estate that would run into the 45 per cent bracket.

I am sending copy of this letter to Mr. Hanna. In justice to 98 Congressmen whom he has misrepresented, he ought to publish it with the same prominence as his editorial.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL B. PETTINGILL, M. C.

In addition to replying to the editorial, I wish to briefly mention three additional points with reference to taxing inheritances.

ALLEGED CONFISCATION

It is for the sound discretion of the legislative body to determine the rate of inheritances taxation. As a matter of sound policy rates should not be so high as to discourage thrift and the saving of sums sufficient for one's old age or for the support of children or to dissipate capital invested in socially useful enterprise. Confiscation, however, does not exist in any legal sense, regardless of the rate. It has been repeatedly decided by the courts that the right to inherit, on the part of heirs, or the right to bequeath, on the part of the testator, are not natural rights, but are rights or privileges conferred by the State, as against its right or power to take to itself the entire estate of a deceased person. As I understand the law, there are no legal reasons to prevent the State from taxing inheritances up to 100 per cent, however unwise and harmful such legislation would be. I mention these decisions of the courts to defend them in part, at least, from the charge that they are often too tender to "vested interests."

SOCIAL INJUSTICE OF INHERITANCE TAXATION

I would not say that there are not exceptions, but generally the accumulation of an estate which runs into the 45 per cent bracket depends upon other factors than the foresight, invention, thrift, enterprise, or ability of the owner. These

LXXV—555

factors are often some privilege conferred by the State upon the accumulator, such as patents and copyrights, tariffs, subsidies, monopolies, or the unearned increment of land values. Other factors may go to means and methods which can not stand before the bar of conscience or square with the golden rule. Krueger, the European match king, who accumulated a colossal fortune, seems to illustrate all three factors, undoubted business ability, a privilege conferred upon him by the State by way of patent protection, and finally, according to press reports, unscrupulous business methods. As far back as 1892, Andrew Carnegie, in speeches, as well as in his books, the Gospel of Wealth and My Partners the People, preached the social justice of inheritance taxation and the trusteeship of wealth. He said at that time:

We must let the worker alone during his life, but after his death the State should step in and demand its share of his hoard, through a graduated system of taxation. Every fortune left by a hoarder should contribute to the State in proportion to its size, small amounts left to those dependent upon the decedent being exempt, but the scale rising by steps until with enormous fortunes reaching into many millions it should be decreed that "one-half goes to the privy coffer of the State."

I might add that the rates of the present bill do not reach the figure advocated by Andrew Carnegie 40 years ago, nor the rates that prevail in England to-day.

THAT IT IS ALIEN TO AMERICAN TRADITIONS

Inheritance taxation may be imposed for either one or both of the following motives—to obtain revenue, or to redistribute wealth. Even when imposed for the first reason, the result of the second follows in every case to a greater or less degree, depending upon the rate of tax. As an application of this latter motive, inheritance taxation, far from being alien to our traditions, is in strict conformance therewith. Anglo-Saxon civilization has felt for centuries that the accumulation of enormous wealth in a few hands is opposed to the "general welfare" and the common weal of society. Again and again for hundreds of years laws have been passed or court decisions rendered to break up great estates and to free the living generations from the "dead hand" of the past. For example, there are the various statutes against mortmain (Statute of Monopolies, 21 James I, ch. 3; Statute de Religiosis, 7 Edward I, A. D. 1279; the Act of 13 Edward I, ch. 32, A. D. 1285; the Act of 15 Richard II, ch. 5, A. D. 1391; the Act of 9 George II, ch. 36, A. D. 1736, all designed chiefly to "prevent undue accumulation of wealth in the hands of corporations"); the abolition of primogeniture, under which the eldest son took the entire landed estate, the repeal of entail, under which land could not be sold but descended indefinitely to the blood heirs of the original ancestor, the rule against perpetuities (Duke of Norfolk's case, A. D. 1685), under which trust funds might accumulate indefinitely, and so forth.

These were all designed to prevent the concentration of great fortunes, and to redistribute them after they were accumulated. They did not even have the motive of obtaining public revenue. They were passed under the broad police powers of the State, to promote the "general welfare" of a great people. If they had not been passed, who will be so bold as to say that we would have had, either in England or America, the greatest social advancement, with more happiness to the greatest number of people, of any civilization that the centuries have produced? Inheritance taxation, within fair and reasonable limits, whether for revenue, or to redistribute great fortunes, is not alien to our civilization. It is indigenous to it. It is as truly a part of our tradition as Magna Charta or Concord Bridge.

AGRICULTURE'S TAX BURDEN

Mr. BUCKBEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to incorporate therein a statement by former Gov. Frank O. Lowden on the economic and agricultural situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCKBEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I print an address entitled "Agriculture's Tax Problem," an address by former Governor of Illinois, Hon. Frank O. Lowden. The address which follows was delivered by Governor Lowden at the thirteenth annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill., Wednesday, December 9, 1931:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and a privilege to appear before you again. Taxation, the subject which you are considering to-day, is engaging the attention of all classes more than ever before in our history, I think. Two years ago I discussed at length before you some methods of taxation, which I thought then, and think now, must be substituted for the general property tax. That method of taxation has become so burdensome, particularly upon farm lands, that it has reached the point of confiscation. In many portions of the United States, lands, to an alarming extent, are being forfeited to the State for nonpayment of taxes.

A few years ago the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the Department of Agriculture at Washington stated that on the average "taxes take about 30 per cent of the net income of farmers." The percentage must be considerably larger now. We then have this situation: The farming population is, in round numbers, about 25 per cent of our entire population. It receives but about 10 per cent of our national income. It pays 30 per cent of this income in taxes. The other 75 per cent of our population receives about 90 per cent of the total income, and pays on an average about 10 per cent of its income in taxes. How long can this glaring inequality go on without ruin to agriculture?

I shall not now, however, repeat what I then said upon that phase of the question. I wish at this time to take occasion to point out how, in my opinion, taxes can be greatly reduced by a simplification and reorganization of local government, particularly in the rural regions. For, after all, by far the largest portion of our tax bill is for local taxes. Indeed, the expenditures of local government for the country as a whole exceed the total expenditures of both the Federal and State Governments.

We are all interested in the Federal Government. We give a good deal of thought to our State government. Our cities are more and more engaging the attention of the citizen. In the realm of county government and town government, however, it is only in recent years that students of political science or the people generally have felt any concern. And yet it is precisely these governments which affect the lives of the country population most frequently and most intimately. It is to support these governments that the larger part of our taxes go. It is to these governments that we look largely for our protection. It is upon these governments that we depend for the maintenance of our poor, for the custody of our petty evildoers and those awaiting trial charged with more serious crimes. It is these governments which administer our schools. It is they, too, which in a large measure build and maintain our roads and construct other local public works. Other important functions also rest upon the county and town governments. No student of the situation contends, I think, that these bodies, under present conditions, are either economic or efficient.

For the protection of our lives and property we have within the same jurisdiction a number of courts, each absolutely independent of the others, with questions of jurisdiction constantly arising. We have justices of the peace. We have probate courts. We have county courts. We have courts of general jurisdiction. Courts in these days have much to do with even purely administrative affairs. It is not conceivable that they can function simply, inexpensively, and effectively as they are now constituted. Isn't it possible to substitute for these divers courts a single unified court for the county? We should, many think, merge all the powers which these different courts now have into a single court. Such court could be in continuous session. The citizen of the county who had occasion to resort to a court would not have to consult a lawyer before he could know to which court to apply. Instead of being obliged to employ a set of subordinate officials for each of the courts, one set of these officials would answer all the needs of the consolidated court, these minor officials to be appointed by the court and not elected at the polls.

Our county jails have been a disgrace to our country for more than a hundred years. One eminent writer says that to find a parallel it is necessary to go back to Turkey and the thirteenth century. Our county almshouses have been a reproach to our civilization since they were first established. This is not the fault of the officials, who, in the main, are humane and considerate men. It is the system which is to blame. The inmates of the county jails and the inmates of the almshouses are too few in number for modern or humane or economical administration of either. They should be abolished altogether, and in their place should come either regional or State institutions.

In some parts of New England, we are told, where the State has partially relieved the counties of the care of the poor, they are more comfortably housed and better cared for at less than half the cost than where the counties perform this function. Virginia recently has substituted for the county almshouse 10 for the entire State. We are told that the inmates are better cared for than ever before, with an average cost per capita of but little above one-half of the original cost.

With reference to the schools, the State has been compelled to exercise an ever-widening supervision over the local authorities.

As to roads also, the State has found it essential to extend its authority in a measure over the local governments. In Illinois, for instance, the county board is required to certify to the State authorities a list of applicants for the position of superintendent of roads. The State conducts an examination and certifies to the county board those who have successfully passed the examination, with their ratings, and the board must appoint one of these.

The State, too, has gradually come to exercise some sort of authority over the public-health administration.

It is evident, then, I think, that the county no longer functions as a successful government.

How, then, you ask, did this form of government come about? Were our fathers so much less wise than we that they devised wholly inadequate units of government? By no means. When counties were first established they met the needs of the times. The functions performed by the county were simple and few. They were chiefly concerned with the administration of justice and an official record of title deeds. In the early stages of the counties even education was a private matter, and there were no public schools. Road construction was simple and largely a township matter. Transportation was slow and difficult. Hence the county must not be so large that all the residents could not reach the county seat with reasonable convenience. The county, therefore, as thus established, while admirably suited to these earlier conditions, is wholly unsuited to those of the present day. For now the county seat, for all practical purposes, is as accessible to the remotest resident as the nearest district school was a century ago. It is significant that the counties in the far West which were last laid out are the largest in the United States.

Not only was the county small geographically to meet the needs of its time, but a genuine organized government seemed unnecessary because of the few and simple functions which it then performed. There must be some authority to levy taxes. Therefore county boards of supervisors or commissioners were formed. These boards exercised the only general administrative powers which the county possessed. For the few definite functions of the county, officers were selected generally by popular election. It was necessary to preserve the records of the courts. Since the courts of general jurisdiction usually covered several counties, a clerk of court was elected in each county within the district or circuit.

The judgments of the court within the county were of no avail unless there was some one to execute them. To accomplish this and to preserve order sheriffs were elected. It was important to preserve the registration of land titles. A separate officer was usually elected to perform this task. A custodian of the public funds was required for the safe-keeping of the county's moneys. A treasurer was elected to perform this duty. In the early days of the county, generally speaking, this is all there was to the county government. It worked fairly well. The county was, in fact, but little more than a political subdivision of the State.

How different the present picture! Within the space of a hundred years the county government has undergone a complete transformation. As the county gradually took on new functions and its accounts became larger and more complicated it seemed desirable to have an auditor of accounts. To fill this place another citizen of the county was elected by popular vote. Public schools have taken the place of private schools. The county has been compelled to undertake the administration of these schools. To this end an elective county superintendent has been added to the list of county officers. The public health, with an advancing civilization, has become an important concern of government. The county, therefore, has been obliged to undertake the administration of a county public health service. How inefficiently this duty has been performed is shown by the fact that the mortality of the country districts is greater than in metropolitan areas, though the reverse should be the fact.

Public highways have become one of the most important of all public functions, involving a much larger expenditure than any other except schools. The county has had to grapple with this problem, too. In most cases it has chosen a superintendent of highways.

In the average county of Illinois—and this is true of most of the States—the salaries of county officials absorb a very large percentage of the total revenues of the county, running as high as 50 per cent. That these officials could serve a much larger territory in most instances no one who is familiar with the situation can for a moment doubt. The county judge is but one instance of this. Even in the smallest county of this State he receives a salary of \$1,800 a year, while as a matter of fact his actual duties can be performed in an insignificant portion of his time. And the constitution of Illinois expressly authorizes the formation of two or more counties into districts for the discharge of this function of government.

I realize the practical difficulty in effecting the consolidation of counties. Without such consolidation, however, contiguous counties to a large extent can be united to administer revenue, schools, highways, health, charities, and other subjects of State concern.

It is a matter of common observation that we have too many public officials. We hear of unemployment everywhere except among public officials. Their number goes on increasing in good and evil times alike.

It is readily seen how greatly the functions of the county government have been enlarged. And yet the machinery for handling these larger functions has in principle remained unchanged. In the realm of State government revolutionary changes have been effected in recent years. There, too, until recently, the larger and more complex duties of the State were performed through scattered, uncoordinated, and independent boards, commissions, and officials. In the most progressive States there has been substituted a unified, cohesive, and responsible government with the governor actually at its head. This has resulted in economy and, above all, in increased efficiency. In the cities likewise there have been noteworthy reforms in recent years. There, too, the trend has been toward a more unified and therefore better coordinated government.

Rural government, however, has been largely untouched by this modernizing movement. It seems appropriate, therefore, to inquire into the principles upon which State and city governments have been organized and to see if these principles can not be made to apply to county government.

No organization of any kind is possible without an actual head. We recognize this fact in every other human institution except in rural government. No business or civic or charitable organization would long survive without a chief executive. In the realm of National and State and Municipal Government we recognized this principle in the beginning. At the head of our Federal Government we placed a President. For the head of our State governments we provided for a governor. In our municipalities a mayor was elected. For our county government, however, we never have had a head. As I have pointed out, this practice was unnecessary in the simpler days when the county was hardly more than a political unit of the State. With the new duties, however, assumed by the county there is the same need for an executive head here that there is elsewhere. Efficiency and economy are idle dreams without a strong directing hand at the head of any enterprise, whether private or public.

The executive budget has come to be regarded as indispensable to an economical government. An executive budget, however, is an impossibility unless there be a chief executive to make it.

If experience has proven anything, it has disclosed that an individual and not a board or commission can alone administer affairs successfully. It is true too that only by conferring power upon the individual official and not upon a board can responsibility be fixed for the nonperformance of duty. The county board, therefore, which is the only authority with anything like a semblance of control over the county government, is wholly inadequate to the task. The situation is made worse, however, for the reason that the control of the county board is only nominal. As we have seen, there is a very considerable list of elected officials with definite administrative duties assigned to them. These officials are independent of one another and in a large measure even of the county board.

Since at least the middle of the last century until quite recently the tendency has been toward elective rather than appointive officers. This was thought to be in pursuance of the democratic ideal of government. It was supposed that the way to cure the ills of democracy was more democracy. Instead, however, of this being the fact this disposition to elect more and more public officials tended to defeat the very underlying purposes of democracy. For democracy means control by the people of its own governmental affairs. The people can control their own affairs only if they can definitely locate responsibility. This is impossible where the powers of government are distributed among many officials, all engaged in a common administrative work. The best evidence that the people themselves realized this fundamental weakness in our county governments is the fact that in recent years when the county has taken over new functions it has appointed and not elected the man to exercise these functions. County public-road work and county welfare work are illustrations of this.

The evils of the long ballot have in recent years been clearly shown by our foremost students of government. Nowhere are these evils more manifest than in county government. And yet we have done less to correct them there than in any other field.

Self-government, locally, has been regarded from the earliest days as the cornerstone of our political structure. Unless the people of the several communities are able in the main to take care of their own affairs, too great a strain is placed upon the central government and a highly developed bureaucracy is inevitable. We have already gone too far in this direction. The present tendency will continue unless local government becomes more efficient. It is sometimes urged that to consolidate counties is a move away from local self-government. Quite the reverse, I think, is true. If counties are so small that their revenues will not support an adequate county government, the State will be more and more inclined to take over duties that can be better performed by the county. If we would check the encroachment of the State upon the functions now exercised by the county we must make the county government so efficient that there will be no reason for such a change. Many years ago Elihu Root pointed out in a noteworthy address that if the States did not successfully exercise their functions the Federal Government would gradually draw those functions to itself. The statement provoked much criticism, and yet he was but stating the simple truth. And so if we would preserve local government in the country, we must bring that government down to date, so that it will be able to cope with the new conditions which environ it.

In any ideal reconstruction of county government, the boundaries would be so changed as to make of the county a natural economic and social unit, regard being paid to the principal cities and towns and the territory naturally tributary to such. The aim would be to create a county in which community activities and community consciousness were possible. That it is possible to reconstitute the local subdivisions of government so as to enhance community cooperation and community consciousness no one can doubt. And, therefore, instead of local self-rule suffering, it would in reality be advanced.

The town or township, as it is sometimes called, is a still smaller unit of government which has largely survived its needs. No one but the town assessor knows what its boundaries are. In the earlier days of slow and difficult transportation to the county seat the township had real significance. It was small in extent, because otherwise its citizens could not assemble even once a year. It was supposed to resemble the New England towns which, from the beginning, have been the real unit of government in that portion of the United States. Never, however, in its best days did town government in the United States generally approach in efficiency the towns of New England. Now, with the coming of swift and easy transportation, the reason for town government, outside of New England, seems largely to have disappeared. Gradually its functions have been taken over by the county.

The roads are being constructed and maintained more and more by the county and State. Even where the township road commissioner survives he is under the supervision of the county authorities. In this State we formerly had town collectors of taxes. These officials did little or nothing and were rewarded with 2 per cent upon the taxes paid. During my service as governor of the State we abolished these township collectors. The result has been a direct saving to the State of more than \$2,000,000 annually, with the taxes collected more efficiently than before by the county officials. Competent authority estimates that the indirect saving has been in excess of this \$2,000,000. Even the township assessor, the last of the town officials who is really active, seems on the way to extinction, as county assessment of all property is now regarded a more equitable method than township assessment.

It may be that the township can be reconstructed so as to become a self-conscious community. The closely knit community, wherever it has been established in rural America, has contributed greatly to the well-being of the members of the community. These communities, however, no longer follow township lines. If, then, something can be created to take the place of the present township, which shall be in fact a rural community, it will be of immense benefit not only to the community itself but to the country at large.

It is often said that we have too much government. Whether this be true or not, it certainly is a fact that we have too many governments. An extreme illustration is the county of Cook, in this State. Chicago, as you know, is situated in this county. All the activities of the county, social, economic, and political, revolve around that city. In fact, Cook County comprises only a part of the metropolitan district of which Chicago is the heart. Portions of other counties are as directly related to Chicago as Cook County is. And yet Cook County alone contains within its borders 392 independent local governments. Is it any wonder that Chicago, with all its vast resources, should be in financial distress?

We are admonished by the current of events that the great problem confronting all civilized countries is to keep public expenditures within public revenues. We have recently seen the great Republic of Germany on the verge of collapse because she could not balance her budget. We have seen the greatest empire of modern times, which has boasted for more than a century that the sun never sets upon her flag, in financial distress threatening the credit structure of the world because she could not keep her expenditures within her income. Are we in America sure that the same danger does not threaten us? With the deficit of our National Government for the last year almost a billion dollars, our deficit for the current fiscal year probably one and a half billion dollars, many of our States and cities and minor political subdivisions in distress, isn't it time for us to take warning from what is happening all round the world?

So much upon the subject of taxation, your special subject for the day. I can not let this occasion pass, however, without briefly discussing some of the other handicaps under which agriculture is laboring at the present time. For the past decade prices of farm products have been lower than the prices of other commodities and services. In a simpler society we were accustomed to see prices move upward or downward together. With the deflation of 1920 a new phenomenon appeared. The prices of farm products declined rapidly, while other prices to a great extent successfully resisted such decline. The explanation by the economists of this disparity was that since earlier depressions other classes of society had succeeded in effecting organizations powerful enough to resist, or at least to moderate, the decline of prices.

The farmers were told that they, too, must organize if they were to acquire the same influence over the price of their products which others enjoy. Cooperative marketing, therefore, seemed to be the remedy for this unbalanced condition.

Organization of the farmers for the purpose of marketing their crops collectively has progressed. Denmark had shown how, under the most adverse circumstances, it could transform the agriculture of a people. Wherever cooperative marketing is farthest advanced,

either in the United States or abroad, there you find agriculture in its best estate; violent fluctuations in the markets lessened; better prices to the producers without an increase in cost, and sometimes with an actual decrease to the consumer; an approach to standardization of product; a more intelligent effort to adjust production to probable demand; a finer and more satisfying community life.

It is doubtful, however, if the cooperatives of the staple farm products will ever be sufficiently organized to give them the power in the making of prices which others now enjoy unless some way be found by which the cost to the cooperatives is borne equally by all producers of the particular commodity. If the producers of any staple farm product are only organized, even though a substantial majority of the producers have united in the cooperative, the producers of that commodity who are not members of the cooperative receive the full benefit of the improved price which the increased bargaining power of the cooperative may secure, without bearing any burden incident to the operations of the cooperative.

It is impossible to maintain the morale of an organization when outsiders receive its benefits in a larger measure than do the members themselves. For this reason the tobacco cooperatives and some others were driven out of business.

I have pointed out how the deflation of 1920 bore more heavily upon the farmers than any other class. Again, when in 1929 the debacle in Wall Street was over and prices generally started downward, farm prices outdistanced all others in the downward march. And for exactly the same reason. As Professor Rogers, of Yale, has recently said, with some prices "entirely rigid, others only partly flexible, and still others, like those of many of our basic raw materials, such as cotton and wheat, completely and immediately responsive to conditions of supply and demand," not only was it inevitable that farm prices should decline more rapidly than other prices, but also that "all sorts of maladjustments would make their appearance." Thus, not only have the farmers suffered as a result of these maladjustments, but all classes of society as well. I have been trying to tell the country for 10 years that we could not maintain general prosperity unless some way were found to correct these maladjustments of which Professor Rogers speaks.

By legislative policies we have created a domestic level of prices higher for those commodities which the farmer must buy in order to carry on his business than obtain in other parts of the world. If it is impossible to make that higher level of prices apply to farm products, how long will the American farmer endure these Government policies which put him at this ruinous disadvantage?

We have erected our tariff barriers ever higher and higher, beyond anything that Hamilton or Clay or Blaine, or even McKinley, ever dreamed. "Tariffs in imitation of or in retaliation for our own" have been adopted by most of the world, with an ever-narrowing market for the products of the farm. The great manufacturing industries of our country are increasingly transferring their operations to foreign lands. It can hardly be claimed that these factories, erected abroad by American capital and employing foreign labor, add to our home market for the farmer's wheat and cotton and corn and livestock. And yet this has always been the basis of the appeal to farmers for their support of a protective tariff.

In September of the present year farm commodity prices were 20 per cent below the 5-year average of 1909-1914. And yet the prices of the supplies the farmer buys, not including taxes and freight, were 27 per cent above the pre-war level.

Now, I submit that there can be no permanent recovery from this depression until this gross inequality has been removed. Let it be remembered that 40 per cent of the purchasing power of our country commonly abides in the farming population and those directly dependent upon it. In other words, in normal times it is worth about four times our entire foreign market.

If, then, farm prices are not to move upward, other prices must come down. If this means a revision of the tariff downward, let that revision be made. If it means lower wages in certain industries where the high labor cost is an important part of the price of the commodity, whatever we may wish, such wages must be lowered. The philosophy of high wages is sound enough if some sort of balance is maintained as between the different large groups of our population. We can not keep this complex economic machine moving, however, if certain millions of our people receive for their labor \$1.50 or \$2 an hour and certain other millions receive 10 cents an hour for work requiring equal or superior skill. For the millions upon the lower level of income can not buy the products of the other millions. We have the tragic problem of at least 7,000,000 of our fellow citizens out of work. How can they return to useful and productive labor unless something approaching an equilibrium between the prices of other commodities and the prices of farm products be restored?

Even, however, if prices had moved down in unison, though farmers out of debt would find themselves in a much improved condition, debtors would be weighted down by an intolerable burden. The dollar of to-day is worth about as much as a dollar and a half was worth five years ago. And so it follows that those farmers who incurred indebtedness a few years ago to improve their farms or to purchase better equipment or better livestock, in response to the urge of the agricultural colleges and other leaders in agriculture, are now in a position where for every dollar they borrowed they must now pay a much larger sum. That injustice is breaking the backs of many of our best and most progressive farmers.

This is the question which is uppermost in the minds not only of the farming population but of our people generally. There has been an immense amount of discussion upon this subject in recent months. There are a great many economists who believe that it is possible to undo some of the deflation which has occurred in recent years. Only the other day, as reported in the Wall Street Journal, two eminent professors of economics, James H. Rogers, of Yale, and Lionel D. Edie, formerly of Chicago University, expressed themselves unequivocally of the opinion that it was possible, even under existing circumstances, for the Federal reserve banking system, by the exercise of powers which it already possessed, to improve greatly the general price level. Many of our most eminent economists believe that it had it within its power before the debacle of Wall Street two years ago to check the inflation of credit which resulted in that debacle, and afterwards, before deflation had gone so far as to inflict the gravest injury upon our entire economic life, to arrest further deflation.

All classes now agree that unless there is an improvement in the general price level there can be no substantial relief from the unprecedented depression in which we find ourselves. The question, therefore, is a vital one. We have boasted in the past of our ability to meet new situations as they arose. To say that nothing can be done in this matter is the counsel of despair. Why not give heed to the opinions of the long line of eminent economists who believe that, without any disturbance to our gold standard, we have it within our power to erase some of the drastic deflation from which we are now suffering. And that deflation is the greatest in our history and it seems to be gathering momentum all the time. The decline in bank credit has been more rapid in recent months than at any time since deflation set in. Unless some way can be found to check this contraction of credit, thoughtful students fear that we have by no means yet seen the worst.

There is another phase of the banking situation upon which I wish to touch briefly. We have gone insane in this country in our banking operations upon the subject of liquid assets. Liquidity and mobility are the two chief characteristics of the present day. The bank examiners insist upon banks throughout the country having nothing but what they call liquid assets.

I remember very well that when the Federal reserve system was devised, the fundamental principle upon which that system was founded was that commercial paper representing goods in the intermediate stages between production and consumption were liquid assets, because they liquidated themselves. That was the theory of the Federal reserve system, and the issue of currency was based upon this paper. To-day, however, the banking authorities regard bonds, which are the very opposite of quick assets as understood when the Federal reserve system was adopted, more liquid than paper representing cattle or hogs or crops, or almost anything else—and so the banks have been driven to withdraw their investments from the farmers and the small tradespeople to invest in bonds. These bonds, by the way, were largely floated by the great banking houses of New York.

Our bankers down the State—and I suppose this is true elsewhere throughout the country—tell me that they have lost more money on bonds which they have been compelled to buy than they have on all the loans they have made to farmers. Bonds of many foreign countries are quoted at only a small portion of the purchase price. They are selling now for something more, I believe, than the commissions which these banking houses received. And yet those bonds have been approved by our bank examiners in preference to loans to farmers for legitimate purposes.

One of the most prominent bankers in Illinois told me the other day that the prejudice against farm loans is so great that one national bank examiner insisted on his having a chattel mortgage if he made a loan to a farmer to buy cows or other livestock or he would not count the loan as an asset of the bank; and then when my friend went to the Federal reserve bank they would not discount the paper secured by the chattel mortgage because that was against the law.

One arm of the Government insisted on the chattel mortgage before permitting the bank to make the loan, and another branch of the same Government refused to discount the paper because it was accompanied by a chattel mortgage!

Now, all the authorities agree that the business of this modern world is carried on, not by cash, as it was in more primitive times, but largely by credit; and whenever you curtail the basis of credit you injure the whole business structure and help to bring upon us such a crisis as we are facing now.

Then there is land. Why, it is no longer respectable to own land, and you can't talk to a banker about making a loan on land. It is because of the fact that in this hurried age we have gotten into a frame of mind in which we want nothing that can not be converted into cash instantly or that we can't leave overnight?

In all the past good land has been one of the objects most keenly sought. Not only have individuals so thought of land, but nations as well have regarded themselves happy when they could add to their domain some area somewhere of fertile soil. Two years ago last winter I visited Egypt. The historic valley of the Nile contains only about 10,000 square miles of delta land, and yet every empire of ancient times hazarded war to gain possession of these 10,000 square miles. Rome's possession of this area probably prolonged the life of the Roman Empire for a century or more by furnishing food to the Roman populace when it was no longer able to feed itself.

In the Mississippi Valley alone we have about four times as much delta land as Egypt contains. This single resource ought to distinguish us among nations. And these lands are but a small part of our agricultural heritage. All at once, however, we seem to have abandoned our idea as to their importance and value. Perhaps in earlier times we attached too much importance to land. If so, we have now gone to the other extreme.

Now, if these lands, or mortgages upon these lands, are held in a bank they are called "frozen" assets. Well, no one likes "frozen" assets, but the banks at the urge of the authorities have been buying bonds, foreign and others, because, as we are told, they can be sold upon the New York Stock Exchange. These bonds never "freeze," it is true, but many of them have evaporated into thin air, and I predict that if we ever return to sanity those "frozen" assets of to-day will be the basis of our financial recovery and not these so-called liquid assets.

We have got to restore our faith in these fundamental things before we shall emerge from this depression.

The farmer has been going through the hardest year he has experienced in all his career. According to the Department of Agriculture, in a statement recently issued, his income for the year ending July 1 last was about \$350,000,000 less than the average wage of farm labor, which itself was ridiculously low, as the department tells us. In other words, he received no income upon his investment; he received no compensation for his management, and received \$350,000,000 less than he would have received if he had been at work for some one else.

If a year ago last spring the farmers of the United States had found some benevolent person to whom they could have given all their property, their lands, and their livestock and other equipment and everything else that they owned and then could have gone to work for this benevolent person, they would have been \$350,000,000 better off at the end of the year than they are now. And yet they are going on even in these difficult times. Drive across the country or go by train between distant points, and everywhere you see the farmer in his field gathering his crops or preparing for another year. Drought may come and wither his fields until they look like desert wastes, or flood may come and ruin in its wake; yet he goes on planning and working for the future.

Now, some of our friends in the city say he ought not to do this; that he ought to let his lands lie idle until consumption overtakes production. And yet I am wondering if the farmer's instinct to produce something of value when he sees millions all round the world hungry and but half clothed who need these products of his toil—I wonder if this instinct is not sounder than the teachings of some of our city friends. I wonder if he is not sensing the fact that the trouble comes from the world's maldistribution of goods and services rather than from overproduction by himself. I am sure that whether I am right about this or not, the farmers of America are setting an example to all of us which we might well imitate. If our people in the cities would but cooperate with agriculture in removing the handicaps of which I have spoken and then catch the spirit of these farmers who are carrying on in spite of all their difficulties the dark clouds that fill the sky would pass swiftly by.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, April 25, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Monday, April 25, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m.)

Continue hearings on soldiers' bonus.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(10.30 a. m.)

S. J. Res. 50, to authorize District Commissioners to close Water Street between Twenty-second and Twenty-third Streets.

H. R. 7305, to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

(11 a. m.)

Hearing on Ogdensburg (N. Y.) Harbor project.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

536. A letter from the vice chairman of the American Legion National Legislative Committee, transmitting the

proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held at Detroit, Mich., September 21-24, 1931 (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

537. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 21, 1932, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey on, and review of reports on, Elizabeth River, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

538. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 20, 1932, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Snake River, Idaho, from Pittsburg Landing to Johnsons Bar; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

539. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 21, 1932, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on Walnut Harbor, Talbot County, Md.; to the committee on Rivers and Harbors.

540. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 22, 1932, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on Potomac River and its tributaries, including Occoquan Creek; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. NOLAN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 10302. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain school lands in North Dakota to the International Peace Garden (Inc.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 11363. A bill relating to the immigration and naturalization of certain natives of Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEHLBACH: Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries. H. J. Res. 328. A joint resolution authorizing the United States Shipping Board to extend, rearrange, or hold in abeyance payments due the construction-loan fund under certain conditions; with amendment (Rept. No. 1115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS: Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries. H. R. 11155. A bill to amend the radio act of February 23, 1927, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 47, sec. 85), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1116). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS: Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries. S. 3908. An act to amend title 33, chapter 4, section 252, paragraph (a), of the Navigation Rules for the Great Lakes and Their Connecting and Tributary Waters; with amendment (Rept. No. 1117). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FULLER: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 7440. A bill to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SCHAFER: Committee on Claims. S. 220. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Van Camp Sea Food Co. (Inc.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GUYER: Committee on Claims. S. 249. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of William T. Stiles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Claims. S. 1421. An act for the relief of Little Rock College, Little Rock, Ark.; with-

out amendment (Rept. No. 1108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHAFER: Committee on Claims. S. 1858. An act for the relief of Harriette Olsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Claims. S. 3504. An act for the relief of Lyman L. Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHRISTGAU: Committee on Claims. S. 4166. An act for the relief of James M. Griffin, disbursing agent, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works; without amendment (Rept. No. 1112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 11567) to encourage the mining of coal under competitive conditions in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 11563) repealing certain sections of the Revised Code of Laws of the United States relating to the Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 11569) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 11570) to reduce the rate of interest on adjusted-service certificate loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAGON: Resolution (H. Res. 202) that there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House not to exceed \$25,000 for the expenses of the select committee appointed under House Resolution 201, to investigate campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 201) that a special committee be appointed by the Speaker to investigate expenditures of candidates for President, Vice President, and House of Representatives, 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. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 11571) granting an increase of pension to Marcha Ann Corkill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTON: A bill (H. R. 11572) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Postlewait; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 11573) for the relief of Ruth L. Shepard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 11574) for the relief of Richard Munster; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 11575) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hoel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 11576) granting a pension to Mary V. Gesner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDER: A bill (H. R. 11577) granting a pension to Hannah Pressler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11578) granting a pension to Claud Hickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11579) for the relief of Graham-Baumgarner Co., of Parkersburg, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11580) for the relief of Shafer Schwartz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 11581) for the relief of Virginia Houghton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11582) for the relief of Mary V. Spear; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11583) for the relief of Alice E. Broas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 11584) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Washington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11585) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Spangler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAY: A bill (H. R. 11586) granting a pension to Sarah Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11587) granting a pension to George W. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11588) granting a pension to Green Morris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART: A bill (H. R. 11589) for the relief of Alfred Jacob Kettner; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 11590) to authorize the waiver or remission of certain coal-lease rentals, and for other purposes; 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:

6922. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of citizens of Hutsonville, Ill., favoring legislation to regulate the use of public highways by motor trucks and busses engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6923. By Mr. BACON: Memorial of the New York Board of Trade, first, favoring the balancing of the Budget and increasing taxes; second, favoring governmental economies; and, third, opposing the payment of the bonus at this time; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6924. Also, resolution of the Merchant Tailors Society of the City of New York, opposing immediate payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6925. Also, resolution of the Merchant Tailors Society of the City of New York, opposing stock-transfer tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6926. Also, resolution of the Merchant Tailors Society of the City of New York, favoring repeal of the eighteenth amendment and Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6927. Also, petition of the New York Department of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, favoring the inclusion in the Budget of funds to provide for the training of group 1, combat pilots of the air reserve, during the fiscal year of 1933; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6928. Also, petition of the Nassau Wild-Life Association, protesting against the enactment of House bill 10604; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6929. By Mr. BOEHNE: Petition of citizens of Johnson, Ind., urging favorable action on all bills which have to do with the interstate trucks and busses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6930. Also petition of citizens of Cynthiana, Ind., urging favorable action on all bills which have to do with the interstate trucks and busses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6931. By Mr. BRIGGS: Communication from S. B. Graham, director of vocational education, Galveston public schools, urging continuance of aid through the Federal Board for Vocational Education; to the Committee on Economy.

6932. Also, communication from F. H. Pitts, of Montgomery, Tex., urging continuance of aid through the Federal Board for Vocational Education; to the Committee on Economy.

6933. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of about 20,000 citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against reduction in pay of Federal employees; to the Committee on Economy.

6934. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of 72 business firms and business men of Sioux City, Iowa, opposing the proposed reduction in salaries of Government employees; to the Committee on Economy.

6935. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the State convention of the Reserve Officers Association, Department of New York, urging the Congress not to reduce military appropriations which will necessitate the reduction in personnel of the Army, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, citizens' military training camps, National Guard, or rifle practice, and asking Congress to include in the second deficiency bill an appropriation sufficient to provide inactive duty and flying training for the air reserve combat pilots during the remainder of the fiscal year 1932, and that there be included in the Budget funds sufficient to permit training of the Group 1, combat pilots of the air reserve during the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6936. By Mr. HART: Petition of residents of St. Charles, Swan Creek, and Chesaning, Mich., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6937. By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: Petition of Huntington Manufacturers Club, opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6938. Also, petition of Madison Rotary Club of Madison, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6939. By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolution of the board of directors of the seven savings and loan associations of Grays Harbor County, Wash., praying for early passage of the home loan bank bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6940. Also, resolution of the Raymond (Wash.) American Legion Post, No. 150, urging payment of the remainder of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6941. Also, resolution of the council of the city of Tacoma, Wash., urging the enactment of pending legislation appropriating \$5,500,000,000 for public-works program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6942. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Zuhrah Temple, A. A. O. N. M. S., Minneapolis, Minn., requesting adoption of John Philip Sousa's march, The Stars and Stripes Forever, as the official national march of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6943. Also, petition of Minneapolis Central Labor Union, urging immediate payment of adjusted compensation for ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6944. Also, petition of Lodge No. 30 of the Switchmen's Union of America, Minneapolis, Minn., opposing any cut in Federal salaries; to the Committee on Economy.

6945. Also, petition of Post No. 352, American Legion, St. Paul, Minn., urging immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6946. Also, petition of Minnesota Commandery of the Military Order of Foreign Wars of the United States, opposing reduction in the strength of the Regular Army, the National Guard, and any reduction of appropriations for the organized reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6947. Also, petition of Local No. 209 of the Farmers Union, Beardsley, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 2487 and House bill 7797; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6948. Also, petition of Women's Auxiliary, Local No. 65, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, St. Paul, Minn., protesting against pay cuts in salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on Economy.

6949. Also, petition of Local No. 209, of the Farmers Union, Beardsley, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 1197; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6950. Also, petition of Minnesota Scandinavian Grand Lodge, Minneapolis, Minn., urging that the wet and dry question not enter into and obscure every other issue that may arise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6951. Also, petition of legislative department of American Legion Auxiliary, Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against repeal of provisions for benefits to veterans without proper hearings; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6952. Also, petition of Post No. 16, United Veterans of Spanish War, Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6953. Also, petition of Minnesota Chapter, No. 25, National Sojourners, requesting support of the national defense act in its present form; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6954. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of 482 citizens and business men of Topeka, Kans., urging favorable action on the Patman bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6955. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, Department of New York, H. S. Wilgus, president, favoring the inclusion in the Budget of funds sufficient to permit training of Group 1, combat pilots of the Air Reserve, during the fiscal year 1933; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6956. Also, petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 930, Earl R. Sawyer, commander, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the Patman bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6957. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of Federal Post, No. 62, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, protesting against reduction of salaries of Federal employees; to the Committee on Economy.

6958. Also, petition from the patients of the Indianapolis Veterans' Hospital, showing their ideas concerning the bonus and other veterans' legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6959. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Merchant Tailors Society of the City of New York, opposing stock-transfer tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6960. Also, petition of the Merchant Tailors Society of the City of New York, opposing the bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6961. Also, petition of New York Board of Trade (Inc.), suggesting means of raising revenue, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6962. Also, petition of the Merchant Tailors Society of the City of New York, opposing prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6963. Also, petition of Military Order of Foreign Wars of the United States, opposing payment of the adjusted-service-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6964. Also, petition of board of directors of Dairymen's League Cooperative Association (Inc.), opposing drastic cuts in the appropriation for vocational training; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6965. Also, petition of New York State shippers, favoring Federal regulation of motor trucks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6966. By Mr. MILLARD: Resolution of the State convention of the Reserve Officers' Association, Department of New York, opposing any reduction in military appropriations, personnel, and defensive plan, and favoring appropriation for training air reserve combat pilots, 1932, and air reserve combat pilots, 1933; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6967. Also, petition signed by citizens of Larchmont, Mamaroneck, and White Plains, N. Y., protesting against proposed soldiers' bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6968. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Petition of F. F. Sieg, of Savannah, Ga., and six other citizens, urging the passage of House bill 9891, and voicing opposition to House bill 10023 and Senate bill 3892; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6969. Also, petition of J. D. Kirkland, of Metter, Ga., and five other citizens, urging the enactment of legislation regulating busses and trucks engaged in hauling passengers and freight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6970. By Mr. PARTRIDGE: Petition of W. A. Redmun and 19 other railway employees residing at Livermore Falls, Me., urging the passage of House bill 9891, and voicing opposition to Senate bill 3892 and House bill 10023; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6971. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of W. L. Murray and 107 other veterans of the United States naval hospital, Pensacola, Fla., urging immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6972. Also, petition of Lawrence M. Tuttle and other citizens and veterans of Waltham, Mass., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6973. Also, petition of American Legion Auxiliary Unit, No. 275, Dallas, Tex., submitted by Mrs. C. E. Wolfe, fifth district committeewoman, Department of Texas, American Legion Auxiliary, indorsing immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6974. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 59, Earle, Ark., submitted by W. O. Buck, commander of said post, indorsing immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6975. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 1, Florence, S. C., submitted by Jack D. Grimes, commander of said post, indorsing immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6976. Also, petition of Appleton Grange, No. 127, Jerome, Idaho, submitted by Mrs. M. S. Perkins, secretary of said grange, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6977. Also, petition of William H. Nellist and 444 other citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., urging immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6978. Also, petition of the Working, Business, and Professional Men's Forum, Birmingham, Ala., submitted by H. M. McGhee, secretary of said organization, indorsing immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6979. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 52, Jersey City, N. J., submitted by John J. Flynn, adjutant of said post, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6980. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 37, Hooksett, N. H., submitted by George A. Cook, adjutant of said post, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6981. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 19, Bayonne, N. J., submitted by commander and adjutant of said post, indorsing immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6982. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 281, Cuyahoga, Ohio, submitted by E. C. Clifford, commander of said post, indorsing immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6983. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 70, Lenoir City, Tenn., submitted by W. C. Lee, commander, and J. A. Coble, adjutant, of said post, indorsing immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6984. By Mr. PEAVEY: Petition of numerous citizens of Spooner, Wis., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1202, providing for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6985. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Polk County, Wis., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1202,

providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6986. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Gleason, Wis., protesting against Senate bill 1202, providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6987. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Brooklyn Technical High School, Albert L. Colston, principal, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against suspension of Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6988. Also, petition of Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, Department of New York, favoring the necessary appropriation sufficient to permit training of the Group 1 combat pilots of the air reserve during the fiscal year 1933; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6989. Also, petition of Brooklyn industrial high schools for girls, Margaret A. Jones, principal, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the suspension of Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6990. Also, petition of Williamsburg Continuation School, George F. Pigott, jr., principal, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the suspension of Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6991. Also, petition of Earl R. Sawyer, commander Post No. 930, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Patman bill, H. R. 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6992. Also, petition of department of vocational education, Syracuse, N. Y., favoring continuation of Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6993. Also, petition of 35,000 New York City teachers, opposing reduction of the Federal employees salaries; to the Committee on Economy.

6994. Also, petition of John T. Burrows, 61 Broadway, New York City, referring to Muscle Shoals legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6995. Also, petition of I. G. Ammen, Yonkers, N. Y., opposing Muscle Shoals legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6996. Also, petition of Isabel A. Ennis, New York City, opposing any curtailment of funds of the Federal Board for Vocational Training; to the Committee on Economy.

6997. By Mr. SHOTT: Resolution of the twelfth Pythian district of the Knights of Pythias, located in southern coal fields of West Virginia, protesting against passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6998. Also, letter signed by Joe S. Gentry of the Gentry Bros. Printing Co., Huntington, W. Va., opposing passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6999. Also, resolution adopted by the Kanawha Valley Coal Mining Institute, Cannelton, W. Va., opposing passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7000. Also, resolution of the Madison Rotary Club, of Madison, Boone County, W. Va., opposing as detrimental to the best interests of the bituminous coal industry and the State of West Virginia as a whole the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7001. Also, resolution passed at a meeting of the directors of the Huntington Manufacturers Club, Huntington, W. Va., opposing as detrimental to the best interests of the coal industry and therefore the entire business field of the bituminous-coal section the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7002. Also, letter signed by A. R. McIntosh, machinists' representative; J. W. Hill, boilermakers' representative; D. L. Holtz, sheet metal workers' representative; R. C. Wright, carmen's representative; H. P. Ward, electrical workers' representative; and J. T. Williams, blacksmiths' representative, representing 741 shop employees of the Norfolk & Western Railway, protesting against the passage of the Davis-Kelly

coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7003. Also, letter signed by Carl Grace, O. C. Wyrick, E. H. Vaughn, Henry Craig, Carl Keyser, and James M. Nunnally, representing 486 shop employees of the Norfolk & Western Railway, opposing as detrimental to the bituminous-coal industry and therefore to the coal-carrying railroads the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7004. Also, letter signed by T. L. Lumpkins, F. M. Leslie, B. H. Hill, R. F. Wilkins, T. C. Farmer, Albert Testerman, representing 84 shop employees of the Norfolk & Western Railway, opposing as ruinous to the bituminous-coal industry and therefore dangerous to the coal-carrying railroads the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal bill designed to regulate and control the bituminous-coal industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7005. Also, resolution of the Fayetteville (W. Va.) Rotary Club, signed by J. K. McGrath, president, and W. C. Neel, secretary, opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7006. Also, letter signed by Arthur L. Wooten, J. J. Bishop, Luther Sanford, Ralph J. Breman, B. F. Looney, W. L. Grubb, F. T. Craig, all of West Virginia, representing 8,000 shop employees of the Norfolk & Western Railway Co., opposing as detrimental to the bituminous-coal industry and therefore to the coal-carrying railroads the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7007. Also, letters from Emery Tilley and M. G. Weaver, of Mullens, protesting against the passage of the Davis-Kelly control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7008. Also, letter signed by J. H. Goosby, J. T. Carey, and G. G. Griffin, of Bluestone, W. Va., representing 196 shop employees of the Norfolk & Western Railway, protesting against the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7009. Also, letter and resolution from the Railroad Employees and Taxpayers Association of Bluefield, W. Va., J. W. Cahill, president, protesting against and opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7010. Also, letter from the Princeton Foundry & Supply Co., Princeton, W. Va., signed by George E. Farmer, secretary-treasurer, vigorously opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7011. Also, resolution of the Rotary Club of Charleston, W. Va., opposing passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7012. By Mr. STEWART: Petition of the guild of the First Presbyterian Church of Plainfield, N. J., protesting against the unjust treatment of Eskimos in Alaska, etc.; to the Committee on the Territories.

7013. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of Johnstown Post, No. 294, American Legion, favoring the immediate payment of the balance due on adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7014. By Mr. SWING: Petition signed by 1,512 citizens of San Diego, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday-observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7015. Also, petition signed by 1,014 citizens of San Diego, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7016. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Guy A. Shick, of Bentleyville, and 27 other residents of Washington County, Pa., supporting the proposed legislation providing for full payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7017. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of bar of Alpine, Brewster County, Tex., protesting against the passage of Senate bills 937 and 939, in reference to depriving individ-

uals and corporations of right to removing suits from State to Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7018. Also, petition of Big Bend Post, No. 79, American Legion, Alpine, Tex., urging payment of balance due on adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7019. By Mr. WEST: Petition of 25 business men of West Lafayette, Ohio, protesting against suspending Federal aid for vocational education for one year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1932

Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, D. D., LL. D., canon of the Washington Cathedral, city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom we intrust the authority of government, especially the Members of this Senate, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. Especially in this day of anxiety and distress suffer not our trust in Thee to fail. All of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8083) providing for the appointment as ensigns in the line of the Navy of all midshipmen who graduate from the Naval Academy in 1932; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON of Georgia, Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma, Mr. DREWRY, Mr. BRITTEN, and Mr. DARROW were appointed as managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had concurred in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) providing for printing additional copies of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance on the bill (H. R. 10236) to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had concurred in the current resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) authorizing the printing of 3,000 additional copies of hearings held before the Committee on Manufactures on the establishment of a national economic council, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11290) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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: