

Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6918. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, asking support in rebuilding vocational education appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6919. By Mr. TURPIN: Petition of American Legion Post, No. 176, of Peely, Pa., requesting the passage of legislation for the payment of the full face value of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6920. By the SPEAKER: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, requesting that an investigation be directed immediately by the House of Representatives of the United States to the end that the expenditures of Representative EDWARD LOWBER STOKES may be regulated or limited as prescribed and intended in accordance with the Federal Statutes; to the Committee on Rules.

6921. Also, petition of the First Ward Democratic Club of Yonkers, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on Economy.

SENATE

SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1932

(Legislative day of Friday, April 22, 1932)

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had concurred in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) requesting the President of the United States to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 3584) entitled "An act to require all insurance corporations formed under the provisions of Chapter XVIII of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia to maintain their principal offices and places of business within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

FINANCING OF CRIME

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I notice in the morning paper an astonishing statement that Al Capone has again offered to assist in recovering the Lindbergh baby and has actually offered an absolute guarantee that if he is permitted temporarily to leave his sojourn in the Federal penitentiary he will see that the baby is returned within a very few days. His friend has assured Colonel Lindbergh that the return of the baby will be made without the payment of a cent in ransom in addition to that which has already been paid.

Mr. President, this is the second time it has occurred that Al Capone has offered to return the baby if he could get out of jail for a while. Furthermore, the Lindbergh family have been in touch with two of the leading gangsters in New York in an effort to get the baby back. The fact that the Federal and local officials have been baffled for weeks and that it has been necessary to turn to the gangsters and that their leader, who made his money chiefly from the beer racket and from bootleggers, is willing to stake his reputation by guaranteeing that the baby can be returned lends some force to the claim which has frequently been made to me by various people that the kidnaping was done by a friend of Capone for this very purpose.

Furthermore, people have been writing to me from various parts of the country saying that they agree with the resolution adopted by the Los Angeles Aviators' Post of the American Legion, which blames the prohibition laws for the gangsters' activities. Essentially the resolution states that it is their belief that these organized criminal activities have been created and are fostered by the continuance of our existing national prohibition laws which have made enormous profits available for such antisocial groups. I have received letters from various persons in widely separated parts of the United States who tell me that circumstances connected with the kidnaping of the Lindbergh baby

have convinced them that the adoption of the eighteenth amendment was a mistake and that it should be repealed. In one letter the father of a family of five children stated that he and his neighbors had until recently been ardent advocates of the eighteenth amendment, but that now they are convinced that it should be repealed.

The crime of kidnaping is not a new crime, and I do not believe that it has been caused by prohibition. At the same time it must be obvious to everyone that the successful financing of crime on a large scale has unquestionably been due to the enormous profits of the bootleggers. The Government has lost hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue which has gone into the bootleggers' pockets as profits. These profits have enabled them to finance crime on a hitherto unparalleled scale.

Although I can not agree fully with my various correspondents who blame the kidnaping of the Lindbergh baby entirely on the prohibition laws, I have the greatest sympathy with the position which they have taken, and I do feel that the time has come for the Congress to face the fact called attention to by the Los Angeles aviators, that our existing national prohibition laws have made enormous profits available to gangsters and racketeers. The sooner we repeal the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act and permit each State to pass the kind of prohibition law desired by the majority of its citizens the sooner will we diminish the enormous profits which are now going into the pockets of criminals and helping them to carry out difficult crimes successfully.

I send to the desk the resolution of the Los Angeles Aviators' Post of the American Legion to which I have referred and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas, apparently as the direct result of a dangerous new development of gangster and racketeer activities in this Nation, there has recently been perpetrated a peculiarly heinous crime, to wit, the kidnaping of the infant son of a nationally honored and beloved hero, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh; and

Whereas under stress of the great anxiety occasioned by the said crime Colonel Lindbergh has apparently deemed it necessary to carry on negotiations for the recovery of his child with reputed notorious gangster, racketeer, and other so-called underworld characters rather than depending solely upon the lawfully constituted authorities of his State and of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the perpetration of such a crime and the most regrettable means considered necessary for its solution are both indications of how seriously gangster and racketeer activities have fastened themselves upon the life of the Nation; and

Whereas, in our opinion, such organized criminal activities have been created by and are fostered by the continuance of our existing national prohibition laws, which have made enormous profits available to such antisocial groups: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Aviators' Post, No. 350, of the American Legion, Department of California, petition our Senators and Representatives in Congress to give earnest consideration to such lawful measures as may secure changes in the existing prohibition statutes which will remove the primary cause of the dangerous gangster and racketeer organizations of the country.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. VANDENBERG presented a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., inviting attention to the naval appropriation bill and favoring the appropriation of sufficient funds therein to enable the Federal Government continue its share of the expense of the Naval Reserve, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ASHURST presented a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from the Phoenix (Ariz.) Clearing House Association, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Norbeck bill, being the bill (S. 4291) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Pima County, Ariz., remonstrating against proposed reductions in the compensation of Federal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented telegrams, in the nature of memorials, from Fred W. Moore, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Flagstaff and the Chamber of Commerce of Wins-

low, both in the State of Arizona, remonstrating against proposed reductions in the compensation of Federal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a telegram from sundry letter carriers of New Orleans, La., congratulating the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] on his stand opposing Federal salary reductions, and stating in part, "Industries are just waiting for this opportunity to cut salaries. This will not only demoralize but will lower living standards. Spending power should not be lowered," which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARBOUR presented a resolution adopted by the Frank J. Bartletta Association, of Hoboken, N. J., protesting against proposed reductions in the compensation of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Cold Spring Grange, No. 132, Patrons of Husbandry, of Cold Spring, Cape May County, N. J., remonstrating against the imposition of taxes on automobiles and the automobile industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Albert L. Quinn Post, No. 52, American Legion, Department of New Jersey, urging the national commander of the American Legion to convene the executive committee of the Legion in special session for the purpose of rescinding the previous action taken on the cash-payment question (bonus) at Detroit, Mich., and at such session to arrange for a poll of the Legion membership on the question, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Atlantic City, N. J., protesting against the passage of legislation to pay adjusted-compensation certificates of World War veterans (bonus) at the present time, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

APPROPRIATION FOR ERADICATION OF GRASSHOPPER PLAGUE

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on yesterday I served notice that on Monday in the morning hour I would press for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 149, providing for lifting the appropriation for grasshopper eradication out of the agricultural appropriation bill, now in conference, unless it appears at that time that that bill will be here for final passage at that time.

To show the urgency of this appropriation I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram received by me this morning from the State entomologist of Minnesota.

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

Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Latest time mash application varies middle May to last of June. Appropriation delay results poor organization for handling bait, due to rules of bidding and shortage bran. Great doubt now that can be secured on time in sufficient quantities. Mash must be in counties May 15. Hopper eggs wintered perfectly. Situation serious.

A. G. RUGGLES.

PAYMENT OF SOLDIERS' BONUS

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I ask permission to have incorporated in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram received from a number of business men of Valparaiso, Ind., favoring immediate payment of the soldiers' bonus.

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

Senator ARTHUR ROBINSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned business men of Valparaiso, Ind., having given the matter serious consideration, advise you that notwithstanding Mr. Dawes's profanity, we favor the payment of the soldiers' bonus bill with greenbacks based on the 40 per cent gold

guaranty as outlined by Senator CAPPER and Representative PATMAN. The deflation, unless checked, will bankrupt 90 per cent of the business men and farmers in our district.

GLEN J. GODDARD.
J. D. KEERN.
JAMES H. MCGILL.
G. R. JONES.
C. L. BARTHOLOMEW.
THOMAS M. HARROLD.
J. L. MEAGHER.
JUSTIN O. SHAUER.
MANDEL LOWENSTINE.

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF FEDERAL SALARIES

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, also I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution of Federal Post, No. 62, the American Legion, of Indianapolis, Ind., protesting against contemplated salary reductions.

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

Whereas certain bills have been introduced in the present Congress contemplating the reduction of salaries of Federal employees; and

Whereas the present economic condition has had a telling effect on the families of Federal employees, in some cases due to relatives of said employees being forced into a state of dependency by the said present economic conditions; and

Whereas the Federal employees have donated to charity institutions and relief organizations in amounts heretofore unknown to be given by men drawing like salaries; and

Whereas Federal employees have worked for a very small salary while others in the industrial service were receiving high wages, the lowest being about double the amount paid Federal employees; and

Whereas such reductions in salaries will decrease the buying power of the Nation and thereby prolong the present economic conditions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Federal Post, No. 62, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, memorialize the national headquarters of the American Legion to protest against such contemplated salary reductions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the national commander of the American Legion, the national legislative committee, and all Senators and Representatives from Indiana.

FEDERAL POST, NO. 62, THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF INDIANA,

By L. E. ZINKAN, *Adjutant*.

PROPOSED TAX ON SALES OF SECURITIES

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, also I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD, without the signatures, and appropriately referred a memorial numerously signed by citizens of Terre Haute and vicinity, in my State, remonstrating against the proposed tax on sales of securities.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures, as follows:

Hon. Senator ARTHUR R. ROBINSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The revenue bill in its present form, providing for a tax of one-quarter of 1 per cent on the sale of securities and a 5-cent tax on each hundred dollars value of commodities traded in on futures markets, will not produce the revenue which is now anticipated. The fact is that the cost to the investors in stocks and commodities will be so prohibitive that they will of necessity seek other forms of investment. This will dry up the markets, and trading of this character will be reduced to a small fraction of its present volume, thereby defeating the purpose of the tax and eventually greatly increasing our taxes on other necessities. In addition to this, many banking institutions, financial houses, and brokerage firms will find it necessary to reduce expenses by force reduction, which in no wise will help our present economic situation.

We, the undersigned, most drastically oppose the passage of the revenue bill, which is now before the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, especially in so far as same pertains to the further taxation of one-quarter of 1 per cent on securities and 5 cents on every \$100 traded on in the commodities markets. It is our earnest belief that such taxation, if permitted to become a law, will undoubtedly be the means of driving out of the securities and commodities markets the speculative and investment interests so necessary to maintain an equitable basis for such markets. Taxation already imposed is sufficient without adding any further burden and tending to destroy the markets of the farmers and industries. We urge that you do everything in your power to bring about the defeat of this proposed legislation.

WILLIAM L. HINDS
(And others).

MINNESOTA SENATORIAL CONTEST

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Le Sueur

News-Herald, of the 20th instant, published at Le Sueur, in my State.

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

Hoidale has filed his papers in an effort to unseat Senator SCHALL. He charges irregularities in certain precincts. If there were irregularities, perhaps they should have been hung on Hoidale. Perhaps Hoidale is above suspicion, and perhaps not. Hoidale says SCHALL violated the postal laws by sending out political matter under his "frank." The United States Post Office Department says Senator SCHALL was within his rights. The department ought to know. Hoidale charges that Senator SCHALL was elected by "illegal methods and by fraud." It is possible the court may hang something on Hoidale that will make him feel about as he did when he made the speech thanking the voters for electing him United States Senator. It is quite evident, however, that Mr. Hoidale is bringing the contest for the sole purpose of "gathering in" the cash allowance made and provided for such cases. Remember Magnus Johnson received quite a sum in a similar proceeding, so the story goes.

REPORTS OF THE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3577) for the relief of Rolando B. Moffett, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 591) thereon.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4190) for the relief of Thomas E. Reed, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 592) thereon.

Mr. DICKINSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1029) for the relief of Basil N. Henry, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 593) thereon.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF THE POST OFFICE COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

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

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LOGAN:

A bill (S. 4462) to accelerate public construction in periods of business depression through the creation of an Administration of Public Works and to provide for a more effective coordination and correlation of the public-works functions of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4463) authorizing the President to appoint Sergt. Charles F. Clark a warrant officer, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

A bill (S. 4464) authorizing appropriations for the improvement of Smiths Creek, N. C.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4465) for the relief of McKimmon & McKee (Inc.); and

A bill (S. 4466) for the relief of James R. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 4467) for the relief of Robert D. Baldwin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 4468) granting an increase of pension to Charles Adkins; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4469) granting a pension to Guy G. Le Moyne (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL:

A bill (S. 4470) granting a pension to Henry Berndt; and A bill (S. 4471) granting a pension to Elsie D. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NYE:

A bill (S. 4472) to provide for the restoration, through exchange, of certain timberlands to the Yosemite National

Park, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 4473) to amend section 19 of the Federal reserve act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AIR MAIL SERVICES IN THE ORIENT

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I ask that there may be printed in the RECORD a letter which I have received from the Department of Commerce, Assistant Secretary for Aeronautics, on the importance of American participation in air mail services in the Orient.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR AERONAUTICS,

Washington, April 21, 1932.

Hon. TASKER L. ODDIE,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ODDIE: I am inclosing a copy of a memorandum on the subject of Encouragement to American Participation in Air Mail Services in the Far East, at the request of Mr. Julean Arnold, the American commercial attaché at Shanghai, China. This memorandum is a copy of one being transmitted by the American Chamber of Commerce of Shanghai to the United States Chamber of Commerce for consideration at its annual meeting on May 16-20 at San Francisco.

It will interest you to know that the German group, who represent in China the Lufthansa Co., of Berlin, which is establishing a line between China and Germany, has made an offer to the Chinese Government to take over the Sino-American contract and to finance the losses accruing to the Chinese Government in connection with the operations of this agreement. It is understood that the Lufthansa Co. will agree to advance 90 per cent of the money needed to establish a factory in China for the manufacture of aviation equipment, thereby frustrating American efforts to conclude a contract with the Chinese on this subject. It appears that the German interests are not lacking in funds. The Lufthansa Co. is subsidized by the German Government.

If there is any further information with regard to this subject which you might desire to have, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE M. YOUNG,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

[Inclosure]

ENCOURAGEMENT TO AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN AIR MAIL SERVICES IN THE FAR EAST

China possesses unusually alluring potentialities in commercial aviation owing to (a) its vast area, (b) its enormous population, and (c) its lamentable backwardness in the development of railroads and motor roads. China's population is densely congested in certain areas, making it possible to reach enormous numbers of people over comparatively short distances in flying.

To realize upon the potentialities in the purchasing power of the masses in China, one of the outstanding essentials is modern means of communications. Through better internal transportation economic conditions will be improved gradually, adding to the purchasing power of these naturally industrious people.

To construct China's necessary trunk railway lines will require enormous outlays of capital and much time. The Chinese people are becoming road minded. Air mail and passenger services accentuate the needs for and advantages of motor transportation. Commercial aviation at comparatively small capital outlays can be speedily installed to connect up the centers of population throughout the vast area comprising China. For instance, a line now operating between Shanghai and Chungking, 1,100 miles by air, delivers mail to the commercial capital of a Province of upward of 50,000,000 people in two days. Prior to the inauguration of this service the average time required for mail from Shanghai to Chungking, 1,400 miles by water, was two weeks. It was estimated that the average time for a letter to make the round trip from Shanghai to Chungking was from five to six weeks. Now, with the air mail service, the average round-trip time is five or six days. It is interesting to note that this service from Hankow to Chungking, where there is a crying need for expeditious transportation, actually pays its way, leading to the assumption that when other equally strategic lines are under operation it will be possible to make at least several of them profitable ventures from the very inception of the services.

American capital and initiative are pioneering commercial aviation in China. In financial cooperation with the Chinese Government they have, for the present at least, a virtual monopoly of Chinese domestic air transport. This will be of great advantage if it can be maintained over the present period of great and unexpected difficulties. They have had to meet numerous obstacles and handicaps, many of which were quite unforeseen. Probably the most serious of these handicaps are the financial drains on the central government treasury due to civil wars, the disastrous Yangtze floods, and the demands arising from the Japanese aggression. Thus the American group operating as the China Airways, Federal (Inc.), United States of America, finds it difficult to tide

over the financial demands during this period of pioneering development, especially so considering the inability of the Chinese Government to raise the revenues required for air mail subsidy, without which no air transport line in the world to-day could continue operating without loss.

This situation is now threatened because a German corporation, which is developing a line through China to connect with Europe, is heavily subsidized, and on account of this fact is able to offer more alluring financial terms to the Chinese Government than can the American corporation, which must depend entirely upon private capital. Unless the American corporation is able to secure assistance from our Government, we may expect to find that the German-subsidized line will be able to present such favorable financial proposals to the Chinese Government as to force the Americans to retire from the field. In this connection it must be borne in mind that the Sino-American line is operating with American pilots and American equipment and considerable American personnel otherwise. It is a very significant fact, for it means that the American pilots are American trade scouts. The American planes advertise American materials and lead to the use of American air equipment as well as other American products in China. Furthermore, Chinese trained in the Sino-American company become accustomed to the use of American equipment, American ideas, and American materials, and unconsciously sell America to China.

The American plan for far-eastern aviation contemplates the pick-up and put-down of American air mail in Yokohama and the similar pick-up and put-down in Manila, with a general distribution throughout China. This plan would speed the round trip of a letter from Shanghai to Yokohama or to Manila by a week and from Manila to the United States by two weeks. Thus the development of internal air lines under American auspices will make for an advantageous distribution throughout China, for contact with the Philippine Islands, with Hawaii, and with prospective trans-Pacific air services.

If the China services are operated under German auspices, little or no cognizance will be taken of the needs of improving communications with the United States. German control would naturally prevent this, since their full energy would be devoted to establishing trade channels in the other direction. The German line, operating through China across central Asia and into Europe, will speed up mail service between Europe and China, thereby further handicapping American trade, unless America is able to develop equally expeditious mail contacts with China. Furthermore, the materials, methods, and ideas will be German and the future of aviation development in China will be of German rather than of American character. The effect on general business will be of German complexion rather than an American.

Hence by supporting the Sino-American aviation developments in China and making them effective services in internal communications we prepare the way for successful and profitable contacts by air between China and other Pacific regions, and more especially with the objective in view of connecting United States and China by regular air services.

At present an air mail line runs from Miami, Fla., to the West Indies, to Central America, and to South America. This line touches roughly about a hundred and twenty million people and a volume of American business approximately equal to American business in the Far East. The United States Post Office Department subsidizes this line to the extent of \$6,500,000 to \$7,000,000 gold annually. If the Post Office Department will subsidize the activities of the far-eastern service above referred to to the extent of \$1,000,000 gold annually, about 300,000,000 people of great potential buying power can be touched.

Our Government has deemed it worth while to subsidize the American lines connecting up with South America with large annual contributions, yet the entire population of all of South America is but a fraction of that of China while the total volume of trade between America and South America, Central America, and the West Indies is less than that between the United States and the Far East. Furthermore, the potentialities of our trade with China will be greater when improved communications make it possible to tap those centers of population and resources of the Asiatic continent now out of economic communications with much of the rest of the world. The American group would not require any such large sum as six or seven million dollars by way of subsidies to support the pioneer years of its activities in China and to hold the great and obvious advantage for American trade, but would be able to operate successfully on a subsidy of about a million dollars.

Thus, with one-sixth or one-seventh of the amount now being dispensed in subsidies to the South American services, and with even greater American trade potentialities, we should be able to hold our place in competition with German or other interests in China and to play a very important part in opening up the internal resources of China to the outside world and in particular to America. It would be a master stroke in trade diplomacy, and it would do more to help in the advancement of American trade prestige in China than could probably be accomplished with an expenditure of a similar sum of money in any other direction. Certainly, after two or three years the subsidy could be reduced. There exists the probability that these operations may become self-supporting after a few years.

REDUCTION OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Postmaster Gen-

eral with reference to the effect of the proposed 10 per cent cut on the Post Office Department, which I have strongly opposed. I want it particularly understood that I disagree with the furlough and the five day a week on the per diem basis plan. I believe we can get along without them and without a cut in Federal wages and salaries.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

Postmaster General Walter F. Brown told the Senate Committee on Appropriations to-day that the flat reduction ordered by the Senate in the appropriations for the Post Office Department, without adopting the President's plan as proposed to the House Economy Committee, would demoralize the Postal Service and work a permanent injury to not less than 40,000 faithful postal employees. Mr. Brown said in part:

"Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I appreciate this opportunity of appearing before your committee on behalf of the postal patrons of our country and on behalf of the 350,000 postal workers whom I have the honor to represent.

"It goes without saying that the Post Office Department desires to cooperate wholeheartedly in any effort to reduce postal expenditures. Substantial reductions in this time of emergency should be, and can be, made, but, as the President has repeatedly pointed out, this can not be accomplished without discharging from 30,000 to 40,000 postal employees and drastically curtailing the Postal Service unless Congress, as provided by his plan, will meet the necessity of suspending or amending the laws which impose unnecessary expenditures on the Postal Service. If the President's plan is adopted, the savings desired can be realized except where the Government is under contractual obligation to make definite expenditures.

"In considering this problem certain fundamental principles must be borne in mind. The Postal Establishment is unique among the Federal departments in that it is a Government-operated public utility, the function of which is the collection, transportation, and delivery of personal communications, money, printed matter, and merchandise for the individual citizens of the United States. Like any other public utility, the department should perform for its patrons whatever service they require and are willing to pay for. It should not exact from them more than the cost of its operations, conducted in accordance with sound business practices, and it should not impose a burden upon the General Treasury by charging less than the cost of its operations. If the necessities of the Treasury so require, the Government may, with propriety, levy an excise tax on postal operations, just as upon the business of any other public utility. But the revenue derived therefrom should not be covered into the General Treasury at the expense of the service to postal patrons who buy the service and pay the tax. I can think of no justification for increasing postage rates and at the same time curtailing service to the public.

"And let me say, with the candor which the present grave situation demands, that if anyone entertains the view that the present Postal Service can be maintained by withholding adequate appropriations at the present time and by voting deficiency appropriations at some more propitious time after November, he is wholly mistaken. We are obliged by law to limit expenditures week by week and month by month to the ratable share of the gross sum appropriated for each respective item. It follows that if the Post Office Department appropriations for 1933 are arbitrarily cut 10 per cent without amending or suspending the laws relating to the compensation of public employees, their hours of work, furloughs, allowances, and promotions, we must abandon or reduce many services now performed for postal patrons and run the risk of seriously impairing the efficiency of the services which may remain.

"A brief analysis of the items carried in the House bill will, in my judgment, make it clear that the arbitrary reduction proposed by the Senate is altogether ill-advised unless it is accompanied by the suspension or amendment of the laws to which reference has been made. Of the \$805,000,000 in the bill as it passed the House, approximately \$105,000,000 is for the compensation of railroads for carrying the mails. The rates of compensation for this service are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The amount payable depends upon the volume of mail handled and is not subject to departmental action. On the basis of the anticipated business for the fiscal year 1933, no substantial reduction can be made in this sum of \$105,000,000 unless service is abandoned on many trains and storage cars substituted for post-office cars, thus greatly slowing up the service. About \$90,000,000 is to cover obligations to other carriers of the mails, including shipping companies, air transport companies, mail messengers, screen-wagon operators, and star-route carriers. Because this service is largely covered by long-term contracts, assuming that the Government intends to carry out its obligations, this item is susceptible of only a small reduction. The sum of \$23,000,000 is for rental, heating, and lighting of post-office quarters. The department's obligations in this particular are also covered in large part by long-term contracts. Approximately \$17,000,000 is for supplies, equipment, travel, and miscellaneous operating expenses, barely sufficient to cover the department's minimum needs if the Postal Service is to be continued.

"These four items aggregate \$235,000,000. The remainder of the amount carried in the House bill for the Postal Service, ap-

proximately \$570,000,000, is for salaries and wages of the officers and employees of the department in the District of Columbia, and the salaries, wages, and allowances of postmasters, supervisors, clerks, carriers, messengers, laborers, watchmen, and other employees in the field. Thus it is manifest that more than three-quarters of the \$80,000,000 which the Senate proposes to cut from the bill must be applied against the appropriation of \$570,000,000 for salaries and wages. The necessary reduction in this item will compel us to drop from the rolls between 30,000 and 40,000 postal workers of all classes, including departmental employees, assistant postmasters, clerks, city and village carriers, rural carriers, and railway postal clerks. Obviously there will not be available a sufficient force to maintain the present postal facilities. It will be necessary to consolidate about 8,000 rural routes and place about 9,000 others on a basis of triweekly instead of daily service. Delivery service must be discontinued in every small town. In the cities it will be necessary to reduce residential deliveries to one a day and business deliveries to not more than two a day. The hours of window service at post offices must be reduced, and, wherever the terms of leases will permit, post-office stations and branches must be closed. I need not state what the effect of all these changes would be upon the postal service, which has been developed to a high standard of efficiency over a period of 150 years.

"I shall be pleased at all times to make available to your committee any information which the department has and to inform you with respect to the effect on the service of any specific cuts which you may contemplate. But unless the Congress will incorporate in the appropriation bill the features applying to the Postal Service contained in the President's economy program transmitted to the House Committee on Economy, I can make no other recommendations with respect to postal appropriations than those which I made to your committee at the hearings on the House bill some weeks ago. The responsibility for demoralizing the Postal Service and doing an irreparable injury to thousands of faithful postal employees must rest upon some one other than me.

"On the other hand, if the Senate will incorporate in the bill the features of the President's economy program to which reference has been made, I shall be pleased to state what savings in specific appropriations can be made thereby.

"It may interest you to know that the officers of the Association of Presidential Postmasters, which group has received the smallest increase in pay since 1919, amounting to approximately 20 per cent, have assured me that their members will accept the 30 days' furlough without pay, in accordance with the President's program, as their contribution in the present emergency. In my judgment, the rank and file of postal workers will much prefer the President's plan of 30 days' furlough, without pay, which preserves the basic wage scale, to the plan proposed by members of the House Economy Committee, which involves substantially a 10 per cent reduction in basic pay, or the Senate's proposal, which involves the discharge of thirty or forty thousand of their fellow employees.

"The President's plan, which provides for staggering work in the Government just as industry is now doing, will discharge no one, but will give employment to at least 20,000 substitutes. Moreover, it will effect great savings, at the same time maintaining the present high standard of service."

GRANTS OF PUBLIC LAND FOR SCHOOLS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3570) to amend the act entitled "An act confirming in States and Territories title to land granted by the United States in the aid of common or public schools," approved January 25, 1927, which were, on page 1, line 3, to strike out "subsection" and insert "subsections (b) and" and on page 1, after line 7, to insert:

(b) That the additional grant made by this act is upon the express condition that all sales, grants, deeds, or patents for any of the lands so granted shall hereafter be subject to and contain a reservation to the State of all the coal and other minerals in the lands so sold, granted, deeded, or patented, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same. The coal and other mineral deposits in such lands not heretofore disposed of by the State shall be subject to lease by the State as the State legislature may direct, the proceeds and rentals and royalties therefrom to be utilized for the support or in aid of the common or public schools: *Provided*, That any lands or minerals hereafter disposed of contrary to the provisions of this act shall be forfeited to the United States by appropriate proceedings instituted by the Attorney General for that purpose in the United States district court for the district in which the property or some part thereof is located.

Mr. BRATTON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

FARM LIFE AND CONDITIONS IN DENMARK

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask permission to print in the RECORD a radio address made to-day by John A. Simpson, president of the National Farmers' Union, over a nation-wide hook-up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION AS I SAW IT IN DENMARK, AND THE SITUATION IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL DENMARK

At this time last year I was in Europe. Primarily I went there to attend a world-wide wheat conference held in Rome, Italy, the last two weeks of March, 1931. Delegates attended this convention from 48 nations. Wheat-importing nations all told of governmental assistance to encourage farmers to produce more wheat. Exporting countries such as Canada, Argentina, Australia, and Russia all declared they would be increasing acreage and production for years to come. Under such circumstances there is little hope for a profitable export market to the farmers of this country in the near future.

One of the features of the convention was a session addressed by Mussolini. He spoke in French, and as I read it in English it was a very sensible talk. He is a man with a lot of personality and a doer of things as well as a preacher. Those with whom I talked, who had been visiting Italy for the last 30 years, told me of the wonderful changes in cleanliness, in policing, in modernizing homes, farms, and cities since Mussolini has been in charge of the Italian Government. Italy has a King, but no one talks about the King; everything is Mussolini. Italy is different in the matter of agriculture from many European countries. The farms are large estates operated by tenants. In France and Denmark agriculture is made up of small home-owning farmers. The landlords of Italy for hundreds of years have treated their tenants like slaves. These tenants live in hay huts that had neither windows nor doors, just openings. The hay huts are round like a ball cut into halves. A hut 12 feet in diameter would house a whole family. Since Mussolini has come into power he is requiring landlords to build large, modern apartment buildings in the center of their estates with an apartment for each tenant. Where this has been done the hay huts have been destroyed. Likewise, these landlords have been compelled to drain and terrace where needed. To increase acreage and production of wheat the Government of Italy guarantees a minimum price equal to \$1.60 a bushel. This assistance has resulted in the farmers sowing wheat everywhere. I saw hundreds of thousands of acres of wheat growing between the rows of grapes in their vineyards. The rows of grapes are so close together that the cradle would be the only means of harvesting the wheat. Italians told me that during the World War they suffered because they depended on overseas countries for bread. They expect to develop the wheat production in their country to the point that in the next war they will have bread of their own.

But I must get to Denmark for my subject is organization and cooperation as I saw it in Denmark. At the wheat conference in Rome the delegate from Denmark was a Mr. Holm, president of the Farmers' Union of that country. When he found out I was going to visit Denmark he made me promise to allow the Farmers' Union to be our host while there. I say "our host" because my wife was with me. When we landed in Copenhagen, we reported to Mr. Holm's office. After about a half day's visit in their headquarters, he placed us in charge of Mr. and Mrs. Claussen, workers in the headquarters of the Farmers' Union there. Mr. and Mrs. Claussen spoke English fluently. Both of them had attended school in the United States after finishing in their own country. In fact, Mr. Holm worked as a hired man in the United States for several years. He worked for some farmer out in Oregon. He told me that while working for this man he was invited one time to speak to a Farmers' Union county convention. He rode 40 miles on a horse to attend this convention, and returned the same night. The man he was working for gave him just one day's vacation for the purpose. Mr. and Mrs. Claussen took my wife and I for two days in their car. I would ask to see a cooperative creamery, and they would show us two or three. I would ask to see a cooperative packing plant, and they would drive us to one. I would ask to see a cooperative cheese factory, and we would be visiting one in less than an hour. I would ask to visit a large-scale farmer, and they would take us to one.

We visited a Mr. Newman, who has a farm of 800 acres. He had a beautiful house with 25 rooms. I venture two of the rooms were not less than 30 by 50 feet. The rooms were as elegantly furnished as they were large and as there were many of them. This man had 200 milch cows in the stanchions and 700 hogs in fattening pens. He had 12 pens, with 60 to a pen. He sold 60 hogs every week and bought sixty 2-month-old weaned pigs every week. This meant that at five months old he marketed hogs that weighed 200 pounds. They standardize on everything. Hogs must be pure white in color and strictly bacon type. Mr. Newman, I think, was about 55 years old. He told me he was not in debt, his farm was clear, and that he maintained this beautiful home with no other income than that from his 800 acres of land.

I visited a medium-sized farm owned by a Mr. Larsen. It contained 90 acres. He had a beautiful place. His house was well arranged and had 10 rooms. We visited a number of what are called the small farmers. They consisted of farms from 10 to 30 acres. All of these farms were well kept. The yards and gardens looked like they were professionally landscaped. There were no dilapidated or run-down buildings. In fact, practically all buildings in Denmark are of stone, brick, or tile, and all roofs are either tile, slate, or thatched. I thought a thatched roof would be short-

lived, but to my surprise I found that they last from 30 to 50 years; much longer than shingles in this country.

The State furnishes an abundance of schools but farmers add to these, many cooperative institutions of learning that they own and operate just like they do their cheese factories or creameries. They told me a most wonderful story of cooperation. They started to practice cooperation about 75 years ago. When they started just 15 per cent of the farmers owned the farms on which they lived; 85 per cent were tenants. After 75 years of cooperation, that situation has been reversed. To-day 85 per cent of the farmers of Denmark own the farms on which they live; just 15 per cent are tenants. In this country 75 years ago more than 85 per cent of our farmers owned their homes; to-day, less than half of the farmers of this Nation own their homes. In Denmark 85 per cent of the farm homes have electricity, telephone, radio, running water. In fact, they are modern. In this country less than 10 per cent have these things. In some of the Southern States less than 1 per cent of the farm homes are modern. In Denmark a dairy farmer sells all his products to some farmers' cooperative. He can not sell any other place because there is no other place to sell. The hog raisers do not take their hogs to some private dealer. They sell them to some farmers' cooperative packing plant, because there is no other place to sell to. The farmers are nearly 100 per cent in their Farmers' Union class organization and practically 100 per cent in their farmers' cooperative marketing organizations. The farmer who produces hogs in Denmark knows before the pigs are born what he is to get for them when they are ready for the market.

The population of Denmark is about three millions, one million of which live in the city of Copenhagen, another million in the towns and smaller cities, and one million out on the farms. The farmers of Denmark are about the same percentage of the total population of that country as the farmers are of this country. In this country, through lack of organization, farmers have very little to say about the affairs of our State and National Governments. In Denmark, through 100 per cent organization, they dominate all governmental affairs. They have a King in Denmark, but Mr. Stauning, Prime Minister, who is an ex-president of their Farmers' Union, writes the messages of the King and tells him where to sign. Those farmers are only one-third of the population of their country, but, through organization, control all legislation. The farmers here are one-third of the population of the country, but through lack of organization we are about the weakest group in national legislation. Denmark should be a lesson to the farmers of this country. We should get into our class organization 100 per cent, and then market all of our products through our own cooperative business institutions.

When we do this, our just part in the affairs of government will follow as night the day. If we were organized 100 per cent, as are the farmers of Denmark, no President would write a message to Congress without consulting the farmers of the Nation; no Congressman or Senator would propose a bill for agriculture that did not have the indorsement of the farmers of the Nation. It is up to you farmers listening in to join your class organization, the Farmers' Union. It is up to you listening in who are members to get those who are not members into the organization.

We farmers must not blame the bankers, the merchants, the lawyers, or somebody else for our troubles. They can not solve our problems; no one can solve our problems but ourselves. We can only solve them through organization. They will never be solved in any other way. Every day you put off organizing your community 100 per cent delays the time when agriculture will be on an equality with other industries.

The situation in the National Capital

TAXATION

I am glad to be able to report progress on the tax question. The legislative program of the National Farmers' Union on this question provides for eliminating as nearly as possible every kind of a tax that falls upon the poor people of the country. Our program on the tax question provides for income-tax rates on the higher income brackets sufficient to pay all the running expenses of the Government. Our legislative program provides for inheritance taxes that take everything from an estate above one-half million dollars to each heir.

They talk about balancing the Budget. If they will eliminate all the graft in government, it will balance the Budget. This is not an extravagant statement. I ask you to write to Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON for a copy of House Joint Resolution 355. This tells a little of the graft in one department. Here is one of over 6,935 cases in this department.

William W. Smith was taken into the Army 13 days before the armistice. He was given a swivel-chair commission. Soon after the war he was given a job in the Veterans' Bureau; is now one of 64 other lawyers in that department. He is drawing a salary of \$9,000 per year as an attorney, although he admits he has never tried a case in court in his life. He has also been drawing, for a number of years, disability compensation in the sum of \$187 per month.

All of these 6,935 cases are similar. None of them show any war service except office service. Nearly all of them qualify for this compensation on the complaint of having a leaky heart. I suggest that they be reexamined for the itch. It will probably disclose the part most affected is the palm of the hand.

The tax bill as it passed the House was a great victory for the Farmers' Union and other farm organizations. During the war income-tax and surtax rates reached a climax of 72 per cent.

Under the influence of Mellon and Morgan on the present administration these rates had been reduced until they were about 20 per cent. Ours was a victory to the extent that these rates were almost trebled. The rates on inheritance taxes were trebled. The President, the leaders of both the Republican and Democratic Parties of the House, all fought placing these rates so high, and all of them fought to place the burden on the consumption of the great mass of common people of the country in a general sales tax. Thanks to the response of members of the Farmers' Union all over the United States, Congress was literally covered up with wires, letters, petitions, and resolutions against the sales tax and in favor of higher rates on income and inheritance taxes.

The battle is now on in the Senate. Big manufacturers, big bankers, that gambling inferno, the New York Stock Exchange, and every kind of big business has been here for two weeks testifying before the Senate Finance Committee asking for a reduction in these high rates on incomes and inheritance taxes; also asking to have the general sales tax put back into the bill. We farm-organization leaders have testified against this. We will lose unless you soldiers back at the crossroads come to our aid. It is absolutely necessary, if you want to keep poverty from being taxed, that you wire, write, and petition your two Senators to oppose the sales tax and support the higher income and inheritance tax rates. You have won one battle; you must win another one in order to win the war.

There are two battles in this war. I hope what you did in the House battle will be duplicated in the Senate battle. Remember the proposed general sales tax raises \$600,000,000 by a tax on consumption. This is an average of \$5 per person, or \$25 per family. A tax on consumption means that a poor farmer or working man pays about the same tax as does a very rich man, because the very rich man consumes little more than a common laborer. An income tax makes those pay who are able to pay, which is fair.

THE WALL OF THE RICH

When the farmers and laborers defeated the sales tax in the House nearly all the big newspapers in the United States cried like their hearts would break. Mellon, Morgan, and others of the international bankers' class wrote a song called "The Wall of the Rich," and that great tenor, William Randolph Hearst, sang the song through his great chain of papers, the greatest in the world. I quote from the Washington Herald of March 25:

"We will have to use the old automobile and wear the old suits.

"We will have to relinquish those pretty things at the shops that we would like to have for ourselves and the family.

"We will have to get along with the old house and postpone the painting job for another year or two.

"We will have to patch up the old furniture and dispense with all luxuries and even comforts.

"We will have to give up some amusements and abandon that trip or vacation we had been intending to take with the 'folks,' and we will have to save every dollar to give to the Government."

Don't let anybody fool you into believing that a general sales tax is a good thing for the common people. Every argument used is that it is a system of theft by stealth, a system in which you tax the poor without their knowing they are being robbed. If they once get this system started, they will increase the rates and include more things under the system until wealth will be relieved of every bit of income and inheritance tax.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

In the legislative program of the National Farmers' Union is a demand for Philippine independence. We have taken an active part in promoting this legislation through this session of Congress. We have been successful to the extent that the House offers a bill granting the Philippines independence in 8 years, and the Senate one granting independence in 19 years. It is our hope that the Senate will recede from its position and adopt the House bill. We fought for independence in five years.

Every day we own the Philippines we are one day nearer the time when that ownership will involve us in the biggest war we were ever in. The quicker we get rid of them the quicker we eliminate the opportunity for that war.

THE FARM BOARD

The National Farmers' Union in their last annual convention by resolution demanded of Congress "a thorough and searching investigation of the Farm Board and its set-ups." I am glad to report that the Senate has authorized such an investigation. I wish you would write to Senator CHARLES L. McNARY, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, asking that this be a real investigation and not a whitewash. There are those who would like to make a whitewash of it.

THE THREE BILLS

We are still working for passage of the three Farmers' Union measures that we firmly believe will remedy the terrible conditions that exist in this country.

First, the Frazier bill, numbered S. 1197. This bill refinances farmers on a basis of 1½ per cent interest and on a basis of Government money instead of bankers' money.

All interest is usury and is forbidden in the teachings of Christ. It is a cancer on the body politic. I saw where two men in Baton Rouge, Mr. J. D. Stottler and Mr. R. E. Collins, made a bet on the question of whether or not a certain building there would be good in 500 years. One bet \$2.50 that it would be a good building and the other \$2.50 that it would not. They placed the money in the local bank where it was to remain 500 years and draw interest at the rate of 3 per cent compounded semiannually. A mathema-

tion figured that the heirs of the winner would have due from that bet at the end of 500 years \$2,084,495,605.22.

I believe you will agree that my statement is not extravagant when I say interest is the most deadly of diseases—a cancer. It eats the life out of everything it touches.

Second. The Swank-Thomas bill, which is numbered in the House as H. R. 7797 and in the Senate as S. 3133. This is known as the cost of production bill for that part of farmers' crops used in this country. After being refinanced under the Frazier bill, we must have cost of production for what the home folks use if we pay off principal on a basis of interest even as low as 1½ per cent.

Third. The Wheeler bill, No. S. 2487. This provides for the remonetization of silver. This bill is absolutely necessary in order that we may sell our products to other countries. Under a high-priced gold-standard dollar other countries can sell their products here but can not buy from us. England has been off the gold standard now for about six months. Her money has been cheapened at least 25 per cent. The Canadian dollar as measured by our gold-standard dollar is worth only 75 cents. Since going off the gold standard Canada now ships in five times the poultry and dairy products she was shipping in six months ago. She can pay the tariff, get our high-priced dollar, take it home, change it into their cheap dollar at about \$1.33 for one of ours, and have a profit.

About the only progress I have to report on these bills is that the Senate Agriculture Committee has invited all farm-organization leaders to appear before the committee next Tuesday, April 26, for the purpose of agreeing on a farm-relief program. Many Congressmen and Senators, through the efforts of the citizens in their districts by writing and otherwise communicating with them, have been converted and are now supporting these three bills who would not support them in the beginning.

Let me urge every one of you to continue your efforts along these lines. We may not get this legislation through at this session of Congress, but we will get it in some future session or there will be revolution in this country. I mean by that that these three bills are real remedies; these three bills on the day they become a part of the laws of this country will start an immediate return to prosperity. Nothing less will do it. If it is not done, the only alternative is revolution.

The Farmers' Union is fighting to prevent revolution. The big interests of this country are doing everything they can to bring on revolution. If it comes they will be the ones who are guilty and they will be the ones who will suffer most. Their greed, selfishness, and avarice have blinded them to where they can not see the inevitable doom that awaits them.

AN UNPLEASANT TASK

You must know it is not a pleasant task to tell the citizens of this country that our Government discriminates between classes. I have but one object in calling these things to your attention and that is to arouse your interest in affairs of government. I do not like to deal in the sins of men; I would much rather talk about their virtues. However, the great mass of common people of this country will never do their duty as citizens except as they understand and know that because in the past they have not done their duty they are not receiving a fair deal from those in power in this country.

Take the national bankers as a class. They have the privilege when they have certain Government promises to pay of laying those promises down on the counter of the Secretary of the Treasury and receiving par in national-bank notes, which they can loan out to their customers at high rates of interest, and continue to draw Government interest on the bonds left as a guarantee that the bank will stay open and redeem the notes on request.

The ex-service boys hold securities of the Government, obligations to pay to the bearer. The Government does not permit them to receive money for them except in the last session of Congress they did provide for loaning these ex-service boys 50 per cent of the Government's obligation to them at 4½ per cent interest.

Thus we see cold-blooded bankers who never did anything for their country granted privileges by the Government that ex-service boys who faced machine guns, gas, and every kind of death-dealing instrument are denied.

In the present session of Congress bills have been passed to help railroads, banks, and the big insurance companies. Two billion dollars have been appropriated to help these interests. Fifty million was appropriated to help the drought-stricken farmers to secure feed and seed; \$25,000,000 was appropriated to extend interest payments for farmers who owe Federal farm-land banks. The farming industry, in dollars and cents, is larger than bankers and railroads combined. In population we are a thousand times that of the groups represented by banks and railroads. We get seventy-five million appropriated out of two billion. This is rank discrimination. Those who administer this two billion further liberalize the provisions of Congress for the railroads, insurance companies, and banks, but make them harder for farmers.

For instance, the funds granted the railroads were to be used to employ men to repair present facilities and to employ men to expand present facilities. The international bankers, the power that dominates the present administration, liberalizes this provision in their own behalf by having the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan large sums of money to the railroads for the purpose of paying interest on what they owed Mr. Morgan and other New York bankers. Even in paying principal on the notes they owed.

The Missouri-Pacific Railroad was loaned \$5,850,000 to pay on a note owed to J. P. Morgan & Co. Altogether this railroad has

received \$17,100,000 for such purposes. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad was loaned \$7,000,000 to pay taxes. The old-line life-insurance companies have received millions of dollars of loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on liberal terms.

Secretary of Agriculture Hyde makes such hard regulations that out of the \$50,000,000 placed in his hands to loan to drought-stricken farmers only a small part has been used. He lays down rules and regulations that if a widow has a team and a cow unmortgaged she is disqualified from receiving any of these funds. If a widow has everything mortgaged, then she is qualified, provided she can get her landlord and everyone she owes to relinquish their claims to any of the crop she produces for the year 1932. The facts are the Secretary has openly declared that he did not want to handle this money. He has said that to prevent these drought-stricken farmers from getting seed and feed would be a good method of reducing production.

They also discriminate in the rates of interest as between big business and farmers. The Government has loaned millions of dollars to the shipping interests at rates as low as three-eighths to seven-eighths of 1 per cent per annum. They have loaned to foreign governments at rates as low as 1½ per cent. Farmers pay on feed and seed loans 5½ per cent. To the Federal farm-land banks they pay 5½ per cent plus a certain amount of capital stock they have to take out. When the stock goes down it amounts to more interest. The intermediate-credit loans to farmers run from 7 per cent to 9 per cent. This is rank discrimination against farmers.

I don't like to deal in these nasty truths. I would not if I did not believe it to be absolutely necessary in order to get you who are discriminated against to wake up and do your duty as a citizen by taking part in the running of the affairs of this country. I do blame Morgan and Mellon for contributing handsomely to the political parties. I do blame them for coming to Washington and working to take all the money away from the common people of this country that it is possible to get through the help of legislation. I do blame the 120,000,000 common people, who think more of a ball game or an Amos and Andy radio program than they do of studying public issues, for allowing this thing to happen. The big fellows will furnish you with amusement while they rob you.

Some one the other day spoke disparagingly of the intelligence of the Members of the House and Senate. That is not the proper view to take. There is no lack of intelligence in the House and Senate; neither is there lack of intelligence among the 120,000,000 common people of this country who send these gentlemen to Congress. There is a lack on the part of the 120,000,000 common people of devoting the intelligence they have to a proper selection of these gentlemen.

Some one wrote me commending to Congress the economies practiced by the President. He says the President commenced economizing by selling the yacht which former Presidents had used. I don't want anyone to unjustly criticize the President this way. If there is one thing he is not guilty of, it is practicing economy. He sold one yacht and bought another. He established an extensive summer camp on the Rapidan River about 100 miles out of Washington. It has been largely developed and improved by the labor of those drawing their pay from the Government.

A few nights ago the President, in behalf of the big automobile manufacturers, broadcasted advising everybody to turn in their old car and get a new one. Practicing what he preached, he turned in nine good used cars and got nine brand new ones for the use of the White House. One secretary used to be sufficient for a President. Our present President requires three secretaries, and each of these has to have an automobile. His wife has to have two and the President has two. Two are kept for the fine guests entertained there.

There is enough truth to tell about the President without misrepresenting him and I do not want anybody to charge him with practicing economy in government. He has appointed more boards, commissions, with other boards and commissions to check up on the ones first appointed, than all other Presidents put together in the history of our country.

The same party writing me spoke of the great courage of the President. Of course, courage is susceptible of different meanings, but I observe that in 17 States that provide for each political party selecting a choice for President through direct primaries the President has filed in only 1 of them.

Amazing things are done in Government circles here in Washington. The other day George F. Byers, a Government chemist in the Treasury Department, one of Andy Mellon's boys, gave a splendid recommendation to the liquor being dispensed by the bootleggers in Washington. I do not know whether these bootleggers are handling Andy's product or not. Here is what Mr. Byers said: "I can not say that there is anything definitely harmful about the quality of the liquor sold here, most of the injuries it inflicts coming from injudicious consumption of it. The rye and corn whisky shipped here is pretty raw, but after ageing can hardly be told from the medicinally legal product."

The exchanges—commodity and stock—are a part of the mess with the bad odor here in Washington. It seems Congress is waking up to the fact that the international bankers use the exchanges as one of the means of robbing the people.

I am a member of an organization that is planning a huge suit against the grain and cotton exchanges in the near future. The secretary of this organization is H. W. Worthington, Mangum, Okla. Any farmers or others interested, I urge you to write to Mr. Worthington for full information on the purpose of the organization.

While I am telling you about places to write I want to let you know that you can get full information on the Muscle Shoals power and light question by writing Judson King, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. It is a Government-printed document and valuable information. Remember my object in this talk is to arouse the citizenship of this country to an interest in public questions.

MUST TAKE PUNISHMENT

Anyone who has the courage to speak and work for the poor people of the country as against the ultrarich must be prepared to take punishment. Congressman LA GUARDIA comes out against the sales tax. He is immediately branded unpatriotic by the henchmen of the big interests. LA GUARDIA was a Congressman when we entered the World War. He resigned and enlisted as a soldier. His father was a Spanish-American War veteran. LA GUARDIA was born in this country. Because he dared stand for the poor against the rich he was maligned and lied about.

Governor Roosevelt pledged himself to a program of help and assistance to the poor, to the distressed of the country. The spokesmen for the ultrarich cry out, calling him a demagogue.

An organization known as the Daughters of the American Revolution are having their annual convention in Washington this week. Their president, Mrs. Hobart, in addressing the convention declares the main job of the organization is to destroy radicals. Another delegate to the convention charged Jane Addams with being a radical. Jane Addams is a welfare worker of world-wide reputation, who established Hull House in Chicago. Jane Addams must take punishment for being a friend of the poor.

Christ was a radical, Patrick Henry was a radical, Abraham Lincoln was a radical. They took punishment for being radicals. If they were on earth to-day Mrs. Hobart would be denouncing them because they were radicals. For Mrs. Hobart I define a radical: A radical is a person who has the intelligence to know his rights and the courage to demand them, and fight for them if necessary. I might define a conservative, which I presume Mrs. Hobart prides herself on being: A conservative is a person who worships dead radicals.

The following advertisement, which appeared in the evening papers the night Mrs. Hobart made her speech, indicates the lack of touch these good women have with the poor of this country: "Laura Scott Fenstermacher, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., a delegate to the Daughters of the American Revolution Congress, reported to the police to-day she had lost a diamond bracelet valued at \$1,000, either in Constitution Hall or in a taxicab on the way to the Annapolis Hotel, where she is staying while in Washington."

TWO CLASSES

In closing, I want to divide this country into two classes. In one group are the 120,000,000 common people whom I will call the debtor class. In the other group are 10,000 ultrarich, whom I will call the creditor class. The 10,000 ultrarich have more voice in running the affairs of this country, and have had for a half century, than the 120,000,000 common people. All financial legislation in the past 50 years has been in the interest of creditors.

The time has come when the 120,000,000 common people must take part and see that some legislation is enacted in the interest of the debtor. You 120,000,000 will never be able to pay your debts with a dollar that buys 16 dozens of eggs from a farm woman, with a dollar that buys 3 bushels of wheat from a western Kansas farmer, with a dollar that buys 20 pounds of cotton from a Texas cotton farmer. The 120,000,000 common people must rise up and demand of Congress that they take from the bankers the power of making money. They must demand of Congress that all money must be issued by the Government as provided in the Constitution.

The present policy in three years has created an army of unemployed of 8,000,000. It has caused six and a half million farmers to lose their homes by mortgage foreclosures or tax sales, or those who have not lost them are holding only a scant equity. It has bankrupted 1,000,000 small business men. It has wrecked 10,000 once happy and prosperous small-town bankers. They have lost everything and those who are not eating at a prison table walk the streets with the rest of the jobless. Add to these 10,000 men who three years ago were what is called small millionaires. They were worth one, two, or three million, some of them five million dollars. The ultrarich are cannibals; they eat each other. The big millionaires ate up the little millionaires. Now these little millionaires are not quite out on the street, but they are walking around with us radicals. In fact, all it takes to make a Bolshevik of any man is to step on his pocketbook.

It looks like, if the present policy is continued, another four years will bring us all to the same level. They will make us a real democracy. This is on the theory that the creditor will be ruined, too. It is happening every day.

Recently, in Mississippi, 82 sheriffs auctioned off and sold 60,000 farms for taxes. These farms, bought in by the counties and State, aggregate more than 7,000,000 acres and constitute one-fourth of the farm lands of that State. In the last three years more than 70,000,000 acres in the United States have thus become public domain. A report from Montana says that 80 per cent of the farm lands in that State have delinquent taxes against them.

I commend these thoughts to those listening in. A copy of this program will be furnished to those asking for it. Until further notice, address me, John Simpson, Kankakee, Ill.

Remember the Farmers' Union hour, the fourth Saturday in each month, at 12.30 to 1.30, eastern standard time.

TARIFF ON ISLAND OILS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Minneapolis Tribune in the nature of an interview with Dr. Alonzo E. Taylor, a world famous chemist, and two editorials upon the subject of Philippine independence and a duty on fats and oils.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article and editorials are as follows:

URGES TARIFFS ON ISLAND OILS—ALONZO TAYLOR, ECONOMIST AND CHEMIST, CITES INJUSTICE TO UNITED STATES FARMER

"As an economist, I have no hesitancy in saying that our Government should immediately take effective steps to stop the importation of tropical oils into the United States. The greatest menace that confronts the American farmer to-day is the Tropics."

This is the gist of an interview given to the Tribune Saturday by Dr. Alonzo E. Taylor, world famous chemist and economist, who was in the city as the guest of James Ford Bell. Doctor Taylor left Saturday night to return to his home at Stanford University.

"Purely as an economist, without thought of the ethics or the political significance involved in the question, I have no hesitancy in saying that we should at once put a duty on coconut oil that now comes in free from the Philippines. We have brought over 600,000,000 pounds of coconut oils into the United States every year, and at the same time we have a tremendous surplus of fats in the United States which go begging because of these oils.

MENACE OF TROPICS

"I think that even a free trader must admit that we are now, rightly or wrongly, in an era of protective tariffs and that being the case it seems to me to be the height of folly to permit tropical oils to displace our American-produced fats. Some 12 years ago at the University of Wisconsin I delivered a lecture on 'The Menace of the Tropics.' The lecture did not attract a great deal of attention, but those who gave it any thought were not overly charitable in their estimate of my mentality. But the last dozen years have borne out the fact that the Tropics are a menace to the agriculture in the Temperate Zone.

"Not only are they a menace but they are an actual damage, and this damage will increase every year. It is a very simple thing to understand that fats—vegetable fats—can be produced cheaper in the Tropics than animal fats can be produced in the Temperate Zone. The additional sunlight and the heat of the Tropics and the fact that the fats are taken directly from vegetation rather than from an animal to whom the vegetation is fed all conspire to give the Tropics an inescapable advantage. In addition to these chemical facts there is the fact of the lower standard of living of the natives in the Tropics. The farmer in the Temperate Zone can not hope to compete with him on any basis of equality.

DOMESTIC FATS SUFFICIENT

"On the other hand, the American farmer produces fats as a by-product. The hog is raised for his bacon, not his lard. The steer is raised for beef, not for tallow. Yet we can not produce either beef or bacon without producing fats. Unless the American farmer can find a market for his fats, he suffers an additional handicap in his competition with the tropical oils.

"There is some admitted need for coconut oil in the United States. There are certain soaps that can not be made without coconut oil, but these soaps constitute a very small percentage of the total volume of soap manufactured in the United States. Probably 50,000,000 pounds of coconut oil would more than take care of the soap necessities. Beyond these necessities there is no appreciable need in the United States for coconut oil which could not be satisfied by the animal fats produced in this country, which are now a drug in the market.

"There is, of course, a widespread opinion that we can not impose a duty on importations from the Philippines. This is not a fact. Since the Philippines have come under our control, the United States has imposed duties on the importations from the islands and can do it again. We could very well make some such arrangement as was made with Cuba. We gave Cuba a preferential duty on sugar. We could impose a duty on all tropical oils and by reason of our relationship with the Philippines give them a lower duty as we do on Cuban sugar.

"I suspect that here in the Northwest you place too much emphasis on the part that coconut oil plays in the manufacture of margarine. If these tropical oils only affected butter, it would be one story, but they affect the whole fat production. Every fat suffers, and butter is merely the first on the list. The tropical oils imported into this country become many other food substitutes.

TROPICS' ADVANTAGE GROWS

"It is common knowledge that science is every day adding to the advantage the Tropics have in the production of fats. The American farmer is beset with many economic disadvantages, but so long as we protect the manufacturer in the interests of our standard of living, there is absolutely no reason why we should not protect the American farmer to the same end. The American farmer is rapidly losing his market for his animal fats by reason of the increasing importations of tropical oils, 600,000,000 pounds of which come in duty free from the Philippine

Islands. There may be ethical and political reasons why the Philippines should be granted their independence or refused their independence. I am not discussing these reasons, but I do say that there is no economic reason for permitting 600,000,000 pounds of coconut oil to come into this country duty free to be substituted for animal fats produced on American farms."

TAX TROPICAL OILS

The clean-cut statement of Dr. Alonzo Taylor, world-famous economist, to the effect that it was the imperative duty of the United States to protect the American farmer from the importation of tropical oils, is both significant and timely. The present bill which proposes to grant freedom to the Philippine Islands in the future is of little present interest to the American farmer. The American farmer is primarily and exclusively interested in the economic effect of our political relationship with the Philippine Islands. It is an incontrovertible fact that 600,000,000 pounds of coconut oil and copra come into the United States every year from the Philippine Islands and drive out of our market as least as many pounds of American-produced animal and cottonseed fats. Doctor Taylor makes it plain that there is not the faintest economic reason to sustain this policy and that there is every economic reason for a policy that will protect the American farmer.

Those who maintain that we have a moral obligation to protect and cherish the Filipino may argue on a basis of morality to their hearts' content. But there isn't any morality in making the American farmer sustain the burden of our Philippine philanthropy. Doctor Taylor is as famous a chemist as he is an economist. Doctor Taylor says that only a small percentage of our soap needs coconut oil as an ingredient. This is a specialized soap not in general use. The American farmer is entitled to protection from tropical plantations to the same extent that the American workman is entitled to protection from oriental labor. We have raised the bars on foreign immigration for the protection of the American laborer, and it is impossible to conceive the mental process of the legislator who can not see the same necessity for the protection of the American farmer from the rapidly increasing flood of tropical oils that is pouring into this country every year. America has a surplus of the animals and cottonseed fats. Animal fat is a drug on the market to-day. The swine raiser is penalized by the packer for the excess fat on his hogs. The dairyman, with the price of butter down to a ruinous level, is forced to compete with the margarine made from Philippine oil importations. When Doctor Taylor as a chemist says that there isn't any reason why American-produced fats should not be used in the manufacture of our soaps, no fair-minded person would question his statement.

Giving the Filipinos their freedom 8 or 10 years hence is a fine, generous gesture which may or may not be translated into a reality, but this does the American farmer no good to-day. In his present state he hasn't the time nor the inclination to clap his hands in glee over the spectacle of the Filipinos waving the flag of independence. It means little or nothing to him. What the American farmer wants is protection from the coconut oil from the Philippines and protection from the other oils of the Tropics against which he is unable to compete any more than is the American manufacturer able to compete with the low wage and low standard of living of foreign countries. If there is any right or justice, if there is any political or economic expediency in a protective tariff, that tariff should be imposed on the oils from the Tropics that compete with cottonseed, peanut oil, and animal fats produced in the United States.

THE FARMER IS FORGOTTEN

The bill recently passed by the House and now before the Senate which proposes to grant political freedom to the Philippines at the end of an 8-year period will be of no benefit to the American farmer.

The bill will permit the Philippines to import more coconut oil into the United States free of duty for the next eight years than is now coming in. Paragraph 2 of section 6 of the bill provides:

"There shall be levied, collected, and paid on all coconut oil coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands in any calendar year in excess of 200,000 long tons, the same rates of duty which are required by the laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on like articles imported from foreign countries."

This provision is supposed to put a limitation on the oil imports from the Philippines in the interests of the American farmer. The joker in the provision is this, that the Philippines have never yet sent as much as 200,000 long tons of coconut oil to the United States. Therefore, instead of putting a limit on this duty-free oil that would tend to remedy the present ruinous condition of the American fat market, it actually permits a greater importation.

Two hundred thousand long tons of oil equals 448,000,000 pounds. In 1930 the Philippines sent us 322,000,000 pounds. Under this bill the Philippines could import free of duty an additional 126,000,000 pounds of oil to compete with American-produced cottonseed oil and animal fats. In 1929 the coconut-oil importation reached its peak of 415,000,000 pounds, some 33,000,000 pounds less than the limit permitted by the present bill.

It is obvious from these figures that for eight years at least the American farmer will get no relief if the present bill becomes a

law. It is equally plain that the bill provides an opportunity to make the situation even worse than it now is to the extent, at least, of 126,000,000 pounds of oil. Under the present tariff law coconut oil imported from other countries than the Philippines pays a duty of 2 cents a pound. But there is likewise a joker in this, because copra, from which coconut oil is extracted, comes into the United States duty free from all countries.

In 1930 the importations of oil and copra in terms of oil reached the staggering sum of 518,161,000 pounds. In 1929, the high point of importation, oil and copra importations together were equivalent to 597,836,000 pounds. The admission of copra duty free into the United States is for the benefit of the copra-crushing mills on the Pacific coast. The oil produced on the Pacific coast affects the American farmer to exactly the same degree as the duty-free oil from the Philippines.

Between the Smoot-Hawley tariff law and the Philippine Independence bill the American farmer, dairyman, swine and beef raiser are deprived of the American markets for fats. The dairyman suffers grievously from the production of margarine, which is sold at a lower price than butter. The swine raiser and the cattleman are in the same predicament as is the cotton grower of the South, who loses the market for his cottonseed oil.

The bill now before the Senate is not a bill conceived in the interest of the American farmer, but exclusively in the interests of the political aspirations of the Filipinos. The very best the American farmer can hope for is the possible limitation to the damage that may be done to him in the next eight years. This limitation is a possibility only and by no means a probability. Under this bill the Philippines can add some 25 per cent to their present imports before they are required to pay a duty, and should their imports reach 200,000 long tons a year, at which point a duty of 2 cents would be imposed on their oil, they still have the opportunity to ship into the United States free of duty all the copra that this country can consume at the expense of the American farmer.

Any bill providing for the independence of the Philippines can be of no economic interest to the American farmer unless it reduces drastically the coconut oil imports, and in turn there can be no reduction of coconut oil imports as long as copra is permitted to come into this country free of duty. The interest of the American farmer in the Philippine Islands is not a political one, it is strictly economic. The issue involves a much vaster area than the Philippine Islands. The issue is that of tropical oils of any description which are used in the United States as substitutes for food fats and for vegetable oils produced in this country. The question will not be settled by the passage of the Hare bill. Should it pass the Senate and receive the President's signature, it will not affect the American farmer in the least. It will leave him in the same or in a worse position for the next eight years than he now is.

The American farmer wants and should have ample protection from coconut oil and copra and from all tropical oils which are now so disastrously competing with him in the American fat market. The Hare bill gives him no protection whatever.

AIR MAIL SERVICE TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a number of letters received by the Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.), which has a contract with our Government for Central and South American air mail. These letters protest against the proposed reduction in air mail service which has been suggested under the 10 per cent cut in appropriations for the Post Office Department and show the importance to American industry in the continuation of that service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters are as follows:

NEW YORK, April 21, 1932.

The Hon. TASKER L. ODDIE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: At the request of Mr. Robert H. Patchin I am sending you to-day by express a binder containing a great number of letters we have received from officials of many industries expressing an opinion as to the value of air mail service to Latin America.

Respectfully yours,

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),

J. D. MACGREGOR,

Vice President and General Manager.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 6, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),

New York City.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

GENTLEMEN: We wish to acknowledge with thanks your letter of May 1 regarding air service to South America.

We use this service regularly and although we have no outstanding incidents to describe, we do wish to say that this air service has proven to be extremely helpful to us, to say the least. Prac-

tically all of our more important mail is now sent by air, and we are very much pleased with the service.

Yours very truly,

ALEMITE CORPORATION,
R. K. TORSON,
Export Manager.

SANTIAGO, December 22, 1930.

GRACE & CIA.,
Casilla No. 14-D, Pte.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of December 19 regarding the Panagra air mail we would advise that we have no comments to make except perhaps to state that we use this service regularly and have found same satisfactory.

Very truly yours,

P. SOC. MPRA. ALLIS-CHALMERS,
L. F. JAMES, *Santiago Office.*

ALUMINUM LINE,
New Orleans, La., May 4, 1931.

Mr. J. D. MACGREGOR,
Vice President and General Manager

*Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
New York, N. Y.*

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of May 1, we do not have occasion to use air mail service to the west coast of Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay, and are therefore not in a position to give you any data in regard to said service.

We do, however, make frequent and quite extensive use of Pan American air mail service to the east coast of Colombia, Venezuela, Jamaica, Haiti, Santo Domingo, the Windward and Leeward Islands, and British and Dutch Guiana. We find this latter service to be of considerable value and assistance in our steamship operations in the territory mentioned. The saving in time by using the air mail has enabled us to handle innumerable matters by mail which we would have otherwise handled by cable less satisfactorily and at much greater expense.

Yours very truly,

WM. J. FINLAN,
General Manager Southern Division.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N. Y., *March 12, 1931.*

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.
(Attention Mr. W. M. North.)

GENTLEMEN: We acknowledge receipt of your kind favor dated March 10, 1931, and since the time of your recent visit literature has been received here in connection with your air mail service, for which we thank you.

You will no doubt be glad to know that we are using your mail service in connection with our transactions in the foreign countries: Panama, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay.

We have found that the use of air mail is most helpful, particularly on involved matters wherein quick decisions are necessary, and to transmit the data by cable would be most expensive.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN CHICLE CO.,
T. J. MACDONALD,
Export Manager.

JANUARY 15, 1931.

Mr. WALTER F. BROWN,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR POSTMASTER GENERAL: We are pleased to inform you that since the inauguration of the airplane mail to the west coast of South America under the control of the Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.) we have consistently used this service and have found it in every way highly satisfactory.

We are now beginning to use the service on the east coast to Rio de Janeiro and Santos, and feel sure that this newer service of the Pan American Airways (Inc.) will prove equally satisfactory.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN COFFEE CORPORATION,
FRANCIS M. KURTZ.

AMERICAN EXPRESS CO.,
New York, May 28, 1931.

Mr. WILLIAM N. NORTH,
*Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.), 122 East
Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.*

DEAR SIR: We thank you for having sent us the maps, schedules, and rates covering your company's service.

You may be interested in learning that we use "Pan American" service to a great extent and in many cases find it indispensable. This is particularly true in cases where we find it impossible to connect documents with the carrying steamer and therefore have to rely on your service to see that documents reach destination before carrying steamer. As a matter of fact, we use your service whenever we desire prompt reports from any of our correspondents located in the West Indies, Central or South America.

In conclusion, permit us to say that the service rendered is A-1 and we shall continue to use it whenever the circumstances warrant.

Yours very truly,

GEO. WESTON,
Vice President and Treasurer.

HOBOKEN, N. J., *March 6, 1931.*

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
(Attention Mr. William M. North.)

GENTLEMEN: Concerning your letter of March 5, we would say that we shall continue to encourage the use of your plane service, as we believe that the growth of such operations is necessary for the development and maintenance of our Latin American business.

Yours very truly,

AMERICAN LEAD PENCIL CO.,
GERARD NOLAN,
Export Department.

COMPANIA AMERICAN SMELTING,
Santiago, December 20, 1930.

MESSRS. GRACE & CO.,
Santiago, Chile, South America.

GENTLEMEN: I have just received your letter of December 19, regarding the Panagra air mail service to the United States, and take pleasure in advising you that we have found it exceedingly satisfactory. So far, to our knowledge, no letter has ever gone astray and has always been delivered at destination as per schedule.

Very truly yours,

JOHN P. CHADWICK.

ANDES COPPER MINING CO., POTRERILLOS,
Potreriillos, Chile, December 9, 1930.

Mr. A. C. STEEL,
*Agent, Grace & Cia. (Chile), S. A.,
Chañaral.*

DEAR SIR: We have your letter of November 25, 1930, in which you ask that we give you a report on the air mail service of the Panagra line.

Recently we have obtained much better results from the use of the air mail service than we did during the earlier months of its inception. We are using the Ovalle station to catch the Panagra line for mail to the United States, and we find that it is the best service that we can secure. We have recently been checking up the dates of arrival of mail here in Potrerillos which has come by air from the States, and we find that in almost every case the mail is delivered to us as quickly as possible with the connections which are available.

Yours very truly,

H. C. BARTEAU,
Business Manager.

THE ANGLO-SOUTH AMERICAN TRUST CO.,
New York, May 25, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: Referring to Mr. North's call upon us a few days ago, we would say that we are using your service exclusively where we use air mail, except to Colombia. The service has so far proven entirely satisfactory.

You will, of course, understand that in certain cases, even where our preference might be to use air mail, we are obliged to use rail and steamer service as shipping contracts often call for certain documents to be sent on the carrier of the merchandise.

Yours very truly,

C. M. PRATT, *Vice President.*

CLEVELAND, *May 5, 1931.*

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

GENTLEMEN: I have your letter of May 1 with reference to air mail service in the United States and the different South American countries. We regret to advise that we have no experience with this service due to the fact that none of our products have been sold in the South American countries as yet. Naturally we are working along those lines and should something develop later that would be of interest to you we will be very glad to write you.

Very truly yours,

THE BAKER-RAULANG CO.,
C. H. WARREN, *Sales Department.*

BANK OF NEW YORK AND TRUST CO.,
New York, May 28, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

(Attention Mr. William M. North.)

DEAR SIR: As per our conversation of to-day, while we do not make any extensive use of your air mails, we have been called

upon from time to time to send letters to points covered by your service. Up to this time we have found such air mail service quite satisfactory to us.

Yours very truly,

JOHN FISCHER,
Assistant Treasurer.

NEW YORK, April 29, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

GENTLEMEN: We received your letter of April 28 regarding the air mail service maintained by your company between the United States and South America.

We have not had occasion to use this service for any outstanding transactions but have kept in mind the saving of time which this service assures. Our South American correspondents have on several occasions used this service and it apparently was entirely satisfactory.

Very truly yours,

Per pro. BANKERS TRUST CO.,
E. M. ANDEL.

NEW YORK CITY, April 23, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),

New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: We use quite regularly the air mail service to west-coast and east-coast countries of South America in communicating to our agents various matters in connection with the sale of our fabrics in their countries and have always found this service to be exceedingly fast and convenient.

Only a few weeks ago in trying to make new connections for our representation in Montevideo we communicated by air mail with a prospective agent giving a great deal of information regarding our line and other matters which could not very well have been treated by cable and the agent in question replied accepting our proposition. This is one of the many instances where time is a major consideration and the short number of days it takes to communicate with far-off places is a distinct advantage.

Yours very truly,

EDWIN E. BERLINER & Co.,
L. O. MONTES, Export Manager.

HAMMOND, IND., May 29, 1931.

J. D. MACGREGOR,

General Manager Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Please pardon the delay in answering yours of May 1. We frequently have occasion to use your service to South American countries. While we do not keep a record of such transactions, I do know of one case in particular where we were able to land a large order by promptly submitting our figures by air mail.

Whenever shipments are made we also use your service in advising our customers names of steamer and date and port from which it leaves, and are sure this is very satisfactory, since it gives consignee plenty of time to arrange every detail before shipment arrives.

Yours very truly,

F. S. BETZ Co.,
J. A. ARR,
Traffic Manager.

NEW YORK, April 15, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),

New York City.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor.)

GENTLEMEN: Answering your letter of the 13th instant, we would advise you that we are using the air mail to quite an extent in the Central American countries and Colombia and Venezuela. To a smaller extent we are using the air mail to the Argentine, but this is due to decreased business in that market and also in Chile.

We feel, however, that air mail is a vital factor, and is serving to bring foreign markets into very much closer contact, and it is our feeling that there will be a very heavy increase in air mail traffic after houses both here and abroad realize the value of the service.

Yours very truly,

M. C. D. BORDEN & SONS (INC.),
By H. N. PEAU.

NEW YORK, April 15, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS,

New York, N. Y.

(Attention of Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

GENTLEMEN: We have been using the air mail between the United States and the Argentine with considerable satisfaction.

The air mail has been most valuable in enabling us to promptly get reports of conditions in the Argentine affecting our policies of doing business there.

We can not say that the same results have been obtained from communication with the more northern countries, such as

Colombia. We can not find any saving in time or service in sending our correspondence to Colombia by air mail. We hope, however, that the schedules will eventually allow a considerable saving in the transmitting of messages between the United States and Colombia.

Very truly yours,

BLAW-KNOX INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION,
NICHOLAS GERTEN, Vice President.

BRADEN COPPER CO., RANCAGUA-CHILE,
OFICINA DEL CONTRALOR LOCAL (AET: OAS),
Rancagua, 2 de Diciembre de 1930

AGENCIA GRACE Y CIA.

(Chile), S. A., Presente.

MUY SEÑORES NUESTROS: Contestando su atenta de fecha 17 de Noviembre de 1930, debemos manifestarles que hasta la fecha no hemos notado ninguna demora anormal en la entrega de la correspondencia llegada por avión y dirigida a esta compañía.

SALUDA A UDS. ATENTAMENTE,
Contralor Local.

CHICAGO, May 19, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),

New York, N. Y.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

GENTLEMEN: We are in receipt of your letter of the 15th regarding additional uses of air mail.

It may interest you to know that we have been using the air mail service for collection of our South American accounts, as well as Central American accounts, for six months or a year and have found that our customers appreciate this service, for the return communications invariably come in via air mail.

Yours very truly,

THE BRUNSWICK-BALKE-COLLENDER Co.,
Per P. O. SEELY, Export Credit Department.

NEW YORK CITY, May 23, 1931.

Mr. J. D. MACGREGOR,

Care of Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MACGREGOR: We are pleased to acknowledge your letter of the 15th and take this opportunity to tell you that we are making extensive use of air mail throughout Central and South America. In fact, air mail has supplanted over 50 per cent of the communications we formerly sent by cable to this territory.

Attached herewith is a copy of a letter which we have just sent to your traffic department and which holds possibilities for further use of air mail. Of course, our use of this will be governed entirely upon the cost.

We take this opportunity to thank Pan American as well as Pan American-Grace for the splendid cooperation they have extended us on the many occasions we have had to call on them.

Very truly yours,

BUTLER BROS.,
B. F. BANTA,
Manager of Export Sales.

CENTRAL HANOVER BANK & TRUST Co.,

New York, May 21, 1931.

Attention Mr. W. M. NORTH,

Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),

New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: We refer to your recent personal call, requesting that we outline our experience and the benefits derived from the use of your air mail service to South America.

We have already addressed your Mr. MacGregor on the subject; nevertheless, we wish to add a few more lines here.

One of the stipulations of an important agreement we made recently contained the provision that all documents were to be forwarded by air mail so that they might be in our possession within a week or 10 days ahead of the arrival of the steamer carrying the merchandise at the American port. This stipulation will involve the extensive use of your air mail service from July 1 on.

All important remittances of funds from South America in the form of checks or drafts now come by air mail, as do all drawings of South American banks on us. The use of air mail for these remittances and drawings has started a controversial discussion among the various banks who contend that their rates when selling their checks on New York are based on a 15 or 20 day schedule of the maritime routes and that they lose interest by having their checks arrive before time by air mail. I have no doubt that in a short time all checks on New York for amounts of any importance will be forwarded by air mail and the various South American banks will find it necessary to adjust their rates in accordance with this new service. This is already being done by some of the institutions in that territory.

Very truly yours,

D. A. DEL RIO,
Assistant Vice President.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, October 8, 1930.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

GENTLEMEN: On all of our collections to South America where we can conveniently use air mail, we are doing so. Some time ago we sent a draft for collection to Buenos Aires. As I recall it, the amount was approximately \$4,000. We specified that settlement should be made by air mail. From the time that the draft was paid in Buenos Aires until it reached our hands, 10 days had elapsed. If this remittance had come by vessel it would have taken approximately 31 days; in other words, 21 days' time was saved by using air mail. Figuring the interest on \$4,000 for 21 days at 6 per cent, after deducting air mail postage, actually meant a saving of approximately \$10.

You may rest assured that when we can advantageously use air mail we do so. We are in hopes of using this service more extensively as time goes on.

Very truly yours,

CENTRAL UNITED NATIONAL BANK,
O. L. CARLTON, Vice President.

CERTAIN-TEED PRODUCTS CORPORATION,
New York, March 30, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

(Attention Mr. W. M. North.)

GENTLEMEN: We find that the air mail service offered by your organization to be excellent and a great help to us in furthering our business interests.

We use this air mail constantly, and we have no complaints to offer as to the service rendered.

Our customers in Latin America also use the air mail service a great deal, and most of our important mail is handled by this method.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD LUTHER, Export Manager.

NEW YORK, May 15, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

(Attention Mr. William M. North.)

GENTLEMEN: For nearly a year and a half we have been using your air mail service between the United States and the various countries of South America which you serve, and we feel that we have effected a considerable saving both in cable rates and in time because of this service.

We have considerable correspondence with our branch office in Lima, Peru, and with our agents in Santiago, Chile, Buenos Aires, and Maracaibo. The fact that we are no longer at the mercy of slow steamship communication has been a source of much benefit to us.

We are very glad, indeed, to have the opportunity of expressing our satisfaction with your service, and we have no criticisms whatever to make of your facilities.

Very truly yours,

CHICAGO PNEUMATIC TOOL CO.,
By MAXIMILIAN PAGE,
Assistant Manager Foreign Trade Division.

THE CHILE COPPER CO.,
New York City, November 21, 1930.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are pleased to advise you of our experience with the air mail service between New York and Chile, South America.

We are able to reach our mines at Chuquicamata, Chile, near the port of Antofagasta, by air mail in 6 days, whereas the regular mail consumes at least 16 days. This has been of great advantage to us, as it has not only speeded up our correspondence but has enabled us to reduce materially the number of cablegrams exchanged with our mine offices. Much of our important and emergency correspondence is now handled by the air mail between New York and Chile, and we can, therefore, testify to the usefulness and value of this service to the company.

Very truly yours,

H. C. BELLINGER, Vice President.

CHILE TELEPHONE CO.,
OFICINA GENERAL,
Santiago, December 31, 1930.

SEÑOR ROBERTO DAGNINO,
Grace y Cia. (Chile), S. A., Santiago.

DEAR SIR: Relative to your letter of the 19th instant, we beg to advise that we make considerable use of the Panagra air mail and find the service quite satisfactory.

The only observation we could make—and we presume that this does not actually affect the Panagra service—is that there is some delay (one or two days after the arrival of the plane) in the delivery of the registered mail (certificados). Perhaps you could have this corrected in the proper quarters.

Yours very truly,

JOHN T. QUINN,
General Manager.

COLOMBIAN-AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
New York, N. Y., May 22, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter inquiring about the results I have obtained by using air mail in soliciting dormant accounts in Colombia, South America, I am very pleased indeed to inform you that I have been using your air mail service for this purpose for a long time already, and, needless to say, inasmuch as I continue using it I am perfectly satisfied with the results.

The saving in time in sending letters, drafts, etc., by air mail from New York to Bogota, Colombia South America, and vice versa, is so practical that compensate any postage expenses.

But the way that I have benefited the most by using air mail service is in sending most of the news and information to the various Colombian daily newspapers I represent. In this respect I have been congratulated by these newspapers for the promptness in conveying to them all information.

The air mail service has proven very effective indeed in soliciting dormant accounts in South America and for all business in general, of which I have been profiting ever since I started using your air mail service.

Hoping that this information will be of service to you, I beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

C. PUYO DELGADO.

NEW YORK CITY, January 30, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

(Attention Mr. Wm. M. North.)

DEAR SIR: At this late date I wish to thank you for the air mail schedule which you so kindly forwarded to me.

Just as soon as we learned of the air mail schedule for Brazil and the east coast of South America we dispatched a few letters to our people in Brazil by air mail, because we have found that the air mail service to South America via the west coast has been entirely satisfactory and has aided us in keeping in closer touch with our people in South America and yet not too expensive to use frequently.

As we have mail on practically every plane that leaves for South America, we would appreciate your advising us in the future regarding any changes in the schedule just as soon as they go into effect, as we have gotten into the habit of depending on our air mail letters reaching the hands of the people for whom they are intended on the very day which the air mail was scheduled to arrive.

Thanking you for past courtesies, we remain,

Very truly yours,

COLUMBIA PHONOGRAPH CO. (INC.),
EXPORT DEPARTMENT,
Per F. E. FRASER.

NEW YORK, May 4, 1931.

MR. J. D. MACGREGOR,
Vice President Pan American-Grace Airways, Inc.,
New York City.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of the 1st instant relative to airplane service between the United States, Central and South American ports, there is really nothing outstanding we can report that would be of material benefit to you. We are exceedingly pleased with the Pan American Airway Service, and in addition to selling transportation we avail of your airplane facilities most freely with satisfactory results.

Very truly yours,

THOS. COOK & SON,
Per GEO. W. WHITE.

CHICAGO, May 18, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: Yours of the 15th instant at hand, and we wish to inform you that our various connections in Central and South America as well as ourselves have been making use of your splendid service, using air mail, and now we will take up your suggestion for a more extensive distribution of our products and will report the results later to you.

Very truly yours,

THE CUDAHY PACKING CO.,
L. GALLARDS.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Detroit, Mich., May 4, 1931.

MR. J. D. MACGREGOR,
Vice President and General Manager,
Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.), New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 1st instant, we have used air mail to South America several times where vessels carrying shipments of merchandise got away before the relative documents were in our hands. By using the air mail we were, however,

able to have the documents in the hands of the correspondents before the arrival of the vessel, thereby avoiding loss of time and expense to the consignees.

Yours very truly,

ROD. P. FRASER,
Vice President.

NEW YORK, December 10, 1931.

Mr. W. S. BROWN,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our companies are regular users of the air post facilities between this country and Latin America and find this service extremely valuable in our business relations with those countries. In fact, we scarcely know how we have been able to get along without it in the past.

Out of our experience, however, we should like to make a suggestion for possible improvement. We find that on letters originating in the Latin American countries, and particularly those of Central America, there is considerable carelessness on the part of post-office employees in the handing out of information concerning the amount of postage required, so that letters are often short of air mail postage.

In such cases they are forwarded by the foreign post offices by ordinary mail instead of by air mail, and the sender is unaware of what has occurred. Evidently there is no provision for collection of "postage due" at the receiving end.

This may be a condition over which your department has no direct control, but we have taken the liberty of bringing this subject to your attention in the hope that there may be some way in which troubles of this nature can be overcome. We are not the only sufferers from this trouble, for other American concerns with whom we are acquainted have experienced the same difficulties.

The air mail is a wonderful help to American business, and we note with great interest every extension of the service which takes place and trust that these improvements will continue. We appreciate the important part that your department has taken in the promotion of this service and it has our hearty support.

Very truly yours,

VALSPAR CORPORATION,
Export Sales Director for Valentine & Co.,
Detroit Graphite Co.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., June 11, 1931.

Mr. R. H. PATCHIN,
Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Delgado has asked me to acknowledge your letter of June 9.

We have taken advantage of the Pan American-Grace Airway service, but as yet to no great extent, and, therefore, are not in a position to offer any special suggestions or criticisms of your service.

Yours very truly,

EASTMAN KODAK CO.,
F. P. ROOT.

THE ECUADORIAN CORPORATION (LTD.),
New York, May 18, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.
(Attention of Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

GENTLEMEN: We have your letter of May 15, and note you speak of a special feature by which air mail is being used to solicit dormant accounts in South America.

In this connection we would advise you that while we are interested to hear of this, our properties are situated in Ecuador, and although we are constant users of your service for our correspondence with our subsidiaries we have no special need for the type of service to which your letter refers.

Very truly yours,

G. O. HOUSTEIN, Treasurer.

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 7, 1931.

THE PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y.

(Attention Mr. William M. North.)

GENTLEMEN: With reference to your inquiry concerning our use of the air-mail service afforded by your company to South and Central America, we wish to say that we have used this from the time of its inauguration, and with increasing frequency lately. We have found the service satisfactory, and so far as we know mail reached destination in scheduled time.

This air-mail service has been of great benefit at times, such as where we have not been able to send shipping documents by regular mail. In such cases we have availed ourselves of the opportunity of sending them by air mail, thus enabling the consignee to have his documents prior to the arrival of the goods, and so avoiding fines.

We have also used it in cases where it was important to place sales and engineering data in the hands of our representatives

in a short space of time, and have appreciated the service rendered.

Yours very truly,

FAIRBANKS, MORSE & Co. (INC.),
Foreign Division, New York.
By E. G. BILLITT.

SANTIAGO DE CHILE, December 22, 1930.

GRACE Y CIA. (CHILE) S. A.,
Santiago de Chile.

GENTLEMEN: We thank you for your letter dated December 19, and are glad to say that we are entirely satisfied with the service given by the Panagra Line.

Our important mail is always dispatched by air, and we are convinced that your service is a great improvement over the maritime route.

Yours very truly,

FORD MOTOR CO.

NEW YORK, May 20, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

DEAR SIR: As requested by your Mr. William M. North, we are writing you this letter to inform you that we frequently use the air mail service to South America to great advantage.

It is, of course, a well-known fact that many times it is very difficult to send shipping documents by the same steamer carrying the goods, and the use of the air mail in these particular instances is of course essential, as it avoids fines and other inconveniences at foreign customhouses, due to delay in receiving documents.

We also use this service on every urgent matter requiring an immediate reply, particularly on public bids, urgent instructions to our foreign representatives and branch offices, and, in short, whenever we find it necessary to communicate with any of our customers, representatives, or branch offices in Latin America with all possible speed.

Yours very truly,

FOX BROS. & Co. (INC.),
E. P. WELLS,
Asst. Export Manager.

GENERAL MOTORS EXPORT CO.,
Santiago, December 22, 1930.

MESSRS. GRACE & CIA. (CHILE), S. A.,
Santiago.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of December 19, requesting information as to the service given by the Panagra air mail.

Both this office and my New York office have been using this service regularly and find that it meets with our entire satisfaction. At first there were delays in one or two letters, but in the past four months the service has been coming through regularly.

Very truly yours,

A. W. ELLIS.

GUGGENHEIM BROS.,
December 22, 1930.

MESSRS. W. R. GRACE & Co.,
Santiago.

DEAR SIR: Anent the above subject, we are pleased to refer to your three letters of December 19, 1930, one addressed to Messrs. Guggenheim Bros., one to Anglo-Chilean Consolidated Nitrate Corporation, and the other to Braden Copper Co.

Although we found that there seemed to be a lack of proper coordination between the local postal authorities and your service some months ago and shortly after you started the service, we are pleased to advise that recently we have had no reason to complain and, as far as we know, during the past month or six weeks our letters have gone forth by the airplane which we had expected would take them according to the schedule. Should we notice in the future any deficiencies, we shall be pleased to call them to your attention.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED HOUSTON (P. A. S.).

GUARANTY TRUST CO. OF NEW YORK,
New York, December 8, 1930.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y.

(Attention Mr. William M. North.)

GENTLEMEN: At the request of your Mr. North, who called on us a short while ago, we are pleased to write you with regard to air mail service.

We use the air mail extensively in connection with our international business relationships in South and Central America and the West Indies, and our banking correspondents in Latin America likewise use the service extensively in their communications to us.

The time element is an important one in the business world to-day and we believe the facility of air mail communication between the Americas has contributed much toward bringing the

continents of the Western Hemisphere into closer contact and understanding.

In regard to specific phases of our dealings with Latin America in which the air mail service has impressed us as being of particular advantage, we would mention the following:

It frequently happens that shipments to various South American ports are made for which documents reach us only after the carrying steamers have sailed. If the consular documents are not in the hands of the proper parties at destination within a prescribed time after arrival of the steamer carrying the merchandise, the importer is often subject to a fine in order to obtain the merchandise. In such instances by sending the shipping documents by air mail we frequently have found it possible to place the papers in the hands of our correspondents before arrival of the carrying steamer at destination, and the expense of air mail is in such cases trivial compared to the loss which would otherwise have been suffered as a result of delay in dispatch of the documents.

We have also found the air mail service beneficial in handling the collection of exporters' drafts on Latin-American firms. Frequently, exporters desiring to amend their original instructions pertaining to their collection items find it convenient to have us despatch such instructions by air mail, where formerly because of the slowness of steamer-mail time it was considered necessary to send such instructions by cable, thereby incurring relatively higher expenses.

Another feature of air mail service that has impressed itself on us is in connection with obtaining credit reports on business houses in Latin America for the benefit of our exporting clients. Before the advent of air mail communication it was often necessary to rely upon brief information by cable which was followed by more detailed reports by the regular mail, which latter information was, of course, received only after considerable delay. The use of air mail in this connection has cut down the intervening period substantially.

We are pleased to give you the above information informally and with the understanding that it is not for publication.

Very truly yours,

S. E. LINNFRED, Assistant Secretary.

MOBILE, ALA., May 5, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS, INC.,
New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: Answering your letter of the 1st, we have found your air mail very convenient between Mobile and Argentine. We have been able to cut down considerably on our cable bill, and get just as good results at considerably less cost.

Yours very truly,

H. M. HEMPSTEAD LUMBER CO.

MEJILLONES, CHILE.

MESSRS. NITRATE AGENCIES (LTD.),
Antofagasta.

DEAR SIR: With reference to our conversation of last Thursday regarding the "Panagra" air postal arrangements, I have pleasure in testifying to the very excellent service I have obtained from this line since I commenced posting letters to England via that route in July last and, for your information, append a statement giving the dates of leaving Antofagasta and arrival in England of each of the 44 letters that I have sent that way during the period July 17 to December 21, from which you will observe that in many cases letters have reached England 12 days after leaving your city, and the average for the whole period is less than 14½ days. The longest time that any letter has taken was 22 days, and that occurred during the Christmas season at home, when it is quite likely that letters were delayed in delivery.

I would mention that prior to adopting the "Panagra" route, I was in the habit of sending air mails to England via the south, but can assure you that, from my own experience of the two lines, I have no intention of changing from Panagra's excellent service.

Dates of air mail, Panagra service

Posted	Arrived	Time taken
		<i>Days</i>
July 17	July 30	13
July 20	Aug. 2	13
July 24	Aug. 7	14
July 27	Aug. 8	12
July 31	Aug. 13	13
Aug. 3	Aug. 15	12
Aug. 7	Aug. 19	12
Aug. 10	Aug. 23	13
Aug. 14	Aug. 27	13
Aug. 17	Sept. 4	18
Aug. 24	Sept. 5	12
Aug. 28	Sept. 10	13
Aug. 31	Sept. 12	12
Sept. 4	Sept. 18	14
Sept. 7	Sept. 22	15
Sept. 11	Sept. 24	13
Sept. 14	Sept. 30	16
Sept. 18	do	12
Sept. 25	Oct. 9	14
Sept. 28	Oct. 11	13
Oct. 2	Oct. 17	15

Dates of air mail, Panagra service—Continued

Posted	Arrived	Time taken
		<i>Days</i>
Oct. 5	Oct. 21	16
Oct. 9	do	12
Oct. 12	Oct. 24	12
Oct. 16	Oct. 31	15
Oct. 19	Nov. 3	15
Oct. 23	Nov. 8	16
Oct. 26	do	13
Oct. 30	Nov. 12	13
Nov. 2	Nov. 15	13
Nov. 6	Nov. 20	14
Nov. 9	Nov. 28	19
Nov. 13	do	15
Nov. 16	Dec. 3	17
Nov. 20	do	13
Nov. 23	Dec. 8	15
Nov. 27	Dec. 12	15
Nov. 30	Dec. 19	19
Dec. 4	do	15
Dec. 7	Dec. 29	22
Dec. 11	do	18
Dec. 14	Dec. 30	16
Dec. 18	Jan. 3	16
Dec. 21	do	13

Yours sincerely,

HILARY C. HOOD.

TROY, N. Y., May 8, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

GENTLEMEN: In answer to your inquiry of the 5th instant, would state that we have taken advantage of your service for Colombia, Ecuador, and Panama, and occasionally for Chile. There are, of course, many advantages in the saving of time, and this is particularly noticeable when it is necessary to refer orders back to customers or representatives for confirmation of necessary changes. Handling by air mail usually saves time that can be reckoned in months and usually enables the customer to reorder much sooner than if shipment on the original order had been considerably delayed.

We also use air mail for Central America, the West Indies, Venezuela, and Brazil.

Our experience in using this service has been most satisfactory and we have no criticism to offer.

With best wishes for your continued success, we are

Very truly yours,

GEO. P. IDE, & Co. (INC.),
W. M. HUTTON,
Manager Foreign Department.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION,
New York, April 25, 1931.

Mr. J. D. MACGREGOR,
Vice President and General Manager,
Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: The letter of April 21, addressed to Mr. J. E. Kaiser, our traffic manager, has been given to this division for reply.

We are frank to state that while numerous benefits have been derived by our organization in this country and in Central and South America, through the extensive use of the air mail, we do not recall any instance of sufficient importance to warrant its being featured.

We use the air mail extensively when communicating with our agencies and branch offices in the countries to the south. In numerous instances we have found that using the air mail service for shipments of parts and supplies meant considerable to us not only in actual dollars but also in customers' good will.

If at any time in the future we should have a case such as you are interested in, we will most certainly be glad to pass it along.

Very truly yours,

W. A. BENTON,
Foreign Division.

NEW YORK CITY, April 22, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y.
(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

GENTLEMEN: Referring to your inquiry of the 21st instant, we are pleased to state that we are very well satisfied with the air mail service which you have rendered between the United States and Montevideo, Uruguay, for the past five months.

In our business it is essential that documents be mailed on the same steamer carrying the shipment, especially if it happens to be a mail vessel, otherwise the consignees are subjected to a fine assessed by the Uruguayan customs.

At times, due to last-minute deliveries to a steamer, it is a physical impossibility to have the documents go forward on the same steamer with the goods, as many shippers require their documents and drafts to be negotiated through certain banks in

this country, thus making it impossible to get the mail off in time.

Whenever such occasions arise we no longer anticipate any complaints from our clients abroad, inasmuch as the banks are authorized to dispatch the documents in connection with your air mail service and same are in the consignees' hands prior to the arrival of the vessel at the port of Montevideo.

In addition to the above, your service has also enabled us to eliminate cable expenses to a certain extent, especially when corrections are necessary on documents which have already been dispatched to destination. These corrections are sent via air mail and are in our client's hands prior to the receipt of the documents which are to be corrected.

Assuring you of our cooperation at all times, and trusting that you will be enabled to maintain your splendid service as heretofore, we are,

Yours very truly,

INTERNATIONAL FORWARDING Co. (INC.),
S. McGEOWN.

INTERNATIONAL GENERAL ELECTRIC Co. (INC.),
New York, May 25, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City, N. Y.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

DEAR SIR: With reference to yours of April 21, addressed to our vice president, Mr. W. J. Edmonds, I am pleased to inform you that air mail between United States and South America has been of benefit to us and the use of it has steadily increased.

It has in a number of instances assisted us in making bids on large propositions where a limited time was allowed to file them.

Yours very truly,

M. TRUSTMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 14, 1931.

Mr. WILLIAM M. NORTH,
Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. NORTH: We are and have been for the past two years using your air mail service to some considerable extent in our more urgent correspondence, chiefly to the countries of South America.

We find that if opportunely mailed the additional speed obtained through air mail is most valuable and forms an important link between the more expensive transmission of messages by cable and the considerably slower means of regular post.

The members of our New York staff are using air mail whenever they feel it justified and are following air mail letters with a copy through the regular mails for confirmation purposes.

It is probable that with ultimate reduction of air mail rates there will be an increase approximately corresponding to that reduction in so far as this organization is concerned.

You may feel free to use this letter as an expression of our feeling on the subject as you see fit.

Very truly yours,

THE INTERNATIONAL B. F. GOODRICH CORPORATION,
E. D. NATHAN, Advertising Manager.

INTERNATIONAL MINING CORPORATION,
New York, N. Y., September 2, 1930.

Mr. WILLIAM M. NORTH,
Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: It gives our firm, and myself personally, much pleasure to let you know that your air mail service is proving most satisfactory for both our outgoing and incoming mail between this office and our office at La Paz (Bolivia). It is in every way reliable and of much value to us by virtue of the saving of time over ordinary mail.

We have now become accustomed to use your air mail service for our regular weekly correspondence with La Paz, and our La Paz friends are doing similarly with their mail to us.

Very truly yours,

EASLEY & INSLEE,
By GEORGE A. EASLEY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., May 5, 1931.

Mr. J. D. MACGREGOR,
Vice President and General Manager Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.), New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: We acknowledge your letter of May 1 regarding the air mail service which was inaugurated on November 30, 1929, between the United States and Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay.

We have not had occasion to use this service and therefore do not have any comments to offer, but if any noteworthy instances come to our attention we shall be pleased to inform you.

Yours very truly,

JOHNS-MANVILLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION,
W. C. THIES, Pacific Coast Representative.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., May 6, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS, INC.,
New York, N. Y.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

GENTLEMEN: We have your letter of the 1st instant, addressed to the attention of the writer.

In answer to your inquiry as to whether the air mail service from this country to South America has resulted in any saving of time and money, or in the securing of new business, we wish to advise that we have found it very satisfactory and a great saving of time and money in our communications with our agents in some of the countries mentioned by you with whom we are able to get in contact by air mail in matters which formerly required the sending of cablegrams.

Yours very truly,

THE KANSAS FLOUR MILLS CORPORATION,
NAMON LEON, JR.
Export Manager.

KARDEX INTERNATIONAL, LTD., INC.,
New York City, April 17, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS, INC.,
New York City.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor.)

GENTLEMEN: We received your letter of April 13, and wish to advise you that we use air mail service to Chile and the Argentine to quite an extent. We are very much satisfied with the possibility of reaching our agents there within seven to eight days.

Yours very truly,

W. PEUCKER,
Assistant Foreign Sales Manager.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 21, 1931.
PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president.)

GENTLEMEN: I have yours of the 13th instant, and am pleased to say that I myself had a very interesting experience in flying from the north coast of Colombia to Ecuador.

Our company and our various agents in Central and South America constantly use the air mail with great saving in time and the ability to carry through details of the business with much greater satisfaction than before this service was established.

We are still sending copies of air mail letters by regular mail. Do you consider your service sufficiently safe so that we can give up this practice?

Very truly yours,

KELVIN ENGINEERING Co. (INC.),
G. LOBO, President.

CHICAGO, April 30, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

GENTLEMEN: With reference to your letter dated April 21, we are pleased to advise you that we have received and sent air mail to most every country in South America, and have found your service to be a great convenience.

It is especially beneficial in that we now receive orders by air mail which were formerly sent by cable. Also, should any special circumstances arise, we learn of it sooner than heretofore.

Yours very truly,

KOTEX Co.,
W. A. FORSTER,
By Export Department.

NEW ORLEANS, May 19, 1931.

Mr. J. D. MACGREGOR,
Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have your letters of May 1 and May 15 addressed to Mr. C. S. Bridges, ex-export manager of this department. Inasmuch as Mr. C. S. Bridges has been transferred to another territory, I take pleasure in answering your letters.

For your information, ever since the Pan American Airways inaugurated the air mail service to Central and South America we have been using this service continuously for quotation of our prices and collections and have found this service to be not only of great assistance to us in speeding up the service with the territories under our jurisdiction but also an important medium to reduce our cable expenses.

I had the pleasure to make a trip all through Central America last year with the Pan American Airways, and inasmuch as I plan to make a trip in the very near future to Panama, Trinidad, Barbados, and the Guianas, would appreciate it very much if you would furnish me with an up-to-date sailing schedule, as well as quotations of fares from Panama to Trinidad, the Guianas, etc.

Anticipating your prompt reply, I am,

Very truly yours,

LIBBY, McNEILL & LIBBY,
By A. O. VERBEHE,
Export Manager.

NEW YORK, April 11, 1931.

MR. WILLIAM M. NORTE,
Care of Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
New York City.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your recent call, we have pleasure in placing on record that we are finding the air mail to South and Central America of increasing service to us. We use it in various ways. Sometimes we write by air mail for a reply by the same route. On other occasions, where details have to be sent for a prompt confirmation, we write by air mail for a reply by cable. When the details are required from the other end subject to a prompt reply from us, we reverse the procedure. By this combined use of cable and air mail we are able to get the maximum amount of service in the minimum time at the smallest cost.

Yours very truly,

MINOT, HOOPER & Co.,
By C. TUTENBERG.

TRENTON, N. J., May 18, 1931.

MR. J. D. MACGREGOR,
Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.), New York City.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your letter of 15th instant, we wish to inform you that we have been making use right along of the air mail, to the great satisfaction of our customers and our own interests. We consider this service the filling of a gap needed for a long time in the commercial trade.

We remain, very truly yours,

J. L. MOTT COMPANY,
A. J. MIRANDA, Export Department.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April, 27, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: We have received your circular letter of April 21, asking us to give you any information regarding some interesting experiences of your service.

We are sorry that we have none so far but we would like to thank you for your good service and we have used it right along in our collections and sending documents when we have missed the steamers.

Very truly yours,

L. MUNDET & SONS (INC.),
Export Department.

NEW YORK CITY, May 20, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor.)

GENTLEMEN: We acknowledge your letter of the 15th instant and your suggestion is a good one. We are happy to say that we have already gotten accustomed to the air mail service and we find it is very effective. From time to time we will increase it as we believe it is going to help our business.

Wishing you success, we remain, yours very truly,

MCKESSON & ROBBINS (INC.),
Vice President.

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 6, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York.

(Attention J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

GENTLEMEN: We have yours of April 29 and wish to state that the air mail has undoubtedly helped us in numerous ways. While we can not stress any one particular achievement and credit it to the air mail, we know that in every instance we have gotten payment of our drafts anywhere from 15 to 30 days quicker by the use of air mail than we did by ordinary mail, all of which means a saving in interest to us. Then again, in instances where we have missed the consignee mail, we have sent the documents by air mail and had them reach our trade in sufficient time to avoid a fine. Then, in instances where complaints of various natures in regard to our shipments have been handled through the air mail, it has been as rapid as the cable and we think more efficient, when you consider the more detailed information you can give in a letter sent by air mail as against the condensed information given in a cable.

We hope that eventually, when you have this air mail going to the height of perfection, that we may be able to eliminate our cable expense and depend upon the air mail entirely, and we believe this is the mark you should shoot at (the old saying is that if you shoot at the sky and miss, you will hit the roof, which is a pretty high mark at that) and that we may see the day not far distant when all these outlying sections of the world will be drawn very much closer or practically outside our own door by the use of air mail.

Very truly yours,

NATIONAL BISCUIT Co.,
J. C. TRACY, Export Division.

THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK,
New York, November 20, 1930.

HON. WALTER F. BROWN,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

SIR: It has occurred to me that it may be of interest for you to learn our viewpoint on the air mail service to South America.

The writer has charge of the South American district division of the bank and direct supervision of our branches in Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, and Chile. Prior to this time I have made my headquarters in Buenos Aires in order to maintain as close contact with the branches as possible. This required more or less of a duplicate supervisory organization in both New York and Buenos Aires. Through the development of the air mail and the opening of wireless telephone service between North and South America, we have found it unnecessary to maintain headquarters in Buenos Aires, and are now directing all supervisory activities from New York, and find that same can be done from here as efficiently and expeditiously as they were formerly done from Buenos Aires before the days of air mail, and with a great many added advantages in the way of coordination with other fields of bank activity.

I personally have watched the development of aviation activities in South America with a great deal of interest. I have lived in the countries of the South American Continent for the past 12 years and have felt considerable chagrin over the fact that English and European interests have very generally gained control of both railroad and steamship holdings that were not owned by the nationals of those various countries, and in almost all cases where transportation activities were in the hands of the nationals they were government owned. There seems to be very little opportunity for American interests to obtain any foothold whatsoever in the transportation picture, and I have felt that aviation was the answer as far as American interests are concerned, and have been very happy to see the activity that American concerns have shown in that regard.

Personal observation of the operations of the American air transportation companies has instilled in me a great admiration for the manner in which they are doing their job. I have personally flown over many of the routes and I have found, on the part of the pilots and mechanics, an esprit de corps which reminds one of the stories of the "pony express" of the old days—everything being sacrificed to the rule that "the mail must go through."

The development of the mail lines, and particularly the multiple service per week instead of the once-a-week service, is fast bringing about a new form of foreign exchange bills and where, in the past, transactions have been done on a basis of cable, sight or 90-day exchange, we are now developing an air mail rate of exchange, and this is peculiarly a dollar exchange and will eventually help to establish the American dollar as the basis for international transactions in South America.

Asking your indulgence for this long letter and assuring you of our hearty support of this great development, of particular interest to American and foreign trade, which your department has done so much to foster, I remain,

Yours very truly,

BOIES C. HART, Vice President.

THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK,
SANTIAGO DE CHILE BRANCH,
Santiago, Chile, December 31, 1930.

Re: Air mail to the United States.
GRACE Y CIA (Chile), S. A.,
Santiago.

GENTLEMEN: We refer to your letter of December 19, asking us for an expression of opinion on the service rendered by the Pan-agra in the dispatch of air mail to and from the United States.

We wish to advise you that we are making considerable use of this service and have it satisfactory.

Very truly yours,

Accountant.

PITTSBURGH, PA., April 29, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y.

(Attention Mr. William M. North.)

GENTLEMEN: Referring to your letter of the 27th, we are very pleased to advise that we have found the use of air mail not only reducing the element of time in securing contact with our representation in the South American field, but also we have found that letters addressed to our various clients and forwarded by air mail receive more prompt consideration, and more careful consideration is given to their contents.

We have also suggested to our South American contacts that they help us in expediting our sales problems by replying promptly and forwarding their reply to us by air mail.

Very truly yours,

NATIONAL ELECTRIC PRODUCTS CORPORATION,
NATIONAL METAL MOLDING DIVISION,
J. D. HOIT, Manager Export Department.

NEW YORK, May 5, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

DEAR SIR: Mr. Budd has referred to me your letter of April 30 relative to the air mail service the Pan American-Grace Airways operates.

The service has been very satisfactory, and we find it especially beneficial in the transmittal of shipping documents to South American countries, where the saving in time makes up for the delay in releasing them from New York.

Very truly yours,

PACKARD MOTORS EXPORT CORPORATION,
G. J. COWAN.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
Philadelphia, Pa., July 11, 1930.
New York City.

DEAR SIR: I have just received at 12.30, daylight-saving time, to-day, July 11, a letter which was written at Santiago, Chile, on July 4, and which, according to the postmark, was stamped at Santiago at 6 a. m. July 5.

I am amazed at the speed of your service and congratulate you most heartily.

Yours very truly,

BROOKE B. PARKER.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, May 13, 1931.
New York City.
(Attention Mr. William M. North.)

DEAR SIR: The Pan American-Grace Airways service has been of inestimable value to us since its inauguration throughout South America.

We have frequent use for this service—both mail and passenger—and at this time are glad to say that we have no complaints. If we find improvements can be made, we will take the liberty of calling same to your attention, as we believe constructive criticism will be of worth to your company in its earlier stages of progress.

Yours very truly,

RAYMOND CONCRETE PILE CO.,
C. E. BRINSLEY,
Traffic Manager.

RAYMOND & WHITCOMB CO.,
Boston, Mass., May 18, 1931.

Mr. J. D. MacGregor,
Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MACGREGOR: Relative to your letter of May 15, it may interest you to know that practically all of our South American mail now goes forward by the Pan American-Grace Airways.

The result, as a consequence of the use of your Pan American-Grace Airways, has been excellent and has greatly speeded up our relations with our agents throughout South America.

You are assured of our every cooperation and we compliment you on the excellent service your lines are rendering.

With kind regards, we remain,

Yours very truly,

E. A. ARMSTRONG,
Foreign Individual Service.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 4, 1931.
New York, N. Y.

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

GENTLEMEN: We have your letter of May 1. This company does very little business with the west coast of South America. However, we believe that your service will materially increase our chances of securing business in that part of the world, and we hope that your good work will continue.

We use the Pan American Airways service between this Continent, Cuba, Porto Rico, and the east coast of South America, and we find the service to be very good and reliable.

Yours very truly,

REPUBLIC CREOSOTING CO.
By A. B. CARMICHAEL.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y., April 22, 1931.
New York City.
(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor.)

GENTLEMEN: Answering your letter of April 21, we may state that we have for some time past used your service to South America quite extensively, and this time-saving feature has proved to be of considerable advantage in our business.

We also find that the use of your air-mail service by our connections in South America is steadily gaining ground, especially for the purpose of submitting orders where formerly cablegrams were employed. This naturally has the advantage that in an air mail letter it is possible to incorporate more detailed specifications which the high cost of cabling ordinarily does not allow.

With very best regards, we remain,

Yours very truly,

ROYAL BAKING POWDER CO.,
R. L. POLK,
Assistant Manager Foreign Division.

ST. LOUIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
St. Louis, Mo., May 27, 1931.

Mr. A. J. Michener, Postmaster,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. MICHENER: Thank you for your letter of May 26, inclosing another communication from the Pan American-Grace Airways, Inc. These people are certainly doing a fine piece of work, and we are doing everything possible to encourage our exporters to take advantage of their service.

I hope you will continue to send me suggestions of this kind, so I can bring them to the attention of our members.

Very truly yours,

E. S. WAHLEN,
Director Foreign Trade Bureau.

J. & W. SELIGMAN & CO.,
New York, May 12, 1931.
PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.
(Attention J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

DEAR SIR: We have been sending by air mail for over a year practically all of our letters destined for Latin American countries, and we have found the air mail service, which has been rendered by your company, to be of great assistance to us, and satisfactory in every way. It has enabled us to save considerable cable expense; in fact, we negotiated by air mail one long contract which, had it not been for air mail service, would have had to be negotiated in large part by cable.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP E. BRADLEY.

PHILADELPHIA, November 14, 1930.

Mr. ROBERT H. PATCHIN,
W. R. Grace & Co., New York City.

DEAR MR. PATCHIN: I recently received your letter of November 11 and am pleased to submit additional data supplementary to my previous letter of November 10 relative to the valuable service we have been able to enjoy due to the facilities offered by the Pan American-Grace Airways.

Three weeks ago we were negotiating with a firm in Chile relative to their signing a contract which ran into many thousands of dollars. We were unable to send by cable to the directors of the Chilean house sufficient details to enable them to come to a decision and it was necessary for us to write a letter of considerable length. This letter was mailed in Philadelphia on Saturday, October 25, and within approximately two weeks' time we received from them their air mail reply. Had it been necessary to handle this exchange of correspondence in the ordinary course it would have taken at least six weeks, which would have probably resulted in our losing the opportunity of obtaining the business.

Some months ago various matters of great importance to our interests came up in the Argentine. It was urgent that immediate action be taken and to make this possible we had to forward various legal documents to our representative there. He cabled us the details he needed and we forwarded them by air mail on August 14. They were in his hands by August 21. If it had been necessary to forward these by boat the best we could have done was to send them on the steamer leaving New York, August 22, which arrived in Buenos Aires, September 9. By utilizing the Pan American-Grace Airways we saved 19 days.

The majority of our orders coming from Chile, Uruguay, and Argentina are coming forward by air mail. In most cases we are able to have the goods on the water on the way to the customers before the time that we would have received the order had it been sent by ordinary mail.

The Pan American-Grace Airways service is indeed speeding up the service we can give to customers, facilitating the transaction of business and through this medium of rapid communication is making it possible for us to better protect our interests.

Very truly yours,

SHARP & DOHME,
KERRO KNOX,
Director of Sales.

SANTIAGO, December 22, 1930.

GRACE & CIA.,
Casilla 14-D, Pte., Chile, South America.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 19th of December relative to your air mail services, we are pleased to state that we have to date no complaints to make.

With the desire of cooperating with you, we would be glad to advise you of any deficiency or difficulty noted by us.

Yours very truly,

SINGER SEWING MACHINE CO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 12, 1931.

Mr. WALTER F. BROWN,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It gives us pleasure to report to you that during the past few months we have been using quite extensively the air mail service to Colombia, Peru, and Chile with very satisfactory results.

This service has permitted us to communicate with our agents, traveling representatives, and customers in the above-mentioned South American countries with unusual rapidity, which has been of positive value to us in the development of our foreign business in the territories in question.

Very truly yours,

E. R. SQUIBB & SONS,
E. L. SAENZ,
Export Sales Manager.

STANDARD FRUIT & STEAMSHIP CO.,
New Orleans, May 7, 1931.

Mr. J. D. MacGREGOR,
Vice President and General Manager
Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
New York City.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 1, requesting that we advise you of any especially interesting experience we may have had by reason of the use of your air mail service between the United States and South America:

Nothing of particular interest comes to mind other than the saving in time, which we have found very valuable, and the regularity and dependability of your service.

Should anything particularly interesting in this connection develop in the near future we shall be pleased to advise you of same.

Very truly yours,

F. G. PRAT, Traffic Manager.

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 7, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y.
(Attention Mr. W. M. North.)

GENTLEMEN: Just a few words to advise you that our representatives in Argentina and Chile are using your service regularly, and naturally it saves considerable time.

In our lines we have a wide range of style numbers and specifications which are very difficult to send by cable and, therefore, they are using the air mail exclusively. The traffic department advise that they are using the air mail service regularly for sending of documents so that papers are in the hands of the customer by the time the steamer arrives.

Yours very truly,

THE STANDARD TEXTILE PRODUCTS CO.
E. MAHN, Export Department.

PHILADELPHIA, April 24, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 22d of April has been received, referring to the service maintained by your organization between the United States and Montevideo, Uruguay, since November 30, 1929.

We regret that we have had no experience of any especial interest, which might be of use to you in the strengthening of the service, but we can assure you that we feel there is a real benefit to the development of trade between the United States and the Latin American countries in the time saved through the use of the Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.).

Yours very truly,

JOHN B. STETSON CO.,
W. DAYTON SHELLY,
Treasurer.

NEW YORK, May 25, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York City.
(Attention of Mr. William M. North.)

GENTLEMEN: It is with great pleasure we take this opportunity of congratulating your entire organization on having inaugurated the air mail between this country and the west coast of South America. We find this service is becoming more valuable every week, as our men located in the various cities in Bolivia, Peru, and Chile are becoming accustomed to depending upon the rapid service which was impossible in the past, particularly due to the fact a complete story could not be economically conveyed by cable and consequently it was necessary to delay matters until the regular mail was received.

We feel your service is putting us in a better position to properly develop our business relations with our southern sister republics. There are numerous occasions when matters can be carefully and diplomatically conveyed by air mail which will greatly strengthen the friendship with our valuable clients in the various territories you so completely cover. It is, of course, impossible for us to definitely establish the actual value of this service in dollars and cents; but, on the other hand, there is no question but what this service is extremely valuable to all concerns doing business in South America, and we sincerely hope nothing will interfere with the continuation of the American air mail to and from the west coast of South America.

Thanking you very kindly for the close cooperation you have given us in the past, we remain,

Very truly yours,

TURNER HALSEY EXPORT CORPORATION,
N. S. W. VANDERHOEF, Vice President.

JANUARY 16, 1931.

Re: Pan American-Grace Airways.

Mr. WALTER F. BROWN,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are pleased indeed to take this opportunity to advise you that we have been making use of the above service for quite some time now, particularly on the west coast of South America, both for incoming and outgoing mail.

We have found this service not only very convenient but also reliable, and we take this means of expressing to you our appre-

ciation of the efforts which the United States Post Office is continuously making to improve the means of communication between the United States and Central and South American countries, thereby greatly assisting our American commerce.

Yours very truly,

ULTRAMARES CORPORATION,
Manager West Coast Department.

NEW YORK, May 13, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

GENTLEMEN: We beg to acknowledge receipt of your esteemed favor of April 28, requesting an expression of opinion from us about the air mail service between the United States and South America.

It is very difficult for us to give you at the present time any particular case from which we have derived any special benefits through the use of your service. Generally speaking, however, we have found the service absolutely reliable. Undoubtedly the saving of time, if measured in dollars and cents, would show the advisability of continually using this service. In our line of business we find that it pays to send samples by air mail to certain countries like Argentina, Chile, Colombia, and Ecuador, where the competition is greater, so that the one who has the sample first to show to the customers is able to obtain larger orders.

We are every day using more and more your service for this purpose, as well as for important mail, and it has proven time and again its advantages in the saving of time when time is of prime importance.

Yours truly,

UNITED MERCHANTS & MANUFACTURERS,
EXPORT CORPORATION,
LUIS A. DOMINGUEZ.

THE UNITED STATES PLAYING CARD CO.,
Cincinnati, May 4, 1931.

Mr. J. D. MacGREGOR,
Vice President and General Manager
Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.),
122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MACGREGOR: Your letter of May 1 recalls the interesting days Mrs. Coffin and I traveled in your company in Bolivia and Peru some 16 months ago. I am sorry that I have no particular interesting experiences to report regarding the air mail, which we use freely.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS COFFIN,
Manager Export Department.

UNITED STATES RUBBER EXPORT CO. (LTD.),
New York, January 2, 1931.

POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We have been approached by a representative of the Pan American-Grace Airways (Inc.), who is anxious to have our opinion of the air mail service being rendered by them in both directions between the United States and countries on the west coast of South America. We were also requested by them to give you the benefit of our observations, and we are pleased to state that it quite frequently happens in the conduct of our business it is necessary to avail ourselves of this service.

We have always found same to be an invaluable aid to us in addressing our customers on matters relating to the collection and payment of accounts and also in obtaining remittances in these various countries covering export shipments from New York.

It also happens that at times we are unable to place our shipping documents aboard the cargo steamer before it sails from New York, and in such instances we forward same through the medium of the air mail, as it is necessary to have these shipping documents at destination of the merchandise within a certain time after the unloading of the goods. Otherwise, storage charges accrue and also fines in certain countries, and we are pleased to state that this service has always been found reliable and satisfactory, and we consider that our using this air mail service has resulted in a certain saving to us.

Very truly yours,

Treasurer.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., March 4, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.
(Attention Mr. William M. North.)

GENTLEMEN: Your valued communication of the 19th ultimo received, having come to hand to-day the copy of the air mail map issued by your associate company, Pan American Airways (Inc.).

I assure you that this map is of great value to me, and wish to thank you for your courtesy in the matter. The expeditious service being rendered by your company is indeed quite noticeable and appreciated by those in urgent need of fast and dependable air mail communication with the South American countries.

Thanking you again for your attention, I am,

Very truly yours,

M. RIVERA, Consul of Uruguay.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., May 4, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. J. D. MACGREGOR,
Vice President and General Manager.

GENTLEMEN: We have your letter of May 1 calling attention to the air mail service provided by your line between the United States and Central and South American countries.

We have not had occasion to use this service, and are consequently not in a position to offer any criticism or suggestions.

Yours very truly,

VIRGINIA BRIDGE & IRON Co.,
H. A. DAVIES, Manager.

VALPARAISO, December 27, 1930.

MESSRS. W. E. GRACE & Co.,
Santiago.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 19th instant addressed to our Santiago house, we are pleased to inform you that so far this service has proved satisfactory, as the mail has been in every case duly received and consequently we are very well pleased with this service.

We remain, dear sirs, yours very truly,

WESSEL, DUVAL & Co.,
Depto. Ventas.

WEST INDIA OIL Co.,
New York, November 26, 1930.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Since the inauguration of your air mail service to Central America, Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay, we have availed ourselves regularly of this new means of communication. The results obtained have been most beneficial to our many interests, due to the great saving in time in handling matters of importance which can not be accomplished so economically nor satisfactorily by cable communication or steamer mail, as heretofore.

While our air mail postage bills have been high, we believe that an economy has been realized in the saving of cable expenses which were very high formerly, due to the fact that many matters had to be treated by cable rather than steamer mail, where time was the important factor.

We have especially benefited by the semiweekly service on the west coast of South America, and take this opportunity to express our appreciation of the excellent service your company has maintained in these mail routes.

Very truly yours,

F. B. BIGELOW, Vice President.

WEST INDIA OIL Co.,
Santiago De Chile, Diciembre 27, de 1930.

Señores GRACE Y CIA.,
Santiago.

MUY SEÑORES NUESTROS: Mala a Estados Unidos por avión. Haciendo referencia a su atenta 19 de Diciembre, nos es grato informar a Uds. que a nuestro juicio el servicio de aviación que tienen Uds. establecido entre Chile y los Estados Unidos, es de lo más eficiente y debemos decir a Uds. que ha sobrepasado a las esperanzas que nosotros teníamos sobre un servicio de esta naturaleza. A nuestro juicio, el servicio se esta haciendo con toda regularidad por lo que les congratulamos muy sinceramente.

De Uds. muy attos. y SS. SS.

F. J. BUNIEL,
Sub-Gerente General.

NEW YORK, N. Y., December 12, 1930.

The Hon. WILLIAM F. BROWN,
Postmaster General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: Reports from the members of our organization abroad, as well as from other sources, attach considerable importance and, indeed, increasing importance to the facilities for travel and communication by established air routes—particularly American owned and controlled air routes—in Central and South America. I am informed and convinced that the success and, to some extent, the survival of American business abroad is contingent upon the continuance and further development of air transport in the hands of American interests.

Having been advised that the development of air transport to and in Central and South America has been substantially fostered by the United States Government through the medium of postal contracts, and believing that you must be interested in the value of the services thus far fostered, I am offering you this voluntary testimony of its usefulness to us.

Very truly yours,

L. A. OSBORNE,
President Westinghouse Electric International Co.

WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC INTERNATIONAL Co.,
New York, N. Y., December 12, 1930.

Hon. HIRAM BINGHAM,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BINGHAM: Having been informed that you are interested in the question of American air service to and in Central and South America, I am taking the liberty of addressing you for the purpose of offering testimony to the usefulness and value of that service.

Foreign commerce is, of necessity, of a highly competitive nature. When those European nations, whom we meet in competition abroad, began establishing air routes for passenger and mail service in and to Latin America, many of the representatives of our company, as well as others, were filled with consternation. When, however, American-controlled lines were established to provide facilities for mail and passenger travel between the United States and various points in Central and South America, and when those lines developed and maintained excellence of service, which has since come to be regarded as indispensable, we were encouraged to continue and renew our efforts abroad.

It is my understanding that this air service is, in some degree, fostered by the United States Government through the medium of postal contracts. I feel that those instrumental in bringing this about should be appraised of the effectiveness and usefulness of the service thus far established.

Very truly yours,

L. A. OSBORNE,
President Westinghouse Electric International Co.

WHITNEY NATIONAL BANK,
New Orleans, La., May 5, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y.
(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor.)

DEAR SIR: We have your letter of May 1, and in reply wish to advise that we have been making use of the air mail service between the United States, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay for some time, to the satisfaction of everyone at interest.

We take advantage of the opportunity to request, if you have published any recent schedules in regard to this particular service, that you be good enough to favor us with one or two copies for our information and guidance.

Thanking you, we remain

Yours very truly,

R. R. BASTIAN, Manager.

THE WHITE Co.,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 9, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.
(Attention Mr. William M. North.)

DEAR SIR: With reference to your call upon our office, last week, I wish to confirm the conversation to the effect that we are using your service and so far have obtained absolute satisfaction.

We use special air mail envelopes as well as letterhead paper, so the recipient is automatically notified that the incoming letter has been transported by air mail.

Very truly yours,

G. BOGART BLAKELEY,
Manager New York Export Division.

CHICAGO, May 26, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y.:

(Attention Mr. J. D. MacGregor, vice president and general manager.)

With reference to your letter of May 15, inviting our attention to the use that some mailers are making of the air mail to South America. This is a practice we have made use of ever since the inauguration of air mail service to Central and South America.

Our business in Central and South America is done through 28 agencies and large plants located at Sao Paulo, Brazil, and Buenos Aires, Argentina, and we are making consistent daily use of the air mail to these points. Especially do we use air mail to those points where there has been a very decided slowing up in business.

We are absolutely familiar with this air service operated by your company and are thoroughly satisfied with the results obtained, as it is bringing us in closer contact by from 5 to 15 days than occurs by the ordinary mail of similar service.

We hope to see additional service on the foreign route No. 10 road as soon as the Post Office Department can be induced to make the necessary provision.

We trust this outlines the proposition as requested in your letter.

Very truly yours,

WILSON & Co. (INC.),
A. W. GRUNWALD,
Mail Department.

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 14, 1931.

PAN AMERICAN-GRACE AIRWAYS (INC.),
New York, N. Y.

(Attention Mr. William M. North.)

GENTLEMEN: We take pleasure in advising that we are using the air mail services to all of the South and Central American territories with extremely good results.

We find it very valuable in following up collections and have recently used it in connection with sales follow up, inasmuch as we believe that it will, without question, command more attention than letters sent by ordinary mail.

Yours very truly,

WM. WRIGLEY, JR., Co.,
A. C. BUEELEN,
New York Export Department.

WOODROW WILSON—ADDRESS BY NEWTON D. BAKER

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by former Secretary of War Newton D. Baker, delivered at the tomb of Woodrow Wilson, in Washington Cathedral on April 13, 1932, the birthday of Thomas Jefferson.

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

There are, in every country, places which have come to embody great traditions; their very names sum up epochs and to them succeeding generations repair to touch again, with their spirits, the emblems of great and triumphant faiths. Often such places are significant because they evoke noble personalities and we gather there knowing that we shall not see the face or hear the voice of the great dead, but sure that memory will reassociate our spirits with theirs and revive our flagging faith, as by an emanation from a faith that never failed. We rekindle our spirits with embers from the altars where their ashes lie and in the presence of the reminders of their mortality meditate upon their immortal services to their fellowmen.

An American approaches with reverence the tomb of any man who has held the historic office of President of the United States, for each in his turn recalls a period of struggle and growth, each marks some part of the rising hope with which our country saw its own liberty made more broad and secure, its philosophy of freedom, by subtle adaptations, made more serviceable to the happiness of men everywhere. But among these there are places of especial sanctity, and already St. Albans is moving to take its place with Mount Vernon, Monticello, Nashville, and Springfield, shrines which summon memories of the great ordeals of democracy, met—it seems to us providentially—by great spiritual forces.

It was only yesterday, eight years ago, that we laid all that was mortal of him here to rest. Only 11 years have passed since he laid down the Presidency. We are too near him to measure his place in the great background of history. We are yet too much under the spell of the inspiration he gave us to make detached estimates. His spirit is still mightily at work in the hearts and minds of men; years must show the harvest of his sowing.

But those of us who lived the brave years of Mr. Wilson's public career can not be mistaken in our belief that they were years of tremendous moment; we can not be mistaken in our belief that his spirit dominated our age; and we can set down some testimony as to his vision, his lofty singleness of purpose, and the intrepidity of his spirit which will help to explain, even if it can not undertake to measure, the work he did.

It ought, at the outset, to be noted that Mr. Wilson's political education differed from that of any other man who has come to the Presidency. Almost without any other exception, our Presidents have been men of affairs, taking the world as they found it and occupying themselves in its business according to rules and practices already established. An occasional military figure has slipped into the Presidency without previous political experience, but for the most part they have been men not only of strong political faith but of long-continued partisan allegiance, graduated into the highest position after service in other legislative or executive places, and so imbued with the traditions of their party and allied to the party's working captains. Mr. Wilson, on the other hand, had lived the life of the scholar, breathing the detached air of academic surroundings. He was a party man in the sense that he had a philosopher's appreciation of the fundamental faith upon which his party was founded, a faith only rarely set forth with any fullness in its platforms. His friends and intimates were college professors and college presidents. His career as a student began at the very time when the scientific spirit and the research method were first beginning to be applied in the study of sociology and politics, and throughout his career as a teacher he and his fellows were organized into great associations of scholars who were busy reexamining and often rejecting traditional beliefs and theories in economics and politics and substituting for wise saws and ancient maxims new doctrines and new rules based upon data compiled by observing the phenomena and experience of modern life. Most of his contemporaries in other fields accepted the ancient order without question and were busy gathering in its fruits. He and his academic associates, however, occupied themselves assigning recent occurrences their true place in a great historic order, discovering tendencies and changes by comparisons over great periods of time and questioning whether ancient forms and procedures were elastic enough to contain and direct the boundless new energies which civilization was developing. This gave him the detached point of view of the scholar, prevented him from having any illusions about the mere accumulation of wealth as the measure of enduring success, and, as his own field of scholarship was politics, he was equipped with knowledge and freed from prejudice in that special department of human affairs which was to be the scene of his whole public activity. It is difficult to imagine better training for a man called to leadership at a moment when the old order was changing and when the thing we call modern civilization was at a parting of the ways.

It was noteworthy, too, that while Mr. Wilson's career as a teacher brought him often into contact with groups and organizations of men of affairs, the major part of his life was spent addressing young men not yet caught up in the trammels of convention and tradition, not yet disillusioned by experience, still having the courage to take the long look, the naïveté, if you care

to call it that, to believe in the possibility of improving conditions by conscious personal effort. Now, the happy effect of constant association with the young is to prolong the best part of our own youth. Successful teachers succeed perhaps because they have preserved the curiosity, the candor, and the courage of children. From this field of labor, from these associations, with these intellectual habits, Mr. Wilson went forth for years to various parts of the country making political addresses in which the virtue always present was challenge and from which the vice always absent was complaisance. Up to the time of his election, these addresses, made with increasing frequency and becoming more daring in their directness, show that Mr. Wilson remained consistently loyal to a set of principles historically derived, but that he always remained elastic as to method, in deference to the immense delicacy of the complicated social order in which they were to be applied. In his own mind there was always present a standard by which he tested the soundness and probable success of any program—will it bring young men eagerly trooping about it? He had no faith in policies which merely sought to protect and perpetuate established interests, as he had no faith in a policy which merely sought to attack established interests. His own philosophy was that every question had to be viewed from a democratic standpoint—that is, how does it affect all the people?—and that in attempting to answer that question too much reliance could not be placed in the judgment, however sincere, of those whose own immediate interests were involved in the issue under discussion.

It is possible to pick out from addresses by Mr. Wilson statements upon practically every political and economic question then or now of importance, and in retrospect they seem to have a prescience and validity perhaps not fully appreciated at the time. He declared that the old order was changing; that the political mechanisms devised to maintain popular control had become so complicated that in effect they defeated the very object of their creation; that many of the economic policies which had been at the very base of national legislation for a period of years had exhausted their virtue; that the tariff, once a policy of protection, had become a practice of patronage; that the banking system devised immediately after the Civil War had become obsolete and inadequate; that at the close of the Spanish-American War the United States had entered the family of great nations with international responsibilities and interests, and that thenceforth our life as a people had to be lived in a world which would be ruled either by cooperation or conflict. Thus his mind constantly dwelt in the higher fields of political speculation.

The people seemed to have understood him perfectly, the politicians not at all, and his nomination was not a machine-made product resulting from the traditional mechanisms of party control but one of those reassuring instances, which sometimes happen, when a tide swelling up from the minds of inarticulate people drowns out the noisy gears of mere political machinery. The merely practical politicians, the morning after the Baltimore convention, were in much the same state of mind as their forerunners were after the Chicago convention which nominated Lincoln. They no doubt asked themselves in both cases, "Now that we have this strange and unaccountable person on our hands, what can we do with him," and in both cases the answer was the same. They did nothing with him whatever, but he did everything with them, for both men were leaders with fixed principles, with vision, and with inflexible wills.

The consequence of all this was the instant assertion of a new type of leadership. The newly inaugurated President met the Congress with a program which had the orderly precision of a synopsis for a course of college lectures. He proceeded, step by step, to proposed reconstruction of the economic life of the Nation, and it was a program which did not admit giving the tenth lecture before the fifth. In the accomplishment of these reforms the President invited the cooperation of the Congress. He was not unsympathetic with the difficulties which individual members of Congress experienced from sectional and local feeling and interest, but his own largeness of view and his own courage "comforted the falling." Here at last was a man who was not politically afraid and here also was a man whose capacity for clear speech was unlimited. The White House became the lecture desk and the Princeton class, in the theory of government, became the whole people of the United States. The same sort of clarity and the same sort of candor characterized the President's utterances to the people, and the response from the people was the same sort of comprehension and the same sort of courage. The net result of all this was the passage of a great series of constructive economic measures any one of which would have been impossible under any other kind of leadership, each of which was possible because of his leadership. This is no place to enumerate, much less to appraise, these economic measures. If we can but discern the qualities of character and education in the leadership which made them possible, the whole present purpose will be served.

In like fashion the quality of his leadership is made manifest by a consideration of his attitude toward international questions. There was the same freedom from traditional restraints in his thinking, the same realization of the newness of the age and of the necessity for new procedures and even new principles. Here as in domestic affairs he moved with courage as an attitude and faith as a foundation, but here, too, he brought the scholar's passionate search for truth and the scientist's love of order. In the early days of his first administration he took new and higher ground in the field of our international relations and declined to be dominated by the theories of national interest which, up to that time, were accepted as the basis of national action. In

those early days it is possible to find the seed which later flowered into the doctrine which was his outstanding gift to the future of mankind. This doctrine was a mere application to the actions of nations of the Christian ethic, long accepted as the ideal of individual action, that he who would be greatest among men must achieve that eminence by his service to his fellows.

From Machiavelli down to the most recent times the rules of individual morality were frankly discarded by political philosophers as having no application to the actions of states. The result was an obvious anarchy in the international relations of the world, with secret diplomacy, offensive and defensive alliances, forcible partitions of weak states, and a world armed to the teeth for aggression. The traditional answer to the perils of such a situation was more and more delicate balances of power, but the efficacy of that answer collapsed when a war involving the whole world destroyed not only the lives and fortunes of countless millions of men but destroyed also the frail materialistic philosophy upon which it had been attempted to build a permanent social order. The World War was not only the greatest catastrophe ever brought upon the race by its own folly, but it revealed the fundamental insecurity of any social order built entirely upon force; and if it be true, as it doubtless is true, that the greatest loss the world sustained was its loss of faith, there is at least this comfort to be extracted from it: That the thing we lost faith in was the thing which it had at last become dangerous to believe. This was the supreme challenge of the new era—could it find the basis of a new and better faith.

Fortunately, three years elapsed before the United States was caught up in the universal disaster. During that time we realized that the accident of geography as well as our democratic institutions had set us apart and in some way made us different from other nations, but it was Mr. Wilson who found and stated the fundamental truths involved, and in a great series of messages and addresses he pointed out that our highest mission as a people would be to serve those whose differences from us had brought them to such tragic suffering. For three years he prepared this greatest nation in the modern world for a healing mission. His great hope was that by keeping ourselves free from selfish purpose we might ultimately not only bind up the wounds of the world but teach it a higher and a better way. There is not in the political literature of any people a loftier conception or a nobler hope than he gave us in those years.

Then the war came to us and immense mobilizations of the man power and material and financial resources of the Nation took place. The general attention was diverted from missions of service to fields of battle; the paramount duty of that hour was to create and support our great army overseas, and there was no faltering in the performance by the President of this stern and tragic duty. But the tragedy of the war served only to lengthen the vision and elevate the hope of the man who had become the undisputed leader of the free peoples of the world. There can be no doubt that the added weight of the fresh and fearless army of American youth shifted the balance to the Allied side; there can be no doubt that the financial and industrial strength of America sustained the almost desperate cause of the nations now associated with us who had long borne the brunt of the struggle; but the victory which was won on Armistice Day was, in its more enduring sense, a victory of ideas and ideals. Readjustments will be made in territorial dispositions and men will forget the material gains which resulted from the mere triumph of arms, but the world will never forget the struggle of a nation moved by no selfish purpose and led by a statesman who dared to foresee as the result of the conflict a new world in which the principle of liberty would be safe, the principle of justice established, and conference, arbitration, conciliation, and adjudication substituted in international disputes for the arbitrament of war.

We must not allow ourselves to be dismayed or deceived by the difficulties which faced the peace conference in Paris nor by the solutions of those difficulties, which time is showing to have been inadequate or erroneous. I am one of those who ventures to believe that some day Mr. Wilson's phrase "peace without victory" will be accepted as one of the most profound and righteous wishes ever expressed by him or any other statesman. The conference at Paris demonstrated that the sense of victory does not create a favorable atmosphere for the construction of just and enduring peace. The portions of the treaty of Versailles that were dictated by the spirit of victory are largely the parts of that treaty which still obstruct peace. Nations, like men, have emotions, are sensitive to hurts to their pride, and in moments of passion submerge their better selves. The only sort of peace which can endure must come from a recognition of virtues as springs of national action as well as guides for individual behavior. The future peace of the world can not be secured by processes which attain diplomatic successes and inflict diplomatic defeats, which inflame nations with a sense of aggrandizement or humiliate them with a sense of wounded pride. Mr. Wilson's vision of the modern world made safe rests upon the establishment of peace-time agencies which, working in the open, summon the intelligence and conscience of disinterested peoples to conciliate controversies before they have been fanned into conflagrations. It has been said of Mr. Wilson that he was a dreamer, with this difference, that he made his dreams come true. To a remarkable degree this observation applies to the bold reforms he brought about in our domestic policies and in the start he gave to the kind of institutions necessary to rationalize international relations, but his long vision of a reordere world is too profound and ultimate to be speedily accomplished. It involves a change

in the psychology of the race as well as in the technique of diplomacy, it rests upon a larger diffusion of knowledge and a deeper penetration of culture, it can be accomplished only by slow steps with hesitations and falterings as the nobler ideal encounters obstinate prejudices and arouses historic fears.

To a larger degree than we commonly realize, progress in these matters has been made since the World War; and if there was at one time a disposition to discount the thing called idealism, that disposition has been chastened by our experiences of very recent years, of which all the lessons are not yet clear but which surely seem to vindicate afresh the inadequacy of a purely materialistic foundation for a modern society. These lean and anxious years seem too to show again the completeness with which the life of any modern nation is integrated with that of the nations of the world, a fact which has followed from the growth of international trade and finance, and which, in effect, extends a nation's frontiers beyond its geographical limits until they coincide with its interests in far-flung parts of the world. Implications of the dangers and of the opportunities of this new situation were implicit in Mr. Wilson's vision of the new era and in his realization that the end of the old era had come.

This 13th day of April is the birthday of Thomas Jefferson. I am speaking in the shade of the monument to Woodrow Wilson. Between the lives of these two men, throughout our national history, flows the current of a democratic philosophy, universal in its scope, propounded by the sage of Monticello. From his day until now his philosophy has battled for the dominance of the world. The tide of its advance has sometimes been retarded; here and there it has met the obstacle of new conditions, and has had to readjust itself in periods of doubt and hesitation, but each obstacle has but served to raise the tide and render its ultimate advance the more irresistible. Certain triumphant applications of it have followed each of our temptations to discard it. In the life of Andrew Jackson, as in that of Abraham Lincoln, it received fresh vindications, and in the whole of its great history it has had no more superb statement than from Woodrow Wilson, no other prophet has with greater vision extended its reach.

Again we have fallen upon days of doubt and disillusionment. Again we need the scholar's detachment and the leader's voice. For the moment we can but say to this great soldier, "Sleep on. The army which you led is still advancing, the acceptance of the doctrines you preached is still growing, the ideals you cherished are still vital, and the happier world toward which all of our faces are turned will recognize you as one of the great architects of its hope."

ALABAMA SENATORIAL CONTEST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 199), reported by Mr. GEORGE and Mr. BRATTON from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN H. BANKHEAD is hereby declared to be a duly elected Senator of the United States from the State of Alabama for the term of six years, commencing on the 4th day of March, 1931, and is entitled to a seat as such.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] is entitled to the floor.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Cutting	Jones	Robinson, Ind.
Balley	Dale	Kean	Schall
Bankhead	Dickinson	Kendrick	Sheppard
Barbour	Dill	La Follette	Shipstead
Barkley	Fletcher	Lewis	Shortridge
Bingham	Frazier	Logan	Smith
Black	George	McGill	Smoot
Blaine	Glass	McKellar	Steiwer
Borah	Glenn	McNary	Stephens
Bratton	Gore	Metcalf	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Hale	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Hastings	Neely	Townsend
Bulow	Hatfield	Norbeck	Trammell
Byrnes	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Hebert	Nye	Walcott
Caraway	Howell	Oddie	Watson
Connally	Hull	Pittman	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

I also desire to announce that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is absent by reason of illness.

Mr. GLASS. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is still detained from the Senate in attendance upon the disarmament conference at Geneva.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, it is my intention to discuss the two phases of the Bankhead-Heflin contest separately. First, I wish to address my remarks to the attack which has been made upon the Alabama primary and to the position taken by some of the Senators as to its effect upon the election of a Senator in Alabama. We come before the Senate with that proposition in a strange and peculiar way. The objection is made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] in his minority views, and yet the Senator from Delaware declines to take the position on the floor, in line with what would seem to be the recommendation which he places before the Senate, that it should affect the seating of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Bankhead].

On yesterday, in response to my inquiries, the Senator from Delaware declined to comment at all upon what he thought should be the effect of the alleged illegality of the Alabama primary and as to whether or not it should result in the unseating of the junior Senator from Alabama. We, therefore, must be led to the conclusion that this part of the views of the minority was placed in the Record not because the Senator from Delaware believed that it should result in the unseating of the junior Senator from Alabama, but because the thought possibly occurred to him that there might be some in the Senate to whom this particular argument would appeal. In other words, it is the same proposition that we have heard sometimes with reference to tariff legislation. If the proponents of a certain measure can not obtain the votes by one method, they try another, even if it be necessary to advocate something which personally they do not favor.

Mr. President, the assertion is made that, by reason of the resolution adopted by the Democratic executive committee of Alabama, the primary in that State was void, and that, therefore, no legal right arose in any nominee of that primary to have his name placed upon the ticket. That being conceded by those who present the proposition, since such nominee could not have his name legally placed upon the ticket, it would naturally follow that he could not be legally elected.

In the outset I might state that both the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Bankhead] and myself took a position within the party in Alabama opposed to the particular resolution of the Democratic executive committee. The committee, however, adopted the resolution; every member of that committee who voted for that resolution and submitted himself to the Democrats of Alabama was renominated for his position, and every member of that committee who ran for any other office in Alabama who submitted himself to the Democratic voters of that State was nominated by the Democrats. We therefore start out with the natural assumption that the rule was approved by the Democrats of Alabama.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand the Senator to say that the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Bankhead] opposed the adoption of the resolution adopted by the Democratic State committee?

Mr. BLACK. He did so in an open statement in the press. That was before the resolution was adopted. After the resolution was adopted, the junior Senator from Alabama took the position that the committee had acted, and that he was bound by the resolution. I took the position that it should be tested in the courts. It went to the courts in two cases. The first was in the nature of an injunction against the holding of the primaries, which petition was filed by Judge Horace C. Wilkinson, who is the attorney for the contestant in this case. The Supreme Court of Alabama held in that case that an entire election or primary could not be enjoined by a voter. I assume that every lawyer will readily conclude that when the court took that action it necessarily implied on their part the belief, as was later

demonstrated in the Lett case, that the primary was not wholly void. Of course, if the primary had been wholly void, as has been suggested, then the probability is that the court would have taken another position.

Later another case went to the court, the case of Lett against Dennis. Bear in mind that the question raised was that section 612 of the Alabama Code, as construed by me and as construed by others, meant that the qualifications for voters and the candidates should be the same. A different qualification was set up in the Democratic primary; a different qualification was set up in the Republican primary in Chilton County; there was a variation in the rules provided; but the underlying fundamental principle was in both, the rule in the Alabama Democratic primary being that no candidate could offer for office in that primary without stating that he had voted the Democratic ticket in the last general election or that he had not in the election openly opposed the nominees or candidates on that ticket. Such a qualification was not imposed upon the voters.

The rule as prescribed by the Republican committee of Chilton County provided that a candidate must file a certificate under oath stating whether or not he had supported the Republican Party ticket in the last general election. No such test was imposed upon the voter. So, in each instance, we find that both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party promulgated rules prescribing different tests and qualifications for the candidates of those parties than were imposed upon the voter; in other words, there was a restriction upon the candidates in both parties which was not imposed upon the voters.

The Republican resolution was taken to the Supreme Court of Alabama by a proper legal proceeding, which was mandamus. A man sought to be a candidate and he took the position that a different qualification had been required of him than on the voters, that a more stringent test had been imposed upon him in that he was compelled to swear to something that a voter would not have to swear to in order to enter the primaries. That case, as I recall, was presented by Mr. Arthur B. Chilton, who later appeared in the record here as one of the representatives of the contestant in this case. The supreme court held in that case, as was admitted by Judge Wilkinson, that the political party had an absolute right to fix reasonable qualifications for the voters. It did not go to the extent of determining what was reasonable and what was not reasonable, except to hold that in that case the resolution of the Republican committee was a reasonable regulation, and that it was the uniform rule that parties had the right to exact tests of party loyalty.

That being true, we have an opinion from the Supreme Court of Alabama, which the attorney for the contestant accepted and admitted to be binding in this case, that the Democratic committee acted within its legal right in requiring every candidate in that primary to file a certificate under oath that he had both supported the Democratic ticket and had not openly or publicly opposed the nominees of that party.

So we have advanced this far with the knowledge that in so far as concerned the action of the Democratic committee in excluding Senator Heflin, who could not make the oath, it acted within its legal rights.

That being true, let me also call attention to the fact that it has been all the time insisted upon in this case, in order to reach the conclusion that Senator Bankhead was not the nominee of a legal primary, that the resolution was wholly and completely void. But that can not be, because the Supreme Court of Alabama has held—and I insist that in so far as this case is concerned, the Supreme Court of Alabama is the supreme tribunal of this Nation—that the resolution was not completely void, and that, if it had any effect beyond that which the committee should have provided, it was merely to admit voters into the primary under the resolution who might be automatically barred by section 612.

That being true, let us see what is the result. Let us assume, as the attorney for the contestant insists, that the res-

olution, because it required a certain test for a candidate, automatically applied that test to a voter. What would be the result? If a voter had presented himself to the election managers and clerks and some one had asked, "Did you vote the Democratic ticket in 1928, or did you openly oppose the nominees of the Democratic Party?" and if he declared that he had opposed them, that voter would have been subject to challenge. Assuming, as I stated, that the contention is correct that the barring of the candidate automatically bars the voter, the remedy was by challenging the voters who had been improperly admitted into the primary.

Now, going a step farther, after the courts had acted, the record shows that the contestant in this case—

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves that point?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BRATTON. The effect of the action, if it was illegal, was not to vitiate the primary but to permit persons to vote who otherwise would not have been entitled to vote.

Mr. BLACK. It was to have a provision in the resolution which would permit them to vote; but if the law intervened, and made it illegal for that particular one to vote, then that voter would have been subjected to challenge.

Mr. BRATTON. Of course. The point I made, however, was that the effect of the resolution was to enlarge the right of suffrage beyond the scope permitted by the Alabama law.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. BRATTON. In other words, if merely permitted persons to vote who, under a strict interpretation of the law, if that view is correct, were not entitled to vote.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is absolutely correct. If the construction placed upon the statute by the attorney for the contestant was correct, it would have restricted the voters to those who filed affidavits and sent them to the chairman of the Democratic executive committee that they had not opposed the Democratic nominees in the last primary.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Did I understand the Senator from Alabama to indicate that the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama had really determined the legal proposition involved here?

Mr. BLACK. The Supreme Court of Alabama determined exactly this: I can not answer the Senator with a "yes" or "no," but I will state exactly what was judicially determined. They judicially announced that in so far as the resolution affecting the candidate was concerned, the committee was within its rights. They said that this candidate from Chilton County could not complain if they had gone farther than they should with reference to the voters. That was the holding of the court.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am one of those who entertain the view that the Senate has the right to inquire into the legality of the primary where that primary has to do with the qualifications of the candidate who is asking a seat in this body; and, frankly, the question which disturbs me most in this controversy is whether Senator Bankhead's name was legally upon the ticket by reason of the action which was taken with reference to the question of qualifications. As I see the matter, unless his name was legally upon the ticket, he could not be a candidate; and I hope the Senator will address himself particularly to that matter for the benefit of some of us who are interested in it.

Mr. BLACK. I have sent for the case of Lett against Dennis, which I shall read when it comes, which pointedly holds that section 612 gave to the Democratic committee or to the Republican committee the absolute right to fix the qualifications of the candidates; and it was under a rule of the committee, adopted in line with that, that Senator Bankhead's name was upon the ticket. When I receive the opinion, I shall read it for the benefit of the Senator and

of the Senate. In the meantime, however, until it arrives I will advance one step farther.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question at that juncture?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Was it not conceded by counsel for the contestant that the committee had the power to fix any qualifications for a candidate that the committee desired to fix?

Mr. BLACK. It was conceded by the counsel for the contestant at about seven or eight different places in the record that the committee did act within its rights in fixing the qualifications for its candidates.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I point out to the Senator from Idaho, who made the inquiry, that on page 3 of the report submitted by Senators GEORGE and BRATTON from the Committee on Privileges and Elections I find this statement:

On page 126 of hearings, Part I, counsel for contestant stated in oral argument:

"I have conceded, gentlemen, that the committee may fix any qualifications for a candidate they want to."

May I add that that concession by counsel for Mr. Heflin follows the rule set up in the Lett case.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is correct. I have the Lett case now, and I will call the Senator's attention first to this feature of the resolution:

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BLACK. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Before the Senator starts reading from that case, will he permit a question from me as to his own view?

Mr. BLACK. I stated my views while the Senator was out, and I am stating my views now.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I had reference to what has been published a number of times, Mr. President.

Mr. BLACK. I understand what the Senator has reference to, and I have already stated my view.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. What I am getting at is this: I should like to know from the Senator from Alabama—because I have not heard him say anything about it yet—whether or not the views attributed to him, published in the report submitted by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], are true; whether he took the position that the committee in Alabama had acted beyond any authority that it had in this matter.

Mr. BLACK. If the Senator had been here when I began, he would have heard me make that exact statement.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I was absent. That is the reason why I was asking the Senator now if he would be good enough to reiterate what he said then.

Mr. BLACK. I do not care to reiterate what I said. The Senator can read it in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the Senator take a different position now than that which he took then?

Mr. BLACK. The Senator does not. The Senator has not. The Senator took the same position then that he takes now. He took the same position in the election in Alabama, all over the State, that he takes now.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. I heard what the Senator said this morning. Is not that contrary to the position he took when this resolution was adopted by the Democratic committee in Alabama?

Mr. BLACK. The Senator knows that it is not, if he heard what I said.

Now, Mr. President, going to the subject to which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] referred, in the first place, if the part of the resolution with reference to the voter

failed to include sufficient qualifications, and if it be true that fixing the qualifications for the voter automatically fixed the qualifications for the candidate, then that part of the resolution would have been mere surplusage, because the law would govern. It would not have affected, or according to the decision of the court did not affect, the entire resolution, because the supreme court has held that the committee had an absolute right to fix the qualifications of the candidate, as I shall now read (129 Southern, p. 36):

It is further suggested that under section 612 of the code, the qualification of the voter is automatically fixed the same as the candidate and that the resolution in question is violative thereof. But that section is not in any manner here involved and a consideration of this insistence as to its proper construction unnecessary. Petitioner seeks relief as a candidate and not otherwise. Any matter affecting those not candidates would in no wise alter petitioner's status.

We have concluded the standard of qualification for the candidate is properly and legally fixed by the resolution, and petitioner's argument would but result in an enlargement by operation of law of the qualifications of those not candidates. With this, he is not concerned, and is therefore in no position to question as it would not affect the requirements of the resolution as to himself. His rights are to be determined by the fixed standard as to candidates, and the only statutory provision applicable thereto is section 672 of the code.

In other words, the court held that the resolution prescribing a different qualification did not make the election void, because, if it had made it void, mandamus would not have been a remedy. There would have been no remedy to apply for a void election.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Am I correct in assuming that it is admitted all through the record that this committee had the absolute power to fix the qualifications of the candidates?

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is correct. It was admitted by the attorney for the contestant.

Mr. BORAH. It is also true, is it, that the supreme court decided in this particular case that the committee had the power to fix the qualifications of candidates?

Mr. BLACK. The supreme court decided in the Chilton County case, which I have just read, under the resolution which I defined a few moments ago—

Mr. BORAH. That they had the power to fix the qualifications of candidates?

Mr. BLACK. They did.

Mr. BORAH. The supreme court did not decide what effect the balance of the resolution had upon the voter?

Mr. BLACK. The supreme court said that he was not the proper one to pass upon that.

Mr. BORAH. But it settled the question as to the candidate?

Mr. BLACK. It settled it finally and decisively and is so admitted by the attorney for contestant.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The supreme court in the Lett case held that the candidate could not raise the question as to the effect upon the voter.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is correct.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to read from a part of the decision of the Senate in the contested case of Senator Mayfield, from Texas. The Senate unanimously, as I understand—I may be mistaken; it may not have been a unanimous vote—but I have understood that Mr. Mayfield was unanimously seated.

Mr. ASHURST. He was.

Mr. BLACK. There was a unanimous report of the committee on both sides. In that contest the question was raised that is raised here, and the committee of the Senate decided as follows:

The contestant complained of the law and practice in Texas which prevented any member of a party from voting at a primary election who had not voted, if he voted at all, for the regular party ticket at the last preceding general election.

It was claimed by the contestant that except for this rule Mayfield would not have been nominated at the primary. Similar

regulations are in force in other States, and your committee has no doubt as to the power of a party or of a State to make such regulations if they see fit so to do.

Mr. President, in so far as the Senate is concerned, it will be noted that it has passed upon this exact proposition; but let us advance to the next step.

Considering, now, that the primary was held, is it the duty of the Senate now, even if the primary should have been wholly and thoroughly illegal, to unseat Senator Bankhead because his name was placed upon the ticket from what would be claimed to be an illegal primary?

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. Before the Senator goes into that, I want to get the matter clear in my mind. There is no doubt, as I gather from what the Senator says, that the party committee in Alabama had the power and the right to prescribe qualifications for a candidate in the Democratic primary. There is no doubt about that, is there?

Mr. BLACK. The statute so provided.

Mr. LOGAN. And the Alabama Supreme Court has so held?

Mr. BLACK. It has.

Mr. LOGAN. If that is true, does it not follow, as a matter of course, that Senator Bankhead's name was undoubtedly legally on the primary ballot? There can be no doubt of that, can there?

Mr. BLACK. I think the Senator is absolutely correct about that.

Mr. LOGAN. Then one step farther. The only difficulty that could arise would be that illegal votes were cast in the Alabama primary, under the resolution of the committee?

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LOGAN. Who would have the right to raise the question about that except in a contest over the nomination, by some Democratic voter or some Democratic candidate? Could some one other than a member of the Democratic Party raise that question at all?

Mr. BLACK. It could be just as well raised by Mr. Street, the Republican national committeeman. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LOGAN. Let me ask the Senator this further. If some one who was not eligible as a Democrat under that primary could raise the question, would not a Democratic candidate, after an election, have a right to say that a Republican candidate who obtained his nomination in a Republican primary had illegally obtained his nomination because illegal votes were cast in the Republican primary?

Mr. BLACK. There are probably some voters down in Chilton County, Ala., who might like to raise that question.

Mr. LOGAN. If that be true, would not that leave Mr. Heflin, who was entirely on the outside after that resolution was passed, without any authority to raise any question about the primary, as long as there was a legal primary?

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I want to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question. Of course, if it is admitted that it is a legal primary to start with, everything else followed in accordance with the views expressed by the Senator. But is it the view of the Senator from Kentucky that under section 612 the committee had the power to fix the qualifications of a candidate for the Senate?

Mr. LOGAN. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. BORAH. If they failed to do what they ought to have done with reference to the voter, it is the Senator's contention that that would not affect the legality of the candidacy of the candidate?

Mr. LOGAN. That is exactly my contention. The Senator has correctly stated it.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Before passing to the effect, and before leaving the proposition that this was a lawful resolution, I would like to ask the Senator again whether he made this statement; and if so, whether his present argument does not satisfy any reasonable person that he had changed his mind?

Mr. BLACK. I do not care to go into the question with the Senator, of whether or not I have changed my mind. The Senator can place that in the RECORD. The Supreme Court of Alabama is the supreme court of my State.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the Senator permit me to ask the question—

Mr. BLACK. I will not permit the Senator to read my statement at this time. He will have plenty of time.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not propose to do that.

Mr. BLACK. It has no effect upon the argument that I am making. It is wholly disconnected with it. I have stated my view, and it is in the RECORD, and I do not care to be diverted from the discussion which I am making by something which the Senator wants to put in which is wholly beside the issue.

Mr. HASTINGS. I should like to ask, if the Senator will permit to read one line of it—

Mr. BLACK. I do not yield to the Senator any further. The Senator can talk when I have finished, he and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], to their hearts' content. Evidently, that must be nearly all the Senator from Indiana has read, because he stated yesterday on this floor that the report of the Senator from Delaware showed rottenness and corruption in every precinct in Alabama, and the Senator from Delaware would not back it up when I challenged him to do so on the floor.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BRATTON. Before the Senator leaves the phase of the question he was discussing when the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Idaho addressed certain questions to him, I desire to understand the view of the Senator—and I think his view and mine are in perfect accord. Let us assume that in 1928 there were 300,000 Democrats in Alabama, 200,000 of whom voted the Democratic ticket and 100,000 of whom did not. The effect of the resolution adopted by the committee in 1930 would be to prohibit anyone going on the ticket until he made an affidavit that he supported the nominees of the party in 1928, and if the interpretation of the statute argued by counsel for the contestant is correct, it automatically permitted the 200,000 Democrats who supported the ticket in 1928 to vote in the primary of 1930. It likewise automatically excluded the 100,000 voters who failed to vote the ticket in 1928. But the committee's action merely resulted in permitting the 100,000 voters to participate in the primary. That was the only effect of it. It did not affect the validity of the primary or the qualifications fixed for the candidate but merely resulted in letting persons vote who, under a strict interpretation of the law urged by counsel for contestant, would not have been entitled to vote.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator's contention is that permitting them to vote would not render the primary illegal?

Mr. BRATTON. That is correct. They could be excluded as any other illegal ballot is excluded. That is my view of it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. It seems to me pretty well settled by the law and by the construction of the law placed upon it by the different parties that, so far as the candidate was concerned, the committee had control of his qualifications.

Mr. BRATTON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BORAH. The contention is that the qualifications fixed for the candidate must necessarily be the qualifications of the voter.

Mr. BRATTON. Of the voter.

Mr. BORAH. But if the resolution failed to make the qualification of the candidate the same as that of the voter, or vice versa, the contention of the Senator from New Mexico is that that did not render the primary illegal?

Mr. BRATTON. That is my contention.

Mr. BORAH. And the candidate was still regularly on the ticket?

Mr. BRATTON. And the primary was legal.

Mr. BORAH. And the primary was legal?

Mr. BRATTON. That is my view, and if the committee made a mistake of law which resulted in enlarging the right of suffrage instead of restricting it, it resulted in permitting persons to vote who under a correct interpretation of the law were not entitled to vote.

Mr. BORAH. In other words, even though a man voted for Mr. Hoover in 1928, under this resolution he could have voted in this primary?

Mr. BRATTON. Yes. Under the hypothetical case I stated a while ago 100,000 persons would have been permitted to vote in the primary of 1930 who were not entitled to vote if the construction of the statute contended for by counsel for the contestant is correct.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, advancing to the next step, it is well to call attention to the fact that whatever was the result of the primary, whatever was its effect, after the action had been taken the contestant in this case organized an independent party. That party was organized in Alabama, and he and two State senators were nominated by it, as well as various county candidates.

There was no effort made to prevent placing Senator Bankhead's name upon the ticket in November, because the record shows that the contestant at that time concluded to take his case to the supreme court of the people of Alabama. The courts were open. Every court in Alabama that had jurisdiction was open to consider the case to prevent placing the name of Senator Bankhead upon the ballot. But it was concluded that the case should be taken to the people of Alabama. Senator Bankhead's name was placed upon the ticket without the slightest objection. There was no suit at law started in any court in that State, there was not a murmur heard in any court, but all over the State there reverberated eloquent appeals, not that the courts should declare the primary illegal, but that the people themselves should repudiate the action of the Democratic committee.

Mr. President, it would seem a strange thing, in a country where the people are supposed to rule for it to be held that it is not necessary to go into the courts and exhaust one's legal remedies, but that he can take his chances with the voters, placing a State to the tremendous expense of a statewide election and thereafter overturn the express will of the people as declared in this form of government under which we live.

It is no strange and novel doctrine that the people themselves shall control. It is the doctrine of democracy. It is the uniform law of every State in this American Union that if a man gets his name on a ballot, even though it may have gone to the ballot in an illegal method, and no effort is made to restrain it, and there is a proper legal remedy, that the voice of the people shall prevail.

That is not at all different from the ruling of this body in the two cases from Illinois and Pennsylvania. There is a distinction which is clear to everyone familiar with those cases. The Senate is the judge of the qualifications of its own Members. The adherents of the contestant have examined the State of Alabama from end to end and from center to circumference; they have summoned witnesses; threats have been made, but there has not come into this record any evidence of the unlawful expenditure of money. It is not shown that 25 men or women in Alabama were even offered money for supporting county tickets in 67 counties in that State.

We are presented here with the strange and anomalous situation of a candidate taking his battle to the people and losing before the people and then coming before the Senate of the United States and presenting the claim that after the people have ruled adversely to him he will then go back and retroactively attack a primary which was not attacked when the opportunity was there to mandamus to prevent the name of Senator Bankhead going on the ticket. There is no question but what mandamus was the proper remedy. That was held in the case of Lett against Dennis, and is backed by numerous authorities in every State in this Union.

Mr. President, it is interesting to know that the Senator from Delaware has heretofore taken the position in cases of this kind that the State should be permitted to select its own Senators. I desire to read from a part of a speech made by the Senator from Delaware on December 19, 1929. He said:

But let us pass from this for the moment to a question that is still more dangerous, and that is whether a State shall be permitted to make its own choice of its representation in the Senate or whether it shall be compelled to adopt the ideas and the standards fixed by the Senate itself. I think every man and woman must admit that this ought to be the right of every State in the Union. I believe that everyone believes that the framers of the Constitution of the United States so intended.

One has but to take a glance at the personnel of the Senate, the ideas they represent, and the States from which they come, to realize the necessity of this rule. As an illustration, it would be inconceivable that the people of the State of Pennsylvania would ever elect to the United States Senate a man holding the ideas and preaching the doctrines that are held and preached by the senior Senator from Nebraska. It would, on the other hand, be equally inconceivable to believe that the people of Nebraska would send to the United States Senate a man holding the ideas and preaching the doctrines of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

In the Newberry case Mr. Justice McReynolds, in holding the statute [primary elections] void, stated: "We can not conclude that authority to control party primaries or conventions for designating candidates was bestowed on Congress by the grant of power to regulate the manner of holding elections. The fair intendment of the words does not extend so far. The framers of the Constitution did not ascribe to them any such meaning, nor is this control necessary in order to effectuate the power expressly granted. On the other hand, its exercise would interfere with purely domestic affairs of the State and infringe upon liberties reserved to the people."

It will be observed from this statement of the court's opinion that the Congress in enacting such a law had exceeded its authority and therefore left the matter of nominations in the hands of the State.

Are the States of this Union—

Said the Senator from Delaware—that is, he said it before these horrible irregularities of writing with a pencil instead of a pen projected themselves before his vision—

Are the States of this Union to be put in the position of submitting a questionnaire to the Senate of the United States before it goes to the trouble and expense of electing one of its citizens as a representative in that body?

The average schoolboy would say that when a man presents himself to the Senate with proper credentials, he takes the oath of office regardless of what may have been said about the irregularities of the election, and that having taken the oath of office it takes a two-thirds vote of the Senate to expel him.

In exercising this power [as judge of the election] it becomes the duty of the House of Representatives and of the Senate to act solely in a judicial capacity, separate and distinct from their capacity as legislators. There is no legal appeal.

Mr. President, we have reached the point with reference to the primary. I should like for those who are interested to read in the brief some cases from almost every State in the Union holding the same thing, that if there is a legal remedy to prevent the placing of a name illegally upon the ballot, it must be taken advantage of before the matter is submitted as an issue to the votes of the people. The courts take the position that if one does not let it be decided in that way, then he is depriving the people of the right of franchise. There was one case which originally held to the contrary, but that State abandoned the theory. That was the State of Montana. I have a list here of the States which have so held, as follows: Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, Idaho, Texas, Kansas, Ohio, Montana, Indiana, Michigan, Colorado, Mississippi, Kentucky, South Dakota, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and even in far-off Honolulu—

Ruling Case Law, and Corpus Juris. The rule is universal and it is natural that it should be. Let us picture the situation.

Here is a situation where a man determines or desires to run for a certain office. He sees where another man has been, as he conceives it, illegally placed upon the ticket. Perhaps he conceives that being placed upon the ticket in that way it will give himself an advantage. He knows that the court is open to him, that he can go into court and file a proceeding to enjoin the placing of this name upon the ballot. But instead of doing that he says, "I will take the case to the people and I will carry my message to the people all over my State. Then, after the State has been put to the expense of an election, if the voters decide against me I will go back behind their action and attack the manner in which the name was put upon the ticket."

Strange, indeed, is the committee report which can reach the conclusion that under circumstances like those, when there is nothing to reflect upon the man whose name was placed upon the ticket, that the committee must disregard the views of the people and overrule their wishes merely because of the fact the candidate was willing to submit it to them and take his chances.

Mr. President, let us advance now to the question upon which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] evidently bases his objection. He does not base it upon the primary. He has declined to state on the floor of the Senate that he does base it upon the primary. He bases it upon "shocking violations of law." Let us for a few moments see what are those "shocking violations of law" which have so disturbed the sensibilities of the Senator from Delaware.

In the first place he makes the statement that there were 15.2 per cent of the votes cast in the primary that were illegal. I desire to present to the Senate very briefly the basis for that statement made by the Senator from Delaware that there were 15.2 per cent of the votes illegal. He bases it on this theory: In Alabama a list of qualified voters is made up by the probate judges. That list is published every two years. It is made up in May. The list of the voters on the poll list is furnished to the election managers and clerks at the polls. Frequently there will be a variation in transcribing the thousands of names. A voter's name may be on the poll list as "J. E. Jones." He may be known as "John Jones." They place his name on the poll list as "John Jones." It may be that it is the voter's wife and that her name appears upon the poll list as "Mary Jones." She may be known as "Mrs. J. E. Jones." They write her name as "Mrs. J. E. Jones." The Senator from Delaware and his supervisors have taken out every name where it does not correspond in that way, and they class such names as illegal voters. We have here in the record the lists of the voters from two counties classified by the Senator from Delaware as illegal. I have in my hand a report made by the probate judge of Colbert County. He shows that out of 44 names which have been classed as illegal by the Senator from Delaware, all but three are qualified voters in that county, and he did not take the time to go out and hunt up the particular three.

Let us go to a very striking illustration from Macon County. I desire particularly to invite the attention of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to this illustration. It might be interesting to him. The supervisors appointed by the committee have given us a list of the voters classed as illegal voters in Macon County in the general election in November, 1930. I hope the Senator from Indiana will listen to this illustration. The probate judge has supplied the list. I want to disclose the ridiculousness of the statement of the Senator from Delaware that there were 15.2 per cent of the voters illegal.

Here is a qualified list of Macon County, Ala., which is in the files of the committee. We find in that poll list, for instance, the name of R. R. Moton. He is the head of the Tuskegee Institute. He is well known. He is evidently called "Dr." R. R. Moton in Tuskegee, and so when he voted the election clerk placed his name on the list as

"Dr." R. R. Moton. Here he is on the list and his name can be found here on the list, but the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] has listed R. R. Moton as one of the illegal voters in Alabama merely because his name was written as "Dr." R. R. Moton instead of being written merely as "R. R. Moton."

That is a sample of the 15.2 per cent of illegal votes which the Senator from Delaware has flaunted all over the Nation. The only difference between the name as it appeared on the poll list and on the list of qualified electors is the difference between R. R. Moton and Dr. R. R. Moton.

The record shows that he voted the Democratic ticket in the general election. We find these lists in the files of the committee and I have them here for anyone who desires to see them.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. Certainly.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Did I understand the Senator to state that the voter just named voted in the general election?

Mr. BLACK. Here is his name on the poll list. Yes; he voted.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Did I understand the Senator to say that he voted the Democratic ticket?

Mr. BLACK. The Senator should so understand, according to the record.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. But he was not permitted to participate in the Democratic primary?

Mr. BLACK. Is the Senator objecting to that?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am merely asking if that be not so.

Mr. BLACK. I am asking if the Senator objects to it.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I do, if the Senator insists on knowing my position.

Mr. BLACK. Does not the Senator think the Democrats of Alabama ought to have the right to determine who shall vote in the Democratic primary?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes; but it ought to be understood that the Democrats of Alabama, represented by their committee, would not permit a colored man or woman, though native born, taxpayer, law-abiding, to participate in the Democratic primary, but when it comes to the election they invite and perhaps receive some of their votes. I merely wanted to have it clearly understood in respect to the primary and the general election.

Mr. BLACK. Here is the qualified poll list and here is the report made of these "startling and shocking" illegal voters who have been classed as illegal voters because, perchance, their initials do not conform to the initials on the list or because, perchance, they are put down on the list, as in the case to which I have just invited attention, where the name is written as "Dr. R. R. Moton" instead of "R. R. Moton."

It is interesting at this point to note that although the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] took the position yesterday afternoon that he was basing his charge of illegality largely upon these voters, that he did not attach any particular significance to it some time ago when Senator Bankhead asked if he wanted the evidence procured in Alabama to show that they were not illegal, because it will be found in the majority report on page 11 that the Senator from Delaware made this statement about the so-called illegal votes:

Of course, speaking to the members of the committee, you can readily understand that if Judge Evans's view is adopted [that those temporarily rejected ballots should be counted unless shown to be illegal] by the committee, then in these 10 counties alone it means an investigation of 5,996 votes by outside evidence. Now, as I have observed the count, there has not been a particle of favoritism toward one side or the other with respect to that.

That is the list of voters whom the Senator from Delaware yesterday classified as being illegal.

That is, one side has lost just about as much as the other has lost, and it occurs to me that there are very much more important things here to be determined than that. That alone will cost

both sides a lot of money, and the proposition has been put up to me whether or not that is not a committee expenditure for them to get up that data. As a practical proposition—

Says Senator HASTINGS—

It does not strike me that either side is hurt if they abandon it entirely.

So much for the so-called illegal voters.

Mr. President, let us go a step farther. There were three classes of votes upon which the Senator from Delaware has depended to invalidate this election. He does not claim that there was any fraud in casting those votes; he does not assert that there is a particle of proof of fraud as to those votes; but he is startled and shocked by the irregularities with reference to three things. First, he says the ballots were not properly numbered, and he quotes at length to show that they were not properly numbered. His theory that they were not properly numbered is based upon two propositions: First, that the numbers were written with a pencil instead of a pen, and, secondly, that they were not numbered at all. The ballots which he complains were numbered with a pencil instead of a pen, I think, aggregate 125,000. The others were not numbered at all, and for that reason the Senator from Delaware says that it is shocking and disturbing and nothing can be ascertained about the result.

However, Mr. President, they have had all this time to find out whether or not there was anything wrong with those votes; and they have not presented any evidence that there were any erasures of those pencil marks. No such evidence is cited in the minority views presented by the Senator from Delaware. He is simply found complaining that 125,000 votes had been marked with a pencil. He further says this:

It further appears that out of a total of 2,043 boxes the ballots in only 125 of them were properly numbered. This leaves 1,918 boxes where the ballots were not properly numbered.

There are three inspectors at each polling place. That means that only 375 inspectors in the Alabama election of 1930 complied with the law with respect to the numbering of the ballots. It also appears that 5,754 election inspectors in that election violated this law and subjected themselves to a punishment of a fine of \$500 or 6 months in prison.

In those cases where 128,856 ballots were written with a pencil and 58,000 were not numbered at all, for the crime thus committed the Senator from Delaware is going to send all the election officers to the penitentiary, including the election officers of the contestant in this case.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, is there any dispute about the statement there made being true?

Mr. BLACK. There is a great dispute as to whether or not it is a criminal offense for a man to write down a ballot with a pencil instead of a pen, as the Senator has set forth. The law provides a penalty not where a man does something that is improper but where he willfully does it. Does the Senator think because men are not experts as clerks and are not trained in the law and have not previously served in an election that it would be proper to subject them to fines of millions of dollars merely because they wrote with a pencil instead of a pen?

Mr. HASTINGS. I have expressed no such opinion.

Mr. BLACK. But the Senator has stated here that they subjected themselves because of improper numbering to a \$500 fine of 6 months in jail.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is not that true?

Mr. BLACK. It is not.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the Senator point out why it is not true?

Mr. BLACK. It is not true because I do not construe the statute which the Senator has read as making it a criminal offense for a clerk at an election to use a pencil instead of a pen, unless he does it for fraudulent purposes; and the Senator from Delaware does not charge fraud in his minority views.

Mr. HASTINGS. I have merely stated the facts. I say when the law provides that a ballot shall be numbered in ink and it is numbered in pencil, that that is not complying with the law, and that the man who does it has subjected

himself to the punishment provided under the laws of the State of Alabama.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator has mentioned 128,000 cases in which 10,000 election officers have subjected themselves to a fine of \$500 for 6 months in jail for writing with a pencil instead of a pen; and he lists that as one of the shocking things that have disturbed him about Alabama. The Senator knows that that provision of the law is directory and not mandatory. It has been so held by the courts; it is so expressly set out in the law itself.

Now let us see. The next crime to which the Senator refers is that the election officers folded up the ballots and did not roll them. He divides the crime in this instance into two particular classes. One of them is that they took the ballots and folded them like this [indicating], and he gives the number, mounting up into the thousands, which instead of being rolled, I presume like this [indicating], were folded, and he again calls attention in his report that in each instance where the election officers dared to fold the ballots they subjected themselves to a prison sentence in Alabama and to a fine.

The next thing he says is—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The ballots are supposed to be rolled up and sealed, are they not, so that there can be no duplications?

Mr. BLACK. I have just started to explain there were two classes of alleged crimes. The first class was that the ballots were not rolled, but were folded.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If they are folded it is of course comparatively easy to duplicate the original ballots with dummies that are put in afterwards, or with those that have been prepared in favor of another candidate.

Regarding marking in pencil and in ink, it is so much easier, is it not, to duplicate ballots when the numbers are entered by pencil than with a pen and ink? Is not the whole purpose of the law to prevent any fraud in an election along that line?

Mr. BLACK. Does the Senator know how they are numbered in Indiana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. As I remember, they are numbered in ink.

Mr. BLACK. Does the Senator know that?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is my recollection, but I may be wrong.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator never heard of anybody in Indiana using a pencil?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Without consulting the Indiana statute I can not make a positive statement on this point.

Mr. BLACK. I suggest that the Senator look up the law of his State and see which way it provides. I might also suggest that I was given this morning a statement that in the State of Delaware pencils are used instead of pens. That statement was made and is here on my desk in a hearing held by a Senate committee.

Mr. President, as I started to say, the Senator from Delaware divides this class of crime into two groups, one of which is that the ballots were folded instead of being rolled. It may be that in Indiana the election officers are so expert in performances of that kind that such a circumstance would be very suspicious, but I would say that even in Indiana, in so far as I am concerned, until some evidence was adduced that the act was fraudulent I would be willing to give the benefit of the doubt to the people of the State of Indiana, despite their political history.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. May I inquire whether the Senator from Alabama does not believe that the provision of the law of Alabama which requires that the ballots shall be rolled

and sealed and placed in the boxes immediately after they are counted is not an important one that ought to be recognized and complied with?

Mr. BLACK. It is one of the numerous provisions of the law, and I think, so long as we have nonexperts administering the law, that we will find that some of them will roll ballots and some of them will fold them; some of them will seal the ballots and some of them will not seal them; some of them will write with a pencil and some of them will write with a pen.

I think it is petty and trivial to number up into the thousands and hundreds of thousands such insignificant details in order to mislead the people of the United States into believing that by their mere cumulative effect there is fraud in an election. One might as well go to Delaware and find out how many people are jaywalkers across the streets of the cities of that State, count them up into the thousands, and say, because they are jaywalkers and because they dare to cross streets in places otherwise than those provided by law, that the people of Delaware are a lawless, corrupt, and crooked people. I deny that any such inference could be justly drawn.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that it is not the Delaware law we are discussing but it is the Alabama law, passed by the Alabama Legislature, and this very provision was placed in the law for the protection of the people of Alabama, as I assume, and I assume that it is an important provision. I have asked that particular question, but I think the Senator has not answered it.

Mr. BLACK. I think I have answered it very satisfactorily. I believe it is so important that the code itself has provided that, in the absence of fraud, it amounts to nothing; that, in the absence of fraud, it is simply directory. The effort to convince the people of this Nation that there is fraud in an election merely because 128,000 ballots are written with a pencil, when every ballot is brought here under the eagle eye of the Senator's careful scrutiny and he can not present to the Senate a single, solitary, lone-some instance in which there was fraud, is an outrageous affront to the people of this Nation. There is no evidence in this record that any ballots that were rolled and sealed were broken. The Senator has not reported to the Senate any one single instance where such is the case. I have examined the record and the report. No such contention is made in the report. Where the ballots were rolled and sealed, according to the report, negatively at least, they were all sealed. There is no evidence that they were broken.

There is evidence that the ballot boxes were open, but the Senator himself in his own statement before the committee has stated that he attaches no significance to that and yet, again on the floor of the Senate he repeats the statement as to how many ballot boxes were open. I submit that he does not know how many ballot boxes were open.

I have four different statements from his own report and the reports of his supervisors as to how many ballot boxes were open before they came here. I have, for instance, before me the report taken from the ledger of his committee, which shows that there were 738 sealed and 1,087 unsealed. No statement is made as to the other few hundred, whether they were sealed or not. I find also in the Senator's report, on page 7, the statement that there were 1,618 unsealed and 425 sealed. In the ledger report it is reported there were 1,087 unsealed and 738 sealed. The agents, however, collecting the boxes and who brought them here show that there were 902 sealed when they obtained them. Yet the Senator has listed as one of his striking exhibits the fact, as he says in his report, that only 425 boxes were sealed, when, according to his own ledger report, which we obtained from the sheets, 902 were sealed according to the agents' report.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think the Senator ought to be fair enough to state that in that report I explained the large discrepancy between the two by stating, when my attention was called to it, that one of the cases was when the boxes were examined here, and the seals appeared to be broken; and the explanation was that it must have been done during transit, because the original report showed a less number. I called the attention of the committee to that fact in the report.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, on page 10 of the report of the Senator we find the statement which I am about to read. The Senate heard the discussion yesterday about the boxes being opened and the seals being broken, and that is given as one of the startling and shocking evidences of disregard of law and of fraud. Let us see what the Senator said about it some months ago:

If this was the practice in the elections of Alabama, and that is admitted, then the finding of the seals broken has no particular significance.

In other words, Mr. President, it was the practice to put the certificates in the box; and the law required that they should be opened, and the supreme court has so held, and they were opened, in those instances where the certificates were put in the box; and yet that is listed as one of the startling and shocking evidences of fraud, or the opportunity for fraud. I will say that it seems that to some people the opportunity for fraud is far more corrupt than the actual fraud itself, judging from the votes which have heretofore been cast.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama farther yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. I will ask the Senator whether he thinks the provision of the law requiring that these ballots be placed in the box, and the box sealed and kept by the sheriff for a period of six months after the election, is an important provision that ought to be observed or not?

Mr. BLACK. That they should be sealed and kept? Why, certainly. In the case of the primary, it provides 30 days. The other law provides six months; and they were kept.

The Senator has called attention to the fact that in three counties the ballots were destroyed. They were destroyed after the 30 days had expired; and, in addition to that, the votes in those boxes, according to the returns, show within 1 per cent of the same percentages that are shown in every other county in the State.

The decision of the supreme court justifies the opening of the boxes. The Senator is familiar with that. He heard it read before the committee. There is no question about the right to open the boxes in order to take out the certificates.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think the Senator ought to explain what the situation is in that respect.

Mr. BLACK. I shall be glad to explain it.

Mr. HASTINGS. It is clearly shown in the report just what that situation is.

Mr. BLACK. It is held that where the certificate or the return is put in the box, so that the canvassing board do not have the certificate outside of the box, they can open the box. That is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is not a fair statement of the facts.

Mr. BLACK. I shall be glad to have the Senator amend it.

Mr. HASTINGS. The law distinctly provides for two boxes. The Senator knows that, does he not? One is a returning box and the other is the box in which the votes shall be placed after they are counted. The law distinctly provides that the votes, after they are counted, shall be rolled and sealed and placed in that box, and that box shall be sealed, and placed in the hands of the sheriff, and kept

for six months, and then destroyed without breaking the seal on the box.

The other box that is required is the returning box; and it is the returning box that the court says shall be permitted to be opened in order to ascertain what the result is. The reason why I stated that it becomes unimportant is Senator Bankhead's statement that they have not followed that practice in Alabama for 25 years. They have used one box for all purposes.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is correct. They have not been using two boxes. The people of Alabama have seen fit to use one box. It is a custom which has been in force all these years.

Mr. HASTINGS. But it is not the law.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator has become a great stickler for law. He thinks everything that is written on the books with reference to the details assumes great magnitude, even though there is no fraud connected with it.

Mr. HASTINGS. There must have been some purpose in enacting the law.

Mr. BLACK. The mere fact that a pencil has been used instead of a pen, time and time again, shocks the tender sensibilities of the Senator from Delaware. I suggest that before the Senator goes all the way to Alabama to condemn the voters of that State for using a pencil instead of a pen, his services might be useful at home.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to read from the Mayfield case with reference to irregularities.

The ballots were gathered in the State of Texas through the office of the Sergeant at Arms and were transmitted in sealed pouches by the Post Office Department under lock and key, with every safeguard against possible tampering.

There were many irregularities and discrepancies and clear violations of law in connection with the casting of the ballots.

The Senator knows, and everybody else knows, that there always will be irregularities or discrepancies, unless you are going to hire people with the meticulous gaze of the Senator from Delaware—

As, for example, the laws of Texas provide that the ballots shall be signed by the judge of election.

Thirty thousand two hundred and nine Mayfield ballots were not thus signed.

Fourteen thousand six hundred and nine Peddy ballots were not thus signed.

The law provides that the ballots shall be numbered.

One thousand seven hundred and twenty-three Mayfield ballots were not numbered.

One thousand and twenty-one Peddy ballots were not numbered.

The law provides that the ballots that are cast shall be stamped "voted."

One hundred eighty-seven thousand three hundred and eighty-seven Mayfield ballots were not thus marked.

Ninety-two thousand one hundred and ninety-two Peddy ballots were not thus marked.

In other words, out of 221,000 votes cast for Mayfield, 187,387 were not marked, in violation of the law of the State of Texas; and I presume it would be fit and proper at this time to go back down to Texas and imprison the people who failed to mark and number 187,000 votes in the State of Texas. Ninety-two thousand Peddy ballots were not marked out of 117,000. In other words, when we find irregularities in that case, examined by the full committee, reported on to this body and voted on unanimously, they did not reach the stupendous proportions that have been asserted here in so far as effect is concerned, because the Senator from Delaware, fortunately for the State of Texas, evidently was not the chairman of the committee.

These are illustrations of the irregularities, discrepancies, and violations of law, but no one of them, nor all of them together, in the judgment of your committee, either did or ought to change the result.

That was the law then. It was accepted as the law on both sides of this Chamber by unanimous vote. Why should it be departed from to-day?

Mr. President, the statement has been made that poll taxes were paid in violation of law. The law of Alabama provides, not exactly as stated by the Senator, but that

where the poll tax of one person is paid by another for the purpose of influencing his vote it is illegal.

In two counties of the State the evidence showed that it had been customary for the parties to pay poll taxes—De Kalb County and Franklin County. Both of them are closely contested counties. De Kalb County at the present time is under Republican administration. Franklin County is under Democratic administration. The evidence showed that in both those counties from time to time the parties themselves—at the beginning of the year and before the date expired for the payment of poll taxes—would take up a party collection and pay the poll tax for members of their party. That does not necessarily mean that they had violated the law with reference to influencing votes. The law was intended to prevent an individual from paying the poll tax of another in order to control his vote.

As a matter of fact, the right of suffrage is one which is sacred in this country. Not in all of the States do they have a poll tax at all; but in Alabama it is necessary to pay your poll tax in order to vote.

The Senator wants to condemn the group paying the poll tax by voluntary contributions, long before the election occurs, simply because they happen to assist in paying the poll tax of some who might otherwise be deprived of the right of casting their votes at the ballot box.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama farther yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to read into the RECORD, just at this point, the section that has been referred to.

Mr. BLACK. I shall be glad to have it read.

Mr. HASTINGS (reading):

Sec. 3464. Poll tax paid by another; penalty: Any person who shall pay the poll tax of another, or advance him money for that purpose in order to influence his vote, shall be guilty of bribery, and, upon conviction, shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary for not less than one nor more than five years.

Mr. BLACK. That is exactly what I said the law was—in order to influence his vote.

Mr. HASTINGS. Just a minute. Does the Senator say that it must be for the purpose of influencing his vote?

Mr. BLACK. Unquestionably it must be to influence his vote.

Mr. HASTINGS (reading):

Any person who shall pay the poll tax of another—

Followed by a comma; that is one thing—

or advance him money for that purpose in order to influence his vote—

That is an entirely different matter.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator may think that the court would so hold; but, somehow, I do not believe that in a question where the right of suffrage is involved the court is going to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel in order to send somebody to the penitentiary.

Mr. HASTINGS. May I make this inquiry: Can it be said that a political party pays the poll tax of a person except for the purpose of influencing his vote?

Mr. BLACK. I do not know. They might think they would get his vote; but I imagine they would not always get it. Of course, the practice was most common up in De Kalb County, where the probate judge is a Republican.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRATTON. Does the Senator from Delaware think that if a husband paid the poll tax for his wife he would be subject to prosecution under that statute?

Mr. HASTINGS. I should not think he would be. He might be technically guilty, but I do not suppose he would be prosecuted.

Mr. BRATTON. Let me put it in this way: Does the Senator think that under that statute a husband would be guilty if he paid his wife's poll tax?

Mr. HASTINGS. I say I think under this statute he would be technically guilty, but I do not think anybody would prosecute him.

Mr. BRATTON. Why not?

Mr. HASTINGS. Because of the particular circumstances.

Mr. BRATTON. If we eliminate the element of intent, and the naked payment of a poll tax constitutes an offense, then, of course, a husband would violate the law if he paid his wife's poll tax.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BRATTON. Is that the Senator's view of the law of Alabama?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; absolutely.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, that is in line with the view which would send a man to jail for writing with a pencil instead of a pen, or for folding a ballot instead of rolling it.

Now, let us get down to the facts in this case which show beyond the shadow of a doubt, even though the burden is not on the contestee, that there was no fraud which affected his election.

In the first place, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it was announced in Alabama that there would be watchers of the independent ticket all over the State. It was also announced that these watchers would send in their reports to the county managers, and they in turn would send them to the independent headquarters. Senator Bankhead requested that the committee write to each one of the independent managers and ask if there had been any fraud reported in his county. That request did not come from Senator Heflin, it came from Senator Bankhead, with the request—and the request was made by the committee—that they report to the committee frauds committed in their counties, if there were any frauds, and whether or not the official vote was correct. That letter went to all of them, as I understand it. The list was furnished by the attorney for Senator Heflin. The letter went from the supervisor, Mr. Smith, asking that the managers report any frauds which came to their attention from their watchers. It was also requested that they send in their watchers' certificates to Washington, in order that we might find out whether immediately after the election Heflin and Locke watchers claimed there had been any fraud. The watchers were supposed to certify how many votes were cast.

Senators will find in the minority report in this case, as I recall it on pages 48 to 75, the reports of those watchers, and, strange to say, although the Senator from Delaware said there was ample opportunity for fraud all over Alabama, not a single watcher in a single report from a supporter of the Heflin-Locke ticket has communicated to this body that there was fraud in the election.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Are these watchers to whom the Senator is referring election officials; that is, are they recognized under the laws of Alabama?

Mr. BLACK. They are recognized under the laws of Alabama.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Are they required to make reports to any authority?

Mr. BLACK. They are not required to make reports. They were instructed by Senator Heflin's party to make reports to their headquarters.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Privileges and Elections Committee of the Senate, at the instance of Senator Bankhead, called upon them to state whether they had reported any instance of fraud?

Mr. BLACK. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And there was no instance of fraud reported by them?

Mr. BLACK. We have here the reports from those watchers, in which they send the reports received from their watchers, and they correspond to the official count. Senators will find instance after instance where they have made reports, as appears from pages 48 to 75, where their reports correspond with the official count; they will find others where they said they did not keep their watchers'

reports because of the fact that they corresponded with the official count, the official count was correct, and they threw the reports into the waste-paper basket. Senators will find others who say that they did not keep the reports, that the managers took the reports over the phone, and finding that they corresponded with the official count, they made no notation of them. They will find others who say that they made a report to Judge Wilkinson, the attorney for the contestant. They will find that in the county of Barbour.

In other words, although ample opportunity had been given to the very people who were placed at the polls for the purpose of reporting frauds for the benefit of the independent ticket, although the request went to them all over Alabama, not a single one has supplied a scintilla of evidence on which it can be proven that there were 5 votes improperly counted in Alabama. Yet in the face of that, in the face of reports made, the failure to make reports, the Senator from Delaware wants to set aside the entire election and unseat a United States Senator because in 128,000 instances the election managers and watchers used a pencil instead of a pen and folded ballots instead of rolling them.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is not a true statement.

Mr. BLACK. I think it is.

Mr. HASTINGS. There is no such thing in the report as that. The Senator has just stated that, as far as I was concerned, I wanted the election declared null and void because of the marking of the ballots with a pencil instead of in ink and for failure to roll the ballots.

Mr. BLACK. I can read from the Senator's summary—

Mr. HASTINGS. That is not a fair statement of the report.

Mr. BLACK. I can read from the Senator's summary, in which the Senator gave that as one of the things that made the election bad.

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; but that is not what the Senator has just said. If he had said that that was one of the reasons, he might have been correct; but that is not what he said.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator himself stated in the record that he attached no importance to opening the boxes, and that he attached no importance to the illegal votes, and it leaves nothing in the world upon which to base his report except the ballots as they were numbered, and as they were rolled or folded. There are only four different elements the Senator has submitted to the Senate, one the numbering of the ballots, which includes the pencil and pen matter; one the folding instead of rolling; one opening up of the ballot boxes; and the Senator himself has said he attached no significance to that, and the Senator has said he attached no significance to the illegal votes. That leaves as the sole base upon which he places his case the numbering of the ballots and folding instead of rolling.

What is the numbering of the ballots? He divides it into two parts, one where they wrote with a pencil, one where they did not number at all.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. In part 3 of the record, at page 395, and running over to page 398, there are 52 separate and distinct items in the brief filed by the contestant. In those the Senator will be able to find the charges made in this case.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator made that statement. I am glad he made that statement. It shows just exactly what I have been pointing out to the Senate—that the Senator is not basing his charges on what he found, but he is basing his charges upon the suspicions of the lawyer for the contestant.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that after that was filed there was no answer at all made by the counsel for Mr. Bankhead.

Mr. BLACK. When was it filed?

Mr. HASTINGS. Does not the Senator know?

Mr. BLACK. The day the case was closed, according to my information; and now the Senator comes here and, not basing his case upon his findings, not putting his feet squarely upon the facts in the record, he takes the vague and wild suspicions of the attorney for the contestant and attempts to unseat a Senator of the United States.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. There was a hearing in which these things were set forth, and several days afterwards the committee had another hearing and expected to continue the matter so that the counsel for Senator Bankhead could reply to this argument and to these charges which have been set up, and the reply was that he did not care to make any argument.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is correct. Even though they had been surprised at many things that had been done, and even though they had been surprised at many statements that had been published, counsel for Mr. Bankhead and Mr. Bankhead himself never imagined, even in their wildest flights of imagination, that the Senator from Delaware, instead of basing his case upon the facts adduced in the record, instead of basing his case upon the facts which he found, instead of basing his case upon his own conclusions, would stand here and say, "I fall back now on a brief filed by the attorney for the contestant." But that is the situation. I doubt whether there is a parallel to that in all the history of contests in the Senate or in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, what do we find now? The Senator from Delaware, driven from his own report by the irresistible facts in this case, as his feet are insecurely placed upon the shifting sands of the charges that pencils were used instead of pens, and that the ballots were folded instead of rolled, we find standing on the insecure island of a brief prepared by the attorney for the contestant. No wonder, when the Senator is driven by the irresistible facts from the conclusions which he has reached, that he seeks to base an ouster of a United States Senator upon something a lawyer said in the record.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that these statements in this brief are but very little different from those contained in the report adopted by the minority members of the committee.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, if they are different at all, why does the Senator have to jump from his own report to the lawyer's report?

Mr. HASTINGS. I only called attention to that fact because there was no reply made to it, and I assumed the charges were admitted as facts.

Mr. BLACK. Oh, that is a very adroit method; but, Mr. President, the facts remain the same—that when the Senator is driven from his report, when he knows he can not stand on it, when he knows that justice will not permit him to stand on it because there are no facts there except the petty and insignificant details of writing with a pencil instead of a pen, then he has to go somewhere, and he flies straightway into the arms of the attorney for the contestant for his facts.

Why, if these were the facts on which he relied, did he not put them into his report? If they are in the evidence, why did he not place them in his report, so that they could be answered? Was it assumed that Mr. Bankhead, the Senator who has the seat, would be required on this floor to reply to the vague and imaginary charges of a man who has proven himself capable of imagining all the charges on earth? No, Mr. President; the reason why the Senator flies for help is because there is no safety on the spot where he has planted his feet.

Mr. President, let us see another matter which shows the absurdity of attempting to unseat a United States Senator because of petty, trivial, and insignificant irregularities. When this question of the tightly folded ballots came up, and it was given as a very suspicious circumstance, Senator

Bankhead went to Mr. Smith, the supervisor, and said, "Mr. Smith, give to me the most suspicious of the folded ballots you have. Select those which in your judgment are suspicious, those which have been pointed out to you as positively not carrying out the intention of the voters. Let me have them, and I will get you affidavits. We will see just what the people themselves swear."

Mr. Smith picked him out three lists, from Cherokee County, Marshall County, and Madison County, and gave them to him as the most suspicious of the folded ballots. He gave him the names on those ballots.

There is in the record an affidavit from the voters whose names appeared in that list, and each one of them swears under oath that he voted exactly according to the ballot that is in the suspicious list.

Then Mr. Bankhead asked for some more, and they did not give him any more. He wrote a letter to the Senator from Delaware and said, "Now, if there are any more suspicious foldings, let me have them. Let us have all of them, and we will get affidavits, if we have to get an affidavit from every voter in Alabama."

The law did not put that burden on Mr. Bankhead, but he assumed it, and the Senator from Delaware did not present him a single other ballot, which he said was suspicious.

And yet, Mr. President, driven now from that point because he knows he can not stand on the "folded" instead of "rolled" point, he takes the position that the thing, after all, is whether they folded them or whether they rolled them, and nobody cares for whom they voted.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BLACK. Certainly.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think the Senator is talking about something that is not included in the report, so far as I know. I think that it is not made clear in the report what the committee was driving at, or else the Senator is talking about something I do not know anything about.

Mr. BLACK. I am talking about the letter written to the Senator and the affidavits which appear in the report.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not mean the letter, but what is the particular thing the Senator is emphasizing?

Mr. BLACK. I am emphasizing the affidavits that were secured and which appear on pages 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45, of the minority report, the affidavits of the men and women who swear that they voted exactly as their ballots appeared, as shown by what the Senator is pleased to call "suspiciously folded ballots."

Mr. HASTINGS. I have not referred anywhere so far as I know in the report to suspiciously folded ballots.

Mr. BLACK. If the Senator did not use the word "suspiciously," I accept the correction, but I assume that the Senator thought they were suspicious or he would not have listed them as one of the reasons for overturning the will of the people of Alabama.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the Senator tell me where it is listed so I may get it straight? I do not know where it is listed.

Mr. BLACK. Where what is listed?

Mr. HASTINGS. The part about folding the ballots.

Mr. BLACK. On page 6 of the Senator's report, as I recall. I will read it for the Senator. On page 9 of his report, in the second paragraph, the Senator referred to the loosely folded and tightly folded ballots.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the Senator mean this statement?

Out of the total of 2,043 boxes, in 1,543 of them the ballots were found folded instead of rolled and sealed, and in 576 boxes they were found loose, both of these irregularities frequently occurring in the same box.

Mr. BLACK. That is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not understand what the Senator is talking about with respect to the affidavits.

Mr. BLACK. I will explain to the Senator exactly what it is. Always up to the time of this contest it has been sup-

posed that one of the objects of an election was to find out for whom the people voted. We did not know until this contest that the only important thing is whether the ballots were rolled or folded. So that I assume when the Senator reported that so many of them were folded instead of rolled, he naturally threw some doubt as to the person for whom those people voted.

If that is not true, then, of course, there is no reason to put it in the report at all, because the object of the election is to find out for whom the people voted. Senator Bankhead secured from Mr. Smith a list of those that Mr. Smith thought were the most suspicious and sent that list of ballots down to the three counties I have named. An affidavit was obtained from each one of the voters showing for whom he voted. The affidavits disclosed that they had voted just exactly as was shown in the list. Of course, if the only object of an election is to determine whether the ballots were properly rolled and properly marked with a pen instead of a pencil, then that would not be material, but if the object is to find out for whom they voted, it is fully explained.

Mr. HASTINGS. What is referred to in the report is the failure to roll and seal them. The important thing is that they were not sealed.

Mr. BLACK. That is far more important than it is to show for whom they voted! It seems, according to the contention of the Senator from Delaware, that it is immaterial for whom they voted. Although we sent back there and secured the affidavits of every one of them, yet now the Senator from Delaware, having stepped lightly and fantastically from his own report to the brief of counsel for contestant, comes back now to his report and says the only thing of importance is whether the ballots were folded and sealed. In other words, it is immaterial to determine for whom they voted. I always had the idea up to this time that it was far more important to find out whom the people of the State wanted for their United States Senator than it was to find out whether the clerks and election managers used a pen or pencil or a roll instead of a fold.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I can not get clear in my own mind who this man Smith was who is mentioned.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Harrison W. Smith is the supervisor appointed by the subcommittee to investigate the ballots and conduct the recount.

Mr. President, let us see what is the next proposition. A great deal of talk has been made about the absentee ballots. I want Senators to note this fact. Senator Bankhead was perfectly willing to have a test made of absentee voters in the State. A request was sent out for those who voted absentee ballots to tell how they had voted. Reports were received from 1,005 in 61 counties. There was a total of 4,566 reported. Out of that 4,566 the returns showed that there were 13 who voted for Bankhead where their ballot was marked for Heflin; that there were 14 who voted for Heflin where the ticket was marked for Bankhead. There were 2 who reported they voted for neither, but the ballots were marked for Heflin. There were 4 who reported they voted for neither and the ballots were marked for Bankhead. In other words, a total of 15 votes were changed from Heflin to Bankhead and a total of 18 from Bankhead to Heflin out of 4,566 absentee votes. Yet the charge is made in this report that the perjury committed by those who voted by absentee ballot is shocking.

What is that so-called perjury? The law of Alabama provides that a man who is away from his home at election time—on business, as I recall the law—may be allowed to vote by absentee ballot. The inference is left in the report of the Senator from Delaware that it is necessary for the man to have been continuously abiding directly at the place where he cast the absentee ballot. If that is the law, then I would not be entitled to vote in Alabama, because I have been away from there six or seven months. The chief justice of the Supreme Court of Alabama, who has been in Montgomery, Ala., for a long period of years, has retained his citizenship back in his home county. The same thing

has occurred with reference to various others. People come to Washington, for instance, and secure positions here. Under the laws of our State they are permitted to vote by absentee ballot. But the charge is made here practically that every person of that kind is guilty of the crime of perjury. I deny it and I resent it. Why, Mr. President, it is not true that a man is not entitled to vote in Alabama if he leaves there for a year or two but keeps his citizenship there. That law is as old as any law of the country. Citizenship is determined largely as a matter of intent. That is what is shown by the absentee ballots.

Let us see what next shows absolutely that there was no fraud. Taking it upon the basis that there was no fraud, on the next day after the election the Associated Press report came out, as appears on pages 86 and 87 of the hearings. In the Associated Press reports Senator Bankhead's majority was given as 51,000. It would have been wholly and completely and physically impossible to have framed up 51,000 majority without there being a state-wide conspiracy. It would have been absolutely necessary and essential that the watchers for the independent ticket and the clerks and managers to have participated in it, a thing which is totally unbelievable.

The same thing happened with reference to Jefferson County. The report was made the very next day after the election by the Associated Press. The attorney for the contestant, who is a vigorous, aggressive attorney, lives in Jefferson County. It is the largest county in the State. The contestant's representatives sent to Birmingham, the center of the county, for evidence. They did not bring any witnesses to show that the Associated Press report was wrong. They did not present any witnesses to show that there was anything wrong in Jefferson County, the home of the attorney for the contestant, and yet the Associated Press report came out there the very next day after the election. It was reported there, box by box. There is in the record a list of the election managers and clerks showing those who were for one ticket and those for the other. There were aggressive watchers there in addition to the clerks and the managers who were there for the independent ticket. There were 35,000 votes cast in that county. Mr. Hampton had said something about it, and it will be found in the minority report at page 24. Let us see why that is important.

This is the way Mr. Hampton, the attorney for the contestant, stated it:

Let us assume, as we think we shall be able to prove, that the returns posted did not represent the vote cast on that day. All ballots in the box at that moment would be right there, but the returns posted and given out did not tell the truth about them.

In other words, he charges that they were falsified all over Alabama by a general state-wide conspiracy at the very time they posted the returns on the doors.

Senator GEORGE. Then your theory would be that the election managers just arbitrarily put up those figures and subsequently fixed the boxes so as to correspond with them?

Mr. HAMPTON. Certainly—

That is the attorney for the contestant—

Mr. HAMPTON. Certainly; that is the burden of our contention that the ballots in the boxes were made afterwards to fit the returns, and that this took place at some time during the weeks and months the boxes were in the hands of the Bankhead election officers, broken open in violation of the laws of Alabama.

Of course, the Associated Press and Senator Heflin's watchers could not send any report different from that made by the official returns.

Why could not Senator Heflin send out a different report? His watchers were there. We have the record that they were there. We have their replies and statements from many of them that they were there. Why were they bound to accept the Associated Press return if the returns were false?

Mr. President, it is as conclusive as anything ever could be in a court or before a judicial body. The Associated Press reports were put up there and they were correct. It has been shown they were right at every step in the case. But now the Senator from Delaware, in order to try to unseat a United States Senator, steps nimbly away from the proposition of the legality of the primary, escapes from the propo-

sition of sealed ballot boxes, and plants himself on the brief filed by the attorney for the contestant.

Mr. President, let us see another thing which is conclusive, if there were not another thing in the case. Many Senators will recall the statement made that all that was needed was to get the ballot boxes. It was said that if we got the ballot boxes it would be shown that there was a difference of 100,000 votes. The ballot boxes came. The ballot boxes are here. Under the law the ballot is supposed to be secret, but this law to which my friend from Delaware looks up and before which he bows with such reverence and respect when it refers to writing with a pencil instead of a pen is not now so sacred. He is perfectly willing to have the secrecy of the ballot destroyed, and so there has been published—and I have it here before me now and can give it to Senators if they want it—a tabulated report of the voters in Alabama disclosing how each voted. That was done along about the last of September. The poll list is here; I have it. It is most interesting, and it is conclusive. There was one of these for each county. It takes up the voters beat by beat.

Why was this done? It was done because the attorneys for the contestant said that if they could have the record of how the voters had actually cast their votes they would then be able to investigate and show that there were ballots that had been improperly marked. In other words, he claimed that the ballots had been changed. I read to the Senate a moment ago one of his statements. Here is the picture. He comes before the committee after they have counted the votes. Of course, at first we were told that all it was necessary to do was to count the ballots, and that would show that the election was fraudulent; but when the counting of the ballots corroborated the Associated Press, when it corroborated the official reports, the attorneys for the contestant said, "Well, the ballots have been changed; now give us the list of how the voters voted." There was placed at their disposal last September a list of the voters in Alabama marked to show the ones who had voted for Bankhead and those who had voted for Heflin. They had that list during October, November, December, January, February, March, and April—seven months. That was ample time for discoveries to be made as to whether or not ballots had been changed.

The list was in their possession, and up to this good day the evidence has failed to show even a suspicion that there were more than 5 ballots changed in all the State of Alabama. I have those ballots here. There is considerable question about them. The two that were changed were absentee votes that were taken to the probate office and put on the probate desk and left there. With reference to the other three, there is overwhelming preponderance of evidence that the ballots had not been changed.

A ballot in Cleburne County also was that of an absentee voter. But, bear this in mind: The secrecy of the ballot has been done away with. Here is the list for anyone who desires to see it [exhibiting]. The contestant had it; he had diligent and vigorous counsel. They have had in their possession, for instance, a list showing how every man and woman in Jefferson County voted. It was easy enough for the attorney to go himself or send somebody to see how a voter voted. He could have gone straight to his friends and neighbors, and if this widespread fraud which has been talked about had existed, perhaps the first or second man he saw would have said, "Yes; I was marked for Bankhead, but I voted for Heflin"; but after seven months' time they present to the Senate the puny and insignificant number of five who claimed that their votes had been changed.

The attorneys for the contestant went to Birmingham and took evidence. They had in their possession at that time a list of the voters showing for whom each one voted. It would not have been difficult at all to have gone out and said, "Come in here and state how you voted." Why did they not do that? There is only one answer. You know, Mr. President, and every other person who is within the sound of my voice knows, that if these votes had been improperly marked, the diligent supporters of the inde-

pendents would have secured their names and there would have been affidavits flowing to the Senate investigating committee. They did not get them because the votes were correctly counted. That is the reason they did not get them.

I submit that it is an affront to the intelligence of the Senate to come in here and ask the Senate to set aside an election on the petty and insignificant trivialities that have been set up with reference to folding and rolling ballots and marking with a pencil under circumstances such as these.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to inquire of the Senator about the list to which he has referred. The list is made up, as I understand, from ballots taken out of the ballot boxes?

Mr. BLACK. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. Every ballot is numbered?

Mr. BLACK. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. And the voter's name has a corresponding number?

Mr. BLACK. That is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. So that in looking the ballots over and comparing them with poll lists one would be able to ascertain just who cast each ballot which was examined?

Mr. BLACK. That is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. And the entire State was covered in that way?

Mr. BLACK. The list of voters in the entire State was published with the exception of three counties, where the ballots were destroyed in 30 days, and with the exception of the ballots that were not numbered, which were about 58,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Is there a provision of the law of Alabama which permits that to be done? How did that come about?

Mr. BLACK. It was done because the Senate committee authorized it to be done.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. It was done on application of counsel for the parties in the case. I think Mr. Heflin's counsel asked that it be done. Then the full list was examined, the ballots compared, and the complete list of all the voters was published sometime late last summer. I would not be able to say exactly the date, but perhaps in August.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, permit me to say, for the information of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], that wherever a ballot was cast for Mr. Bankhead a slash was placed in front of the name of the voter, and if the ballot was cast for Mr. Heflin a cross was placed following the name of the voter. So that both sides knew how each ballot was marked, and knew the name of the voter who cast each ballot, thus giving them full information and enabling them to go to Alabama and say to John Jones, for instance, "Your ballot appears to be cast for Bankhead; is that correct?" And so on throughout the State.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I might amplify the matter by reading just why this was done. On page 58, part 1, of the hearings appears this colloquy between Senator HASTINGS and Mr. Hampton, attorney for Senator Heflin:

Mr. HAMPTON. Our third request is:

"That each side be furnished with the numbers (where the ballots are numbered) of ballots marked for the contestant and the contestee."

Senator HASTINGS. The purpose of that, as I understand it, is to give each side an opportunity to check up in any particular district they want to check up in, with the person who cast the ballot—

Note that—

to check up in any particular district they want to check up in, with the person who cast the ballot, to ascertain, for instance,

whether or not he actually cast his vote for Heflin, or whether he cast his vote for Bankhead. Is that correct?

Mr. HAMPTON. That is correct. Our view is that nothing in this contest is perhaps so important as that.

I agree with him in so far as obtaining the truth of the case is concerned there could be nothing more important—

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

Mr. BLACK. Let me finish this, and I will be glad to yield to the Senator.

We have affidavits which we will later present to the committee, when you come to hear the matter, where the voters swear, take their oath that they voted for Senator Heflin—

It will be noticed he said he expected to prove it—

voters whose votes are now in the boxes marked for Bankhead.

Senator WATSON. Do you mean in these 10 counties alone you are talking about?

Senator HASTINGS. Oh, no.

Senator WATSON. I just want to find that out. That involves, then, our going on and opening all the ballot boxes in all the State?

Senator HASTINGS. We are doing that, anyhow.

That is the reason the boxes were opened up.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, I should like to explain to the Senator from Nebraska that the list published does not show how the voter voted so that anyone getting hold of a list outside of the parties interested themselves could ascertain the fact. It does not disclose how persons voted. I thought the Senator from Nebraska would be interested in knowing that. However, we did have a supervisor check the vote and give to the interested parties the confidential information contained, but that was not given to the public. I thought the Senator from Nebraska might be concerned about that point.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not quite understand; perhaps I did not get the explanation which the Senator from Delaware has made.

Mr. HASTINGS. In the first place, there was given the number of the voter and his name. That is all that was published and that is all that appears in print. That does not show how the individual voted.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood the Senator from Alabama to say that—

Mr. BLACK. They were supplied the list; yes.

Mr. NORRIS. There was a slash before the name of one candidate and a cross before the name of the other.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator from Delaware is explaining that the information was not given out to the public, but that there was given to the contestant and the contestee the information with marks in front of the names to show how the individuals had voted.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is what I was interested in having the Senator from Nebraska understand.

Mr. BLACK. That is correct.

Mr. President, at an expense of perhaps more than \$100,000 this contest has gone on up to this time. If there were anything in the world that would be conclusive as to who was elected it would be this list itself [exhibiting], with the names checked off, and with seven months to find out whether or not the voters so listed had been incorrectly counted. Of course we all know that Senator Heflin received practically 100,000 votes, as I recall the figures, in that election. We naturally know, therefore, that he had friends and followers all over the State, and it would have been easy for them to have found out if there had been any widespread fraud.

They have county organizations, and he had the list, so that he could let his supporters know the names of the voters and say, "Find out how these people voted." And here we have the Associated Press report, we have the list of voters marked, given them seven months ago; we have, in addition to that, the statements of their watchers themselves, who were put there charged with the duty, and who found no fraud; and yet it is said here is such a case that the Senate, which is supposed to be impartial and nonpartisan, should stand on the uncertain ground of overturning the will of the

electorate of Alabama merely because the election managers failed to observe the technicalities of the law.

I have in my possession a list of the election officers showing, county by county, how many Senator Heflin had and how many Senator Bankhead had. This list has been checked up according to the ballots here, and we find that of the election inspectors, there being three in each polling place, there were 2,365 for Senator Bankhead and 1,095 for Senator Heflin; not voting 348. As to the clerks, we find 1,217 for Senator Bankhead and 986 for Senator Heflin, and 233 not voting. We find a total of 3,808 inspectors and 2,416 clerks; 62.1 per cent of the inspectors voted for Senator Bankhead and 28.8 per cent for Senator Heflin; while of the clerks there were 50.4 per cent who voted for Senator Bankhead and 40 per cent who voted for Senator Heflin, 9 per cent not voting.

There are two other most significant facts, and then I am through with reference to the evidence.

In the first place, six different kinds of ballots have been referred to. There is the official count, the committee recount, the three counties where the ballots were burned, the boxes reported by the agents as sealed, the unnumbered ballots, and the temporarily rejected ballots. I want to read you the percentages showing how those votes went in each case.

On the official ballot Senator Bankhead received 59.9 per cent and Senator Heflin 40.1 per cent.

On the committee recount Senator Bankhead received 60.11 per cent and Senator Heflin 38.89 per cent.

In the three counties where the ballots were burned Senator Bankhead received 59.65 per cent and Senator Heflin 40.35 per cent.

In the case of the boxes where the agents reported they were sealed there were 59.54 per cent for Bankhead and 40.46 per cent for Heflin.

Of the unnumbered ballots there were 57.5 per cent for Senator Bankhead and 42.95 per cent for Senator Heflin.

Of the temporarily rejected ballots there were 56.44 per cent for Senator Bankhead, and 43.56 per cent for Senator Heflin.

Take any class of the ballots you choose—those that were in the boxes, sealed and locked, those that were in the boxes unlocked, those that were marked with a pencil, those that were marked with a pen, those that were folded and those that were rolled; take them all, and you will find the percentage runs practically uniformly the same through the State.

What is the reply to that? Some one has said, "A state-wide conspiracy." What are you going to do with the more than a thousand election inspectors and practically 2,000 clerks who were out there representing Senator Heflin? Where do they come into the picture on the question of a State-wide conspiracy? With these people there at the polls, loyal to Senator Heflin, watching out for his interests, appointed to represent him, can it be true, can it be thought possible even by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], because they folded instead of rolled, and wrote with a pencil instead of a pen, that they entered into a state-wide conspiracy to defraud Senator Heflin of his seat?

Why, Mr. President, the committee went down to Alabama and took the evidence of witnesses. Every man who took the stand who was a watcher or an election manager or clerk for Senator Heflin was asked the question whether he knew of any fraud. I challenge the record to find where they have given anything on which fraud can be hung. It is not there. We have exhausted every recourse. We have gone to their own election managers and their own clerks. We have gone to their watchers. We have gone to their county managers. It has been shown that some of the reports for the various counties have been sent to Senator Heflin's attorneys, and yet they have not presented to the Senate anything more significant or more important than trivial violations of directory provisions of a statute.

There is one other thing: We have here tally sheets. They were brought up here. They were checked off here by the supervisor. Not only were they checked with refer-

ence to the senatorial election, but they were checked all the way up and down the line for State, county, district, and circuit offices. That was done, as I understand, at the request of Senator Bankhead. These tally sheets were checked against the certificate of result. They tell their own story. If, by the wildest flight of the imagination, it could be conceived that they had taken votes away from Senator Heflin and deprived him of his seat, they took them away from every other officer in the State and every county officer.

Such a thing did not occur. They check just as anyone would know they would check. Everything in this case shows, beyond the peradventure of a doubt, that Senator Bankhead was elected in Alabama by a majority of practically 50,000 votes.

There appears in the hearings, part 2, page 396, the record of what happened in the Republican counties in Alabama. It shows the way they voted both in 1928 and in 1930.

It will be found that in Chilton County Smith received 1,402 votes, Hoover 3,186, Bankhead 1,280, and Heflin 1,768. In other words, it shows that the Republicans in that county, in the main, just did not vote at all.

In Cullman County and in De Kalb County and in St. Clair County and in Winston County the vote likewise is given on page 396 of the hearings, part 2.

In Cullman County Smith received 1,574 votes, Hoover 2,959, Bankhead 2,152, and Heflin 1,947.

In De Kalb County Smith received 3,957 votes, Hoover 5,761, Bankhead 3,958, and Heflin 4,411. Smith had received 3,957, and Bankhead received 3,958. In other words, in De Kalb County Mr. Bankhead received one more vote than Smith had received in 1928, while Senator Heflin received about 1,300 fewer votes than Mr. Hoover had in that county.

Hoover's majority in these five counties was 7,967. The Heflin majority in these five counties was 1,725. The difference in the Hoover and Heflin majorities was 6,242. These were Republican counties, showing that in the main the Republicans just did not vote in that particular case. The election officers were appointed by them.

Mr. President, in so far as I am concerned, I have now covered those features of the charges that have heretofore been made. I take the position that in so far as the law of this case is concerned, it is clear. There can be no shadow of doubt left in the mind of any fair individual who studies this record as to who was elected in Alabama.

Alabama has been charged from this floor, and by public statements made by a Member on this floor, with corruption; and yet the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], who is the chairman of the subcommittee making this unfavorable report, has admitted on the floor that he had no evidence on which to base it. The charge did not fall from his lips, but from the lips of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], that fraud and corruption and rottenness were shown in every precinct in Alabama. I challenge his statement. He has not read the evidence. The evidence is contained in these several volumes; and he could not find any basis for the statement except in a few of the petty little trivialities that are found here.

For instance, the charge was made, and heralded all over the United States, that it had been found that one dead man had been voted; and even after the man had been produced and had testified on the witness stand, another interview was given out by the Senator from Delaware saying that if this man had told the truth he had violated the law. Either he had violated it or the other man had violated it, because, he said, if there were two, one of them was an election manager.

How did the Senator reach that conclusion? Some of the diligent activity which has been supplying him with information has found where a John W. Moore had served as election manager in a precinct in Jefferson County, and straightway the Senator gave to the press a statement that this John W. Moore had violated the law by serving as an election manager in Jefferson County and voting in Shelby. Straightway he received telegrams from the two John W. Moores demanding a public apology. So far as I have seen, that has never been printed; but he did admit before the

committee that he had wired down to the marshal and found out that he was incorrect.

This shows how wrong and how unjust it is to make charges against the people of a State and the election officers of a State when you have not the facts to back them up, but you jump at inferences from a similarity of names.

All through this record they have declared votes illegal. They even set aside the vote of a candidate for the Democratic nomination for governor in the last primary. He happened to be a probate judge of the State, and he had moved from one precinct to another; and in this list of 30,000 so-called illegal votes will be found the name of Judge J. A. Carney of Coffee County, the probate judge who had moved from Elba to Enterprise, and whose name had not been changed on the list. You will find also, in the list of votes that the Senator says are illegal, the probate judge of Shelby County, who had moved from one precinct to another; and when they failed to find his name in the precinct where he voted, they set it aside as an illegal vote. You will find, and I have the case in one record I have here, that the wife of the probate judge of Macon County, Ala., had her ballot set aside as illegal because forsooth they gave her name according to the initials of her husband, and it appeared on the record according to her given name.

That is the kind of "illegal" votes that make up the 30,000 that have been heralded throughout the country as casting reflections upon the election officers in the State of Alabama.

Mr. President, the time is here when the Senate can decide for itself whether it believes that people should sit in the Senate who have been elected or whether they should have their seats taken away from them because of technicalities and the piling up of thousands and thousands of irregularities.

It reminds me of a statement that I read many years ago in Mr. Wigmore's most excellent work on evidence, where he was commenting on the reversal of criminal cases on trivial and technical grounds. He said that the judges of America reminded him of a crowd of African fetish worshippers who were bowing down at the shrine of technicality instead of trying to get to the justice of the case and to try cases upon their merits. He pointed out instances where indictments on serious charges had been quashed in States for the failure to dot an "i," or for leaving out a single letter of a word, and where people have escaped just punishment on account of technicalities like that.

As I have heard presented the petty, trivial, small, trifling, airy charges, running up into the hundreds of thousands, as to whether a person voted with a pencil or with a pen, or whether somebody folded a ballot instead of rolling a ballot, I have thought that Mr. Wigmore, if he were to write another treatise, could refer again to the African fetish worshippers bowing at the shrine of form instead of substance.

There is only one thing for the Senate to decide, and there is only one thing it will decide: Who was elected in Alabama? As it did in the Mayfield case, the Senate will discard these trivialities, it will brush aside these technicalities. Whether the Senator from Delaware wants to do so or not, it will look behind the rolled ballot; it will say, "Who was the choice of the people whose ballots were rolled? Who was the choice of the people whose ballots were folded?" It will not determine finally and base its decision upon whether an Alabama farmer took a fountain pen to the polls to mark the ballots or whether he used the old-fashioned pencil, which the farmer of Alabama knows so well. It will ask, "When this ballot was cast, was it for Heflin or for Bankhead?"

That is the only issue, and I submit, as Senators view this record, measured by everything in the world lawyers can demand as to proof or taken according to the layman's viewpoint, simply upon the fairness and justice and equity of the case, there can be but one result, one irresistible conclusion, and that is that approximately 60 per cent of the voters of Alabama put their cross marks in front of Senator Bankhead's name, and approximately 40 per cent of the

voters of that State put their cross marks in front of Senator Heflin's name, and Alabama claims its right, just as does Delaware, or Illinois, or Indiana, to send a Senator of its own choosing, selected by its own people, to the Senate of the United States.

I can not close my remarks without expressing my gratification that after a long, painstaking, and critical examination, which has been made of the election in Alabama, with all the charges that have been hurled all over the Nation, there has been no evidence of illegal expenditure of money. I am glad to say that with all that has been done, with all the microscopes which have been used, there has not yet been brought to the Senate any evidence which justifies even a reasonable inference that expenditures were corruptly made. Of all the terrible things which can be done the worst in a democracy, in my judgment, is corrupting the electorate of a nation by bribing them with money. There is nothing under the shining sun which, in my judgment, constitutes a more severe crime or can be a more severe indictment against the people than the fact that there is corruption through the unlawful expenditure of money.

Yet, Mr. President, after an examination of more than a year, with a committee that was certainly willing to get everything it could, we come before this body and the spokesman for the minority report does not present a single instance to show that money was corruptly used in the Alabama election.

Mr. President, I close my presentation of this case with the simple statement that Alabama is proud of her record as a State. She takes just pride in the achievements of her sons and of her daughters.

We are proud of the fact that after a thorough and complete examination they find that we have had an election which stands the scrutiny of its critics, and where the man who speaks for the minority must stand and charge our people with no more serious crime than that the nonexpert election managers dared to contravene the laws of this Nation and reach into their pockets and get pencils instead of pens with which to mark the ballots and that some of them folded the ballots when the law has said they must roll them.

I submit the case to the Senate with the sincere hope and with the belief that there can not be secured on the other side of this Chamber votes sufficient to give a partisan flavor to the unseating of a man when it is shown by every particle of proof that John H. Bankhead was elected by a majority of 50,000 of the sovereign voters of a sovereign State.

DEMAND TO WITHDRAW AMERICAN MARINES IN NICARAGUA—PROTEST THE KILLING BY NICARAGUAN SOLDIERS OF THE AMERICAN OFFICERS AND MEN

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I do not rise to participate in the discussion of the Alabama election case, which I understand is to be resumed Monday. I want to congratulate all the Senators who have been discussing it upon what is very evident—a display of energy, industry, and great ability.

Mr. President, I want the privilege of the Senate for a couple of minutes that I might attract attention to what I feel is a great tragedy. In my home, in the village of Highland Park, at the city of Chicago, there are mothers, sisters, little ones, who must record their mourning in tears on the murder of their blood beloved, the United States marines in Nicaragua on yesterday. I beg to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that there can be no justification tendered from any source within the spirit of our Constitution nor the principles of our Government, within the theory for which this America is established, to excuse, far less to justify, the theory upon which this Government has launched these American soldiers and send down to distant foreign lands its young men—the heroic members of its marines, as pledges with their lives as additional security to private bankers, whose money, being lent upon an adventure in that country for excessive interest, under conditions of most exaggerated premiums—and this, our Nation, to lend the lives of its sons as this human pledge for the securing of this money. Thus we risk them where in the conflict they must die and be brought back in coffins to the bemoan-

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 C. 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. Reddellen.
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 Koonz.
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. 5956. 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. Margyette 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. Chice M. Ranbarger.
H. R. 8865. Jane Richards.
H. R. 8866. 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. Emline 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 Tipple.
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. SCHAFER 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. SCHAFER. 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. SCHAFFER. 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. SCHAFFER. 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 see 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. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. 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. SCHAFER].

Mr. SCHAFER. 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

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 official 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: