

2462. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of conference of mayors and other municipal officials of the State of New York, relative to obtaining additional Federal funds for municipal improvements of a permanent nature in behalf of the cities and villages of the State of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2463. By Mr. HESS: Resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, urging the Congress of the United States to adopt an antilynching law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2464. By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Resolution of the Allied Independent Railroad Labor Organizations, western district, opposing the consolidation of shops or the merging of railroads at this time; to the Committee on Labor.

2465. Also, petition of citizens of Minnehaha County, Edmunds County, Beadle County, Yankton County, and various other counties in First Congressional District of South Dakota, opposing radio discrimination; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

2466. By Mr. JAMES: Resolution of the Parent-Teacher Association of Kenton, Mich., advocating and supporting an adequate program of Federal aid for public schools of the United States; to the Committee on Education.

2467. Also, resolution of the board of supervisors, by J. E. Clements, county clerk, L'Anse, Mich., favoring the extension of the Civil Works Administration program beyond February 15, 1934; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2468. Also, petition of William McGlue Post, No. 144, L'Anse, Mich., favoring a naval armory at Hancock, Mich., for the Naval Reserve Division of Hancock, Mich.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2469. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, opposing a Federal tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2470. Also, petition of J. A. Knight, publisher of Madisonville Meteor, Madisonville, Tex., opposing Tugwell bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2471. Also, petition of Roy F. Perry, publisher of the Oakwood Oracle, Oakwood, Tex., opposing the Tugwell bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2472. By Mr. KINZER: Communication from 145 students of Immaculata College, Immaculata, Pa., protesting against the use of the mails for the dissemination of contraceptive information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2473. By Mr. KLOEB: Petition of 8,500 Fourth Ohio District residents, protesting against interference with radio-broadcasts; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

2474. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of the members of the Dayton's Bluff Methodist Episcopal Church of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the increasing of armaments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2475. Also, petition of members of the Central Park Methodist Episcopal Church, of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the increasing of armaments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2476. Also, resolution of the county board, Lake County, Minn., opposing an extension of the present national forest within that county, unless approved by the county board, and requesting an acreage tax upon national forest lands within said county; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2477. Also, resolution of Grand Portage (Minn.) Farmer-Labor Club, urging passage of laws for the payment of an acreage tax of 5 cents per acre on all lands owned by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2478. Also, resolution of Grand Portage (Minn.) Farmer-Labor Club, opposing the application of an individual to build seven dams on the Pigeon River, Minn.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2479. Also, resolution of Grand Portage (Minn.) Farmer-Labor Club, urging completion of Highway No. 61 to the Canadian boundary, through the Grand Portage Reservation; to the Committee on Roads.

2480. Also, resolution of United States 108 Highway Association, asking the passage of Federal appropriations for

highway-construction purposes, and opposing provisions requiring the matching of such funds by the several States; to the Committee on Roads.

2481. Also, resolution of employees of the United States Customs Service, stationed at Ranier, Minn., requesting the favorable consideration of recommendations of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations with reference to restoration of pay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2482. Also, resolution of Minnesota State Department of Conservation, urging restoration of Mud Lake area in Marshall County, Minn., as a wild-game refuge; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2483. Also, petition of Minneapolis Central Labor Union urging that permission be granted Minneapolis to proceed with the metropolitan drainage project under the day-labor system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2484. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Henry Nias, president Lily Tulip Cup Corporation, New York City, opposing certain provisions of the National Securities Exchange Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2485. By Mr. MEAD: Resolution of the New York State Legislature, concerning the importation of hop roots into Oneida County; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2486. By Mr. MONAGHAN of Montana: Petition of Butte Miners Union, No. 1; to the Committee on Labor.

2487. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Carleton C. Green and 960 other citizens of Vermont, protesting against certain interference through censorship of radiobroadcasting; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

2488. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of the Legislature of New Jersey, requesting Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out the provisions of the National Defense Act of 1920 and accompanying legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2489. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Gregory School Parent-Teachers' Associations, urging that action be taken on Senate bill 1944, and endorsing the principles enunciated in the proposed revision of the present Federal Food and Drugs Act in accordance with said Senate bill 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1934

(Legislative day of Tuesday, Feb. 20, 1934)

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

THE JOURNAL

On motion of Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal for the calendar days of February 20 and February 21 was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Copeland	Hayden	Reynolds
Ashurst	Costigan	Hebert	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Bachman	Davis	Kean	Russell
Bailey	Dickinson	Keyes	Schall
Bankhead	Dieterich	La Follette	Sheppard
Barbour	Dill	Logan	Shipstead
Barkley	Duffy	Loneragan	Steiwer
Black	Erickson	Long	Stephens
Bone	Fess	McAdoo	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Fletcher	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Frazier	McKellar	Thompson
Bulkeley	George	McNary	Townsend
Bulow	Gibson	Metcalf	Trammell
Byrd	Glass	Murphy	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Goldsborough	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Gore	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Hale	O'Mahoney	Walcott
Carey	Harrison	Overton	Walsh
Clark	Hastings	Patterson	White
Connally	Hatch	Pittman	
Coolidge	Hatfield	Pope	

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] are detained from the Senate by severe colds.

I desire further to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. MCGILL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. HEBERT. I desire to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7835) to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7835) to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this day it is customary for the United States Senate to have read the Farewell Address of Washington. The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who had been selected to read the Farewell Address, is unable to be present on account of illness. In his absence, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been designated to read the Address.

Mr. O'MAHONEY read the Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States, being not far distant, and the time actually arrived, when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person, who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation, which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped, that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives, which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement, from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice, that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty, or propriety; and am persuaded whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say, that I have with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious, in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services, they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe, that while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment, which is intended to terminate the career of my public life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgement of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honours it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes dubious,—vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging,—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected.—Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete, by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiment; which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all-important to the permanency of your felicity as a People. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of Government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very Liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee, that from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly

and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the Palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of Patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the Independence and Liberty you possess are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the Union of the whole.

The *North*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *South*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *South* in the same intercourse, benefitting by the same Agency of the *North*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *North*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated;—and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted.—The *East*, in a like intercourse with the *West*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications, by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home.—The *West* derives from the *East* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*.—Any other tenure by which the *West* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength, or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in Union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations;—and what is of inestimable value! they must derive from Union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighbouring countries, not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalships alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments and intrigues would stimulate and embitter.—Hence likewise they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to Republican Liberty; in this sense it is, that your Union ought to be con-

sidered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of Patriotic desire.—Is there a doubt, whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere?—Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. 'Tis well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to Union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those, who in any quarter may endeavour to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterising parties by *Geographical* discriminations—*Northern* and *Southern*—*Atlantic* and *Western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence, within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head: they have seen, in the negotiation by the Executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event, throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests in regard to the *Mississippi*: they have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them every thing they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, toward confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the *Union* by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their Brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a Government for the whole is indispensable—No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute, they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a Constitution of Government better calculated than your former for an intimate Union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true Liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their Constitutions of Government.—But the Constitution which at any time exists, 'till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish Government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established Government.

All obstructions to the execution of the Laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the

regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force—to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation, the will of a party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reigns of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government, and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles however specious the pretexts.—One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of the constitution alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions—that experience is the surest standard, by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country—that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change, from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests, in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigour as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty, is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you, the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism.—The disorders and miseries, which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual: and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of Public Liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise People to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the Public Councils and enfeeble the Public Administration. It agitates the Community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another, foments occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the Government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of Liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in Governments of a Monarchical cast, Patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favour, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in Governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched; it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country, should inspire caution, in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power; by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the Guardian of the Public Weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the People, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.—The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable supports.—In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labour to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and Citizens.—The mere Politician, equally with the pious man ought to respect and to cherish them.—A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure; reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

'Tis substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge.—In pro-

portion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible; avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expence, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burthen which we ourselves ought to bear.—The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate.—To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be Revenue: that to have Revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining Revenue which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all Nations, cultivate peace and harmony with all; Religion and Morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great Nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be, that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a Nation with its Virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular Nations, and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The Nation, which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed and bloody contests. The Nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the Government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The Government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of Nations has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one Nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favourite Nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite Nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the Nation making the concessions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties

from whom equal privileges are withheld: And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favourite nation) facility to betray, or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent Patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the Public Councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of Republican Government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it.—Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other.—Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favourite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith.—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off, when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality, we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humour, or caprice?

'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances, with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronising infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favours or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing

and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing, with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them; conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that 'tis folly in one nation to look for disinterested favours from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favours, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favours from nation to nation. 'Tis an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations: But if I may even flatter myself, that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare, by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my Proclamation of the 22d of April 1793 is the index to my Plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your Representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me; uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it, with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe, that according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the Belligerent Powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interests for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavour to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress without interruption, to that degree of strength and consistency, which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error: I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my Country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incom-

petent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man, who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow Citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favourite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labours, and dangers.

G. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES, 17th September, 1796.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS—PURCHASE AND SALE OF ARMY SUPPLIES

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege. It has been drawn to my attention that certain newspapers today are carrying a story in connection with the current grand jury investigation of the purchase and sale of Army supplies, to the effect that I was one of three Senators who interested themselves in the affairs of one Joseph Silverman, who, I am informed, has been barred from further negotiations with the War Department in the matter of surplus Army supplies, and whose activities in the past are now under the scrutiny of the grand jury.

I desire to place in the RECORD certain correspondence directed to Hon. Harry H. Woodring, Assistant Secretary of War, to which, so far as my files show, no reply was ever made, and such other memoranda as comprise my entire file in this whole connection. I do this that any Member of Congress, Government official, newspaperman, or citizen may read my complete file on the subject.

The facts in the case, as I recall them, are as follows: About a year ago, Mr. Silverman came to my office in the Senate Office Building, and representing himself, as was the case, as being a citizen of New Jersey and one of my constituents, said that he was interested in the sale of certain materials to the Army and Civilian Conservation Corps. I treated the incident in the same manner, and as a matter of office routine, as I have done in countless other instances where constituents have come to me as their representative in the United States Senate, to seek information of various officials, or otherwise help them in a purely routine way.

I personally had no dealings with Mr. Silverman or anyone else, nor, in the personal sense, the slightest interest, directly or indirectly, in either Mr. Silverman or his undertakings.

The following is a copy of a letter written by me, under date of January 15, 1934, to Hon. Harry H. Woodring, Assistant Secretary of War, inquiring for information with respect to the negotiations between the office of the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, the office of the Assistant Secretary of War, and the Breecot Co., New York City, this letter having been written upon the request of the said Joseph Silverman:

JANUARY 15, 1934.

HON. HARRY H. WOODRING,
Assistant Secretary of War,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am advised that early in October of 1933 negotiations were entered into between the Office of the Director of the C.C.C., the Office of the Assistant Secretary of War, and the Breecot Co., of New York City, for the acquisition by the War Department, for the use of the C.C.C. of approximately 700,000 pieces of unused wool underwear originally purchased from the United States Government.

Numerous conferences, I am advised, were held and the Breecot Co. finally agreed to sell back the War Department the above-mentioned quantity of underwear, at the price of 15½ cents per garment, provided the War Department additionally sold the Breecot Co. other miscellaneous items of surplus, or to be made surplus, materials such as saddles, horse and mule covers, horse brushes, canteens, etc.

The Breecot Co. signed a contract early in December and since that time it states that no further action has been taken by the Government, and the company reports that it is unable to get any additional information.

I would be very grateful indeed, if you would advise me the present status of this deal, and the impediment existing therein, if any, particularly in view of the apparent savings to the Govern-

ment if the transaction was consummated as contemplated. I also understand that underwear has been and is being purchased by the Army for use by the C.C.C. at a cost considerably greater than that offered by the Breecot Co.

Awaiting your advices, and with kindest regards,
Most sincerely,

The following is a copy of a letter written by me under date of January 15, 1934, to Hon. Harry H. Woodring, Assistant Secretary of War, with reference to the announced policy by the Army in connection with the repurchase of materials previously sold by them:

JANUARY 15, 1934.

HON. HARRY H. WOODRING,
Assistant Secretary of War,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Last spring, in the midst of the rush for the purchase of clothing and other supplies for the Civilian Conservation Corps by the Army, a policy was announced to the effect that the Army would not repurchase materials previously sold by them for use of the C.C.C. This, apparently, in spite of the fact that similar materials still in the warehouses of the Army were being issued to troops and enrolled members of the C.C.C.

I would be grateful, indeed, if you would advise me the premise upon which this policy was instituted and why the policy should be continued, and wherein the advantage to the Government lies, through the pursuit of this policy?

With kindest regards, sincerely yours,

The following is a copy of a letter, left in my office, which I was informed by Mr. Silverman was sent by Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, United States Senator, to Assistant Secretary Woodring on this same subject, under date of January 11, 1934:

JANUARY 11, 1934.

HON. HARRY H. WOODRING,
Assistant Secretary of War,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am advised there is a matter pending in your department with reference to a suggested purchase of wool underwear from the firm of J. Silverman in New York City. In view of the tremendous difference in price at which this lot of underwear is purchasable from the above firm, as compared to what the Army is now paying for similar materials, I would request that the War Department give to this particular matter very serious consideration.

I am informed that purchase of underwear from the Silverman Co. would save the Government at least \$750,000, and if there is any reason whatsoever why this enormous saving should not be made for the Government, I should like to be advised with reasons clearly set out.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator.

The two following memoranda were left in my office by Mr. Silverman on January 15, 1934, with the suggestion by Mr. Silverman that they might be of assistance in explaining the technical points involved:

Memorandum for:

Last spring, in the midst of the precipitate rush for the purchase of clothing and other supplies for the C.C.C. by the Army, a policy was suddenly announced to the effect that the Army would not repurchase materials previously sold by them for use of the C.C.C.

This in spite of the fact that similar materials still in the warehouses of the Army were being issued to troops and enrolled members of the C.C.C.

The adoption of this policy on only four transactions in which our firm was interested has to date cost the Government a loss of at least \$3,000,000. There is no reason for a continuation of this policy, which is plainly detrimental to the interest of the Government and the public policy, and I would request that proper steps be taken to cause the discontinuance thereof.

Very truly yours,

Memorandum for:

Early in October 1933, negotiations were entered into between the office of the Director of the C.C.C., the office of the Assistant Secretary of War, and ourselves for the acquisition by the War Department, for use of the C.C.C., of approximately 700,000 pieces of unused wool underwear originally purchased from the United States Government.

Numerous conferences were held, and finally we agreed to sell back to the War Department the above-mentioned quantity of underwear at the price of 15% cents per garment, providing the War Department would additionally sell us other miscellaneous items of surplus or to be made surplus materials, such as saddles, horse and mule covers, horse brushes, canteens, etc.

We signed a contract early in December, and since that time absolutely no further action has taken place, and we are unable to get any additional information.

We would request that you ascertain from the Assistant Secretary of War, the Honorable H. H. Woodring, the present status of this deal and the impediment existing therein, if any, and if the answer is unsatisfactory we would request that this matter be made the subject of an investigation by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, in order that the full facts may be ascertained.

For your information, underwear has been and is being purchased by the Army for use of the C.C.C., and the average price for similar garments such as we are offering, but of inferior specifications, is approximately \$1.15 per garment. In view of the enormous saving reflected herein (approximately \$750,000), we are at a loss to understand such actions or lack of action on the part of the War Department.

We are attaching hereto copy of letter from Senator ROYAL COPELAND, written when this negotiation was originally entered into.
THE BREECOT CO.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

For the past several weeks I have observed through the columns of the local newspapers, and innumerable others throughout the country, considerable publicity relative to an investigation which is now being made by the Federal grand jury of the District of Columbia relative to certain purchases or proposed purchases by the War Department.

I am informed that during the course of this investigation one official of the Government made the assertion, in connection with a gentleman by the name of Silverman, that three Members of this body had directed communications to him interceding in behalf of Mr. Silverman.

I desire to say at this time that I am one of the Members of this body who availed himself of the opportunity of directing an inquiry to an official of the War Department.

Some weeks ago I was informed that a purchase was about to be made pertaining to equipment and supplies for the War Department. At that particular time I was informed that the Government was about to be occasioned to make an expenditure of \$750,000 which it should not make, because, according to the contentions of those with whom I conversed, a saving of \$750,000 could be made. As a consequence thereof, being a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I became interested, because I was desirous of being instrumental, or at least helpful, in saving the Government \$750,000, if something of that sort could be accomplished.

As a result thereof, I was very pleased at the time and am now glad to be able to say that on January 11, 1934, I directed to Hon. H. H. Woodring, Assistant Secretary of War, the following letter:

JANUARY 11, 1934.

HON. HARRY H. WOODRING,
Assistant Secretary of War, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am advised there is a matter pending in your Department with reference to a suggested purchase of wool underwear from the firm of J. Silverman, in New York City. In view of the tremendous difference in price at which this lot of underwear is purchasable from the above firm as compared to what the Army is now paying for similar materials, I would request that the War Department give to this particular matter very serious consideration.

I am informed that purchase of underwear from the Silverman Co. would save the Government at least \$750,000; and if there is any reason whatsoever why this enormous saving should not be made for the Government, I should like to be advised, with reasons clearly set out.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator.

FIELD-SERVICE POSITIONS UNDER FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 132 (agreed to Jan. 23, 1934), a statement showing the number of persons employed in the field service in each salary grade, segregated by States, together with the names and addresses of all persons receiving in excess of \$2,000 per annum in each State, which, with the accompanying statement, was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of Hilda Phelps Hammond, for and on behalf of the Women's Committee of Louisiana, praying for a prompt investigation of charges preferred by her on behalf of said Women's Committee of Louisiana against Mr. Long and Mr.

OVERTON, Senators from Louisiana, and also with reference to the employment of counsel and other matters, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas presented a letter from Herman Dierks, Kansas City, Mo., relative to section 115 of the revenue act, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Tipton, Kans., praying for the passage of legislation to require packers to buy hogs through open, competitive terminal markets, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Jewell County, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called "Frazier farm refinancing bill", which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Hutchinson and Lyons, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Tugwell bill", to prevent the manufacture, shipment, or sale of adulterated or misbranded food and drugs, and to prevent the false advertisement of such commodities, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition signed by patients of the Veterans' Hospital, Wichita, Kans., praying for the passage of the bill (H.R. 1) to provide for controlled expansion of the currency and the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Harper County, Centerville, Garrison, and Olsburg, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called "four-point" legislative program of the American Legion, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2139. An act for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co. (Rept. No. 347); and

S. 2554. An act for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 348).

Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 2796) to authorize payments for the purchase of, or to reimburse States or local levee districts for the cost of, levee rights-of-way for flood-control work in the Mississippi Valley, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 349) thereon.

Mr. STEPHENS, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (H.J.Res. 207) requiring agricultural products to be shipped in vessels of the United States where the Reconstruction Finance Corporation finances the exporting of such products, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 350) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2835. An act to amend section 21 of the act approved June 5, 1920, entitled "An act to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and to provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes", as applied to the Virgin Islands of the United States (Rept. No. 351); and

H.R. 7205. An act to provide for the care and transportation of seamen from shipwrecked fishing and whaling vessels (Rept. No. 352).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2860) to amend Public Act No. 81 of the Seventy-third Congress, relating to the sale of timber on Indian land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

A bill (S. 2861) for the relief of Eddie B. Black; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2862) granting an increase of pension to Leonidas O. Hollis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY:

A bill (S. 2863) for the relief of Don C. Fees; and

A bill (S. 2864) for the relief of Weymouth Kirkland and Robert N. Golding; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 2865) for the relief of certain officers of the Dental Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

A bill (S. 2866) granting a pension to Barbara Oertel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

A bill (S. 2867) authorizing loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation direct to individuals, partnerships, associations, and corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 2868) to remove inequities in the law governing eligibility for promotion to the position of chief clerk in the Railway Mail Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 2869) for the relief of the counties of Haywood and Swain in the State of North Carolina by reason of their loss in taxable valuation by the establishment of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2870) to require the publication of reports of condition of State member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

A bill (S. 2871) giving jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the Cherokee Fuel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON and Mr. CLARK:

A bill (S. 2872) for the relief of Marie Louise Belanger; and

A bill (S. 2873) for the relief of Stella D. Wickersham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER and Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 2874) authorizing the submission of an alternate budget for the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2875) for the relief of Margoth Olsen von Struve (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HATCH (by request):

A bill (S. 2876) to provide for the transfer of national-forest lands to the Zuni Reservation, N.Mex., exchanges, and consolidation of holdings; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

INCLUSION OF SUGAR BEETS AND SUGAR CANE AS BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2732) to include sugar beets and sugarcane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO STATE, JUSTICE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HARRISON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,750, to be immediately available, for continuing the survey of the fishes and fisheries in the State of Mississippi, heretofore undertaken by the State game and fish commission in cooperation with the Bureau of Fisheries, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7513, the State and Justice, etc., appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

On February 19, 1934:

S. 2152. An act granting certain property to the State of Michigan for institutional purposes.

On February 20, 1934:

S. 248. An act for the relief of Rolando B. Moffett;

S. 381. An act for the relief of Samson Davis;

S. 727. An act for the relief of Francis N. Dominick;

S. 1659. An act to authorize an increase in the number of directors of the Washington Home for Foundlings;

S. 2053. An act for the relief of Capt. P. L. Worrall, Finance Department, United States Army; and

S. 2552. An act for the relief of Charles C. Bennett.

On February 21, 1934:

S. 860. An act for the relief of George W. Edgerly.

FIELD-SERVICE POSITIONS UNDER FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, in compliance with the provisions of Senate Resolution 132, there has been sent, and I have in my hand, a statement as to the field personnel of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which I ask to have printed as a public document, and in connection therewith some statistical data which I have prepared, which show that the lowest cost per single loan is \$11, in the State of Washington, and that the highest cost per single loan is \$368, in the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator the purpose of having this matter printed as a public document?

Mr. DICKINSON. Numerous requests have been made for information as to this personnel, and the statement has been sent in compliance with a Senate resolution. Having it printed as a public document is the only way I know of by which we can get the information in such shape that it may be distributed.

Mr. FLETCHER. Why not have it referred to the Committee on Printing, and let them look into it? We have no way of knowing what it is going to cost, or anything about it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that he have the matter referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. DICKINSON. I have no objection to that being done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The data will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

PRESERVATION OF PRESENT SUPREME COURT CHAMBER

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, in relation to the resolution providing for the preservation in its present condition of the room now occupied by the Supreme Court of the United States, I submit a letter from Mr. Charles Warren, an eminent attorney residing in Washington, D.C., containing interesting information concerning the present Supreme Court room and the room just below it occupied by the Court prior to its entering into the room now used.

This letter also communicates to me excerpts from a speech by Vice President John C. Breckinridge, on January 4, 1859, in the old Senate Chamber, now the Supreme Court room, describing the glorious events associated with the Chamber.

This is a matter of genuine historical interest, and I ask that the letter and the excerpts from the speech referred to be printed in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 20, 1934.

HON. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ROBINSON: I am greatly interested in the passage of the resolution introduced by you relating to the preservation of the Supreme Court room. The room, as it now stands, is structurally the same as it was when the Senate occupied it from 1819 to 1859, with only two exceptions: (1) There is a false flooring now in existence which covers the old flooring of the Senate room which was arranged in tiers of seats; (2) an iron

gallery which extended around the back of the room has been removed since the Senate left the room in 1859. Otherwise, the room exists practically as it was from 1819 to 1859.

From 1800 to 1809 the Senate occupied the room below the present Supreme Court room, which is occupied by the library of the Supreme Court and which room then extended up through two stories. In 1809 a flooring was constructed at the level of the present concealed flooring, and from 1809 to 1814 the Senate occupied the room now occupied by the Supreme Court, until the Capitol was burned by the British in 1814. After reconstruction it again occupied the same room from 1819 to 1859. You will find some details as to this in my the Supreme Court in United States History (1922) vol. I, pp. 456-460.

On January 4, 1859, when the Senate moved into its present Senate room in the then new wing of the Capitol, an interesting ceremony took place before the Senate left the old Chamber, at which Vice President John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, and the senior Senator John J. Crittenden, of Kentucky, delivered addresses strikingly portraying the historic association of the old room. I enclose extracts from these speeches, which appear in the Congressional Globe of January 4, 1859. The historical association has been increased in the 75 years which have elapsed since 1859, and make it even more desirable to preserve the room.

Cordially yours,

CHARLES WARREN.

SPEECH OF VICE PRESIDENT JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE, JANUARY 4, 1859, IN THE OLD SENATE CHAMBER

* * * The Senate is assembled for the last time in this Chamber. Henceforth, it will be converted to other use; yet it must remain forever connected with great events, and sacred to the memories of the departed orators and statesmen who here engaged in high debates and shaped the policy of their country. Hereafter, the American and the stranger, as they wander through the Capitol, will turn with instinctive reverence to view the spot on which so many and great materials have accumulated for history. They will recall the images of the great and good, whose renown is the common property of the Union; and chiefly, perhaps, they will linger around the seats once occupied by the mighty three, whose name and fame, associated in life, death has not been able to sever; illustrious men, who in their generation sometimes divided, sometimes led, and sometimes resisted public opinion—for they were of that higher class of statesmen who seek the right and follow their convictions.

There sat Calhoun, the Senator, inflexible, austere, oppressed, but not overwhelmed by his deep sense of the importance of his public functions, seeking the truth, then fearlessly following it—a man whose unsparing intellect compelled all his emotions to harmonize with the deductions of his rigorous logic, and whose noble countenance habitually wore the expression of one engaged in the performance of high public duties.

This was Webster's seat. He, too, was every inch a Senator. Conscious of his own vast powers, he reposed with confidence in himself; and scorning the contrivances of smaller men, he stood among his peers all the greater for the simple dignity of his senatorial demeanor. Type of his northern home, he rises before the imagination, in the grand and granite outline of his form and intellect, like a great New England rock, repelling a New England wave. As a writer, his productions will be cherished by statesmen and scholars where the English tongue is spoken. As a senatorial orator, his great efforts were historically associated with this Chamber, whose very air seems yet to vibrate beneath the strokes of his deep tones and his weighty words.

On the outer circle sat Henry Clay, with his impetuous and ardent nature, untamed by age, and exhibiting in the Senate the same vehement patriotism and passionate eloquence that of yore electrified the House of Representatives and the country. His extraordinary personal endowments, his courage, all his noble qualities, invested him with an individuality and a charm of character which, in any age, would have made him a favorite of history. He loved his country above all earthly objects. He loved liberty in all countries. Illustrious man!—orator, patriot, philanthropist, whose light, at its meridian, was seen and felt in the remotest parts of the civilized world, and whose declining sun, as it hastened down the west, threw back its level beams in hues of mellowed splendor, to illuminate and cheer the land he loved and served so well.

* * * Fortunate will be the American statesman who in this age, or in succeeding times, shall contribute to invest the new hall to which we go with historic memories like these which cluster here.

SPEECH OF SENATOR JOHN J. CRITTENDEN, JANUARY 4, 1859, IN THE OLD SENATE CHAMBER

* * * We cannot quit this Chamber without some feeling of sacred sadness. This Chamber has been the scene of great events. Here questions of American constitutions and laws have been debated; questions of peace and war have been debated and decided; questions of empire have occupied the attention of this assemblage in times past; this was the grand theater upon which these things have been enacted. They give a sort of consecrated character to this Hall. Sir, great men have been the actors here. The illustrious dead that have distinguished this body in times past naturally rise to our view on such an occasion. I speak only of what I have seen, and but partially of that, when I say that here, within these walls, I have seen men whose fame is not surpassed by anything of Grecian or Roman name. I have seen Clay

and Webster, and Calhoun and Benton, and Leigh and Wright, and Clayton (last, though not least) mingling together in this body at one time, and uniting their counsels for the benefit of their country. They seem to our imagination and sensibilities, on such an occasion as this, to have left their impress on these very walls; and this majestic dome seems almost yet to echo with the voice of their eloquence. This Hall seems to be a local habitation for their names. This Hall is full of the pure odor of their justly earned fame. There are others besides those I have named, of whom I will not speak, because they have not yet closed their careers, not yet ended their services to the country; and they will receive their reward hereafter. There are a host of others I might mention—they deserve to be mentioned—but it would take too long. Their names are in no danger of being forgotten nor their services unthought of or unhonored.

* * * Because we leave this Chamber we shall not leave behind us any sentiment of patriotism, any devotion to the country which the illustrious exemplars that have gone before us have set to us. These, like our household goods, will be carried with us; and we, the representatives of the States of this mighty Union, will be found always equal, I trust, to the exigencies of any time that may come upon the country. No matter under what sky we may sit, no matter what dome may cover us, the great patriotic spirit of the Senate of the United States will be there; and I have an abiding confidence that it will never fail in the performance of its duty, sit where it may, even though it were in a desert.

WATCHTOWER RADIO PROGRAM

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, in this morning's mail there came to my office, by actual count, 270 letters on one subject in the form of a protest and petition.

After signing the attached petition, which purports to have been signed by several thousand persons and sent to Congress, each signer has, upon request, written to his Senator relative to keeping on the air what is known as "the watchtower religious program." These 270 letters, written in almost identically the same language upon the request of the watchtower program officials, have, as I say, been received in the last mail.

I simply desire to make the statement, after looking over the letters, that they apparently refer to a withdrawal of permission to certain people to continue broadcasting from certain radio stations. The signers of the letters and petition are asking for favorable consideration of some legislation that has been introduced in the House.

In lieu of answering all of these communications, I want to say publicly, for the press and for my correspondents, that I will give consideration to this proposed legislation now pending in the House when it comes to the Senate. However, at this time I do not know just what the purport of the legislation is.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SALARY LEVELS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial in the Government Standard of February 16, 1934, entitled "Establishment of Salary Levels." This article shows the great variation in the methods used to determine an equitable means of fixing salaries.

I have said once before on this floor that cost-of-living statistics are not a sufficient criterion upon which to base wages. While this battle for wage restorations is being carried through on many fronts, there are intolerable conditions connected with the problem which should not be endured. I refer to the 12-hour shift required of graduate nurses and male attendants in Gallinger Hospital. The employment of 10 additional graduate nurses and 30 more orderlies would remedy this condition and make possible an 8-hour shift. This is a reasonable request, and one which is in accord with every theory and ideal of good business and government. There is no just reason why these hospital workers, particularly women graduate nurses, should be required to work on a 12-hour shift at Gallinger Hospital when the 8-hour shift is in effect at St. Elizabeths Hospital. With the large number of nurses who are unemployed, and with the burdens consequent to their profession which are heavy upon nurses in line of duty, there is every reason why some immediate adjustment should be made of this matter.

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

[From the Government Standard, Washington, D.C., Feb. 16, 1934]

ESTABLISHMENT OF SALARY LEVELS

Salary levels of Government personnel are fixed by four entirely different methods.

A study was made in September 1933 as to the 536,274 employees in the executive service. This study showed that the salaries of 271,095, or approximately 48 percent, are set by specifically controlling acts of Congress. This group includes positions in the Post Office Department in the field, many in the Customs Service, and many in other similar services where definite salary schedules are set up by act of Congress for specific positions.

The salaries of 47,361, or approximately 8 percent, are fixed by the Classification Act, which requires that the salaries depend on the duties performed in certain grades set up by the Classification Act applying to positions in the District of Columbia.

The salaries of 196,606, or approximately 34 percent, are fixed by administrative officers without restriction, except that they are instructed to make the salaries accord insofar as practicable with salaries fixed in the Classification Act. These are field-service positions not covered by specific legislation.

The salaries of 51,212, or approximately 9 percent, are fixed by decisions of wage or labor boards after study of prevailing wages in the vicinity. These are field positions.

All of the above methods of fixing salaries were frozen by the original economy legislation.

Two of the major objectives of this organization are to remove the salary freeze for the Classification Act group, as well as for all other groups, and to have the Classification Act extended to the third group, in which salaries were fixed by administrative action.

The second item of the program is necessitated by the fact that administrative officers in order to make good records have maintained salary levels for positions, over which they have supreme jurisdiction, at low levels and not consistent with each other. The whole problem of the extension of the Classification Act to the field service is a matter affecting the third group.

The American Federation of Government Employees does not desire to have the Classification Act extended either to the group of positions of which salaries are fixed by specific act of Congress or to the positions of which the salaries are fixed by wage and labor boards.

It may be said in general that the Classification Act salaries are lower than the salaries specifically fixed by statute or by wage boards but higher than the salaries fixed by administrative officers.

For the group 2 positions the American Federation of Government Employees demands a return to Classification Act salary levels. This requires the salary to depend on the duties performed. This will entail the repeal of section 22 (f) of the independent offices appropriation bill for 1935.

It also demands the inclusion of group 3 (salaries fixed by administrative officers), within the operations of the Classification Act, in order that these salaries may be uniform and nondiscriminatory.

NATIONAL OLD-AGE PENSIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH

Mr. COOLIDGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on National Old-Age Pensions delivered over the Yankee Radio Network, Wednesday, February 7, by my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

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

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I am grateful for the opportunity accorded me to present my views on one of the most humane and compelling social problems of our day.

Here in Washington we are in the process of creating new social and economic relationships and controls in recognition of the breakdown and failure of the old order of rugged individualism, unrestrained competition, and survival of the fittest.

We have embraced, under the inspiring leadership of President Roosevelt, a new social philosophy.

He has given us a new conception of government and a clearer perception of the obligations of society as a whole to its individual members.

Relief of unemployment—permanent relief—by so ordering our productive processes, industrial and agrarian, as well as provide opportunity to work for every man and woman able and willing to work, is a paramount objective of the new deal. Ways and means of attaining this end—a job at a living wage for every worker—are now being devised. Their complete success cannot yet be foretold with certainty. But if not by one means then by another, succeed we must and will.

But providing work for those able to work is not half the battle. What about those who through age and infirmity are unable to work and who are without means of support? Society owes them not mere charity but justice. Society must provide for such of its numbers as cannot provide for themselves, not as a matter of favor but as a matter of duty. The validity of such an obligation is beyond dispute. It is incontestable. And this obligation, resting upon society in the collective sense, in the final analysis rests upon the Government as the instrumentation of society.

This new conception of government, which recognizes the need for a national elimination of child labor, a national minimum wage law and regulation of working conditions, a national system of providing work for the unemployed instead of charity, and a national plan for saving the homes and the farms of the distressed toilers, must logically also recognize the need for a comprehensive plan of old-age security.

The number of aged dependents in the United States is not known with exactness. The most conservative estimates I have

seen give a figure of upward of 2,000,000 persons over 65 years of age partly or wholly dependent for support on other individuals or upon public and private agencies of relief. This number represents about one third of the aged population of the Nation.

What an anomaly—the more prosperous the country the harder becomes the lot of old age. Prosperity is for the youthful and vigorous. Twenty years ago living was far easier for men and women who had passed the age of 60 than it is today. There were more opportunities in proportion to population for the older members of the community and a stronger recognition of their value as citizens and workers. That was the era before the youth of both sexes began to dominate so many branches of industry. The ties between parents and children were stronger. The father and mother remained the heads of the family as long as they lived, and they were recognized as such. No man or woman was too old for work until he became actually incapacitated.

The rush of modern civilization and revolution in industrial and business methods changed all this. Now most young families need everything they earn to make both ends meet. Young people earning their own living consider themselves set free from family obligations. The father and mother are soon pushed into the background. Estrangement and even bitterness results in homes where old persons are forced upon the young. Business demands speed, enthusiasm, youth—not that those in advanced life are less efficient, but because this is a youthful age.

It is an ironical state of affairs when medical science and vigorous methods of enforcing proper living conditions have added 10 years to the life of the average person in the past half century, and yet, economic conditions have subtracted more than that from the working life of an able-bodied man. What good does it do to prolong the lives of men and women only to cut them off from means of livelihood? Industry tends more and more to throw them out at the age of 50, while science is busily engaged in giving them more years to live—in misery.

Our Government will soon be spending a billion dollars a year on pensions, disability pay, hospitalization, and other aid for former soldiers. No one has begrudged the expenditure of huge sums for this purpose. We are all agreed that men who enlisted for war should be taken care of if in need. But how about those who have faithfully served the Government in time of peace, by contributing through their labor to the wealth of the country, by attending to their duties as citizens and raising children to add to the man power of the Nation? Are they not entitled to consideration and to assistance? A bread line for the aged, whose only impediment is that they are the victims of faultless infirmity and poverty is unthinkable.

It has been sometimes contended that old-age pensions discourage thrift. This objection assumes that independence in old age is a matter of choice and that saving is a mere matter of will power. Dependence or independence in old age hinges upon whether or not the worker has dependents, receives a wage large enough to permit saving, and a period of employment long enough to accumulate a reserve fund, as well as the length of life after retirement from toil.

Millions of men and women in the United States do not receive a sufficient wage to allow for reasonably comfortable or even decent living, and there is no margin to cover the emergencies of sickness, accident, or periods of unemployment. Millions who do not receive a saving wage while working cannot, because of modern industry's demand for clear eyes and a steady hand to guide its machinery, lay by enough for old age before they are discarded for younger employees.

Everyone likes to think he is generous. So do nations. We Americans boast that we are the most humanitarian people in the world. Perhaps we are. At any rate, we are wont to point to our post-war relief to the starving of Europe, our quick response to foreign famine funds, our private philanthropies and benefactions, which are much larger than those of other nations, and more recently to the enormous sums poured out of the treasuries of our government—Federal, State, and municipal—for unemployment relief as evidence of our generosity and our humanitarianism. Yet in the face of all this, the United States stands today as the only industrial nation which, in a national and governmental sense, has done little or nothing to make old age more secure.

Forty-one foreign nations have old-age protection in one form or another on a national basis.

Twenty-six States of the Union now have old-age pension laws of one kind or another. An awakened social consciousness, coupled with the increasing social necessity of dealing with an increasingly acute social problem, has brought rapid progress in recent years in the direction of State aid for the aged and infirm and dependent members of society.

The objective which we are seeking is well stated in few words in the title of the California State law: "An act to provide protection, welfare, and assistance to aged persons in need."

In my advocacy of this principle there is nothing new. I have believed in it ever since I entered public life 25 years ago. I have publicly favored it at every opportunity.

The almshouse idea is 300 years old. It began in Queen Elizabeth's reign in England. It is time we put the ancient, heartless, and expensive almshouse out of business. And we are rapidly doing so. But we must do more than abolish the poorhouse, and must do more than charity—public or private. We must abolish the fear of poverty and the fear of old age, the fear of potter's field. The strong must sustain those whom our modern industrial life have made weak. The young must sustain the old, who have added through their toil to the comforts of life for those who take

up the tasks they are forced through age to surrender. That means that society collectively must sustain those not able to sustain themselves. Old-age pensions established on a national basis are an indispensable agency to that end—not charity, but justice. The pension system will not remove the necessity of taking care of old people who are ill either in hospitals or homes.

Let me, from my personal experience, illustrate the need and benefits of an old-age pension system. When a schoolboy living in a factory town in Massachusetts, the first pennies I earned came to me from what now seems an humble task, but what was to me at the time a proud privilege, namely, carrying the dinner box at noon, between school sessions, to neighbors employed in one of the industrial plants in my community.

Adjoining my home lived a family of working people typical of millions of industrial builders of America. The family consisted of father, mother, and three daughters, all of whom were in the full enjoyment of robust health, with every prospect of a life of independence and comfort.

Years have rapidly passed since I first knew this family and was privileged, for a mere pittance, to carry to the mill gate every day of the year the home-prepared meal for the women family bread-earners. The father and then the mother died. Sickness and one unavoidable misfortune after another visited the family. Eventually death reduced the group to two maiden ladies. A small tenement in due time was substituted for the family homestead. For more than 40 years I have seen these two women face the cold blasts of winter and the burning heat of summer, as they daily trod from home to factory and from factory to home. The bloom of youth has faded from their cheeks, and the once strong, womanly frames have become distorted and broken from the exactions of constant, unceasing bending over the machines that were grinding out dividends for their employers.

Entrance into public life removed me from intimate knowledge of their lot in recent years. Imagine my surprise in receiving a personal visit from them 2 years ago. One had now passed four score years, the other a few years younger. For years the factory gate had been closed to them. Fear of destitution had constantly shadowed them. The money which they saved and expected to care for them in the latter years of their life and to bury them had dwindled, and their purse was now empty. Their only transgression was that of having lived too long. Had death visited them 5 or 10 years earlier, the funds they possessed would have given them the respectable burial that every honest toiler merits, as the least of his compensations for a life of labor and sacrifice.

Their visit vividly portrayed to me a scene that could be duplicated 10,000 times in the lives of the toiling class of America. Words cannot describe the satisfaction and pleasure that it gave me to turn to the treasury of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and ask, that these noble women be given the benefits of recently enacted old-age pension legislation.

Their joy in escaping the poorhouse and being relieved from a life of mendicancy was indescribable. A rebirth of hope and courage took possession of them. Tonight they are in their comfortable little home, perhaps listening to me, happy and content in the knowledge that they are not forgotten and abandoned.

I never realized before that aristocracy found lodgment with poverty, for these ladies have so providently and wisely managed their small weekly old-age allowance, that in the midst of poverty they are at heart real aristocrats.

Let me plead with you, my radio listeners, that we shall not cease from mental strife and political agitation until the episode I have described finds all self-provident, aged persons in America enjoying the realization that they will not be discarded, like obsolete machinery, after a life of toil, of service, and sacrifice.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, on February 14 of this year the able senior Senator from New York, Dr. ROYAL S. COPELAND, delivered a most able address to the alumni of the College of Pharmacy at the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Temple University at Philadelphia, Pa.

The address of the Senator is indeed profound and timely. It was delivered before a group of scientific men whose professional efficiency and integrity have a marked bearing upon the destiny of every human being beneath our flag and who must at some time in their lives rely upon this knowledge, character, and skill.

The Senator's discourse on this occasion plainly indicated man's responsibility to his fellow men, and it pointed the way to a better present and future protective citizenship. The Senator issues a most timely warning, substantiated with facts, that should have the thoughtful deliberation of those who lead and undertake to chart a course for the destiny of mankind.

The success of the efforts of these leaders can be measured from a scientific point of view by the weakest individual in the human chain; he represents the underlying and controlling unit in their efforts to achieve progress.

The success or failure of these scientific efforts are so well portrayed in Senator COPELAND's address upon this occasion

that it is worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there to be recorded for the perusal of those who are interested in enhancing the welfare of the human race.

I ask permission that the Senator's remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

One who has had a scientific education cannot regard life quite as does his neighbor whose training has been different. Both may tread the same sidewalks, attend the same church, and indulge in the same sports. It is safe to say, however, that the approach to their brains is by different routes.

It is folly to attempt any general conclusion as to which manner of thinking is preferable. Even if in the minority, you would never concede that anything short of the scientific route could possibly be correct.

It is said that science is cold, calculating, unimaginative, and even nonsocial. Even though we admit this, there can be no doubt that, in some ways certainly, scientific methods are badly needed if we are to answer the many questions pouring in upon the world today.

It is impossible to deal effectively and finally with the problems of life unless the methods proffered are logical and founded upon reasons which bear analysis. A "hunch", an intuitive impression, a guess, will never do, as we view things.

Of course, the honest scientist must admit that there are many, many problems which have never been submitted to scientific analysis. In the face of this truth, we cannot afford to hold back and refuse to have any part in a movement which, in spite of our doubts, may be a forward one. If we were to take the position of chronic opposition, we, too, would be open to criticism, and just criticism.

The long and short of it is that in public matters the scientist is in an embarrassing position. His training makes him so overwhelmingly conservative that he is in danger of becoming a "ferinster", if I may use that word.

The plea I make today is that we of the scientific world must take our full share of responsibility in the present economic crisis. There are particular reasons why. In the first place, we cannot disregard the debt each of us owes to society.

There is not one of this audience who did not receive an education, the cost of which to a considerable extent, surely, was borne by somebody entirely outside of his own circle of family and friends. There is not an educational institution in existence that does not depend upon endowment or governmental appropriations. No matter how much each one of us may have paid in the way of matriculation and annual fees, laboratory charges, and the other items incidental to college attendance, there can be no doubt that those payments fell far short of the actual cost of the educational facilities extended.

In my own case, if I may mention it, from the beginning of my formal education to its completion I attended the public schools and State institutions of higher learning. The large appropriations made for the maintenance of these schools is evidence that the contributions made by me as well as by the other students of my time fell far below the costs of operation.

The privately endowed schools depend to a great extent upon endowments established by their friends. Modern education is so technical, so complicated, and so dependent upon the quality of the faculty that it must greatly exceed the payments made by the students.

I speak of these things to prove the contention that there rests upon every school and college graduate a positive obligation to return in some worthwhile manner the cost of his education. I am not called upon to make any appeal for the splendid institution represented here tonight; indeed, I do not know what its financial needs may be, if it has any. What I am saying is in the nature of a general statement regarding the relationship of graduate or student to any institution which has helped so generously to supply his mental equipment.

No matter how appreciative one of us may be for what the colleges bestow, we may be financially helpless and unable to cancel our debts by money payments. There is one sure thing, however, and that is that each of us, no matter how poor he may be in this world's goods, can contribute to the public service and to the improvement of the civic life of the community. In that way he aids the college of his graduation by adding to its reputation.

I started out with a statement regarding the attitude of mind of the scientifically trained individual. I did this believing that, on the average, the trained man is better qualified in many ways to serve than is his brother who has not had the privileges of scientific education, or, for that matter, higher education of any type. If we truly believe the scientific approach is superior to that of the other man, there rests upon us a greater individual obligation than rests on him. The question is: Are we living up to that obligation?

During recent months I have had occasion to appreciate as I never did before, what in one of many particulars the pharmaceutical profession has contributed to the human welfare. No matter how we may differ as to details, no matter what opinions we may hold as to how the facts involved should be formulated, the truth is that the Pharmacopœia of the United States and similar publications have had a large part in the promotion of health and the extension of life.

It has been my duty, and in many ways a burdensome one, to direct the formulation of a new Federal food and drugs act. The experience has been most illuminating. Even though I spent 25 years of my life as a professor of medicine, it never came to me so strongly as it has this winter what the Pharmacopœia has done to standardize medical products and thus to guarantee the safety of the human family. Those outstanding men of this profession who from decade to decade have given of their time and ability to amplify this great storehouse of knowledge have certainly paid their debt to society and paid it many times over.

I should like to say that most of the witnesses who appeared before my committee, charged with the duty of preparing and reporting a food and drugs bill, have been entirely unselfish in their devotion of time and professional ability. This is but one example of the many professional contributions which have fallen to the lot of your profession.

But I have a larger thought in mind. I am thinking of what scientifically trained persons can contribute to the cause of better citizenship. There is great need in this direction. For example, there must be a restatement of what should be the attitude of society toward the control and prevention of crime.

It may seem strange to some of you that on this particular occasion I should make any reference to this subject. It is not alone that the matter is close to my heart at present, but it is because I have an appeal to make to you, that you will assist in the movement I have in mind. As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Crime, it has been my duty to study this problem.

There are two things which must command the thought and attention of every American citizen. It should appeal particularly to the scientifically trained person. The first of these is the necessity of giving attention to what is going on in the criminal world. Unless we can find a way to deal with things as they are, with the present-day trend, organized society is in danger.

I have no desire to be sensational in any statement I make today. Unless everything said to you is susceptible of proof, I would be flying in the face of the major premise of my thesis. But I tell you in all seriousness that there are communities in the United States which are now under the domination of the underworld. Unless the public is aroused, there can be no question that every home—which ought to be the castle of its owner—will be menaced by gangsters and other criminals.

The pathetic thing about modern-day crime is that the offenders are mere boys. The average age of the criminal in America today is 23 years. The largest age group is 19, and that is followed by 18. In short, society is menaced by what is really juvenile delinquency.

What are we going to do about this? Are we going to fold our arms and wait for any fate that may befall us? Or have we spunk enough to turn our minds to this question and find a solution for the problem?

It seems to me, as my investigations have proceeded, that there is something wrong with the church, the school, and the home. I know of no way to reach the home, except perhaps through the church and public education. I have no right to criticize any church except my own. As a citizen, however, I do have the right to find fault with the schools.

It is to educated groups like this that the appeal must be made. Through these groups the individual citizen must have his mind turned to the problem.

My purpose in mentioning this matter is to ask that you use your scientific training to grapple with the problem. It has no relationship to pharmacy, to engineering, or to other of the great sciences that might be mentioned. I do feel, however, that the habits of thought cultivated in this profession, and any other of the scientific professions, should qualify the citizen to assist effectively in the removal of the growing evil I have mentioned. I would not have a word I have said distorted into an attack upon the teachers in our schools. As a matter of fact, we owe far more to them than we can ever repay. It seems to be the American custom to turn over to the school teachers many functions which ought to be performed in the home. We pay the teachers, not only to instruct the pupils in arithmetic, reading, writing, history, and the languages, but we expect them to teach manners to our children. They show the youngsters how to enter a room and how to fry eggs. I fear that we lean heavily upon them in the teaching of morals and ethics. In short, we are imposing upon the school teacher many duties which really belong to the parents. They are carrying too heavy a burden under present conditions of school operation. In justice to the schools, if we are to demand of them the doing of all the things that should be performed in the home, we must enlarge our appropriations and extend the facilities for instruction.

Personally, I am not sure that the objectives of education are as they should be. I am referring now to the public schools. As I view it, there are three things which should be kept in mind in attempting to define the objectives. Is it not a reasonable statement that the purpose of education is to prepare for parenthood, self-support, and social responsibilities?

Certainly it should be the highest ambition of any young person to be worthy of the responsibilities and the privileges of parenthood. This ideal demands first a healthy and vigorous body. The pupil must learn the significance of practices and habits that undermine health.

If at the same time the curriculum can be made to include a training that will insure self-support after graduation, that is desirable. No one can question that the graduates of our schools should be good citizens, loyal to the flag and the American institu-

tions, ethically and morally upright, and with a full conception of their social and civic obligations.

It is not enough merely to sharpen the mind. Schools must fail miserably if they are limited to the development of tool skill or of intellectual power. Conduct and character are fundamentally essential to decent parenthood and good citizenship. It is a temptation to enlarge upon this phase of our subject, but time does not permit.

I wish to raise the question as to what we are to do with certain groups of unfortunates found in every community. Let me give you the results of a survey covering a certain number of institutions, in one more or less restricted area of our country. It was found that in these custodial establishments there were 23,000 juvenile delinquents. In round numbers, there were 100,000 blind, 100,000 deaf and dumb, 100,000 paupers in almshouses, and 100,000 criminals. There were 300,000 insane and feeble-minded persons. This survey gave reports of a little short of three quarters of a million individuals in this limited area.

Here is a startling fact about it. Two thirds of these defective persons were found to be the parents of defective children. That is a terrible commentary upon society.

I do not undertake to say how this particular problem should be solved. I do not hesitate to state, however, that the advice of the scientific world should help greatly in its solution.

There is no wonder the newspapers have so much to say about sterilization. At this time I am not venturing to express any personal opinion on that subject. I am stating the problem in order that you may be thinking about it and assisting in finding a remedy.

There is another field in which scientists have much to do. I refer to the question of what shall be done with criminals found guilty by the courts. After the trial and the determination of guilt, I ask in all respect to the courts and recognized legal procedure if it is wise to pass sentence immediately. That seems to me like deciding that the patient has typhoid fever, and then, without individualizing the case, the giving of a stated number of doses of the official drug. I cannot conceive it possible that it is scientific to fix with more or less inelasticity the sentence which must be imposed upon every criminal convicted of a certain crime. Of course, I have in mind the first offender, although I am not sure that what I am saying does not apply to every criminal case.

For the purposes of the discussion, however, let us limit the matter to the first offender. It is really a tragic thing that many a criminal—and I have told you how young most of them are—should be incarcerated in a prison with hardened characters, even though there may be extenuating circumstances and a suspicion of mental or physical inferiority.

I realize how difficult it is in a brief and general résumé such as I am giving you to make clear my position. I am pleading for a better understanding of what has made this prisoner antisocial. Is it because of some failure in the home or the school? Is it because of a certain backwardness that the youth lost heart and became a chronic truant? Is it because of this truancy and his contact with other backward boys, or possibly bad boys, that he became an amateur gangster? Through his experience in this little group he becomes perhaps a burglar or pickpocket and enters upon a course which will make him soon a dangerous underworld character, a professional gangster.

The point I am trying to make is that the roots of criminality reach back into the nonsocial attitude. That in its turn was developed by reason of the failure of society to recognize the tendency and at the right time to apply effectively preventive measures.

Anyhow, after conviction in court is had and before sentence is passed, the convicted person should be submitted to the examination of trained experts, psychiatrists, psychologists, medical men, and perhaps those trained in social welfare. Is it not in the interest of social justice and of the ultimate welfare of the community that the individual prisoner should be dealt with more scientifically and the treatment laid down by persons competent to determine how society shall be best protected and how the guilty person may be returned to social usefulness? In this work men and women trained as you have been could be most effective members of a body recognized as of equal dignity with the court. As I view it, that is what will be done ultimately; and the sooner we have an aroused opinion looking to that end, the better.

I am not making any plea for leniency. I am not governed by softness of heart. I am trying to think out how an application of scientific methods might make more effective our management of the criminal.

When we add to this the preventive measures which I have suggested in connection with the schools, and have aroused the church and home to their responsibilities, I think we may look forward to a better state of society and greater safety for every family and every citizen in our great country. It is shameful that we have to face the danger of kidnaping and other crimes of violence. But until we approach the problem along the scientific route, I fear we will make little progress toward the goal of social safety.

Perhaps I have wandered afield somewhat from the purposes of this gathering. But I could contribute nothing to your knowledge of pharmacy, pharmacology, and the many branches of your essential profession. I can see, however, how the training you have had in this fine institution not only has fitted you for the successful practice of your profession, but it has also fitted you for a public service. You are prepared to carry social responsibilities and by having them given over to you to make this world in which we live a far better one than it is today.

SPIRIT OF '76 VERSUS NEW DEAL

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, today is the two hundred and second anniversary of the birth of the Father of our country, and it is perhaps fitting that we, for a moment, turn our thoughts back to the founders of the Nation and renew our devotion to the spirit of '76, when George Washington, the true man of destiny, the gift of Providence, trained and preserved to win a country's freedom, moved as the master spirit. In him there was little that was romantic, less that was sensational, nothing that was dishonorable. He, the instrument of a fickle Congress, doubting its own authority, fought the infant Colonies, few in number, scanty in resources, torn by internal strife and jealousy, against the British Empire. He conducted a campaign in his own country where a blunder would have ruined his cause, directing an army poorly clad and poorly fed, from point to point of a defenseless coast 1,500 miles in extent, and marking every mile—yea, every foot of his march—with blood, not the blood spilled amid the impetuous charge, not the blood shed by shrieking bullets, but the bloody imprints of shoeless feet, torn and lacerated for a country's freedom. When we think of that army starving and poorly clothed and the conditions surrounding it, and in the conditions that confront us today, compare it with the army of the C.C.C., clothed, fed, furnished golf courses and handball courts, and compare it with the C.W.A., the members of which, as my friend from Louisiana [Mr. Long] said, sweep the leaves from one side of the street to the other and back again and are told to be sure not to lose any leaves because of the blowing of the wind, it seems to me that the spirit of '76 should be here regenerated, and that we could have well listened with attention today to the Farewell Message of Washington; that we could well go back to those sterling characters who laid the foundation of freedom here; and that we should watch more jealously and speak more often of those who attempt to usurp the functions of government and call themselves, not like Louis XIV, "the state" but call themselves the "new deal." We should guard the spirit of '76 and compare it with the spirit of '33 and '34.

Under the constitution of the ancient Republic of Rome there was a provision that in time of exigency and danger a dictator could be invested with absolute authority for a period of 6 months. A subservient Congress has given ours 2 years. During those 6 months the dictator was free of challenge to do for the Commonwealth whatever in his judgment the emergency required. At the end of 6 months the constitution required him to resign. The most famous of the Roman dictators were Cincinnatus, Camillus, Sulla, Marius, Pompey, and Caesar, who was the last to be invested with this power. Thereafter the dictatorship, or emergency power, became permanent in the office of emperor.

The first Roman dictatorship or emergency executive was in 498 B.C. Emergency rulers are not a new deal. From 493 B.C. down to the assassination of Julius Caesar, 44 B.C., Rome had 8 emergency dictatorships in a period of 450 years. The last dictatorship usurped the functions of the legitimate government and created an empire.

In 150 years of the American Republic, this is our first experience in granting absolute power to the Executive without challenge from the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Thus we are doing somewhat better than ancient Rome. We are not doing so well, however, as Great Britain. In the past 200 years the British House of Commons has ruled the United Kingdom without a dictator or emergency potentate.

In retaining our republican mode of government, as declared in 1776 and ratified by the Constitution of 1789, we have also done better than many of the nations of modern Europe, such as Germany, Italy, Russia, and even France. But we are behind the Swiss Republic, which today, after three centuries of independence, still has its federal assembly that bows to the command of no emergency ruler, however persuasive and benevolent. We are also behind Switzerland in recovery from this depression. After a depression lasting only 2 years, the Swiss Republic is now back to a

condition of normal business recovery and employment and still on the gold standard with a balanced budget.

I could not help thinking as I heard read the farewell message of Washington that God had, through His instrument, written that message. I could not help thinking that, just as Christ came to guide mankind, so the Government of the United States, constructed under the leadership of men like Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, was raised by the hand of God that it might be a beacon light to the nations of the world, so that protection might be afforded and a chance given to the human being to grow. Christ tells us that we are free—free to choose between good and evil. Without that freedom we cannot develop. It was King Solomon who said, when the Lord asked him what he most desired, "Give me a heart of understanding that I may discern between right and wrong." It is that freedom, planted in the Government of the United States, that has enabled it to be a beacon and throw its light out over the world until 42 republics have followed our example.

I think we would do well to contemplate the development and growth of this Government, consider the people who made it and realize whence they came. In those days it was worth one's life to voyage across the Atlantic. Only men and women of courage would undertake such a hazardous journey. Courage, Senators, is an attribute of God, and I think that courage is now seriously lacking in the United States, the kind of courage that should be manifest in the Senate, which should speak out and say the things we all do know, but which seems somehow to be lethargized and to prefer to wait until tomorrow for what should be said today. A lethargy has settled over the country from one end of it to the other. When this subservient Congress gave all the functions of the legislative body and a portion of the functions of the judiciary to this administration, no one seemed to say a word. They said, "Let us wait; let us see; an emergency is here."

I noted in the address which has been read to us today Washington's warning about not allowing an emergency to take away the fundamental principles on which our freedom depends and rests. So this group of men picked, as it seems, by God, because only those who had courage would venture across the sea, came here to conquer a wilderness, to carve out for themselves a future. God was their common Master, and each was the equal of his brother. These men grew and developed here for some hundreds of years. They met the forests and the wild animals of the forests and faced the things that it took men to face, and they conquered them. They grew souls because they were free to choose between good and evil.

You will remember, Mr. President, that Christ said when His disciples were quarreling among themselves as to who should be first and who should be last that, "The last shall be first and the first shall be last." Where else than in the United States has there been a government previous to this last special subservient Congress, where the last can be first and the first last; the humble man who has built a soul shall be first. One cannot build a soul without freedom; the mass of people cannot be raised by law; it is necessary for the development of mankind to have a government that guards the rights of the individual, that gives him equal opportunities and the right to choose; a chance of education, a chance of understanding, an opportunity to grow a soul, and thus come closer to God. It must have been His plan that this Government should be raised for that purpose.

And now it is all to be swept away in one way or another—the "national ruin act", the "national racketeers' association." Great combinations in restraint of trade have been given their release. The Democratic Party, built upon the principles of Jefferson, goes to the people and lays down its platform, but not one single plank of that platform has been kept; indeed, the reverse is true. Not a single plank of that platform, I repeat, has been kept. They advocated safeguarding the civil service, and they broke that pledge; they advocated strengthening the antitrust laws and enforcing them. They were much put out at the way the Republicans did not enforce them. There was some ground for

their concern in that respect, and I am holding no brief for anyone; but I am trying to stand on this floor and in a humble way speak out loud, as loudly as I can, for this administration has licensed the newspapers, the press of the country, so that they dare not speak. God knows they are doing the best they can, but they dare not speak. Two weeks under the strong disciplining hand of the Government would put them out of business.

The radio is licensed. No one may speak over the radio without being censored. The former President pro tempore of this body, George Moses, who sat in yonder chair only a few months ago, tried the other day to make a speech over the radio and he was interfered with. The subject of his speech was "Back to Sanity." It could not be done. The dictatorship, through the licensed power of the radio, said, "No, you must not get the facts to the people." The avenues of information have been clogged against the people of the United States understanding what is going on in the country. Newspapers are licensed. The radio is licensed.

Oh, Mr. President, somebody somewhere must speak. Nothing is left to the United States but the United States Senate where freedom of speech still exists. Yet our country was built and its foundation laid upon freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Our schools, from whose towers the Stars and Stripes still fly, are today being infested with propaganda that tears away the Constitution and all the individual freedom that it represents.

I go back and read my history and I hear the voice of Patrick Henry. I hear him tell an assemblage that—

The next wind from the north will bring to our ears the resounding clash of arms. Our brethren are already in the field. Why stand we here idle? What is it that the gentlemen wish? Is life so pure or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?

Then he said:

Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me give me liberty or give me death.

Oh, that we had some Patrick Henrys here today, somebody who would speak and be heard throughout the country crying "Give me liberty or give me death."

It is "the man on horseback" always with the new deal. Down through history we find him there on horseback waiting to usurp the freedom that has been built up here in 150 years. Today more power rests in the administration than ever before in any government. We have given to the President the power of legislation, the power of the judiciary, all concentrated in the White House.

I hear the voice of John Adams, and though I think the words were put in Adams' mouth by Daniel Webster, yet the words express the thought when he said:

Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish—I am for the Declaration. It is my living sentiment and, by the blessing of God, it shall be my dying sentiment—*independence now, independence forever!*

I would like to hear some of those sentiments expressed here again. Lethargy has crept over the country from one end to the other. I went out home after Congress adjourned last summer and went around among the business men to see how they viewed the national ruin act—the national racketeers' association. I inquired among the manufacturers and found that none of them wanted it, but none of them had the courage to refuse to join except Henry Ford. Thank God, he stuck to his guns and showed some independence in the heritage that belongs to the American people.

No; they did not have the courage to open their mouths. Too much softness, too much luxury, too much everything has been given to the American people, and they are soft. They are like the old Romans, who used to go into their baths and cut a vein and die before they would get up and assert themselves. They have become degenerate.

I took my old Ford over to the Northeast Garage here the other day and said, "How is business?" They said, "It is pretty good since the C.W.A. is going on. We are getting C.W.A. checks all the time in payment for fixing up the old Fords." That indicates that the C.W.A. workers have to

have cars in which to go to work. Every laboring man in the country has to have a car. That is all right; I want him to have two cars, if he can, just like Hoover's two chickens in every pot. This administration has gone Hoover one better and has furnished a blue duck for every window. [Laughter.]

We have lost something. We have lost the courage to stick. We are allowing the administration to take your money, Mr. President, and my money, the public money, the taxpayers' money, to buy a revolution in this country, to close the avenues of information, to see to it that nothing gets out except what they want to go out. Hold your investigations, and if you find any business that is doing well, kill it; get into the national racketeers' association game and kill it.

They found a great hero in the country who had dared to show the courage that we all ought to emulate in this country. He crossed the Atlantic Ocean in a little spindly airplane. The administration strikes down such courage as that. If there were 10 such men in the United States who had the privilege of speech in the House and the Senate, they would drive the President out of the dictatorship of this country.

But no; we must quell all courage. The man who dares write or say "give us a fair trial" is impudent. That is the height of impudence. He should be destroyed. I read in the morning paper that the administration is coming back to the same old thing and is going to give the mail contracts to the same old concerns; only they will be in at the killing. We have put the Army into the business of carrying the mail, and in 2 days killed seven men who were trying to get to their posts to start carrying the mail, and I understand another Army flier went to his destruction today.

The theory of the administration seems to be, "If there is anything that is doing well, let us kill it. We must get in on it. We have a good thing in the N.R.A.—the national racketeers' association. Let us get in on these other good things. If we are not in on it, let us bust it up. Let us drag some man in here and convict him and send him to jail for 10 days, and then on the strength of that one man's conduct let us destroy a great business in the country." That shows the power of the administration, but it should not be used in that way.

There was a great Roosevelt whose first name was Theodore. I remember a sentence from his pen or his voice, I am not sure which, but it sticks back in my brain somewhere, and it may be of service here if I quote it. He said:

We here in America hold in our hands the hope of the world, the fate of the coming years, and shame and disgrace shall be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve is dimmed and we trail in the dust the golden hopes of men. If we merely build upon this new continent another nation of great but unjustly divided material prosperity, we shall have done nothing and we shall do as little if we merely pit the greed of envy against the greed of arrogance, and thereby destroy the material well-being of us all.

That is what we are doing today. We have taken over everything under the "national ruin act" and nullified the antitrust laws, put the Government back of combinations in restraint of trade that have driven out of existence everything deserving the name of competition today in the United States. We are going on under that plan.

Then we depreciate and debase the dollar. Barney Baruch and his gang make a couple hundred million dollars by sending gold over to Europe when the price was \$20 an ounce and then bring it back and sell it for \$35. It makes a great campaign fund for the furtherance of dictatorships.

Then we put into existence the N.R.A. and appoint a brigadier general, the fellow who put over the draft in the last Democratic administration that took our boys to war, and then under another Democratic administration they were deprived of the compensation to which they were entitled because of injuries they had received. The administration takes them out of the hospital and puts in the C.C.C. boys. Senator HATFIELD yesterday on the floor said that Walter Reed Hospital is full of the C.C.C. boys who

have taken the beds of the wounded ex-service men who were forced out of the hospital by the decrees of the present dictatorship, although this hospital and scores of others over the country were built with the peoples' money for the express purpose of taking care of the ex-service men. He says there are only four soldiers out there, though there are a thousand beds.

If one of these C.C.C. boys die under the edict of our dictatorship, the Government gives his widow \$45 a month. Under the same edict a soldier's widow gets \$15. It has been indicated from more than one source that the administration's idea is to militarize these C.C.C. camps.

It seems, judging from the last two Democratic administrations that it is a common thing for them to pay no attention to preelection promises. The people elected a Democrat to the Presidency because he kept us out of war. No sooner had he been assured of his reelection than he began plans, with the aid of the international bankers, to take us into the war to make the world safe for democracy.

We appropriated \$42,000,000,000 for that war. We won that war, and we did not get a thing out of it. We were not even able to hold Guam as a cable station. We did not protect ourselves anywhere. England took something like a third of the world, and Japan filled her arms and her lap, and France her pockets, and we got prohibition. [Laughter.] And then the Democrats took that away from us. So, you see, we did not get anything out of the war.

Then they came last election and said, "Now, it could not be worse." You remember they said, "It could not be worse"; and so the dictator was elected, and now you can see that it can be worse; and that "worse", mind you, when you stop to think about it, was made by a Democratic administration that promised to keep us out of war, which the people wanted to have done, but they did not do it.

Think of the money that was spent and the contracts that were let. You know they did not have the national racketeers' association [Laughter] at that time, but they did have this idea of letting contracts on a percentage basis; and all you old boys will remember how that worked out. You know it made thousands of millionaires. It made them burn up lumber piles, whole lumber yards, in order to collect this percentage. They filled swamps full of cement and allowed it to spoil so as to get the percentage. They paid from \$20 to \$45 and \$50 a day so that they could get the percentage, and they had five or six men on the same job. So it ran into percentage; and God knows, and you know, and everybody else knows, what happened.

It was that money, the waste of that war, that got us into the condition we are in today. We did not even get back the money that we loaned to the governments over there on an IOU. Although Congress definitely provided by law that the Secretary of the Treasury should take bonds for the money loaned, instead of that they just took an IOU, the same as they do when you lose at poker; you just give them an IOU. If we had had those bonds, gentlemen, we could have put them on the market over there when this depression started, and those boys would have behaved themselves. You can bet your boots they would have behaved themselves if we had had the bonds to stick on their market. They would not have stuck up their noses and told us that "that was yesterday."

We went over there and furnished the men and the money that won the war, and then they forgot us. If we had had their bonds to put on the market, they would not have been like the girl who promised to marry the fellow and he saw her a little later after she had seen somebody else that she liked better; so he said to her, "Why, you know, we are going to be married." She said, "Yes; I remember." He said, "You promised to marry me." She said, "Yes; but that was yesterday." [Laughter.]

So the tremendous amount of money we loaned to the Allies was yesterday, and it was not paid, and the calamity came. As you know, however, a new generation grows up every 15 or 20 years, and it was these young fellows that elected the Democrats. They had grown up since the last

Democratic administration, and did not remember it, and so they voted with a free hand. If they had remembered the administration that brought on the war, the administration that drafted the boys, the administration that spent the money that put us into the hole we are in today, they would not have elected the same wrecking crew to take care of us today. [Laughter.]

Yes; somebody must speak. Somewhere, somehow, a voice should be raised to let the people know the facts. My voice will not go far, because the newspapers will be criticized and frowned upon by the dictator for publishing what I am saying [laughter]. They might lose their license if they did. So all that I may do today is to hope that some spark may kindle some other soul; and somewhere, somehow perhaps, my voice will start a thought in some of the great men of this Senate, and they will get on their feet, and in the only place left to free speech in the whole United States, battle for the independence and individual liberty that Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt stood for. I hope, I pray, that it may come soon.

Out in the Middle West, not so far from my State, in the Black Hills of South Dakota, there are being carved into a great mountainside the heroic figures of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt. On the other side of that sheer rising mountain is to be inscribed nine important events in American history that tell the history of our inception and growth, and space is to be left for other inscriptions.

I hope that there never may be the tenth inscription to the effect that in the years 1933-34 a subservient Congress abdicated its powers to a dictatorship that was the beginning of the end of the great Republic.

The dictatorships of history have been marked by certain outstanding characteristics:

First. The temporary exercise of power has been followed by the demand that the emergency powers be made permanent. The exceptions to this rule are few. Absolute power breeds on what it feeds. When the emergency powers are made permanent, the republican form of government is overthrown and the temporary dictator becomes emperor. That is the common process of changing republics to empires. Even our own experiment, before the end of its first year, is followed by the demand that the emergency powers shall be made permanent.

Second. It is the common feature of all dictatorships that the ruler in power aspires to augment his hold on government by organizing a multiplicity of executive bureaus or a bureaucracy supported by powerful commercial interests, variously known as the "oligarchy" or the "reactionaries." Even in our first-year experiment we have seen 37 bureaus, called "administrations" or "corporations", rise up like mushrooms at the rate of about one a week in the first 9 months, and we find that all the heads of the chief industries, or so-called "trusts", are today sitting on Federal advisory boards making price-boosting codes to plunder consumers.

Third. With only a few exceptions—and those exceptions where the dictator has had the wisdom to let go and resist the demand of his beneficiaries to make his emergency power permanent—the dictatorships and the oligarchies of history have been notable failures. It was so with Sulla, Marius, Pompey, and even the Caesars, in Rome. It was the same with Napoleon and the czars, and even with Diaz in our neighboring state of Mexico. Today there are practically no emperors, few kings left, and only a small crop of new-deal dictators. In fact, the people of a civilized world are fed up with the strong-arm class of would-be rulers. A free people, in an age of public schools and a free press, will grant a certain degree of emergency powers—but woe to the oligarchy, the reactionary gang, that seeks to make its emergency powers permanent. Coercion and dictation have no place, least of all on the soil hallowed by the traditions of '76.

Fourth. All dictatorships describe themselves as a new deal. Most dictatorships turn out to be new versions of the same old deal.

There were 2,000 years of dictatorships in the ancient world before the first Roman dictatorship, in 493 B.C. The antiquity of so-called "emergency" dictatorships runs back 4,000 years. And, according to their own versions, they were all new deals.

When the President in his message to the present Congress announces the policy to abolish old civilizations, and when his journalistic spokesman, Mr. Moley, says we are never going back to the principles of 1776, what do they mean? The American Republic is 30 centuries younger than the dictatorships of the ancient Asiatic civilization and 20 centuries younger than the heyday of dictatorships of ancient Rome and Greece.

The American Republics—North and South—are the youngest of civilizations. Are we going to abandon the new creed of freedom to take up the worn-out theories of government that cracked down humanity in the centuries before Christ?

This month of February is the anniversary month of Washington and Lincoln. Washington, who led the American forces in 1776 and presided over the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Lincoln, who at Gettysburg gave utterance to the aspiration of freemen in every land:

That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

In this same month of February the journalistic mouth-piece of the brain trust, Mr. Moley, tells the country that we are never going back to the ideas of 1776. The emergency powers of the new dealers, according to them, are already made permanent. We are never going back to the inalienable rights declared in our Declaration of Independence, so the new dealers imagine. They tell us that a revolution has taken place, though without the knowledge or consent of the American people. The suspension of the Constitution under an emergency plea is permanent, they hold. They are in the saddle permanently, they imagine, and what are we going to do about it?

They have suspended the antitrust laws and enthroned 259 code monopolies.

They have created a bureaucracy of 37 corporations and administrations with dictatorial powers over trade and industry.

They have installed as brigadier general over these 259 monopolies a Wall Street assistant stockbroker to govern all American industry and all American trade—the boldest buccaneering feat in the history of world dictatorships.

Under the National Recovery Act, which covers only interstate and foreign trade, they have assumed to control all local intrastate industry and trade down to the shoe-shine parlor and the barber shop.

Under the pretense of helping labor and the wage standard, they have set up minimum wage codes 20 percent to 30 percent below the wage scales in leading industries.

The new deal began by creating an emergency in closing all the banks of the country, both the solvent and insolvent, the large majority solvent, and thereby struck down the business of the country in March below the lowest previous level in July 1932. That was the entering wedge for disciplining and getting control of the banking system.

They then proceeded, without express authority and without public notice, to invest \$900,000,000 of the Treasury deficit in the stocks of 5,200 banks. In banks, railroads, and insurance companies the new dealers have invested, loaned, or advanced upwards of \$2,000,000,000 of Government debt to obtain financial control of the Nation. They are even establishing Government banks to finance Russia and China—and this under the party banner of Andrew Jackson, who abolished United States banks.

This appears to be only the beginning of the new-deal dictatorship program. The Secretary of Agriculture, in a 14,000-word memorandum, as outlined in the Washington Post of February 19, describes how the farm-reduction program requires removal of 50,000,000 to 100,000,000 acres from agricultural production, a shifting of millions of population from the cotton States, and the compulsory licensing of

farmers to enable them to plow their own land. He admits that the program is highly unpopular and hints that this program of dictatorship may require the censorship of the press and thereby the probable suspension of the first amendment of the Constitution.

Without material deliberation or debate in either House of Congress, a \$2,000,000,000 bill is railroaded to the statute book making the Treasury the world's greatest central bank in financing the world gold supply—paying a premium of \$14 an ounce on foreign gold—with a secrecy provision preventing a public report on operations until the next presidential election. Secrecy is the mark of all dictatorships, and power over the gold supply is essential to every war chest of the military.

Two further measures are now suggested—thrown out to the public casually to familiarize us with the idea that we are living under a Federal dictatorship—to emasculate the States. The States are to be reorganized by consolidation of towns and counties. The control of crime is to be taken from the States and placed in Federal control. Federal control of the liquor traffic was a failure, but control of the right to bear arms is to come under a Federal prohibition act.

This so-called "revolution", we are told, has already taken place, having been purchased by taxpayers' money, and we will never go back to the inalienable rights of '76, to government by and for the people as enunciated at Gettysburg. We have forgotten Washington and Lincoln, and we are now living under the one-man rule of the Pharaohs and Caesars.

The world is now saying: "We know that the British House of Commons yet functions. We know that the Swiss Republic still lives and functions as a true democracy. We know there are republics in South America—10 of them followed the plan laid down in the Constitution of the United States. What has become of that Constitution? What has become of the principles of Washington and Jefferson, Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, Jackson and Cleveland? What, since the session of 1933, became of the United States Congress?"

This is the issue of the hour. Has Congress abdicated? Have we made the "emergency" powers of the dictatorship permanent? Have we abandoned the preamble of our Constitution that begins—"We the people of the United States"?

Have we become "reactionaries"—gone back 20 centuries to the time when ancient Rome permitted an emergency dictatorship of 6 months, and finally a permanent dictatorship under the name of emperor? The "new dealers" tell us we have. The "revolution" from a republic to a Mussolini Fascistic program has taken place in the United States of America. For one, I do not want to believe it, and I hope when the people of the United States wake up to what is going on under their eyes in a period of dire stress they will speak. They will speak with ballots. Nor do I want to believe that this Congress will permit the temporary dictatorship of so-called "emergency" to be made permanent and enthrone reactionaries on the ruins of the Republic. I hope, I pray that the spirit of '76 will live, that the "brain trust" is not the one hundred and thirty millions, that it is a passing mirage that fools only those who seek to be fooled. My friends, Democratic Senators, let your voices be raised in behalf of the individual. Strike a blow for State rights while it is not yet too late. "Come over into Macedonia and help us."

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6663) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ADAMS in the chair). The pending question is the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Copeland	Hayden	Reynolds
Ashurst	Costigan	Hebert	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Bachman	Davis	Kean	Russell
Bailey	Dickinson	Keyes	Schall
Bankhead	Dieterich	La Follette	Sheppard
Barbour	Dill	Logan	Shipstead
Barkley	Duffy	Loneragan	Steiner
Black	Erickson	Long	Stephens
Bone	Fess	McAdoo	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Fletcher	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Frazier	McKellar	Thompson
Bulkley	George	McNary	Townsend
Bulow	Gibson	Metcalf	Trammell
Byrd	Glass	Murphy	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Goldsborough	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Gore	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Hale	O'Mahoney	Walcott
Carey	Harrison	Overton	Walsh
Clark	Hastings	Patterson	White
Connally	Hatch	Pittman	
Coolidge	Hatfield	Pope	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COPELAND in the chair). Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. STEIWER obtained the floor.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. STEIWER. May I ask the Senator from West Virginia whether he proposes at this time to present the amendment which he sent to the desk some days ago?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Oregon that that is my intention.

Mr. STEIWER. The amendment which the Senator has in mind, I think, is much broader in scope than the amendment I have in contemplation. Probably, as a logical procedure, it ought, therefore, to be considered first, and I will yield the floor to the Senator.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I present my amendment as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the amendment of Mr. BYRNES it is proposed to insert the following:

TITLE III. VETERANS' PROVISIONS

SEC. —. All of the provisions of the following acts reducing or limiting or voiding the benefits, payments, care, or treatment of American veterans, their dependents, and beneficiaries—

Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, first session, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat., pt. 1, p. 283), entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes"; Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, first session, approved March 20, 1933 (48 Stat., pt. 1, p. 8), entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", are hereby repealed, and all laws repealed by section 17, title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, are hereby reenacted; and such benefits, payments, care, or treatment are hereby restored as in effect on March 19, 1933.

SEC. —. This title shall become effective on the first day of the calendar month next following the month during which this act is enacted.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, on January 11 I offered an amendment which included provision for the restoration of the pay of Federal employees; but as that part of my amendment was dealt with yesterday, the amendment I have sent to the desk now, and which has just been read by the clerk, has been perfected so as to leave out that part of the amendment which had to do with the pay of the Federal employees.

On Monday, February 19, I went at great length into the subject matter of my amendment as it applied to the World War and Spanish-American War soldiers. I do not deem it necessary at the present time to detain the Senate upon the justification for the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. President, I think, in justice to the World War veterans and the Spanish-American War veterans, if we take into consideration the regulations which have been prescribed by a dictator and which are now in vogue, that my amendment should appeal to each and every Senator.

I cannot agree that regulations will do justice to the soldiers of the different wars. In my humble judgment, laws work out over a period of years. Skilled scientific men, skilled lawyers, skilled members of the medical profession, all are very much more capable of prescribing rules and regulations expressed in law which will do justice to the veterans of all of our wars than any regulations which may be suggested or promulgated by the President of the United States.

In a consideration of the situation which confronts the Spanish-American War soldier, only 5,421 of whom, we are told, out of the 280,000 are suffering from disabilities directly connected with the war, there is no one who knows better than the distinguished Senator who occupies the chair of this body at the present time [Mr. COPELAND] that there has been no army in the past, there can be no army in the future, subjected to communicable diseases such as those to which the Spanish-American War soldier was subjected, for the reason that science, in the great profession of medicine, has obliterated a great many of the communicable diseases which sent a great majority of those who died to untimely graves, because there was no preventive medicine known to science at that time that would have warded off or prevented the development of those diseases.

We are informed by the records that 77,000 of the 280,000 of the Spanish-American War group were subjected to that preventable disease known as typhoid fever caused by the bacillus of Eberth. We know now that it is not necessary for anyone to suffer from that communicable disease. We know that the same preventive medicine applies to many of the other tropical diseases, about which we know more at the present time than we did 36 years ago.

Mr. President, when we see the Spanish-American War soldiers crippled in body, in many instances crippled in mind, because of the ravages of the sequelae of the diseases which they contracted and from which they suffered while soldiers in the Spanish-American War, and we then are told that only 5,421 are entitled to direct service connection, I say, Mr. President—and I feel that Senators will agree with me—that to render such judgment does great injustice to the soldier of that war. I venture the assertion, Mr. President, that instead of only 5,421 of the Spanish-American War soldiers being directly connected that each and every soldier who is today disabled because of some joint involvement, because of some ear involvement, because of some heart lesion, because of some liver complication, because of some intestinal involvement, should not be presumptively considered to have contracted that disease while in the service of his Government 36 years ago but he should be directly connected because of some phlebotic condition and should be upon the same roll and given the same consideration that is given the 5,421 soldiers who are now held to be directly connected for the reason that these manifestations represent the aftermath of the communicable diseases from which the soldiers suffered while in service.

The same principle, Mr. President, applies to the World War soldiers. When I am told that 500,000 World War soldiers have been eliminated from the honor rolls of this country, and of whom it has been said that they are not entitled to the consideration of their Government for faithful service which they performed when they were called to duty and to service under their flag, I cannot be convinced, as a man of the medical profession, that that is the just and proper treatment which should be meted out to these men by the Congress of the United States or by the executive departments of our Nation.

It is for those reasons, Mr. President, which I went into thoroughly in my address of Monday, February the 19th, that I justify the offering of my amendment, in its modified and perfected form, as a substitute for, or as an amendment to,

the amendment that was offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

In other words, Mr. President, this is a prerogative that the Congress of the United States should assume. It is a prerogative that the Congress of the United States should take back, as it gave it up in the enactment of the economy law, and until Congress reassumes its responsibility and writes upon the pages of the Federal laws of the land the principles that will prescribe the rules and regulations which will be controlling in the treatment of the World War soldier, we shall be derelict in our duty. For these reasons I offer this amendment.

I feel, Mr. President, that the Congress of the United States ought to pay the debt it owes to the soldiers of our wars. I feel that this is the opportune time to do so. If some soldier, perchance, is upon the roll who is not entitled to be there, he can be eliminated after fair and impartial consideration is given to his claim under the statutes that prevailed before the enactment of the Economy Act of March 20, 1933. It is unjust to say that of the 122,000 men suffering from tuberculosis only a part are entitled to be considered upon the rolls of the Government, should be cared for, after giving only a very brief period to the examination of their cases and to their claims. In less than 3 months 11,000 cases of tuberculosis, which at one time were on the rolls and service-connected, were examined and eliminated. The President who now occupies the chair knows as well as I that it would be an impossible task for any group of men in the profession of medicine to undertake. The results are unfair.

There might have been, Mr. President, some justification for the enactment of the economy law in the minds of those who voted for it when it came to the floor of the Senate. What has happened since the adoption of the regulations under that law, resulting in the elimination of deserving soldiers from the rolls and the experience every Senator has had in connection with efforts to get deserving veterans hospitalized and cared for, justifies the adoption of my amendment.

The soldiers throughout this land are appealing to the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will eliminate the issuance of frequent regulations by the executive department. Due to their ever-changing character, the veterans do not know their status. Our laws should be basic in their character and upon which they can depend, and to which they can look for relief and protection. If the soldiers of the wars are not entitled to consideration, and if the Congress of the United States holds that they are not entitled to consideration, then the Congress ought to say so. The Congress ought not to pass this responsibility to someone else. The Congress should take this responsibility unto itself and deal with it as it was dealt with in the beginning of legislation upon this subject, so far as it applies to the Spanish-American War soldiers some 35 years ago.

On Monday, February 19, when I discussed the merits of my amendment, I read two or three letters into the RECORD. They were conclusive, they were convincing, Mr. President, to me as to why Congress should do something to restore the laws that had for their purpose the protection of the veterans in the past. We have legislated for every type and character of citizenship in America. We have legislated for the great banking institutions of America. We have legislated for the great railways of this country. We have legislated for the farmers of this country. We have legislated for the toilers of this country. But we have failed, Mr. President, to legislate for the men who bore the flag of this country.

I submit, Mr. President, that my amendment is justifiable; I submit it is meritorious; and if I rightly understand the sympathy of those who make up this body, as well as the body at the other end of the Capitol, I am sure they are anxious to do something to bring about relief from the injustice which the Economy Act has brought upon the rank and file of the American soldier.

With these brief remarks, which represent a conclusion to what I had to say on last Monday, I wish to submit this amendment, and I trust that I may have the courtesy of a roll call in order that we may know, Mr. President, who are the friends of the veterans.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it would completely repeal the so-called "Economy Act" which was passed last March?

Mr. HATFIELD. That is true.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And would put the veterans of all the wars of the United States and their families right back where they previously were?

Mr. HATFIELD. That is true.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the amendment and hope most earnestly it will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD].

Mr. LONG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Costigan	Hebert	Robinson, Ark.
Ashurst	Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Austin	Davis	Kean	Russell
Bachman	Dickinson	Keyes	Schall
Balley	Dieterich	La Follette	Sheppard
Bankhead	Dill	Logan	Shipstead
Barbour	Duffy	Lonergan	Steiwer
Black	Erickson	Long	Stephens
Bone	Fess	McAdoo	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Fletcher	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Frazier	McKellar	Thompson
Bulkley	George	McNary	Townsend
Bulow	Gibson	Metcalf	Trammell
Byrd	Glass	Murphy	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Goldsborough	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Gore	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Hale	O'Mahoney	Walcott
Carey	Harrison	Overton	Walsh
Clark	Hastings	Patterson	White
Connally	Hatch	Pittman	
Coolidge	Hatfield	Pope	
Copeland	Hayden	Reynolds	

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING], and the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] are unavoidably absent from the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Carolina as to the position of the committee on the pending amendment. If he has already made such an explanation, I will not ask him to repeat it.

Mr. BYRNES. I have not referred to that. The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia, if adopted, would repeal all the provisions of the Economy Act with reference to veterans of all wars. That is, as I understand, a succinct statement of the object of the amendment.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is correct, Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH. In other words, it would restore what is known as "disability allowances"?

Mr. BYRNES. It would restore the name of everybody who was on the rolls because of disability allowance; it would restore misconduct cases; in fact, any kind of a case that was on the roll on the day the Economy Act was enacted.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is correct, Mr. President.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia whether or not his amendment would repeal all the provisions of the Economy Act with reference to the compensation of Federal officers and employees?

Mr. HATFIELD. No, Mr. President; my amendment has been perfected, in view of the action taken yesterday, so that

the provisions regarding compensation of Federal officers and employees have been eliminated, and the amendment now deals only with the veterans.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD] has offered this amendment to the pending bill. As soon as the present session of Congress convened I introduced a bill to repeal the entire so-called "Economy Act", and I had an amendment ready to present now which would have had the same effect as the bill which I had introduced, namely, to repeal the entire Economy Act. But, Mr. President, it makes no difference to me who offers a measure having for its purpose the eradication from the statute books of the United States of this insult to every man who ever wore the uniform. I will support the amendment of my good friend from West Virginia just as whole-heartedly as if it were the one I myself had prepared. After all is said and done, what we desire is results, and we do desire results with justice to the veterans of the country.

I suppose everybody was amazed last March—I confess I was—when the new President of the United States, who had just been inaugurated into that high office, sent to the Congress the so-called "economy bill", demanding that it be passed forthwith. The entire Nation, I think, was startled that the Chief Executive could seemingly so completely forget the sacrifices made by those who had defended the country in time of war. His reason for demanding that the bill be passed was entirely materialistic. He had run for office on a platform promising the American people to reduce the Budget to the extent of \$1,000,000,000 annually. He frankly said, regardless of mercy or justice, that if \$400,000,000 could be taken from the veterans and their dependents it would enable him to balance the Budget, and, inferentially, keep his platform pledge.

It was a materialistic appeal. It made no difference that veterans might be kicked out of hospitals like dogs; it meant nothing to him that veterans who had been receiving benefits from the Treasury of the United States, accorded them by a grateful people, would be impoverished and sent to the bread lines all over the Nation, and that the care of the destitute should thenceforward be charged to the local taxpayers, already taxed to death from one end of the country to the other. Apparently the Congress would know neither mercy nor gratitude if it should stand behind the Presidential demand.

It was a question of balancing the Budget and keeping a campaign pledge to reduce the Budget to the extent of \$1,000,000,000. I regret to say, Mr. President, that both Houses of the Congress, apparently panic stricken, driven by the lash of the Chief Executive of the Nation, in the most cruel demand that any Chief Executive ever made in the history of the country, acceded to the demand and by large majorities in both Houses passed the bill.

The story since then has been tragic. What paradoxes have been suggested by this administration! The bill was so unusual when it came from the White House that it was given three names. Ordinarily, as every lawyer in this body knows full well, one name is all that is necessary for a measure. It usually takes that name and is known by it throughout the years. But this bill came in here like a thief in the night, heavily disguised or, as we used to say overseas, deeply camouflaged. First of all it was said to be "a bill to maintain the credit of the United States"—God save the mark!—as if any nation should deserve to have any credit that deliberately turned its back on its own defenders. "To maintain the credit of the United States", when every Member of this body knows that throughout the depression, 4 years or more, there never has been a time when an issue of bonds offered by the Government of the United States was not oversubscribed time and again—as many as 25 times.

Yet that misrepresentation was deliberately made—"to maintain the credit of the United States." That was false

nomenclature. The bill, to some degree, bears the name and title to this day "to Maintain the Credit of the United States" when since then the administration has created an additional indebtedness of more than \$10,000,000,000. That is the administration which took a paltry \$400,000,000 from the lame, the halt, and the blind; from the old soldiers who had given their future, their careers and even their lives in the service of the American people. From them was taken a paltry \$400,000,000 and since then, with a lavish hand, in the most reckless orgy of extravagance this country or any other has ever known; the administration has poured out \$10,000,000,000 in less than a year's time "to maintain the credit of the United States."

But, evidently fearing that was not enough to drive the weak and timid Members of the Senate to do the bidding of the Executive, the measure was given another name. It was said to be "the economy bill." It was not an economy bill. It was false economy—false as hell itself, Mr. President! It did not put a single man back to work. Instead, it added untold thousands of additional men, women, and children to the bread lines throughout the Nation, and robbed the veterans of nearly half a billion dollars in purchasing power at a time when purchasing power was the thing needed to make the recovery machine go. It simply heightened the depression, added to the strength of the deflation, and transferred the burden of taxes from the shoulders of the big-income earners throughout the country to the shoulders of the little property owners and the farmers throughout the United States already taxed to death. It was not an economy measure in any sense of the word.

Mr. President, it was decided to give it another name, still further to mislead public opinion in the country. It was said that it was "a bill to balance the Budget." Balance the Budget! Do Senators remember last year, hardly a year ago, when the President of the United States sent his message here and said, in substance, "If you will pass this bill I will balance the Budget"? Ha! How hollow it all sounds now! What a mockery! How could the President of the United States make that statement in the light of what has taken place in the last 11 months? "Balance the Budget!" Yes, he would balance the Budget! He had just complained bitterly here and throughout his campaign because of the fact that during a period of 3 years his predecessor had been unable to balance the Budget by about \$3,000,000,000 in round numbers, as I remember, and he proposed to balance the Budget forthwith "if you will just take this money away from these disabled veterans of the United States."

That was less than a year ago, hardly 10 months ago, and today by the President's own admission we face a deficit in the Treasury of more than \$10,000,000,000 and a national indebtedness of approximately \$32,000,000,000, the largest in all our history; and no one is to be found here or at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, in the Executive Mansion, even to suggest a way of paying off the indebtedness save by onerous and enormous taxes or by what the country fears, printing-press money utterly uncontrolled. Yet that appeal was made to the Members of both Houses: "Pass this cruel, unjust, utterly brutal law against the disabled veterans of the Nation, and we will balance the Budget." That, in effect, was the statement made then.

Well, of course, it was not a bill to balance the Budget. It did not balance the Budget. The Budget is not balanced today. It will not be balanced next year, nor the year after, nor in the next 10 years; and everybody here within the sound of my voice who understands that 2 and 2 are 4 knows that that is a true, correct, and conservative statement.

"Balance the Budget!" What crimes are committed in that phraseology, "Balance the Budget!"

So it was all wrong. The premise was wrong. The promises were not kept; but a cowardly Congress, driven by the lash of the Chief Executive, passed the law just the same.

There is an element of grim humor in it all, though, Mr. President. It is a sense of humor that has sustained the

American soldier throughout all the conflicts in which he has engaged.

It was a sense of humor that permitted the boys in blue in the dark days of the sixties to look on the tragedy on all sides and yet find, somewhere or other, something over which they might smile, even though they were called upon to spill their blood ultimately to reconstruct the Union and let it continue to be the land that Washington had built and that Lincoln preserved.

It was a sense of humor that sustained the Spanish War veterans on many battlegrounds far from home. Nine thousand miles away they fought in the Philippines and gave an empire to the American people. I have seen their graves out there. They died in the service of their country in Puerto Rico, at San Juan Hill, in Cuba, and elsewhere. Everywhere they fought for the glory of the flag. Yet they were able to smile at the embalmed-beef scandals in connection with the profiteers of that day; the profiteers, the scavengers that hang on behind the army fighting at the front, defending them and perpetuating their fortunes, were selling rotten meat to the Government of the United States, which they knew would be fed to the defenders of the Nation out under the stars; they knew that those soldiers would die from that rotten embalmed beef—as hundreds of them did—yet in order that they might enrich themselves, they did this dastardly thing.

They were the predecessors, the antecedents of this similar organization that calls itself today the National Economy League. Yet a grim sense of humor permitted the soldiers, sailors, and marines of that conflict to smile in the midst of their troubles.

It was a sense of humor that permitted the lads some 17 years ago, over on the other side of the sea, to face death a thousand times a day and still smile, thinking of the folks back home for whom they were sacrificing. So the soldier can always appreciate a humorous incident; and there was some grim humor in the signing of this bill, when it was finally signed.

Mr. President, you are perfectly familiar with the fact that whenever an important measure passes the Congress, many Members of the Senate and many Members of the House go trooping up to the White House to claim the pen that signed the act. No great crowd went charging to the White House to get the pen that signed this law. No, Mr. President; not a Member of either body wanted to claim that pen; and among all the pens of the earth, this pen is the pariah. It still goes about unclaimed; but the act was passed.

Then what happened? Immediately those in charge of its administration began throwing disabled veterans out of the hospitals over all the United States—hospitals which a grateful people had erected for the care of their defenders. Three hundred and fifty of them almost immediately at Dayton, some in their underwear, more than 80 a day at the hospital at Leavenworth; 15,000 within the first couple of weeks were kicked out of the hospitals.

I submitted to the Senate a photograph of one lad ejected in his underwear. They let him have a suit of Government clothing to wear while he was in the hospital. Finally, when we passed this thing called a "law", which is a blot on the escutcheon of the United States of America, they threw him out and took the clothes off his back and started him down the company street clad only in his underwear, and a kindly citizen out there picked him up, took him to the nearest place where he might be outfitted, and himself bought him some decent clothing.

Do you know what it means, Mr. President, to throw a disabled veteran out of a veterans' hospital?

Here is a soldier, lying on a bed of pain in a hospital erected for him by a grateful people, and an attendant of the hospital comes up to him and says, "Get up! Get out! We cannot keep you here any longer." "But", says the soldier, "Why? I am not able to move. I am wounded. I am sick. I am sore. I did not get myself in this condition for my own advantage. I got this way out there serving the United States, maintaining its sovereignty, sacrificing

for the people of the Nation, who always have been grateful in the past."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUFFY in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I do.

Mr. HATFIELD. Does the Senator know the number that were eliminated from the hospitals?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have not the number here. If the Senator has it, I shall be glad to have him state it.

Mr. HATFIELD. Between eleven and thirteen thousand.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I had understood that it was around 15,000 in round numbers. That was the figure I mentioned a moment ago. I am glad to have the exact number.

"But", says the soldier on the bed of pain, "I am not able to leave, and I have nowhere to go. This is the only home I have." The hospital attendant says, "It makes no difference; you will have to get out." Some of them were carried out on stretchers. "Get out! We have got to balance the Budget. We have got to balance the Budget." That is what followed the passage of the so-called "economy law."

There were hundreds of thousands of cases of hardship. This law affected only disabled veterans, widows, and orphans—only the disabled; not the able-bodied men. It affected the old soldiers of the Civil War, whose average age now is 90. Has a grateful nation so soon forgotten and become ungrateful? Everybody here knows that a man 90 years old is thoroughly disabled by age. They have been slashed under this act to such an extent that many of them find difficulty in eking out a decent existence.

Only the other day a dear old lady from southern Indiana, a regular correspondent of mine, herself 89 years old, the widow of a distinguished Civil War veteran dead these many years, wrote me a letter and in substance said, "I have always been proud of this great Nation. I have been thrilled when the flag went by. I still am. I have worn with vast pride my button as a member of the auxiliary of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Women's Relief Corps, and still do. I am so happy that my late husband was willing to bare his own breast to the foe to preserve this Nation and the Constitution on which it rests; but", she said, "in these latter days I am wondering, 'What price glory?' They have slashed my pension now. I was receiving \$20 a month. It was all in the world I had on which to live; and they have slashed that now to such an extent that it begins to look as if I shall have to wind up my days in the poorhouse."

The average age of the Spanish War veteran is 60—threescore years. They are disabled by age alone.

How could it be otherwise in a time like this, when big industry over the United States will not employ anybody over 40 years of age? Ninety-three thousand of these veterans are above the age of 62. They never received anything in the way of recognition until 1920, perhaps, 22 years after the Spanish War ended. Then they received the merest pittance, what amounted to practically nothing. Finally in 1926 we gave them substantial consideration, 28 years after the war which gave us an empire had ended. They were permitted to enjoy the benefits received then, though by no means an extravagant benefit, for about six years and a half. Then it was taken from them overnight and without the slightest warning in the world—to balance the Budget! To maintain the credit of the United States! As an expedient of economy!

Mr. President, this is what happened overnight, right here in this Chamber and in the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol. The benefits given to these men—men up in years, threescore years of age—were taken from them without the slightest warning. They were ordered, in effect, by the Government of the United States to go out and join the line of unemployed, upward of 15,000,000 walking the streets looking for jobs, with none to be found; to find jobs, when industry will employ no one above 40 years of age—and they

are now 60—or else starve to death. That is the way they were sentenced.

No wonder that any number of those men have committed suicide, not knowing how they might subsist. Now, in the evening of life, they have been deprived of benefits which a grateful people had told them they might rely upon in old age. So they are disabled by age, and many of them are physically disabled as well.

Thirty-six years after the conflict ended they are now commanded, if they receive anything at all, to prove direct service connection, to prove that any disabilities from which they may suffer today are directly connected with their service when all the evidence is gone. Comrades of theirs with whom they served, major surgeons of the long ago, are dead and in their graves, and whatever small fragments of evidence may remain are in the hands of the Government, not accessible to them. Yet, under this act and its cruel administration by the "personal" government, as it is characterized, they are deprived of what had been given them. Under the personal government, regulations have been issued from time to time, and under the law and these regulations the Spanish War veterans are ordered to go out and produce evidence directly connecting their disabilities with the service they rendered 35 or 36 years ago. Service records were practically unknown in those days; so they are asked to do the impossible and are eliminated entirely from presumption, though they are all disabled.

Let me now read from the message of the President transmitting this evil thing to the Congress last year, this ill-smelling thing which now smells to high heaven, which, as enacted, has been the cause of so much tragedy in this land among men, women, and children. Let me read the President's words:

When a great danger threatens our basic security it is my duty to advise the Congress of the way to preserve it. In so doing I must be fair not only to the few but to the many. It is in this spirit that I appeal to you. If the Congress chooses to vest me with this responsibility it will be exercised in a spirit of justice to all, of sympathy to those who are in need, and of maintaining inviolate the basic welfare of the United States.

I ask that this legislation go into effect at once without even waiting for the beginning of the next fiscal year.

He was so anxious to get the money out of the pockets of these poor old disabled veterans; he wanted it on the spot, to balance the Budget, to maintain the credit of the United States.

I give you assurance that if this is done, there is reasonable prospect that within a year the income of the Government will be sufficient to cover the expenditures of the Government.

A year has not passed, only about 10 months have gone, and now we are \$10,000,000,000 worse off than we were then; but we have robbed disabled veterans and their families, and sent innumerable persons to their deaths.

The only World War veterans affected are the disabled. Their average age is 40 now. But under the laws they had to prove physical disability, with the burden of proof on their own shoulders—10-percent disability if service connected, and 25 percent, at least, if nonservice connected.

Mr. President, this severe action was taken against only the disabled veterans of the United States—Civil War, Spanish War, World War. The able-bodied were spared. The only ones we robbed were the disabled, the lame, the sick, and the halt; those who are unable to take care of themselves or to fight for themselves.

I grant there might have been some abuses; that is possible. I never heard of any law enacted by any Congress that could not be abused by unscrupulous persons. But if there were abuses, they could easily have been remedied by proper administration, and should have been. There was no occasion to destroy the entire structure of the laws just because there might have been an abuse here and there. There is no good reason for tearing down and destroying a building just because a window pane may be broken. That is precisely what was done here.

The entire building was destroyed, the entire structure of benefits and pensions granted to veterans during the last

12 years by Congress was overturned overnight; the veteran was robbed of his vested rights, and he was placed at the mercy of an autocratic Executive, at the absolute mercy of the Chief Executive of the Nation.

We can never begin to do justice to these veterans until we restore their vested rights, give them laws backing them up in their benefits, so that they do not have to trust to the whim of one man in the United States out of 130,000,000; one man, who, if he happens to rise in the morning not feeling well, could by proclamation wipe out everything that had been given the veterans in the years gone by.

I want to restore the veterans' vested rights, give the veteran a law behind him so that he does not have to depend on any one man for justice. The Government of the United States, by legislation, has protected him. His vested rights we took away from him. It was not only unfair; it was unjust, cruel, and brutal.

The principal force behind all this was the National Economy League. In May a year ago a little group of millionaires and near-millionaires, in the very shadow of Wall Street, projected the so-called "Economy League." Look at the list, and it will be found that the names all cluster around the stock exchange. It was organized in July of that same year. It was incorporated in November of the same year. Yet in those few weeks, according to the evidence given before the Joint Congressional Committee Investigating Veterans' Affairs, of which committee I happen to be a member, they had collected together a slush fund of more than \$200,000 to be used in the nefarious work of poisoning public opinion in America against the defenders of the Nation.

They employed one Major Curran to manage the work directed against the veterans. According to his own evidence before the committee, they paid him a salary of \$15,000 a year and, so far as I know, they still do. He rather boasted of the salary he received, seeming to fear that some of us might think that some time or other he might have been near a bread line. He submitted a list of 17 names of individuals in this country who had contributed—just the 17—\$35,100 to this slush fund; and if Senators will examine that list of 17 names, it will be found they represent the wealthiest families in the United States.

Why this hue and cry against the veteran? What was the purpose of it all? Only that this little group and those allied with them might save a little something in income tax. That is all it was done for, as shown by their own testimony.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to know if the Senator does not think that those gentlemen had better be making their peace with the soldiers if conditions continue to go as they have been going in the last few years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Why, of course, Mr. President. The Senator from Louisiana is entirely right on that subject. War is all around us. War is apt to break out any moment. One man whom this administration has tried to make unpopular is the soldier. If there is one man in the country whom they have set out to make unpopular with the American people it is the old soldier. Under those circumstances, where are we going to get our recruits; where are we going to get our soldiers, our sailors, and marines for a possible war with Japan, or if by their international bickering they drive us into war in Europe? Where are the soldiers of this country coming from when they are treated like dogs? Wars cannot be won without soldiers. Wars cannot be won without sailors and marines. How can we expect to get soldiers, sailors, and marines to fight for our country when we treat them in such brutal fashion?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am wondering if the Senator from Indiana has ever thought about the fact that some 7,000,000 or

8,000,000 people, representing families of perhaps 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 people, might some day get tired of starving, at which time those rich people might need some soldiers.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Why, of course, Mr. President. They are short-sighted; there is no doubt about that. Unfortunately, however, this injustice has been done finally by the Congress and by the Chief Executive. It is up to the Congress and the Chief Executive to, so far as possible, right that great wrong that has been done before it is too late. Even now it is too late, Mr. President, to bring back from the grave those who have been slain by this cowardly thing.

Mr. President, I received a letter the other day which is characteristic of the many letters every Member of this body receives. This letter comes from the West coast and is as follows:

Facing blindness and insanity in his penniless old age, the Reverend Harry W. Burton, 72-year-old Spanish-American War veteran, yesterday took the easiest way out—suicide.

Slumped over in his little room at 2301 South Hope Street—a room he took when Government economy moves forced him to leave the veterans' hospital at Sawtelle—he was found dead by Detective Lieutenant Vern Flivy.

At his side, next to an empty poison bottle, was a note. It read: "I humbly ask forgiveness for all I have done wrong. I am facing insanity and blindness as well as suffering. I wish a little flag buried with me as well as my badges."

He still loves the flag.

"Many thanks for the kindnesses shown. I hope the dear Lord will forgive me. There is no need for an inquest. Just a suicide."

That is his own statement. If the American people knew just how this iniquitous thing we call the "economy law" is working, they would rise up en masse and demand that Congress repeal it forthwith.

A man writes to me from Yountville, Calif.:

But my case is no worse than thousands of others and not as bad as many others. In the San Francisco Bay region, according to records kept by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, 700,000 free meals have been given to needy veterans during this depression, and since the Economy Act 55 have brought their misery to end.

Fifty-five have committed suicide right in the San Francisco district because of the Economy Act.

The number of unnatural deaths is still increasing.

That is a personal letter to me. Anyone interested in it can have the name and the address of the correspondent.

I have received hundreds of such communications. I suppose every Senator has. So I shall not dwell further upon it. The facts are known to all of us.

I desire to go a little further, however, with reference to the economy law. The idea was to save income tax. Of course, someone must pay the bill, Mr. President. That is true. Finally the taxpayers must pay the bill. The only question involved in legislation of this kind is which taxpayers shall pay it.

Something like 20 years ago we adopted the Federal income-tax amendment and added it to the Constitution. During the years from then till now a great deal of the revenue of the Federal Treasury has been derived from that source. Normally it costs about \$4,000,000,000 a year to run this Government—the annual Budget amounts to some \$4,000,000,000. In other words, to put it in a homely phrase, it costs Uncle Sam in normal times approximately \$4,000,000,000 a year to keep house. Included in the \$4,000,000,000 was approximately \$400,000,000 annually to the disabled veterans of the country. They were included in the Federal Budget. It was less than that, Mr. President. I think it is claimed the saving has been about \$275,000,000 at the expense of the veteran. Of course, if a substantial part of this revenue comes from income taxes, then those who pay income taxes might expect considerable relief if \$400,000,000 could be eliminated yearly from the Budget, if one cared not for mercy or justice.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I do not quite understand the Senator's figures of \$400,000,000. The Senator does not mean that that

includes the payments to all veterans of all wars and their widows and dependents?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That was the amount that was undertaken to be saved through the Economy Act.

Mr. GORE. I thought the Senator from Indiana said there was a saving of \$275,000,000 as a total.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The Senator from Oregon can perhaps give us the exact figures. I will give the Senator from Oklahoma my own understanding of the situation. I understand they started out to save \$450,000,000 by depriving the veteran of certain benefits which had been allowed him. That in the end it amounted to only about \$275,000,000, which was saved at the expense of the veteran.

Mr. GORE. I misunderstood the Senator's statement. I thought he said that the \$400,000,000 was the aggregate of expenditures on veterans of all wars.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No; it is probably more than that, Mr. President; but the amount they undertook to save was \$400,000,000, and that \$400,000,000 was included, of course, in the Federal Budget.

Mr. GORE. As I said, I misunderstood the statement of the Senator. I thought he was limiting his statement to the aggregate expenditures, whereas he spoke of the savings that were endeavored to be made. I think the total expenditures of all kinds in connection with the veterans was something over a billion dollars.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Oh, no, Mr. President. Before this debate shall be finished I think we can put the exact figures in the RECORD. That sounds like the statement put out by the Economy League, which never had any basis in truth.

Mr. GORE. It includes the expenses of disbursement. Very well; I should like to have the exact figure in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I think we can secure those figures, and I am quite sure they are nowhere near the aggregate mentioned by the Senator from Oklahoma. They were given in the debate last year at the time the bill was under consideration here, and especially, as I now remember, when there was pending the so-called "Steinwer-Cutting amendment", which was adopted by the Senate, but in conference was eliminated, that question came up again, and I think the exact figures, as nearly as we could get at the exact figures, were put into the RECORD. They were very much less than the amount the Senator has just suggested, as I now recollect; but we will try to put in the RECORD the exact figures, which, of course, are available.

But, Mr. President, if the amount were \$400,000,000 or \$250,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000, and a grateful people decided that the defenders of the Nation, now disabled and unable to gain a livelihood in the ordinary vocations, were entitled to it, then, of course, it was an unjust act to deprive them of it and throw them on charity and the local taxing units throughout the Nation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. STEIWER. If the Senator will indulge me, I can supply some of the figures in which the Senator from Oklahoma is interested. The high point of veterans' expenditures was in the independent offices bill of a year ago. That bill was passed at the close of the old administration but never became a law. It carried for pensions, including World War compensation, a total of \$592,000,000 plus; it carried for administration, including hospitalization, \$111,000,000 plus. That makes a total, I think, of \$704,300,000 plus. Those figures, of course, do not include some additional items, such as the appropriation for the fund to retire the adjusted-compensation certificates and certain appropriations which had relation to the insurance policies under the War Risk Insurance Act.

That, I submit, is the high mark with respect to these figures. It might be interesting to note that for the fiscal year 1935, that is to say, in the pending bill now before the

Senate, for pensions, including additional allowances under the regulations of January 19, there is proposed to be appropriated a total, I think, of \$296,000,000 plus, for administration purposes \$86,000,000 plus, or a total of \$383,000,000.

I think the Senator from Indiana is quite right in his recollection that it was thought that there might be a saving of approximately \$400,000,000 by virtue of the enactment of the economy bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. STEIWER. Just one more sentence, and I will conclude. I recall at the time that bill was pending before the Finance Committee of the Senate a statement was made by General Hines and an additional statement by the Director of the Budget. In those statements it was estimated that the total saving under the economy bill would be \$383,000,000; but subsequently, when the regulations were promulgated, it was found that they went just a little further than had been contemplated; and it was announced in the press, and, I think, everywhere accepted, that the regulations of March 31 would have made a total saving in excess of \$400,000,000. One figure that was used was \$405,000,000. There were those who contended, after the cases were reviewed and the regulations were put into effect, that the saving would run somewhat higher than that; and I think some of the veterans' organizations estimated that the total savings contemplated under the regulations of March 31 would run as high as \$450,000,000, affording a basis for the figures used by the Senator from Indiana a little while ago.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Did the Senator from Oregon say that the aggregate appropriations for pensions in the appropriation bill of last year which was not enacted aggregated \$575,000,000? I did not quite get the figures.

Mr. STEIWER. The aggregate amount was \$592,000,000 plus.

Mr. GORE. Was the proposed saving of \$450,000,000 supposed to come out of that \$592,000,000?

Mr. STEIWER. No; the major part of it, of course, would come out of that figure, and something like twenty-five or thirty million dollars would come out of the cost of administration, including the overhead of the Bureau and the cost of hospitalization.

Mr. GORE. I was wondering what the aggregate would be, including all items, from which the \$450,000,000 should be subtracted in order to have the minuend and subtrahend correspond to items. Obviously it would not be correct to subtract \$450,000,000, covering various and sundry items, from \$592,000,000 which is limited to pensions alone. My point is to develop how much would have been paid after the saving had been effected.

Mr. STEIWER. It would not have been very much if the regulations of March 31 had been maintained, but the Senator will remember that on June 6 the President liberalized those regulations by raising the rates and changing the method of figuring the rates of compensation. It was supposed that that action restored to the veterans about \$47,000,000, as I remember. Then, in June, Congress enacted a bill that became Public Law 78 and that restored to the veterans benefits of nearly \$50,000,000. So that altogether nearly \$97,000,000 in benefits were restored by those two acts. Then, subsequently, on January 19 of this year, the President made a further liberalization which it was estimated would cost about \$21,000,000; so that at this time it is necessary to carry into this bill a very substantial sum of money; but as it was originally contemplated under the regulations of March 31, 1933, the cost to our Treasury for taking care of the veterans of this country was not a stupendous figure.

Mr. GORE. The background I had in mind was the statement that the expenditures for the veterans of various wars and their dependents, widows, and orphans, for hospitalization, compensation, and adjusted-service certificate sinking

fund aggregated about \$1,080,000,000, or something like \$3,000,000 a day, and that \$2,000,000 a day were allotted to the veterans of the World War. Was that an overestimate?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That was evidently an overestimate. I have never seen the amount estimated that high. I think the correct figure—certainly much more nearly correct—is that just suggested by the Senator from Oregon, who has made a very careful study of this entire question, especially so far as costs are concerned.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I should like to say, if I may, in reply to the question of the Senator from Oklahoma, that the estimate of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, which estimate was pending at the time of the passage of the Economy Act, was a total for veterans' activities of \$945,988,634.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. May I ask the Senator, in addition to the figure named by the Senator from Oregon, where does the Senator get the other three or four hundred million dollars?

Mr. BYRNES. I must say that I was unable to follow the statement made by the Senator from Oregon. The figure just given by me represents the estimated cost for the Veterans' Administration for 1934, and it contains a number of items, including compensation and pensions to veterans of the World War, Spanish-American War, Civil War, and other wars, and dependents of such veterans; compensation for peace-time, service-connected disabilities, and expenditures for administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, military and naval insurance, hospital and domiciliary facilities and services, State and Territorial homes for disabled soldiers and sailors. It includes all veterans' activities.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. What is the source of the Senator's information?

Mr. BYRNES. It is the estimate of cost for 1934 of the Veterans' Administration, and this is a duplicate or a photostatic copy of the estimates made at that time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That figure is a great deal higher than the correct figure.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. STEIWER. I think there is no basis for any controversy about a point of this kind. The figures just stated by the Senator from South Carolina are no doubt correct, but they include an item covering the war-risk insurance policies. It must be remembered that the veterans pay the premiums on such policies, and the money is put in and then appropriated. The figures read include also the retirement fund for the so-called "bonus certificates." There can be no question as to what those figures were, because the estimates just read to the Senate by the Senator from South Carolina were incorporated in the independent offices appropriation bill that was passed by the Congress, but which failed to become a law at the end of President Hoover's administration.

The figures I read a little while ago were the figures taken from the bill by one of the members of my own staff, and I have no doubt they correctly set forth the amount of money that was contemplated for expenditure at that time for the fiscal year 1934, but excluding these additional items and dealing only with the subject of pensions and compensation; that is to say, the amounts that go direct from the Treasury to the veterans in the way of benefits of one kind or another, the total was \$592,000,000 plus, and the administration cost, including hospitalization, was over \$111,000,000, making a total of \$704,300,000. I think there will be no difficulty on that score. If any Senator cares to verify these figures he will find that the estimates which the Senator from South

Carolina just read to the Senate will verify what I have said as to the amount carried in the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Before I yield to the Senator from West Virginia, let me suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that that only shows the nefariousness of the campaign which has been carried on against the poor old disabled veteran in this country, especially by the so-called "Economy League", which used the same figures as the amount the veteran was receiving from the Government. I am not at all imputing any blame to the Senator from South Carolina, because he read the estimates as they were given to Congress. I merely suggest that included in these figures, by those concerns of the country and those individuals who are working against the veteran and against justice for the veteran, were amounts that the veteran himself has paid for his own insurance when he went forth to offer his life, the premiums that he himself has paid into the Government, and disbursements from that insurance fund. For the first time in the history of this country, the insistence by the then President of the United States was that the veteran, as he went forth to offer his life for his country, should never receive any pension, but in lieu thereof he should insure his own life and pay the premiums out of his own pocket, which he did, making allotments to the Government out of his pay; and then he made allotments for Government bonds which he had to buy. He sent those allotments to the Government. Then he made allotments to his folks back home, and when he got through making allotments the \$30 a month he had been given or promised for stopping bullets had evaporated to about \$2 remaining for tobacco and cigars.

All of that money has been charged against the veterans in these statements that have been published to the country against him, endeavoring to show how he was a "Treasury raider", and there have been charged in those statements his own premiums, his own money that he paid for insurance on his own life as he went forth to offer himself as a sacrifice for his country.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield further to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. STEIWER. Unless I am entirely mistaken in my recollection of the matter, there was included also in the estimates read to the Senate by the Senator from South Carolina a considerable item for cost of retirement pay for the officers and men of the Army and Navy. That was one item the Government undertook to pay as a part of the national defense. It ought not to have been charged to the veterans for the purpose of determining the cost of maintaining the veterans of the country, but I am quite sure that the figure is in the total. It is another item used by the Economy League to endeavor to prove that we were paying too much for the care of the veterans of the war in this country.

I should be very glad, if the Senator from Indiana will permit, to have the Senator from South Carolina read that particular item or, if it is in a group, the group of items that make up the retirement allowance for the men of the Army and Navy.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes; I shall be very glad to have the Senator do that.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I will state that the figures I read did not include any item that I could identify in connection with the Senator's remarks. The figure I read was, in round numbers, \$945,000,000. The statement of the Senator is exact as to excluding the amounts estimated to be paid by the adjusted-compensation certificate fund. That was \$100,000,000. I find no item such as the Senator has referred to with reference to retirement. There is an item of \$20,000,000 which is not included in the \$945,000,000, but

which makes the total estimate \$966,000,000. The item the Senator refers to as \$20,000,000 is not included in the \$945,000,000.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I promised first to yield to the Senator from West Virginia, but if he will pardon me, I will yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to get this information, and I thought while the Senator from South Carolina was on his feet he might give it to me. What is the difference in cost, if the Hatfield amendment be adopted, as against the present cost under the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. BYRNES. I am unable to answer that question. The Hatfield amendment, as I understand it and as the Senator from West Virginia has confirmed, simply restores to the roll everybody who was on the roll for any benefit at all prior to March 19, 1933.

Mr. OVERTON. It restores the original status quo?

Mr. BYRNES. It restores all emergency officers, all disability-allowance cases—in fact, it restores everyone to the rolls who was on there on the date of the passage of the Economy Act on March 19, 1933.

Mr. OVERTON. How much have we saved to the Government in respect to veterans' benefits?

Mr. BYRNES. Approximately \$364,000,000 less one figure, I am informed, of \$20,000,000, which should not be included. It would be approximately \$325,000,000 to \$340,000,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I am glad to yield now to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the figure the Senator from South Carolina gives covers a full year and part of another year. The disbursement, as it appears in the annual report of the Administrator for the full year 1932, was \$869,000,000. The bill at the present time carries \$567,000,000. The difference would be \$302,000,000. That takes care of all, as I understand, of the disbursements for the year 1932, which was the last full year of the administration of the veterans' law before the enactment of the Economy Act.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, it does not make so much difference in times like these when we are spending hundreds of millions weekly, when we have more than 40 new bureaus erected, with more than 40,000 additional employees with no civil-service status required, when we are throwing money away prodigally to employ youngsters to plant trees and all that sort of thing. This amount really is not so much. But suppose it is? If my very good friend from West Virginia does not object, I would like to read a statement made by him in a very excellent speech last Monday which goes straight to the point. Said the Senator from West Virginia:

Mr. President, as an American and in keeping with the history of our forefathers, I think it more important that we look to remedying the injustices in which this body participated rather than to quibble about the cost involved. There has not been the slightest indication of a penurious attitude on the part of those who raised this question when they have been asked blindly to place in the hands of those not elected to public office the expenditure of not millions but billions of the taxpayers' money. However, I do not hesitate to state the cost, insofar as that cost can be ascertained by inquiry at Government offices. The cost will be approximately \$295,000,000.

I should like to develop a little further, if I may, the attitude of the so-called "National Economy League" and some of the reasons, perhaps, that motivate them.

In the first place, they represent the interests that made money out of the war, that always make war pay. They are the profiteers. The last war cost the American people approximately \$36,000,000,000. How much of that vast sum do you suppose went to the cannon fodder, to the troops, to those who are now veterans of that conflict and to their deceased comrades? Less than four and a half billion dollars. In other words, of the tremendous sum of \$36,000,000,000 that the American people dug out of their pockets and their savings with which to buy Liberty bonds and Victory Loan

issues to assist in winning the war, only approximately four and a half billion dollars went to the more than 4,000,000 men engaged in the conflict. Thirty-one and a half billion dollars, practically all the rest of that vast sum, went to the profiteers, the munition makers, the cantonment contractors, all those engaged in the big business incident to the war; those, in a word, who, 4,000 miles behind the lines, were making war pay, and pay with a bang.

A most interesting disclosure came to light in the bank inquiry. As I remember, my good friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER] mentioned in the debate last year the names of those who were on the pet lists, the preferred lists of the House of Morgan, receiving vast gratuities from that financial institution for which they had not rendered any service whatever.

A large percentage of the names of those persons on the pet lists, as we call them here, who had received these bonuses, these gratuities from the House of Morgan for having rendered no service, were members, active members, of the so-called "Economy League", that insists on balancing the Budget with the nickels of the disabled veterans of the country. Not only that; a large percentage of them in the House of Morgan—all of the partners, as I remember—who invented the pet list, failed during 1931 and 1932 to pay any income taxes whatever toward defraying the cost of the Budget of the United States.

But we will assume that those with large incomes will have to pay considerable in the way of income taxes into the Treasury of the United States; from the Treasury, of course, comes the money to defray the cost of the Budget, which includes the veterans' benefits. These charges we have always considered before as a national obligation, a national responsibility. Of course, if now we could eliminate \$400,000,000 or even \$295,000,000 from the Budget, thereby doing this vast injustice to the disabled defenders of the country, we could reduce the income taxes of those who organized the National Economy League and the people they represent, and they would save a few paltry dollars. And to do so they would take the pennies from the pockets of the veterans and their dependents.

The taxpayers have it to pay. Listen: When we take \$400,000,000 away from the national Budget and discharge these disabled veterans from the hospitals, they go back to the local communities whence they came. Who takes care of them? They cannot be allowed to starve, so the local citizens—the overtaxed and overburdened small property owners and farmers—have this additional burden placed on their shoulders; but it is all right with the Economy League. They have gotten out from under. They have been relieved from income taxes.

Here is a man receiving \$12 a month, a disabled veteran, with which he has been supporting a wife and three children, perhaps. I know of one case where a disabled veteran was receiving \$12 a month for 25-percent disability, and was supporting with the \$12 himself, his wife, and seven children, and has never asked for charity. I do not know how he did it, and no one else does, but he did it. But August 1 came. The Government took the \$12 away from him. What happened? The local people had to take care of him, and they are taking care of him today. The local taxing units have to bear the cost of it. By that sort of economy we just transfer the burden from Wall Street, from the big income earners, to the shoulders of the local taxpayers throughout the United States.

That is unfair. Listen, Mr. President: War is a national emergency. War is a national responsibility. When men go into war, they go into war for their country. These disabled veterans who now are unable to work at any gainful means of earning a livelihood because of their wounds, their disabilities, did not fight the war for New York City, or for Indianapolis, or for San Francisco. They fought the war for the Nation. Therefore, it is a national responsibility; and all the costs of the war, no matter how high they may be, should and must be borne by the National Treasury, and not by the local taxpayers of Columbus, Ohio, or Miami, Fla., or Detroit, Mich., or any State in the Union.

It is a national responsibility. It is a national obligation. But the Economy League is entirely satisfied. Its members have saved a few dollars in income taxes.

Mr. President, I have in my letter files hundreds of cases that have come to my personal attention, and that I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate. The only reason I forbear is because I know every Member of this body has received the same kind of communications. Everybody here knows the cruelty of this thing, and the tragedy that has followed in the wake of the Economy Act. If that be true, then everybody here should vote to correct today, as far as we can humanly do so, the injustice that has been done. The only way to do that is to repeal in its entirety the infamous thing we call a law.

We paid huge bonuses to the big interests of the country. We gave the railroads an enormous bonus as soon as the war had ended. We did not ask them to wait until 1945. We paid them cash. We gave the cantonment contractors a bonus. We did not ask them to wait until 1945, but paid them cash. Others came and received large payments; but when the veterans came in 1924 the Congress not only did not pay him cash but it told him to wait until 1945, and said that if he should then be still living it would give him something!

That was bad enough. Of course, the so-called "bonus", the adjusted-service certificates, should have been paid in cash at the time. I shall not go into that subject extensively at this time. Later during the session I hope to do so. I mention it now merely, incidentally, to show you that injustice was done the veteran. The debt was acknowledged, but not paid. It is now 16 years overdue; but in addition to that, adding insult to injury, the Congress then proceeded to take his benefits away from the veteran.

Does anyone in this body believe for a moment that any member of the Grand Army of the Republic would attempt to rob the Treasury of the United States? Yet that great organization recognizes the injustice that has been done the few survivors of the Civil War and the widows of those who have gone on.

Does anyone in this body believe for one moment that the Spanish War veterans would try to rob the Treasury of the United States, when they are organized to keep alive patriotic fervor, organized to implant patriotism in the hearts of the youth of the land, organized to see that everybody shall revere the flag and defend it whenever it be in danger?

Does anybody here believe that the members of the great American Legion would try to rob the Treasury, when that organization has been extolled on all sides, from coast to coast and from the Lakes to the Gulf, for its high sense of patriotism and patriotic duty?

Does anybody here believe that the Veterans of Foreign Wars, staunch in their fidelity to American traditions and to the Constitution of the United States, to patriotic activity on the part of all our citizens—does anybody think the Veterans of Foreign Wars would attempt to rob the Treasury?

Does anybody think that the Disabled American Veterans, men all disabled, unable to work at the ordinary vocations of life, those who have given their whole careers, their future, for this country and its institutions—does anybody believe that they would rob the Treasury?

There are other organizations of a similar kind and the auxiliaries; and they are all crying out for justice, for repeal of this infamous thing that is called a law.

Mr. President, there can be no justice with anything less than complete repeal of the so-called "Economy Act", which was forced through this body and the body at the other end of the Capitol under the lash of the Chief Executive. This was the Chief Executive who could say at a great veterans' convention in Chicago but a few months ago that a man who has worn the uniform is entitled to nothing if he be starving except charity from local units of government; and if they cannot supply it, then from State charity facilities; and if the State cannot supply it, then, and only as a last resort, may he appeal to the Federal Government, when it, through its charity, might keep him from starving to death, if he has

not already starved long before he got through all those stages.

Mr. President, that, in substance, is what I heard him say. It is all wrong, and absolutely contrary to the American tradition, to the patriotic impulse of the American people. It is all wrong. Any public official who utters such a dictum and undertakes to say that that stands for American public opinion misrepresents thoroughly American public opinion, and, in my judgment, is false to his trust.

We shall have other wars and we shall need other defenders. I warn you not to make it too unpopular to wear the uniform of your country. There will be other times when men will be seen, if they may be enlisted, marching through the streets of all our cities, going out yonder, under sun by day and stars by night, to defend the people of this country, to defend the women and children. I hope you will not make it so unpopular to become a soldier that when the time comes when we require defense there will be nobody to offer himself.

Mr. President, when two nations go to war they fight to the death. One may die; both may die. We have seen great nations go to their death during the past 20 years. When two nations go to war one or the other invades its antagonist's land, the land of the adversary, and when a nation's territory is invaded who is it who suffers first and most, worse than death itself? It is the women and the children. No one ever knows which land may be invaded, and when a man puts on the uniform and goes out, therefore, to fight for the flag of his country, he fights to defend the women and children of the land against a fate far worse than death.

When two nations go to war the conqueror may undertake to enslave the vanquished. Then the citizens of the vanquished nation become slaves and vassals to the other nation. So, when a man wears the uniform and goes out to defend the flag of his country, he defends the freedom of his country, he defends the men as well as the women and children in their rights as free men and free women. He does this with his life, if need be.

This is the man, this disabled veteran, who has been crucified by this thing called law. It is necessary, if we would do any measure of justice worthy of this body, that the entire economy act be repealed, that the vested rights of the veterans of the United States of all the wars be restored to them, and that we wipe this blot off the national escutcheon, so that never again will anybody attempt to persuade this Nation to turn its back on its own defenders.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall most cordially, most heartily, most enthusiastically support the amendment offered by my friend from West Virginia, with the hope from the depths of my heart that it may be adopted by this body, and the body at the other end of the Capitol, unanimously and with great enthusiasm.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POPE in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator from Indiana is aware of the fact that 1,125,000 of these boys suffer from some chest ailment, such as influenza, pneumonia, and bronchitis?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. What was the number?

Mr. HATFIELD. A million one hundred and twenty-five thousand.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I did not know that was the number, but I am glad to have that in the RECORD. The Senator is a very skillful surgeon, noted all over the country as a skillful and famous surgeon, and I would like to ask him a question. I have heard that in upward of 55 or 60 veterans' hospitals of the country up to date, of the something over 4,000,000 called to the colors in 1917, more than 1,000,000 cases have been hospitalized, so terrific is war in its devastating effects in these days of poison gas and tremendous engines for the mass destruction of human beings, and that we shall not have reached the high peak of disa-

bility until 1945, which means that in the next 11 years other hundreds of thousands, who today believe themselves to be strong and healthy, will nevertheless be forced to enter the grim portals of these institutions. I would like to ask you if that is true.

Mr. HATFIELD. The peak will not be reached until 1948, I am told.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That means 14 years yet to go before we reach the peak of disability. May I ask the Senator whether it is true that more than 1,000,000 cases have already been hospitalized?

Mr. HATFIELD. That is about the figure.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONSERVATION OF OIL

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall not consume much of the time of the Senate, but there is rather an urgent matter to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate very briefly in connection with the tax bill which passed the House of Representatives on yesterday, and which is now before this body for consideration by the Finance Committee and the Senate.

It will be remembered that last year when the National Recovery Act was enacted, I offered and secured the adoption of an amendment known as the "Connally hot-oil amendment", providing that the President should have power to prohibit the interstate shipment of oil and its products which might be produced in violation of State law.

As Senators are no doubt advised, we have great oil fields in my State which have been prorated or controlled by law in order to limit their production and balance production and consumption. In Texas the power to prorate, as between these various fields, rests with the State regulatory body known as the Texas Railroad Commission.

After the adoption of the so-called "hot-oil amendment", the President of the United States issued orders prohibiting the interstate shipment of oil produced in violation of the orders of the State regulatory body, and Secretary Ickes was appointed Oil Administrator. I desire to say that the Secretary has been endeavoring, to the limit of his ability, to enforce Federal regulations regarding the illegal production of oil produced in violation of State laws and orders of the railroad commission. But, Mr. President, there are those who bootleg oil. Certain oil interests are violating the laws regarding the production of oil. They are surreptitiously appropriating to their own use oil that belongs to leaseholders and landowners; in familiar language, they are stealing the oil from the owners of the leases.

It has been very difficult to enforce this statute, because a Federal court has held that the agents of the Government could not go upon the oil owners' property, nor into their refineries, for the purpose of determining whether or not the oil was intended for interstate shipment and therefore was in violation of the Federal law. In order to provide additional funds to enforce the law the pending revenue bill carries a provision levying a tax of 0.1 of 1 cent per barrel upon all oil produced in order to provide a fund to enable the Secretary of the Interior to place more agents in the field to assure that the laws in behalf of the conservation of oil shall be respected and enforced.

I desire to say further, Mr. President, that when the Senate shall take up the bill for consideration I shall urge, in addition to the levying of the tax of one tenth of 1 cent, that an amendment, if it be found necessary, be adopted giving to the agents of the Secretary of the Interior power to visit refineries, authority to visit producing plants and oil properties, giving them the power to examine their books and records, in order to determine whether or not the oil is being properly accounted for, for taxation purposes, and in order to give the Government full possession of knowledge of their operations for all proper purposes.

Mr. President, there is no conflict between the State authorities and the Federal authorities. In my State the railroad commission has been acting in complete harmony with the Federal oil administrator. The railroad commission fixes the amount of oil which may be produced in Texas.

It then allocates that oil to the various fields and allocates it to the various producers. So there is no question here of conflict between the Federal and the State authorities. Both of them are undertaking to prevent the violation of the laws both of the State and of the Federal Government. But there are certain criminal elements in the oil industry who, for their own selfish profit, are violating the laws, are bootlegging their products, are shipping them in interstate commerce, and yet are claiming that they are not engaged in interstate commerce.

Of course, the people of my State would like to produce all the oil which it is possible to produce from their wells, but they believe to do so at the present moment would tend to wreck a great industry; and, in behalf of conserving this tremendous natural resource and in order to balance production and consumption, the people of my State have authorized the railroad commission by statute to conserve and to control the production of oil in behalf of the people of Texas and in behalf of the landowners and lessees of lands in our State and in the interest of those who are dependent upon this great industry—the men who work in the fields and those whose resources are invested in oil properties.

Mr. President, it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide additional funds and additional agents, and it may be necessary for the Congress to give to the oil administration additional power and authority to bring those violators of the law in the oil industry within the pale of the law, in order that the laws may be enforced, and in order that the rights of the landowners and the leaseholders in these great oil fields may be protected.

So, Mr. President, I ask Senators to give attention to that particular section of the revenue bill found in section 605, appearing on page 207 and the following pages of the bill. When the measure shall come before the Senate I shall take occasion to again press this matter upon the attention of Senators, because it is of utmost importance not only to my State but to all the other oil States of the Union, and for that matter it is of importance to all the people of the United States.

Mr. President, it would be a crime to dissipate the great oil resources of the Nation. They should be preserved not only on account of national defense, on account of the needs of the Navy, but on account of the needs of industry, on account of the needs of the great automobile industry, and the users of automobiles. The reserves of oil may be permanently threatened by the dissipating of the great oil reserves. To waste the oil by profligate production unduly depresses the price and brings about actual physical waste in the field.

I am appealing to the Senate that when it takes up the revenue bill those of us who are interested in this matter may be allowed to present necessary amendments to the Senate in order that the Federal Government and the State governments may be provided with the instrumentalities for protecting the public welfare against the lawless elements in the oil fields who are defying the Government, who are defying the Secretary of the Interior, who are defying the State authorities, in order that they may for the immediate future and for their immediate profit secure larger and illegal production of their own oil to the detriment of those who are obeying the laws, to the detriment of those who are interested in conservation, to the detriment of those who want the laws administered in an orderly and proper fashion.

If Senators will bear these matters in mind, I am sure that I shall be joined at the proper time by Senators from other States who are of the same opinion with respect to these matters. The administration of this act ought to be paid for at least in part by the oil industry. Therefore we are willing that a small tax be levied upon every barrel of oil produced in order that funds may be provided whereby the Secretary of the Interior, as oil administrator, may properly and efficiently execute the Federal laws in harmony with the State authorities who are undertaking to bring about the same result.

REPEAL OF TERRITORIAL PROHIBITION LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, I submit a conference report, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The House recedes from its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POPE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6574) to make inapplicable in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands certain Federal laws relating to intoxicating liquors, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

M. E. TYDINGS,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
KEY PITTMAN,
CARL HAYDEN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOHN McDUFFIE,
JOE L. SMITH,
C. L. BEEDY,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

REGULATION OF STOCK EXCHANGES

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, some days ago introduced a bill which is called the "securities exchange regulatory bill of 1934." There has been inaugurated against that measure throughout the Nation a campaign of propaganda which has been organized by the New York Stock Exchange. The Senator from Florida, who is not now in the Chamber, has given me permission to have read to the Senate a statement which he made yesterday with respect to that propaganda. In view of the fact that so many Senators are receiving communications in reference to the subject, I should be glad to have the clerk read at the desk the statement of the Senator from Florida, because I believe that no premature decision should be reached until the committee has had an opportunity to consider the bill itself.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, in common with the Senator from Michigan, I have received probably some hundreds of telegrams upon this particular subject. Is it the view of the members of the committee, who are familiar with the matter, that the propaganda is all manufactured?

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from California, let me say it was publicly announced that after this bill had been drafted and introduced by the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. Whitney, president of the New York Stock Exchange, sent out communications to some 875 industrialists and to some 1,370 brokers urging them to protest to their Members of Congress against the enactment of the bill. In other words, there is just one central organization of propaganda, and the propagandizing is carried on before any hearings have really been had upon the bill itself. I want to say in all fairness there may be some amendments necessary to the bill, but the measure was drafted hurriedly so as to have it acted upon, if possible, at the present session of Congress and so as to give the public an opportunity to understand it. It was not contemplated, however, that there would be at one point hundreds of thousands of dollars spent in propagandizing the industrialists and business interests of the

Nation against a bill that had not yet been finally concluded.

The Senator from Florida, who has been an ideal and a most patient and painstaking Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, issued a statement yesterday, and I think Senators and the public ought to know about it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I quite agree with what has been said by the Senator from Michigan; I also quite agree, indeed, with emphasis, with what he has said about the chairman of the committee; I think he has done a magnificent work. He has done it under some difficulty, and he has done it not only well but he has done it bravely. I want to add my little meed of praise for the work that has been accomplished by him and his colleagues upon the committee.

The only reason I ask the question of the Senator from Michigan was that in the mass of correspondence that comes, which with the aid of a dictaphone I am unable at the present time to answer, notwithstanding my hours probably are as long as those of any other man in this body, there are included recently hundreds of telegrams upon the subject, and so I was very greatly interested in what the Senator was saying.

Mr. COUZENS. I venture to say that those who are protesting have not a single thing on which to base their protests except the mere statements of the authors of the propaganda. I venture further to say that not one of them has read the testimony or heard even a part of the testimony which Senators upon the Banking and Currency Committee have heard. Their opposition is based on the premise that the stock exchange wants, as soon as Congress adjourns, to be permitted to regulate itself and to return to its nefarious methods. I now ask that the communication which I have sent to the desk may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the New York Times, Thursday, Feb. 22, 1934]

FLETCHER'S STATEMENT ON STOCK PROPAGANDA

WASHINGTON, February 21.—Following is the text of the statement on the New York Stock Exchange made before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee today by Chairman FLETCHER:

"I have noted with interest the country-wide propaganda which has been turned out by the New York Stock Exchange against the bill to regulate stock-market activities. The exchange has followed the same practice during the past 25 years every time that proposals have been made for its regulation.

"Fortunately, this time the American public will have the advantage of testing propaganda with facts. That test will prevent the successful use of smooth words to cover unconscionable deeds. The representatives of the New York Stock Exchange, instead of uttering glib generalities, must explain away the mass of sworn evidence showing how its facilities have been used by a relatively small group of men for their own profit at the expense of the investing public.

"The propaganda released by the exchange officials is intended to persuade the people that regulation of that exchange and the other exchanges by the Federal Government will hurt business. Whose business? Only that of brokers who have lined their pockets by disregarding the interest of their customers.

COLLAPSE OF 1933 RECALLED

"Government regulation will certainly hurt those market operators and speculators who have used the facilities of the stock exchanges of the country to mulct the public out of millions, and, in sum total, out of billions of dollars.

"But regulation will not hurt the investor or the business man. On the contrary, if we do not have regulation, the investor and the business man are going to continue to be hurt as they have been hurt in the past. The proof of that is overwhelming.

"Only last summer—in 1933—after the country had started on the road to recovery, the facilities of the New York Stock Exchange were used by a group of selfish men in such a way as to give them very large profits. Their method of doing business through the medium of pools, manipulations, options, puts, calls, and market rigging, left the public holding the bag as usual when the market collapsed in July 1933.

"It collapsed because it was run by these men as a gambling and manipulative market for insiders against outsiders. The collapse shook the confidence of business men and took away the money of investors. It is only a few months since that collapse slowed up our recovery, and it was some time before the business community was able to get into its stride again after recovering from the misleading and dangerous activities permitted on the New York Stock Exchange.

"This is not a new story. The same thing happened in 1930. Business had apparently begun its slow movement upward. At once the opportunity was seized by market riggers and market

operators to unload stocks after running prices up to absurd levels, and to fill their own pockets with the money and the savings of the American people.

"When the New York Stock Exchange sends out its propaganda and when its representatives appear before the congressional committees, those representatives should explain this constant recurrence of gambling and rigging and this constant interference by such methods with business recovery.

"The stock exchange representatives will have to explain, for example, such evidence as was produced before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last week, showing that in the year 1933, a year of alleged penitence and reform, the manipulators ran the price of certain shares up so high that during a 3-day market collapse the market value of these shares dropped to one third of the dizzy prices at which the general public was induced to come in and buy.

"Let the New York Stock Exchange people deal with facts, not promises, with sworn testimony, not propaganda. Let them explain away the blows they have inflicted on business, on legitimate trading, and not divert attention from existing evils by broad generalizations and threats to the effect that government regulation of the very men who have caused such damage to business will in itself constitute a bar to business recovery.

PROPAGANDA CALLED CONFESSION

"As a matter of fact, the frantic elaborateness of the propaganda of the exchange is in itself a confession that the history of its activities right down to the present day puts it on the defensive. The exchange, convicted by its own laxity and negligence or impotence and by the improper activities of many of its members, now comes forward and says that it has reformed.

"But on the very day last week that its reforms were made public, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency heard testimony of recent activities on the New York Stock Exchange which those reforms would not be adequate to eliminate.

"In other words, the financial skulduggery described in our hearings last week could be perpetrated over and over again, and is likely to be perpetrated over and over again, even under the stock exchange's new rules.

"The difficulty with the self-reform of the stock exchange is that once Congress is adjourned, the exchange can modify its rules again. But there is a worse difficulty. That difficulty was disclosed at our hearings last week. That difficulty is the laxness, if not the incompetence, of the stock exchange authorities in enforcing even the inadequate rules heretofore adopted by the exchange.

"They were not successful in preventing the manipulations and market rigging of 1933 after they claimed to have turned over a new leaf and achieved complete reform.

CRITICIZES INQUIRY BY EXCHANGE

"Apparently they did not even know that such reprehensible use of the New York Stock Exchange was being made by manipulators, among them members of the exchange itself.

"Indeed, when the Senate committee last summer asked the stock exchange to investigate the stock market collapse of 1933 and to report to the Senate committee on pools and other operations of that kind, the stock exchange authorities conducted an investigation of several months and then reported to us that nothing improper had been found.

"It was not until we continued our hearing on the subject last week that the stock exchange authorities, according to their own statement, learned of the gross improprieties, of the gambling, of the manipulation, of the rigging which took place in 1933 on the New York stock market, and which our own agents were able to uncover without the aid of and against the assurances to the contrary by the stock exchange authorities.

"Apparently these exchange authorities cannot protect the public, do not know when the public is being mulcted, are unable to find out those things even when they make an investigation, and must rely upon public authorities to bring the facts to light.

"The American public can no longer afford to depend upon such uninformed and inadequate self-regulators of these market places.

"Everyone who heard the evidence before the committee last week was struck by the lameness of the excuses advanced by the stock-exchange representative at those hearings. The representative admitted, as he was compelled to admit, that the exchange had been lax and had permitted fraudulent transactions of large size within recent months.

"But the representative claimed that the exchange had been deceived. Case after case was brought to his attention. Each time his excuse was that the exchange authorities had been misled.

"If these excuses are to be given credence, it would appear that the authorities of the exchange are a group of naive, trusting, and gullible men ready to buy the first gold brick offered to them. But they paid for these gold bricks with the money of investors, not with their own.

"It is high time that the regulation and prevention of indefensible practices and deals and of market rigging be placed in the hands of men who will not seek to excuse their failure to perform their duty by painting portraits of themselves as guileless and gullible guardians of the investing and business public.

"Certain members of the New York Stock Exchange, realizing that they have discredited themselves by their own record, have sought to wage a fight against the bill intended to regulate their activities by enlisting the support of large corporation executives.

The authorities of the New York Stock Exchange have sought to warn these corporation executives that they will be damaged if the bill for regulating the exchanges becomes law.

DEMANDS WHITNEY EXPLAIN

"This propaganda is correct in one respect only. The bill will deprive those corporation executives who have dealt dishonestly with their stockholders of opportunity for such dishonest dealing in the future.

"When Mr. Whitney comes down to explain his propaganda, he must be ready to explain the testimony which was introduced before the Senate committee last week. The testimony showed that with respect to stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange corporation executives had employed dummies to organize subsidiary corporations and to effectuate schemes by which these corporation executives deprived their own stockholders of their legal rights.

"The president of the New York Stock Exchange should explain why it was that the exchange not only did not prevent but by its actions and permission enabled those corporation executives to run pools and to make enormous personal profits at the expense of their own stockholders. Implicated in these transactions were leading members of the New York Stock Exchange.

WARNS AGAINST PROPAGANDA

"It is surprising to me that the officials of the New York Stock Exchange believe that they can induce the executives of our large corporations to act as cat's-paws for the stock exchange and to run the risk of opposing legislation aimed at dishonest corporate practices and dishonest corporation executives.

"The facts have demonstrated that the power of stock-exchange authorities to subject the interests of the Nation to the purposes and profits of stock brokers and stock-exchange officials must be ended. We shall insist, when the stock-exchange officials come down here to talk about the bill, that they deal with these facts and leave behind them the propaganda manufactured by the propaganda machines which they have built up for many years and have operated by the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars taken from the American people.

"In the face of the evidence they will need something more than propaganda to satisfy the public that they furnish an open and free market for securities."

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6663) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD] to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. STEIWER obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STEIWER. I want to make a statement which will not take more than 2 minutes.

Mr. LONG. I want to ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator for that purpose. Mr. LONG. The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, if adopted, would mean that the soldiers would get what we took away from them last March?

Mr. HATFIELD. That is very true. It will reinstate the veteran to the status he enjoyed and the protection he had before the enactment of the Economy Act.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate, and shall not do so, in connection with the pending amendment. It is my purpose to vote against the amendment, and I desire that the RECORD may show my reason for so doing.

I was one of those who cooperated with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD], with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], and with others in opposition to the enactment of the so-called "economy law." I then regarded the law as a repudiation of the obligations which the Republic owes to its defenders who had served during the various wars in which we have engaged. I still regard the law as unduly oppressive and feel that its application in thousands of cases has been hurtful and cruel. There is nothing said in denunciation of that law to which I cannot subscribe. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I am one of those who believe that in our pension laws there were certain

legislative mistakes and in the administration of those laws certain abuses which at the time we enacted the economy law ought to have been corrected. Some of them have been dealt with under the economy law and by virtue of regulations which the President has promulgated.

Those regulations have excluded from benefits certain types of cases that ought never to have been included, except insofar as permanent and total disability cases are concerned. Those regulations have excluded benefits to those who were drawing so-called "disability allowances" in non-service-connected cases. They have eliminated the benefits in misconduct cases; they have taken from the roll men who enlisted subsequent to the armistice and who served during the period from the armistice to the formal declaration of peace.

So, Mr. President, without further enumeration of the details, I feel that there are certain benefits that have come by reason of the economy law; repeal would reestablish all those cases of which I personally disapprove. Although I opposed the enactment of the economy law in the first place, now that we have it I prefer to deal with the condition and not with the theory, and suggest to the Senate that the proper procedure is to take up, one at a time, the injustices that resulted under that law and seek to alleviate the hardship that has come from the law's enforcement. That may be done by the consideration of proper amendments to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina, and if in the consideration of those amendments we can liberalize the regulations of the Economy Act, we shall have done all I think that we want to do, and we shall have done it without a complete loss of the savings effected, and without restoring to the pension roll certain classes of disabilities that ought not in good conscience to be restored to them.

Let me say in conclusion that the repeal of the Economy Act would cost something like \$300,000,000 per year. Congress can enact every proposal submitted here by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and myself at a cost which will not greatly exceed \$100,000,000, which will continue in force economies resulting in savings to the Government of more than \$200,000,000, and which will leave our pension rolls unencumbered by the classes of cases that none of us like to defend.

I do not urge this position with the idea of influencing the attitude of other Senators, and I do not propose to discuss it further. I make the statement merely that I may not be misunderstood, and that it will not be thought that I have abandoned the fight which I helped initiate at the time of the enactment of the law.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I desire to express the hope that the Senate will not agree to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD]. That amendment would do just exactly what the Senator this afternoon has admitted it would do. It would restore to the rolls every man or woman who was on the pension rolls prior to March 19, 1933. It would restore to the rolls the emergency officers who were retired, whether by presumption or otherwise. It would restore to the pension rolls those who enlisted after November 11, 1918, and were in the service from that time or any date subsequent to November 11, 1918, down to July 2, 1921, the date when, by law, the war was terminated.

The Senate will remember that the young man who did not volunteer to serve during the war, who was not drafted, who made no effort to serve his country while the war was on, but who after November 11, 1918, after the armistice, enlisted in the Army, was, by reason of the provisions of law, serving during the war because under the provisions of law the war continued until July 2, 1921.

Therefore, any one of those enlisted men who, between November 11, 1918, and July 2, 1921, suffered any disability, was under the law entitled to the same compensation and the same privileges as the enlisted man who suffered a disability by reason of his service on the battlefields of France. Under the action of the Veterans' Administration as a result

of the Economy Act they were removed from the rolls and are now entitled only to such compensation and such benefits as all other men who served in peace time. By the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia they will be restored to the rolls, and the men who went to war to save their country will know that by our action we put on the same plane with them the men who failed to go and who claim benefits by reason of a disability incurred in 1920 or 1921.

The amendment would restore to the rolls all misconduct cases. Under the regulations adopted pursuant to the Economy Act, they were removed from the rolls. It would cost approximately \$300,000,000 to the taxpayers at this time.

I believe a mere statement of what the amendment would do is sufficient to insure its defeat.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER] has appealed to the Senate not to adopt the amendment. I join in that appeal. In doing so I shall consume a few minutes to explain the two amendments I have offered, and which are pending—the amendments to which the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia has been offered.

In the first place, let me call to the attention of the Senate the fact that as a result of the action of the Veterans' Administration 59,000 men whose disabilities were presumptively service connected were removed from the rolls. In order to make certain that no injustice was done to these men, the President of the United States directed that there should be established throughout the country 128 appeal boards. He directed that those boards should be composed of five men each; that only two of them should come from the Veterans' Administration; that three should be entirely outside of the Veterans' Administration. Those boards were constituted. Sixty-three percent of the outside members were ex-service men. Thirty-seven percent did not indicate whether they were ex-service men or not, and, therefore, we assume that they were not. Of the members appointed by the Veterans' Administration, 85 percent were ex-service men and 15 percent nonservice men.

Pursuant to the direction, they considered throughout the country the appeals.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BYRNES. I do.

Mr. CLARK. I do not know whether or not the Senator is familiar with this circumstance: It is undoubtedly true that in certain cases where those boards refused to follow the instructions of the local manager of the Veterans' Administration the boards were not discharged, but additional boards were created in the same district, and the business was taken away from the original board.

I happen to know about one case of that kind in the western district of Missouri in which the board was not willing to follow the dictates of Mr. Brody, manager of the Veterans' Administration at Kansas City, and two additional boards were constituted for the purpose of taking away the business of the original board, composed of as high-class citizens as there are in the State of Missouri, and turning it over to boards that would follow the dictates of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the committee during its consideration of the bill, had brought to its attention the matter referred to by the Senator from Missouri. As a matter of fact, the only board as to which there was on file with the Veterans' Administration any complaint was the board in Missouri to which the Senator has referred; and because the complaint seemed to be based upon fact the Director of the Veterans' Administration immediately ordered the file in every case sent to Washington, and is now proceeding with an investigation of every case that was passed upon by the board to which the Senator from Missouri has referred, because, after all, the question was more important than the action of one manager of the Veterans' Administration. The question was whether or not any injustice had been done to the ex-service man, and

without waiting for any appeal from any man, the board is considering every case that was passed upon by that board of Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from South Carolina that the Director of the Veterans' Administration, General Hines, did go so far as to appeal on his own motion every case which had been decided in favor of the veterans, as well as every other case.

Mr. BYRNES. I will say to the Senator that the question was investigated most carefully, and in view of the fact that there was criticism of the board, there was direction that every case that had been passed upon by that board should be reviewed and considered on appeal.

Mr. CLARK. That is perfectly true. I read the evidence in that case very carefully, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina, and I never saw a more perfect case of a bureaucracy trying to build up a defense of its own bureaus by taking the testimony of its own agents than was contained in that file. But the letter was addressed to the Senator from South Carolina and was referred by him very courteously to the Senator from Oregon. It reminded me of a case in which I once had a client who told me that he would like to help me prepare a brief on appeal in a case I was trying for him. When I came to examine, to see what assistance he had given me, I found it consisted of taking an abstract of the evidence and writing on the margin opposite each paragraph, "lie", "lie", "lie." That was the response of the agents of the Veterans' Administration to the very serious charges made against them by Mr. John E. Cannon, who is chairman of the board at Kansas City, who was not appointed on my recommendation, who has been a political enemy of mine for a great many years, and for whom I hold no brief, but for whom I have high respect.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Missouri that I asked that that information be furnished to me in order that it might be presented to the Senator from Missouri. I will say again that with 250 outside members who were ex-service men, and 148 who were not, selected throughout the country, selected as these men were selected, after recommendations were sought from Senators, Governors, ex-service men's organizations, chambers of commerce, and so forth, whenever we are fortunate enough to find not more than one board as to which there is serious complaint we are fortunate indeed.

Reading the testimony, I agree with the Senator from Missouri as to the complaint filed by Mr. Cannon, and I will say to him that the Veterans' Administration, in my opinion, when the case was called to their attention, did everything in their power to remedy the situation. Since that time a representative from another State has been sent into Missouri and, according to my information, is there now for the purpose of endeavoring to secure further information in order to enable the Veterans' Administration to do what is right under the circumstances in that district.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again for just a moment?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield for the purpose, I should like to ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at the close of the Senator's remarks a letter which I received just a day or two ago from Mr. Cannon in regard to the qualifications of the man who has been sent into that district by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES. I have not seen the letter, but I have absolutely no objection to the request at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The letter appears at the conclusion of the remarks of Mr. BYRNES.)

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I repeat that if we can select throughout the United States 128 boards, and find complaints lodged in only one instance, it is an exceedingly fortunate thing. All that the Veterans' Administration can do is to endeavor to remedy the situation, and I think the committee, after going at some length into this matter, was

satisfied that an honest effort was being made and was going to be continued to remedy the situation.

Unanimous decisions, however, were filed in 94 percent of the disallowed cases. That means that the five men, 63 percent of them outside members, ex-service men, and 37 percent of the Veterans' Administration representatives, ex-service men, 37 percent outside men who were not connected with the service, 15 percent of the administration representatives, not connected, all agree in 94.49 percent of the cases that were disallowed by these boards.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator's trend, but if he will yield again, the Senator certainly does not mean to convey the impression that these unanimous decisions represented the opinion of the ex-service men on those boards that these were not meritorious cases. It simply means that they agreed that they fell outside the very rigorous and stringent rules provided by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES. All those decisions were to the effect that under the regulations submitted to them, and the instructions that were submitted, the cases fell without those regulations. The instructions were most liberal. The directions of the Veterans' Administration and of the President were that every doubt should be resolved in favor of the soldier.

This is the statement contained in the letter of August 3, addressed to the boards:

The purpose of the establishment of these boards was to insure to all veterans whose disabilities had heretofore been presumptively connected with service a special review of their claims to the end that if, because of the stress of service brought about particularly by actual combat or other strenuous duty, there might reasonably be some connection between their condition and their military service that their pension should be continued.

There were some other statements, but I do not at this time want to take up more of the time of the Senate in discussing them.

I have called attention to this only for the reason that these boards were established, passed on these cases, and cost the taxpayers \$602,498.

Now, by reason of the amendment I have offered, every man whose pension claim was disallowed, every man in whose case the board decided that there was no justification for the presumption of service connection, would have the right of appeal to the board which has been established in the city of Washington to hear those appeals.

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

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Would that apply to veterans who have decisions rendered against them by the appeals board at the present time?

Mr. BYRNES. It would apply to every veteran in case the decision has been against him.

Mr. WALSH. So that it amounts to opening the case once more and granting another opportunity for every veteran to have his case heard before a board of appeals?

Mr. BYRNES. It does; and further, under the amendment I have proposed, the veteran would be given 1 year in which to do that, so that he will have ample opportunity to present additional evidence, to appear in person, and present his case to the board.

The board is constituted today of 15 members, 9 entirely outside of the Veterans' Administration, 6 only from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. WALSH. Does this body of 15 men compose one board or several boards?

Mr. BYRNES. One board.

Mr. WALSH. The board of appeals is one board, composed of 15 men?

Mr. BYRNES. One board of 15 men. The men serve in groups for the consideration of the cases.

Mr. WALSH. That is what I had supposed.

Mr. BYRNES. In order to facilitate the decision of the cases and make possible more careful consideration, it is proposed to increase the number to 30, providing that there shall be 18 of the 30 entirely outside of the Veterans' Administration and only 12 from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. WALSH. What is the number who usually sit upon veterans' cases in the appeal board?

Mr. BYRNES. Three members sit to hear each case.

Mr. WALSH. And at least two are outside the employees of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. There was a statement before the committee that a case would be worked up by one of the employees of the Veterans' Administration and then the facts presented to the board. When 30 men are appointed, 12 will be outside the Administration and 18 inside of the Administration. I want to repeat that more than 75 percent of the members of the appeal board are ex-service men.

Mr. WALSH. Let me repeat, because I think it is extremely important, that, as I understand the Senator's position, if his amendment shall be agreed to, every veteran who in the past received compensation due to the presumptive law will have his case opened anew before the appeal board?

Mr. BYRNES. That is absolutely correct, and it is provided that it is to be done in every case, for the reason that I feared there might be some ex-service man, living in some isolated part of the country, who might not know of the opportunity that was presented to him, might not appeal, and therefore the only way to protect his rights was to provide that there should be an appeal in every case and that the time should be extended.

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

Mr. BYRNES. Let me finish this thought.

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNES. My amendment as first drawn provided for an extension of the time for 1 year. It was called to my attention that that was unwise, for the reason that if within the year it was not possible to complete the review in every case, then there would be necessity for legislation in order to accomplish that object. Within the last few days the President has prepared an order to extend the time a year, and if at the end of the 12 months the review has not been completed, or if it is thought that more time should be had by regulation, he can extend it for an additional year, because there would not have expired the 2 years in which he can act under the original law.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, that applies to the cases now pending under existing regulations?

Mr. BYRNES. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH. And not to the review the Senator proposes?

Mr. BYRNES. No; I wanted to make sure that it would apply to all of the cases which were disallowed and claimed to be service connected by presumption. I was fearful that the review might not be completed within the year, and so provided that there would be additional time in which such reviews should be completed.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that is in the Senator's proposal, but I understood the Senator to say the President is preparing a regulation along that line to apply to the existing situation and not to the situation the Senator is dealing with in his amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. No; it does not. The Executive order has been signed, and it applies to any case in which the appeal is filed, and as the appeal is filed by the Director in every case, it would apply to these cases.

Mr. WALSH. But, of course, it would not apply to a case where there has been an appeal and an adjudication against the veteran. Those cases where there has been an appeal and an adjudication against the veteran are closed.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator is correct in his statement.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator's amendment has given the veterans a year's opportunity to resurrect again their cases for appeal, but, of course, the President's regulation does not propose to deal with those cases.

Mr. BYRNES. No.

I should like to complete the statement, and then I will be glad to answer any questions. The amendment proposes that when a man is put back upon the rolls pending a final determination of his rights by the appeal board, he shall be paid 75 percent of the amount he was receiving March 9, 1933.

The reason that percentage was fixed is that in these cases there has been a determination by the local board that the man's disability was not service connected, that he was not entitled to the presumption; but the amendment provides that when the board shall hear that case, if the board shall determine that he was entitled to it, and that he should not have been removed from the rolls, he then will receive not 75 percent but the full amount that he would be entitled to from the day that he was removed from the rolls until the day that there is a final determination of his rights.

Mr. WALSH. And notwithstanding the decision adverse to him by the appeal board?

Mr. BYRNES. Notwithstanding the decision adverse to him that may have been rendered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to say to the Senator from South Carolina that, in my opinion, the provision contained in his amendment and in the President's Executive order for extending both the privilege of appeal and the time for exercising that privilege is a most meritorious one, because one of the most vicious features of the whole situation growing out of the Economy Act has been what has unquestionably, in my opinion, been an effort on the part of the Veterans' Bureau to keep veterans from exercising their right of appeal. In other words, in the files to which the Senator and I referred there is, to my mind, conclusive proof that a direct order came from the Veterans' Bureau to members of the local board of Kansas City to refrain from advising veterans of the fact that their cases were coming up for review or to refrain from advising them of their right of appeal. I think the provision contained in the Senator's amendment is a most meritorious one in that it obviates any such situation.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I join with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in his commendations of the provision of the amendment with reference to appeal. I was interested in knowing particularly how the board of appeals will be composed. It seems to me the board, at least a majority of the board, should be composed of ex-service men. Will the Senator please enlighten us on that point?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the board of appeals is today composed of 15 men, 9 in no way connected with the Veterans' Administration, and 6 from the Veterans' Administration. It is proposed to increase the number to 30, so as to provide that 18 shall in no way be connected with the Veterans' Administration, and 12 from within the Veterans' Administration. Today of the 15 on the appeal board more than 75 percent are ex-service men.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Having reference to the situation which we have discussed, at Kansas City and the western district of Missouri, with which I am very much concerned, the Senator will readily recognize that no matter what the composition of the board as set up by the Congress may be, the advantage of this composition will be wiped out if the Veterans' Bureau insists, as they did in that district, on exercising through officials of the Veterans' Bureau, control of the manner in which those boards shall operate.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have said several times to the Senator that I heartily concurred in the opinion he had of the action of the manager of that veterans' office. There was a dispute as to what he did. I am assuming that the statement of the chairman of the board is correct, which statement is confirmed by the Senator from Missouri; but because one man in all the Veterans' Administration does wrong is no reason why it should be considered that every man is wrong, and I know the Senator will agree with me

as to that. I said that the Director of the Veterans' Administration as soon as it was called to his attention, because he feared that the manager of one office may have acted in that way, had taken steps, and is still taking steps, to do everything possible to make sure that no injustice will be done.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, he has still left that same manager on the job at Kansas City, and he is still addressing letters to him "personal and confidential", just the same as the one contained in the file in which he reprimanded him. The chairman of Board No. 1 at Kansas City took the trouble on his own responsibility of not advising veterans of appeals coming up.

Mr. BYRNES. But the Senator knows that in the file that I gave to him there was a difference and a controversy between members of the board; and the Director of the Veterans' Administration has, according to the information given to the Senator and to me, sent a special agent, who, I understand, is now there to investigate that particular problem and determine whether or not the board was right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. GORE. My question really relates to the inquiry propounded by the Senator from Massachusetts. But I will ask the Senator from South Carolina a question. The Senator's amendment permits an appeal where there was a unanimous decision below against the soldier?

Mr. BYRNES. It does.

Mr. GORE. Even where the veteran members of the board below voted against the soldier's application?

Mr. BYRNES. It does.

Mr. GORE. He can still prosecute an appeal to the new board?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; and it provides that that appeal shall be filed by the Director in order to insure that there will be an appeal in every case, and that no man shall suffer by reason of his lack of information as to his rights under the circumstances.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to know if the Senator from South Carolina realizes what the process of appeal is before these boards? If he has never had the experience, I want to say that I, for my own enlightenment, availed myself of the opportunity of viewing one of those appeals, and the fact of the matter is there was not a member of the board present. There was an examiner present. No one would even subject a yellow dog to the process that was resorted to in the review of that case. It was not an appeal heard by a board; the board was not there.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the information that was given to the committee by the Director of the Veterans' Administration is not in accord with the statement of the Senator from Nevada. There was a statement that in some cases an employee of the board as to certain information would hold a hearing; that then all the testimony was presented to the board, and that in every case there was no decision until the board members passed upon it. That is a positive statement upon which I certainly think we have a right to rely.

The Senator from Nevada may have appeared and presented some information to an employee of the board; but he does not say, and I do not think he would say, that there was a decision by the board at that time, nor was there a decision until all the evidence was presented. But under the amendment I have offered the Veterans' Administration would be directed to secure and prepare the evidence in order that it might be presented for the appeal.

Mr. President, the other section to the amendment I have offered is one with reference to hospitalization. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that under the regulations of January 19 the President restored the compensation to the men with service-connected disabilities,

increasing it from \$90 to \$100. In addition to that, the President liberalized the hospitalization regulations so as to use the facilities of the veterans' hospital to their fullest extent. I have written into the pending amendment substantially the regulations of the Veterans' Administration with reference to hospitalization. Under that amendment the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration will be used to their capacity. Preference, however, will be given to the war-time service-connected disabled.

Approximately 15,000 beds are needed for the war-time service-connected disability cases. Under the regulations the administration will see, first, that that number of beds are reserved for those who are most entitled to hospitalization; second, the facilities will be available to peace-time service-connected disabled; third, to veterans with non-service-connected disease or disability; fourth, to men discharged from peace-time service for a disability which is service connected, but who thereafter seek admission to a hospital, not by reason of disability incurred in war time, but by some other non-service-connected disability.

Mr. WALSH. What is the limitation for the period of service in all these classifications?

Mr. BYRNES. Ninety days. It is the same as to non-service-connected cases. The provision is the same as in the present law.

Mr. WALSH. Is it possible, if the facilities of the hospital permit it, for a veteran struck by a street car to be given care in a veterans' hospital?

Mr. BYRNES. It is possible, with this one condition, that under the regulations he must show the necessity for seeking hospitalization. If he is worth \$50,000 a year or has an income, he could not be received. The Veterans' Administration must adopt regulations under which it must be shown that it is necessary for him to seek hospitalization in the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. WALSH. But the point I make is that it is not necessary for him to be suffering from a disease or injury that he thinks or believes or alleges is due to war service.

Mr. BYRNES. Regardless of whether his disability was connected with war service or not, he would be admitted to a hospital to the extent of the facilities of the veterans' hospitals.

In the so-called "Legion four-point bill", as embodied in the so-called "Reed amendment", hospitalization is provided but limited to the capacity of the Veterans' Administration hospitals; but there is no limitation, there is no order of preference, and there is the danger that if non-service-connected disabled were admitted where they please and when they demand, a situation might arise that the 69,000 beds would be occupied by them and a man with a service-connected disability would be unable to secure admission to a hospital. Therefore the regulation that has prevailed, and which I seek to carry into effect by the amendment, gives preference to the service-connected cases and to insure that at all times they will be entitled to admission to a hospital, and when they are provided for, then to the extent of the hospital facilities the non-service-connected disabilities can be taken care of.

Under the other amendment and without any restriction this situation might arise: A man might apply and find the hospitals filled with non-service-connected disabled, and he would be unable to get in. He would see men inside the hospital—non-service-connected disability men, such as the one hurt by a street car, as the Senator from Massachusetts suggested. The only result would be that the Government would have to enter upon another construction program or use the Army and Navy hospitals.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it the Senator's purpose to discuss the Spanish-American War situation?

Mr. BYRNES. I will make only this reference to it—

Mr. CONNALLY. I will not interrupt the Senator now, if he is going to discuss it later.

Mr. BYRNES. I was discussing the regulations of January 19 and what was included in the regulations issued at that time. At that time the President issued a regulation under which 9,700 Spanish-American War veterans are entitled to \$15 a month, provided they are 50 percent disabled. Previously only those 55 years of age who were 50 percent disabled could secure \$15 a month. The age limit was removed by the provision of January 19, and all Spanish-American War veterans who suffer a 50-percent disability are entitled to receive a pension of \$15 a month, even though their disability is in no way connected with the service.

Of course, if they are 62 year of age, they are entitled to the scheduled pension that applies to Spanish War veterans of 62 years of age. That provision, according to the Veterans' Administration, would mean that 9,700 Spanish-American War veterans would be added to the roll. That is the only provision in the regulations of which I know that specifically extends the benefits to Spanish-American War veterans. They are affected by the changes relating to service-connected disabilities.

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

Mr. BYRNES. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Service connection has never heretofore, in any law enacted by Congress, been made to apply to Spanish-American War veterans. Under the Economy Act, when that act was applied to the service-connected cases, it simply provided for Spanish-American War veterans, because they had never made their applications on that basis and there were no records preserved and there was no possibility of their proving the service connection of their disabilities except in very few cases.

Let me ask the Senator, is it just, in the case of a Spanish-American War veteran, who is an older man than the World War veteran and 50-percent disabled, to give him only \$15 a month, whereas the World War veteran is allowed \$50 a month for the same 50-percent disability? The World War veteran is a younger man than the Spanish-American War veteran. I do not mean to draw any invidious comparisons, but this is a comprehensive measure, and we are trying to take care of all of them. The Spanish-American War veteran is at least 20 years older than the World War veteran and perhaps suffering the same degree of disability, and yet we give the younger man three times as much as we give the Spanish-American War veteran.

Mr. BYRNES. I did not want to go into that matter at this time. I always had the impression that the Senator from Texas had, that the Spanish-American War soldier could not show his service connection. However, the fact was that there were 23,144 Spanish-American War veterans on the roll by reason of service-connected disability prior to the passage of the service pension law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me interrupt the Senator there. The Spanish-American War veteran got his pension because of the general law applicable to the Regular Army and not because he was a Spanish-American War veteran.

Mr. BYRNES. That is true, but that was not the point about which the Senator inquired, and in which I was interested on my own account, to find out whether they could prove service connection. By reason of the general law they were required to prove service connection, and they proved service connection in 23,144 cases.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Of course that is perfectly true. Nevertheless the fact remains that the compensation to veterans of the Spanish-American War has been in the main on the basis of a service pension which the Government of the United States has deliberately, by its policy, allowed to remain in effect while twenty-odd years have elapsed during which a man might have made proof of service connection. As to those cases which were not sufficiently acute or in which the veteran did not desire to claim compensation—

as many of them did not, because they were making a good living on the side—they were, by the Government's policy, induced not to undertake to prove service connection; and now, in the vast majority of cases, it is impossible for them to prove service connection.

The Senator knows that during the Spanish-American War, service records were not kept in the same way that they were kept in the World War. I do not think anybody in this Chamber or out of it will accuse me of trying to make an invidious distinction in favor of the Spanish War veteran against the World War veteran; but I think the most cruel feature of the Economy Act in its operation as to veterans was to strike a lot of men off the rolls, most of whom were too old to find new employment, who were depending for their support in some part on the pension that the Government had granted them voluntarily over a long period of years; and I do not think any justification can possibly be made for the course of the Government with regard to the Spanish War veterans.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I said I did not want to go into that subject. I did want to answer the question, however, and it has been answered. Whether it was wise or not is a matter that can be discussed. When it comes to the question of service connection, however, 23,144 men, constituting 6.38 percent of those who served in the Spanish-American War, proved service-connected disabilities. In the case of the World War, out of a total of 4,249,614 men, 337,000, or 7.95 percent, were on the rolls for service-connected disability, and that included the presumptive cases. So when we include the presumptives, the percentage of World War veterans who proved service connection was 7.95, and the percentage of Spanish-American War veterans who proved service connection was 6.38.

The questions as to age and other factors that have entered into service pensions are entirely apart from that matter. I mentioned it only in response to the Senator's statement.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina further yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BYRNES. I do.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator certainly must realize the difference between the number of men who have not had an opportunity for more than 20 years to bring in their proof, and men whose service records were kept, and who, even after this lapse of years, still have an opportunity of proving from the service records what their service disability was.

In the case of the Spanish War veterans, service records were not kept. Only those men got pensions because of service-connected disability who applied immediately after the war, or so closely after the war that they were able to bring in the doctors who examined them and the men with whom they served to prove it.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will permit me just one moment more, in the case of the World War veteran he not only now has the opportunity, 20 years better off than the Spanish War veteran, of bringing in the doctors who examined him and the men who served with him but he also has a very much more perfect system of service records than the men who served in the Spanish-American War.

I again insist, and press it upon the attention of the Senator from South Carolina, that the Spanish War veteran had been lulled into a sense of security, as far as requiring proof of service-connected disability was concerned, by twenty-odd years of Government policy.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, ordinarily the Senator from Missouri and I understand each other. This time we do not, for the reason that my sole purpose in answering the question of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was to call attention to the fact that notwithstanding all the circumstances that were stated about having no records, 6 percent did prove service connection after the Spanish War as against seven and a fraction percent after the World War

through the years; and then, when the service pension came, they very wisely did what prudent men would do: They got off the service-connected pension roll in order to go on the service pension list, because the service pension list was higher; and so, like men of good common sense, they got off the service-connected roll and got on the service-pension roll.

That is all there was to the statement. Whenever the question is presented, as I understand it will be, I expect to discuss at greater length the situation with reference to the Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. WALSH and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BYRNES. I should like to conclude my remarks, because I had no desire except to explain the two amendments that are pending. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, however.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina is very ably and properly making answer to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD]. He is pointing out that he and others will later offer modifying amendments to existing laws affecting veterans. We must renew all this discussion again tomorrow, because many proposals are to be made, will be made, and many amendments offered, and the able Senator from South Carolina will be called upon to make these explanations to his committee amendment again.

Is it not the sensible thing to do tonight to have a vote on the sweeping amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, go on record, and adjourn, and tomorrow take up some of these other meritorious proposals—the extension of benefits to the Spanish War veterans, the extension of hospitalization, the so-called "Legion proposals"—and discuss them separately and vote upon each?

Let us have the vote now—it is a holiday—and go home, and tomorrow come here and take up these other questions relating to the veterans.

I desire to compliment the Senator from South Carolina on his very able presentation, and my suggestion is not designed in any way to interrupt him or take him off the floor. It is to prevent repetition of the arguments on this important issue when we meet tomorrow.

Mr. BYRNES. I will say to the Senator that I understand that just as soon as we can have a vote on this amendment the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] intends to propose a unanimous-consent agreement as to a recess to a future day.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator agree to the suggestion I make that we have a vote?

Mr. BYRNES. I hope we can.

Mr. WALSH. I call for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the question of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the answer of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] left me in a state of uncertainty as to what the law is and what the fact is, and I believe leave the record in a state of uncertainty.

The Senator from Texas said that he could not understand why it was that a Spanish War veteran with non-service-connected disability amounting to 50 percent received only \$15 a month, whereas the World War veteran in the same category, 20 years younger, received \$50 per month.

Am I to understand that the facts and the law parallel each other in those two cases?

The Spanish War veteran has non-service-connected disability, yet he receives \$15 per month; and, as the Senator from South Carolina answered, I understood that a World War veteran with non-service-connected disability amounting to 50 percent receives \$50 per month. Is that the fact?

Mr. BYRNES. No, Mr. President; the Senator misunderstood me. I did not make any reference to the World War veteran with non-service-connected disability, because, as a matter of fact, he does not receive anything unless the disability is permanent and total.

Mr. GORE. The question propounded by the Senator from Texas, and the answer of the Senator from South Carolina, left that point in a state of uncertainty; and I desire the RECORD to show what the fact is in that regard.

Mr. BYRNES. The World War veteran receives compensation only when his disability is permanent and total.

Mr. GORE. That was my understanding.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have a letter from John S. Cannon, an attorney in Kansas City, that throws a good deal of light on the manner in which the investigation of veterans' claims under the present law are being conducted and is germane to the subject now before the Senate. I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD.

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

KANSAS CITY, Mo., February 12, 1934.

HON. BENNETT C. CLARK,

Senator, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is now in Kansas City a Mr. L. L. Montgomery, who styles himself as investigator for General Hines. Said investigator states that he has been sent out here by General Hines in investigating the charges made in my letter of November 20, 1933, concerning the matters and things which came before the special board sitting at Kansas City in September and October. Mr. Montgomery has a set of trick questions which are designed to trip the unwary, evidently prepared by a clever lawyer in the Veterans' Administration offices.

Be the foregoing as it may, I find that Mr. Montgomery's real job will be the investigation of cases and the preparation of the same in behalf of the disabled veterans who have not been given an opportunity to prepare and defend their cases. I find that Mr. Montgomery has no legal education or experience whatsoever, that his business is a traveling salesman; therefore the point I am making here is that not yet is the Veterans' Administration's attitude such as to insure justice to the veteran; that if General Hines is setting up a staff to investigate and prepare these cases for the disabled veteran the personnel should be of the highest and that personnel should not be selected by General Hines or anyone connected with the Veterans' Administration. The personnel should be independent, fearless, and fair-minded lawyers of experience and ability, preferably antagonistic to the Veterans' Administration, but certainly honestly and sincerely in sympathy with the disabled veteran, who has been crucified by Public, No. 2. Would it not be a good plan to suggest to the President that the national commanders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, and the American Legion submit names of competent, experienced lawyers to prepare these cases for the disabled veterans? This, together with a provision that adequate compensation be paid these lawyers, will, in my opinion, insure in some measure justice to the veterans of the World War.

Yours sincerely,

JNO. S. CANNON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD] to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to detain the Senate. I have made the record here of the treatment that has been accorded the veteran of the Spanish-American War and the veteran of the World War.

By analyzing the reports made by the different review boards set up in the different States of the Union appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Veterans' Administration, one can see at a glance the very great injustice that has been done the veteran.

For instance, take the set-up in New Mexico, at Albuquerque. Eight hundred and eighty cases were reviewed, 310 allowed, and 570 disallowed, or 64.7 percent. That is just an example. The differential runs between 25.3 percent and 76.9 percent, as reported by the different review boards. So, Mr. President, we can see at a glance the inconsistency of these different boards that were set up throughout the different sections of the United States that dealt with the veteran and finally eliminated him from the rolls. Here we see the strong arm of the administration dealing out injustice to the disabled veterans.

I can understand the attitude of those who do not understand the situation which confronts the Spanish-American War veterans at the present time. I can understand why they cannot get the same impression that I have as to what

the Government should do in the way of protecting the Spanish-American War soldier.

I can also understand why it is that the lay mind, or the average man, cannot understand from a medical or scientific point of view the consideration that should be afforded the World War veteran and also the Spanish-American War veteran. For 2 hours and 15 minutes on last Monday I went into great detail and demonstrated by letters received by me, reading the letters paragraph by paragraph, that the Veterans' Administration was unfair, possibly because of a lack of understanding in dealing with the veterans, the results of which are that many veterans are eliminated from the rolls by regulation and not by law.

In my humble judgment, there is no hope of relief for these veterans until new legislation shall have been enacted here to safeguard the rights of each and every veteran, whether he be a member of the group making up the Spanish-American War soldiers, or the 4,000,000-plus group who represented our flag in foreign lands. There is no regulation, there is no edict that can be issued from the White House that will properly protect and care for the fighting men of the past in an effort to rehabilitate them and put them back upon their feet as breadwinners.

Mr. President, I have done my best. The responsibility is not upon my shoulders. I pass it and the odium that may follow to some other shoulders which, possibly, will be better prepared to assume these responsibilities than I. It is they who must be responsive to the needs and the equities of the veteran.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD] to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when Mr. CUTTING's name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous roll calls concerning the absence of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING], I desire to state that he is paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. If present, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea", and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

Mr. DICKINSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who is necessarily detained from the Chamber this afternoon. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea", and if the Senator from Kentucky were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when Mr. NORRIS' name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MCKELLAR (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND]. He is not present; so I transfer the pair to the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HEBERT. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], and that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I am not advised as to how any of these Senators would vote on this question.

I have also been requested to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT] are necessarily absent, and that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is detained on official business.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HEBERT. I desire to announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] is detained on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] are detained by severe colds.

I also desire to announce that the following Senators are necessarily detained from the Senate on official business: the Senator from Kansas [Mr. MCGILL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ERICKSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—14			
Carey	Gibson	Long	Robinson, Ind.
Clark	Hatfield	Metcalf	Shipstead
Davis	Kean	Nye	
Frazier	La Follette	Patterson	
NAYS—60			
Adams	Caraway	Harrison	Overton
Ashurst	Connally	Hastings	Pope
Austin	Coolidge	Hatch	Reynolds
Bachman	Costigan	Hayden	Robinson, Ark.
Bailey	Couzens	Hebert	Sheppard
Bankhead	Dieterich	Johnson	Steiwer
Barbour	Dill	Keyes	Stephens
Bone	Duffy	Logan	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Fess	Loneragan	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Fletcher	McCarran	Thompson
Buikley	George	McKellar	Trammell
Bulow	Glass	McNary	Vandenberg
Byrd	Goldsborough	Murphy	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Gore	Nealy	Wagner
Capper	Hale	O'Mahoney	Walsh
NOT VOTING—22			
Barkley	King	Pittman	Tydings
Black	Lewis	Reed	Walcott
Copeland	McAdoo	Russell	Wheeler
Cutting	McGill	Schall	White
Dickinson	Norbeck	Smith	
Erickson	Norris	Townsend	

So Mr. HATFIELD's amendment to Mr. BYRNES' amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I desire to submit a request for an order touching the business of the Senate, and I ask the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its labors today it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday; and that on Monday, at the hour of 4 o'clock, the debate be limited so that thereafter no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes on the bill, or on any amendment that may be pending or that may be offered in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Let me add to my statement, before the Senator from Oregon makes his announcement, that a large number of Senators find themselves unable to attend upon the Senate tomorrow; and if this arrangement shall be entered into, I feel that it will assure the conclusion of the consideration of this bill either Monday or early Tuesday.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, originally the plan was to hold a session tomorrow; but after conferring with my colleague [Mr. STEIWER], who, with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], has the amendment in charge, I think that will be quite agreeable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, in order to perfect the record and to present a question for the consideration of the Senate on Monday next, I send to the desk at this time an amendment which I offer upon behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and myself. I ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert, at the proper place in the bill, the following:

SEC. —. The fifth paragraph of section 20 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934, is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding any of the provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, no pension being paid on March 19, 1933, to any veteran of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer rebellion and the Philippine insurrection, or to the widow and/or dependents of any such veteran, shall be reduced by more than 10 percent, except in accordance with the regulations issued pursuant to Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, pertaining to hospitalized cases: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply (1) to persons to whom payments were being made on March 19, 1933, through fraud, clear or unmistakable error as to conclusions of fact or law, or misrepresentation of a material fact, except that decisions as to degree of disability rendered prior to March 20, 1933, shall be conclusive, or (2) to any person during any year following a year for which such person was not entitled to exemption from the payment of a Federal income tax."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether the amendment that he and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] have offered is an amendment to the Byrnes amendment or an independent amendment?

Mr. STEIWER. It was offered as an amendment to the Byrnes amendment, and it was contemplated by the Senator from Nevada and myself that it should come at the end of the amendment. I think that is following line 12 on page 4.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

TRANSFER OF BUREAU OF MINES FROM COMMERCE DEPARTMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (H.DOC. NO. 262)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

To the Congress:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 16 of the act of March 3, 1933 (ch. 212, 47 Stat. 1489, 1517), as amended by title III of the act of March 20, 1933 (ch. 3, 48 Stat. 8, 16), I am transmitting herewith for the information of the Congress an Executive order transferring the Bureau of Mines from the Department of Commerce to the Department of the Interior.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 22, 1934.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6951) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 10, 16, 17, and 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 10 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the sum "\$500,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$34,000, and in addition thereto the unexpended balance for this purpose for the fiscal year 1934 is continued available for the same purpose for the fiscal year 1935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,981,040, and in addition thereto not to exceed \$75,000 of the unexpended balance for this purpose for the fiscal year 1934 is continued available for the same purpose for the fiscal year 1935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$112,140, and in addition thereto not to exceed \$50,000 of the unexpended balance for this purpose for the fiscal year 1934 is continued available for the same purpose for the fiscal year 1935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$105,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$143,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$301,130, and in addition thereto the unexpended balance for this purpose for the fiscal year 1934 is continued available for the same purpose for the fiscal year 1935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$375,890"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$89,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$78,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$69,800, and in addition thereto the unexpended balance for this purpose for the fiscal year 1934 is continued available for the same purpose for the fiscal year 1935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$78,390; in all, \$163,190"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,313,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 27 and 34.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
GERALD P. NYE,
FREDERICK STEIWER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
W. W. HASTINGS,
B. W. JACOBSEN,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the conference report and move its adoption.

The report was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

WILLIAM THOMAS DOWD

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, for immediate consideration of the nomination of William Thomas Dowd to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina.

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

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is contrary to the usual procedure. Unless there is a very emergent situation, will the Senator wait until we have an executive session?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I may state for the information of the Senator from Oregon that the nomination of William Thomas Dowd was reported yesterday and is printed on today's Executive Calendar. The term of the marshal who is now holding office, Mr. Gragg, expired on January 1 of this year.

Mr. McNARY. That was nearly a month ago. I suggest that the Senator wait until Monday, because no one has had an opportunity to consider the nomination or the action of the committee.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The committee has acted on the nomination.

Mr. McNARY. But the nomination has just been reported, and was not placed on the Executive Calendar until today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It was reported on yesterday at noon and is printed on today's Executive Calendar.

Mr. McNARY. The calendar has not been distributed among the Senators.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It was distributed this morning.

Mr. McNARY. It has been placed on the desks of Senators, but some of us have not as yet had an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I hope the Senator will not object to the confirmation of this nominee.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think it would obviate the difficulty to have a brief executive session.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate several messages from the President of the United States submitting nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. STEPHENS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney, district of Rhode Island, to succeed Henry M. Boss, Jr., whose term expired December 16, 1933.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be placed on the calendar.

The calendar is in order.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest that the first nomination on the calendar, that of Robert H. Jackson to be general counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue at Jamestown, N.Y., be passed over until the next executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

THE JUDICIARY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William Thomas Dowd to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Felipe Sanchez y Baca to be United States marshal for the district of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

LAND OFFICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Clarence Ogle to be register of the land office at Lakeview, Oreg.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel D. Moore to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate, under the order heretofore entered, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, took a recess until Monday, February 26, 1934, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 22 (legislative day of Feb. 20), 1934

MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RADIO COMMISSION

Anning S. Prall, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Radio Commission for a term of 6 years from February 24, 1934, vice William D. L. Starbuck, term expired.

MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Fred W. Catlett, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the unexpired portion of the term of 4 years from July 22, 1932, vice Russell Hawkins, deceased.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

John C. Bowen, of Washington, to be United States district judge, western district of Washington, to succeed Jeremiah Neterer, retired.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Ardis J. Chitty, of Washington, to be United States marshal, western district of Washington, to succeed Charles E. Allen, whose term will expire June 16, 1934.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Herman Feldman, Field Artillery (detailed in Quartermaster Corps), with rank from July 1, 1920.

TO INFANTRY

Maj. Peter Kenrick Kelly, Ordnance Department, with rank from October 17, 1928.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE MAJOR

Capt. Hurley Edward Fuller, Infantry, from February 16, 1934.

TO BE CAPTAIN

First Lt. James Albert Durnford, Quartermaster Corps, from February 16, 1934.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Second Lt. Dwight Lewis Nulkey, Signal Corps, from February 16, 1934.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Adolphus Andrews to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 16th day of January 1934.

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, from the 1st day of March 1934:

Manley H. Simons
William S. Pye

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Tom Morris, Jr., to be postmaster at Berryville, Ark., in place of J. E. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1933.

Will H. Wardlaw to be postmaster at De Queen, Ark., in place of F. M. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Bess M. Nobles to be postmaster at Dierks, Ark., in place of R. D. Henry. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Allan M. Wilson to be postmaster at Fayetteville, Ark., in place of M. A. Stice. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1934.

Jo Etta Carolan to be postmaster at State Sanatorium, Arkansas, in place of G. D. Tubbs. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1933.

John M. Drummond to be postmaster at Stuttgart, Ark., in place of C. H. Denslow, removed.

Mildred B. Woollard to be postmaster at West Memphis, Ark., in place of Isabella Tice. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1933.

Richard H. Craig to be postmaster at Wilson, Ark., in place of F. F. McKinzie. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Don N. Matthews to be postmaster at Yellville, Ark., in place of H. A. Burnes. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

CALIFORNIA

Owen Kenny to be postmaster at Calistoga, Calif., in place of L. B. Hopkins, removed.

Harry S. Markofer to be postmaster at Elk Grove, Calif., in place of C. D. Tribble, resigned.

Leslie A. Johnson to be postmaster at Escalon, Calif., in place of T. H. McPherson. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Edith A. Knudson to be postmaster at Klamath, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1933.

Sidney F. Horrell to be postmaster at Moneta, Calif., in place of Mabel Winter, deceased.

Edith B. Smith to be postmaster at Patton, Calif., in place of E. B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1934.

CONNECTICUT

John J. Murphy to be postmaster at Westport, Conn., in place of William Krause. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1932.

DELAWARE

Edwin E. Shallcross to be postmaster at Middletown, Del., in place of J. C. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

FLORIDA

Emma A. Laird to be postmaster at Greenville, Fla., in place of S. T. Morse, deceased.

GEORGIA

Marion C. Farrar to be postmaster at Avondale Estates, Ga., in place of A. L. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

Charles E. Benns to be postmaster at Butler, Ga., in place of C. W. Bazemore. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1933.

Olin L. Spence to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ga., in place of W. M. Cobb. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1933.

Ruth A. Redmond to be postmaster at Chatsworth, Ga., in place of J. F. Charles. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

Lollie L. Ward to be postmaster at Commerce, Ga., in place of J. L. Dunson. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1933.

Osep N. Ruben to be postmaster at Davisboro, Ga., in place of L. C. Riddle. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

Ernest L. Wilson to be postmaster at Leslie, Ga., in place of F. P. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1933.

Lillian G. Rambo to be postmaster at Marshallville, Ga., in place of G. E. Love, removed.

Rushin Watkins to be postmaster at Reidsville, Ga., in place of St. James B. Alexander, removed.

Blanche L. Marshall to be postmaster at Reynolds, Ga., in place of W. M. Hollis, removed.

Roy Thrasher to be postmaster at Tifton, Ga., in place of Joseph Kent. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

James C. Pickren to be postmaster at Unadilla, Ga., in place of J. H. Beddingfield. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1933.

Lewis R. Powell to be postmaster at Villa Rica, Ga., in place of C. L. Roberds. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1933.

Aron Otis Johnson to be postmaster at Waycross, Ga., in place of W. A. Seaman, removed.

IDAHO

Lowell H. Merriam to be postmaster at Grace, Idaho, in place of L. H. Merriam. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1934.

ILLINOIS

Perry F. Arnold to be postmaster at Browning, Ill., in place of B. I. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1932.

James M. Allen to be postmaster at Decatur, Ill., in place of J. H. Hill, removed.

Grover C. Norris to be postmaster at Effingham, Ill., in place of W. W. Austin, removed.

George E. Brown to be postmaster at Franklin, Ill., in place of R. C. Hills. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

James R. Maher to be postmaster at Hillside, Ill., in place of Irma Walters. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1933.

George E. Kull to be postmaster at Strasburg, Ill., in place of William Fester. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Martha G. Baily to be postmaster at Table Grove, Ill., in place of R. A. Lance. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

George A. Larimer to be postmaster at Tuscola, Ill., in place of A. L. Houk, retired.

INDIANA

Rose K. Hubers to be postmaster at St. Meinrad, Ind., in place of J. F. Ruxer. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Charles Lebo to be postmaster at Winamac, Ind., in place of W. F. Kahler. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

IOWA

Opal V. Ocheltree to be postmaster at Bayard, Iowa, in place of H. C. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1933.

Thomas C. Kelly to be postmaster at Charles City, Iowa, in place of L. H. Henry, removed.

James S. Walton to be postmaster at Clearfield, Iowa, in place of Harry Aitken. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1932.

John Miller to be postmaster at Paton, Iowa, in place of T. E. Templeton. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Edward Van Zante to be postmaster at Pella, Iowa, in place of L. F. Bousquet, removed.

John Batchelor to be postmaster at Thompson, Iowa, in place of C. C. Clifton, deceased.

KANSAS

Edmund W. Emery to be postmaster at Atchison, Kans., in place of W. P. Ham. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Beulah H. Stewart to be postmaster at Baldwin City, Kans., in place of M. W. Markham, resigned.

Irvin T. Hocker to be postmaster at Baxter Springs, Kans., in place of F. H. Bartlett. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1933.

Frank M. Proffitt to be postmaster at Chase, Kans., in place of W. C. McFarland. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1933.

Orville E. Heath to be postmaster at Chetopa, Kans., in place of J. C. Shields, removed.

Lula E. Kempin to be postmaster at Corning, Kans., in place of O. G. Hannum. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles F. Mellenbruch to be postmaster at Fairview, Kans., in place of R. C. Minneman. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Charles H. Ryan to be postmaster at Girard, Kans., in place of H. W. Shideler. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1933.

Ray T. Ingalls to be postmaster at Goff, Kans., in place of C. S. Goodrich. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Roger M. Williams to be postmaster at Lawrence, Kans., in place of C. B. Hosford. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1932.

John C. Carpenter to be postmaster at Oswego, Kans., in place of R. H. Montgomery. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1933.

Guietta Stark to be postmaster at Perry, Kans., in place of C. G. Hart. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1932.

Oscar E. Edwards to be postmaster at Robinson, Kans., in place of R. B. Terrill. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1931.

William L. Kauffman to be postmaster at Seneca, Kans., in place of R. G. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Anne W. Vanbebber to be postmaster at Troy, Kans., in place of L. C. Sandy. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Margaret A. Schafer to be postmaster at Vermillion, Kans., in place of F. W. Arnold. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

KENTUCKY

Benjamin F. Turner to be postmaster at Outwood, Ky., in place of M. M. Noel. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1933.

LOUISIANA

Henry M. Sample to be postmaster at Lecompte, La., in place of W. L. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired October 10, 1933.

MAINE

Milton Edes to be postmaster at Sangerville, Maine, in place of E. E. Pynes. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1932.

MARYLAND

Ernest Green to be postmaster at Baltimore, Md., in place of B. F. Woelper, Jr., deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Mary L. McParlin to be postmaster at Sandwich, Mass., in place of E. M. Small. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1933.

MINNESOTA

John Oberg to be postmaster at Deerwood, Minn., in place of John Oberg. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1934.

Nettie A. Terrell to be postmaster at Elysian, Minn., in place of N. A. Terrell. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1932.

MISSISSIPPI

Aaron B. Johnston to be postmaster at Enid, Miss., in place of A. B. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expires February 25, 1934.

MISSOURI

Nat M. Snider to be postmaster at Cape Girardeau, Mo., in place of H. H. Haas. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Elizabeth Farnan to be postmaster at Clyde, Mo., in place of M. M. Enis. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1933.

Ora Lee Dean to be postmaster at Dearborn, Mo., in place of S. F. Duncan, deceased.

Joseph F. Hargis to be postmaster at Downing, Mo., in place of Hobart Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

James P. Moore to be postmaster at Liberal, Mo., in place of Zoe Morris. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1933.

Theodore C. Robinson to be postmaster at Maryville, Mo., in place of H. L. Raines. Incumbent's commission expired October 10, 1933.

MONTANA

Joseph P. Sternhagen to be postmaster at Glasgow, Mont., in place of O. M. Christinson, removed.

Allen S. McKenzie to be postmaster at Philipsburg, Mont., in place of A. H. Neal. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

NEBRASKA

Albin E. Rodine to be postmaster at Stromsburg, Nebr., in place of R. L. Ericson. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1932.

Eric Fredrickson to be postmaster at Wakefield, Nebr., in place of G. E. Barto. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

Richard H. Schwedhelm to be postmaster at Westpoint, Nebr., in place of L. A. Elliott. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

NEW JERSEY

William L. Scheuerman to be postmaster at Basking Ridge, N.J., in place of W. L. Scheuerman. Incumbent's commission expired November 12, 1933.

John Netterman to be postmaster at Island Heights, N.J., in place of A. A. Ayres, resigned.

Eleanor H. White to be postmaster at Plainsboro, N.J., in place of E. H. White. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1934.

NEW YORK

Joseph W. Cain to be postmaster at Adams, N.Y., in place of F. P. Redfield, removed.

Leo W. Pike to be postmaster at Belmont, N.Y., in place of I. G. Howe, resigned.

John A. Holland to be postmaster at Brushton, N.Y., in place of C. H. Hamlin. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

Bertha Sagendorph to be postmaster at Claverack, N.Y., in place of Guy Shook, resigned.

James D. George to be postmaster at Gardiner, N.Y., in place of H. C. Rosekrans. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1933.

Frank L. Egger to be postmaster at Larchmont, N.Y., in place of R. C. Clark, resigned.

Robert E. Purcell to be postmaster at Philadelphia, N.Y., in place of G. A. Hardy, removed.

Elmer R. Chaffer to be postmaster at Point Pleasant, N.Y., in place of Albert Pinfold. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1932.

Harold D. Ashline to be postmaster at Rouses Point, N.Y., in place of L. G. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1933.

George O. Fountain to be postmaster at Scarborough, N.Y., in place of E. M. Doying, removed.

May A. Cupernall to be postmaster at Thousand Island Park, N.Y., in place of M. A. Cupernall. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1934.

Charles R. Frank to be postmaster at Yorkville, N.Y., in place of E. W. Elmore, removed.

NORTH CAROLINA

Jack Barfield to be postmaster at Mount Olive, N.C., in place of W. J. Flowers. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

James H. Howell to be postmaster at Waynesville, N.C., in place of T. L. Green. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1933.

NORTH DAKOTA

Orpha B. Wells to be postmaster at Robinson, N.Dak., in place of O. B. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1934.

OHIO

Samuel E. Tidd to be postmaster at Columbiana, Ohio, in place of G. G. Patchen. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1932.

Olin B. Stahl to be postmaster at Jewett, Ohio, in place of B. F. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

Wallace F. Mock to be postmaster at Powhatan Point, Ohio, in place of E. G. Saner, removed.

Michael F. Mulheran to be postmaster at Salineville, Ohio, in place of Mathias Tolson, resigned.

Randle B. Hickman to be postmaster at Wilberforce, Ohio, in place of R. B. Hickman. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1934.

William G. Hoffer to be postmaster at Willshire, Ohio, in place of W. G. Hoffer. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1930.

OKLAHOMA

Earl A. Brown to be postmaster at Ardmore, Okla., in place of E. F. Harreld. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1931.

Monroe Burton to be postmaster at Poteau, Okla., in place of F. J. Kohr. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1934.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph C. McCormick to be postmaster at Marion Center, Pa., in place of J. C. Bovard. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1934.

Thomas J. Devon to be postmaster at Moylan, Pa., in place of T. J. Devon. Incumbent's commission expired October 10, 1933.

Esther F. Rivers to be postmaster at Ogontz School, Pa., in place of E. F. Rivers. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1934.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Marion G. Andersen to be postmaster at Conway, S.C., in place of A. T. Collins, removed.

Hattie J. Peebles to be postmaster at Varnville, S.C., in place of H. J. Peebles. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1934.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John E. Dunn to be postmaster at Elkton, S.Dak., in place of Fred Engelbrecht. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1933.

J. Russell Anderson to be postmaster at Irene, S.Dak., in place of O. D. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1932.

John W. Hoven to be postmaster at Selby, S.Dak., in place of E. E. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1933.

Daisy E. Berther to be postmaster at Wentworth, S.Dak., in place of J. A. Gorrits. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1932.

TEXAS

Gertrude E. Berger to be postmaster at Boling, Tex., in place of G. E. Berger. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1923.

Jack B. Kerr to be postmaster at Cotulla, Tex., in place of C. H. Reynolds, removed.

Zack F. Devine to be postmaster at Groveton, Tex., in place of W. A. Reese, removed.

Mills Awbrey to be postmaster at Presidio, Tex., in place of L. L. Sample, resigned.

VERMONT

Glennie C. McIntyre to be postmaster at Danby, Vt., in place of G. C. McIntyre. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Albert C. Moore to be postmaster at Westminster, Vt., in place of F. E. Metcalf. Incumbent's commission expired October 2, 1933.

VIRGINIA

Harry B. Jordan to be postmaster at Bedford, Va., in place of H. M. Stowe. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1934.

Alfred C. Darden to be postmaster at Fortress Monroe, Va., in place of H. H. Kimberly, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

Eddie L. Southard to be postmaster at Standardsville, Va., in place of L. G. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

WASHINGTON

Orris E. Marine to be postmaster at Colton, Wash., in place of O. E. Marine. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1934.

Raymond A. Landgraf to be postmaster at Klickitat, Wash., in place of W. C. Hubbard. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

Joshua E. Leander to be postmaster at White Bluffs, Wash., in place of E. J. O'Larey, transferred.

WEST VIRGINIA

James W. Penix to be postmaster at Belle, W.Va., in place of A. S. Borrer. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Ada B. Steiner to be postmaster at Berkeley Springs, W.Va., in place of H. A. Russell, resigned.

Katherine C. Brannen to be postmaster at Cabin creek, W.Va., in place of W. O. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

James H. Moyer to be postmaster at Cass, W.Va., in place of S. L. Clark, deceased.

Julius W. Singleton to be postmaster at Charleston, W.Va., in place of H. R. Mathews. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1933.

Virgil Y. Given to be postmaster at Clendenin, W.Va., in place of M. D. Dye, deceased.

Arthur J. Duncan to be postmaster at Fayetteville, W.Va., in place of D. K. Hesse. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1933.

George O. Sinsel to be postmaster at Flemington, W.Va., in place of W. A. Sherwood, resigned.

Oscar W. Johnson to be postmaster at Piedmont, W.Va., in place of C. A. Wilcox, resigned.

Albert R. Bibby to be postmaster at Whitesville, W.Va., in place of J. W. Pettry. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

WISCONSIN

Sheldon S. Chandler to be postmaster at Brooklyn, Wis., in place of Andrew Crahem, resigned.

Charles L. Haessly to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Wis., in place of F. L. Rolson. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

Aloysius W. Fries to be postmaster at Kenosha, Wis., in place of C. L. Holderness, resigned.

Meridan D. Anderson to be postmaster at Omro, Wis., in place of S. T. Barnard. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1933.

Grover E. Falck to be postmaster at Seymour, Wis., in place of G. F. Fiedler. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1933.

Louis J. Thompson to be postmaster at Spooner, Wis., in place of W. C. Crocker. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1933.

John E. Arent to be postmaster at West De Pere, Wis., in place of A. J. Vansistine. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

WYOMING

Albert E. Holliday to be postmaster at Laramie, Wyo., in place of E. T. Beltz, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 22 (legislative day of Feb. 20), 1934

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

William Thomas Dowd to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina.

Felipe Sanchez y Baca to be United States marshal for the district of New Mexico.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Clarence Ogle to be register of the land office, Lakeview, Oreg.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Daniel D. Moore to be collector of internal revenue, district of Louisiana.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Benjamin L. Edmonds, West Blocton.

GEORGIA

Ulmer L. Cox, Baxley.
Lewis L. Wolfe, Brunswick.
Grover C. Oliver, Clarkesville.
John A. Walker, Cochran.
Kirby A. Kemp, Cumming.
L'Bertie Rushing, Glennville.
Cora W. Rogers, Jasper.
Henry B. McCoy, Woodbury.

LOUISIANA

Ruby M. Ivey, Benton.
Joseph C. Ballay, Buras.
William C. Reynolds, Ida.
Edwin R. Ford, Jonesville.
Lucille M. Wilton, Laplace.
Albert C. Locke, Marthaville.
Annie B. Netterville, Newellton.
Mary S. Hunter, Pineville.
Ada K. Allums, Plain Dealing.
William S. Montgomery, Saline.
Elias C. Leone, Zwolle.

TEXAS

Andrew J. McDonald, Alvord.
Leslie L. Cates, Ben Wheeler.
Marvin A. Anderson, Cleveland.
Edgar W. Brooks, Eldorado.
Gladys Waters, Grandview.
Baxter Orr, Idalou.
Samuel C. Rhinehart, Iraan.
Grace McKay, Madisonville.
Jennie W. Reynolds, Mason.
Herbert Meurer, Muenster.
Mae Whitley, New Waverly.
Virginia Mansell, Overton.
Pearl B. Monke, Weinert.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1934

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou, the ever-blessed and living God, again we wait at the altar of prayer. Do Thou bless and sustain the inner harmony of our natures; allow us not to be swayed by fierce and irritable passions. Solemnize us by the thought of God; enrich us by the friendship of our Elder Brother; and guide

us by the presence of the divine Spirit. Heavenly Father, we wait; the past is with us. We breathe the deep emotion of gratitude in memory of him who sleeps on the banks of the historic Potomac. Oh, may his spirit bend over us in sacred benediction. We bow the head to the blessing of the immortal Washington. He heard the tramp of coming millions, and in a vision hour he saluted our generation. Almighty God, our country, our country; there is no vale but what has been consecrated by some patriot's prayer; there is no hilltop but has been dedicated by some heroic deed. Oh, freshen and deepen the wells of patriotic devotion in every section of the Republic. Do Thou hold all our fellow citizens to the strong realization that it remains for us to guard, strengthen, and enrich the institutions which a free people have received as a heritage for generations to come. We pray in the name of the world's Redeemer and Savior. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a very short telegram to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown]. I think it would be of exceeding interest to all the Members here, and I ask unanimous consent that the telegram may be read from the Clerk's desk, together with Mr. Brown's reply.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUGUSTA, GA., February 21, 1934.

Congressman PAUL BROWN:

Married yesterday. Must have work. Please wire me by Western Union, care Clarendon Hotel, here, any honest work, regardless.

W. H. LYNCH.

FEBRUARY 22, 1934.

W. H. LYNCH,

Care of Clarendon Hotel, Augusta, Ga.:

My advice is to have your wife apply for divorce immediately.

PAUL BROWN.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today and tomorrow the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be allowed to sit during sessions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER. This is Washington's Birthday. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, will read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, representing, as I do, that district in Virginia where Washington, the Father of our Country, lived and died and where his remains now rest enshrined in the peaceful shades of his beloved Mount Vernon, and where his virtues and character have indelibly imprinted themselves upon the character and patriotism of the people of that section in the generations which have followed him, I am profoundly grateful to the majority leadership of this House that I have been accorded the honor and the privilege, as the Representative of that district, to read to you, my colleagues, on this occasion of his two hundredth and second birthday, the Farewell Address of Washington, delivered on September 17, 1796.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States, being not far distant, and the time actually arrived, when your thoughts must be employed in

designating the person, who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation, which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped, that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives, which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement, from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice, that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty, or propriety; and am persuaded whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say, that I have with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious, in the out set, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services, they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe, that while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment, which is intended to terminate the career of my public life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgement of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honours it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes dubious,—vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging,—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected.—Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that,

in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete, by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiment; which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all-important to the permanency of your felicity as a People. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of Government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very Liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee, that from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the Palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of Patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the Independence and Liberty you possess are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the Union of the whole.

The *North*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *South*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *South* in the same intercourse, benefitting by the same Agency of the *North*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *North*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated;—and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is

unequally adapted.—The *East*, in a like intercourse with the *West*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications, by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home.—The *West* derives from the *East* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*.—Any other tenure by which the *West* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength, or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in Union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations;—and what is of inestimable value! they must derive from Union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighbouring countries, not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalships alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments and intrigues would stimulate and embitter.—Hence likewise they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to Republican Liberty; in this sense it is, that your Union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of Patriotic desire.—Is there a doubt, whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere?—Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. 'Tis well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to Union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those, who in any quarter may endeavour to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterising parties by *Geographical* discriminations—*Northern* and *Southern*—*Atlantic* and *Western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence, within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head: they have seen, in the negotiation by the Executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event, throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests in regard to the *Mississippi*: they have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them every thing they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, toward confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the *Union* by which they were procured?

Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their Brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a Government for the whole is indispensable—No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute, they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a Constitution of Government better calculated than your former for an intimate Union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true Liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their Constitutions of Government—But the Constitution which at any time exists, 'till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish Government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established Government.

All obstructions to the execution of the Laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force—to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation, the will of a party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reigns of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government, and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles however specious the pretences.—One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of the constitution alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions—that experience is the surest standard, by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country—that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change, from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests, in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigour as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty, is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you, the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism.—The disorders and miseries, which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual: and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of Public Liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise People to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the Public Councils and enfeeble the Public Administration. It agitates the Community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another, ferments occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the Government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of Liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in Governments of a Monarchical cast, Patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favour, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in Governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched; it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country, should inspire caution, in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power; by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the Guardian of the Public Weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the People, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by

which free governments are destroyed.—The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable supports.—In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labour to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and Citizens.—The mere Politician, equally with the pious man ought to respect and to cherish them.—A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure; reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

'Tis substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge.—In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible; avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burthen which we ourselves ought to bear.—The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate.—To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be Revenue: that to have Revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining Revenue which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all Nations, cultivate peace and harmony with all; Religion and Morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great Nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be, that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a Nation with its Virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular Nations, and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The Nation, which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is

sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed and bloody contests. The Nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the Government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The Government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of Nations has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one Nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favourite Nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favourite Nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the Nation making the concessions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld: And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favourite nation) facility to betray, or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent Patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the Public Councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of Republican Government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it.—Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other.—Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favourite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith.—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off, when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality,

we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humour, or caprice?

'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances, with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronising infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favours or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing, with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them; conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that 'tis folly in one nation to look for disinterested favours from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favours, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favours from nation to nation. 'Tis an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations: But if I may even flatter myself, that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompence for the solicitude for your welfare, by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my Proclamation of the 22d of April 1793 is the index to my Plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your Representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me; uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should de-

pend upon me, to maintain it, with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe, that according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the Belligerent Powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interests for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavour to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress without interruption, to that degree of strength and consistency, which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error: I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my Country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man, who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow Citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favourite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labours, and dangers.

G. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES, 17th September, 1796.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes in order that the Clerk may read a resolution adopted by the Council of Moonachie, N.J.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What is the resolution?

Mr. KENNEY. It is a resolution adopted by the Council of Moonachie, N.J., a municipality.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to put in the RECORD all the resolutions that come to the individual Members of the Congress, let us have that understood now. If any Member is to be allowed to put in such resolution, that is all right; but, otherwise, the practice should be stopped now.

Mr. KENNEY. This is a very important resolution.

Mr. SNELL. I have some very important resolutions that came to me this morning, and I should like to have the majority leader announce what he wants done as a matter of policy. Does the gentleman want to put in the RECORD all these resolutions that the Members receive every morning?

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that if we adopted that as a uniform policy, it would increase the size of the RECORD enormously.

Mr. SNELL. I think it would be a bad policy; but if one Member is to be allowed to put in such resolutions, the rest of the Members will expect the same privilege. I have such matters come to me every morning.

Mr. KENNEY. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I regard this as a specially important resolution; otherwise I would not offer it in this way.

Mr. SNELL. I think most of them are regarded as important by the Member who receives them and by the com-

munity from which they come. It is a matter of policy which I think we ought to have settled now. If we are to allow them to go in, well and good; but I want the House to allow such resolutions to go in from this side, as well as the majority side.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, for the time being, I object.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to proceed for 3 minutes.

Mr. SNELL. Is this for the purpose of reading the resolution referred to?

Mr. KENNEY. Referring to it and reading from it.

Mr. SNELL. I shall have to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

MANY QUESTIONS THAT MANY ASK ABOUT THE CONGRESS, ITS WORK, AND WAYS ARE HERE ANSWERED

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, no doubt each Member has had guests in the galleries and in the House restaurant, as well as friends back home who are desirous of knowing just what our Congress is, how it is organized, and how it functions.

During my two terms of office I have had the pleasure of explaining to my many guests many things which we take as a matter of course but are foreign to those of the laity.

I shall try, in this brief, single-handed dialogue which is to follow, to answer some of the questions which have been asked me repeatedly in the past, and which, I am sure, will be asked me and other Members in the future. Some of the things about which I shall speak are, perhaps, already understood by the majority, but it may be that I shall make mention of a few things which might never have been brought to the minds of my friends. I hope in this way to bring out a few points which will be of interest to some and at the same time be of service in bringing about a better understanding between the representatives of the people and the laity.

How often have we heard Members in the House and Senate say in speeches, "The people back home should know this and that", implying that they are not only speaking to the Congress but to the country at large. So it is with these few remarks. I am not making them for your benefit, although you may be able to get some facts from them—facts which would assist you in answering the questions of your friends back home.

For the benefit of the many who would like to know a little more of the inside workings of Congress I am putting these questions and answers in printed form. I know I have many friends in Ohio who would like to know about these matters and encourage me to talk of them in small fraternal groups and through the press. It may be that there are others who have a healthy curiosity, living in other sections of the country, who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope that I may, in serving my own constituency, be of service to them.

That I may not tire you with a longer preface, I will begin this single-handed dialogue by asking and answering the following questions:

What is Congress?

Congress is the legislative body of the United States Government. The functions of the National Government are divided into three parts—executive, judicial, and legislative. States have their State legislatures. Cities have their city councils. The Nation has its Congress. Its existence, authority, and limitations are provided by the Constitution; article I, section 1, of which reads:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

How long have we had a Congress?

About 143 years. The first Congress dated from March 4, 1789, to March 3, 1791. The first Congress did not con-

vene, however, until April 6, 1789, because a quorum of Members did not show up until that date. Travel was not as easy and swift then as it is in these days.

What is the length of a Congress?

A Congress is elected for 2 years. It is officially in existence at noon on the 3d day of January. Members of the House of Representatives are all elected every 2 years, for a term of 2 years. Members of the Senate are elected for a term of 6 years, one third of that body being elected every 2 years.

What is a Congressman?

Strictly speaking, a Member of either the Senate or of the House of Representatives is a Congressman. However, in general practice we speak of a Member of the Senate as a Senator and of a Member of the House as a Congressman, although the official title of the latter is Representative in Congress.

How many Members?

There are 96 United States Senators, 2 from each of the 48 States in the Union. There are 435 Members of the House of Representatives, each State being entitled to the number its population justifies. The number of Members of the House should be apportioned to the different States after each decennial census. There was a reapportionment after the Seventy-first Congress which was based on the 1930 census, at which time some States lost a Member or two and other States gained a Member or two because of the shifting population. Ohio gained two Members. We have 22 Members and 2 Representatives at large.

What qualifications are required for membership?

The Constitution provides that a Member of the House of Representatives must have attained the age of 25, have been a citizen of the United States for 7 years, and be an inhabitant of the State in which he is elected. In practice, he is usually a resident of the district which he represents, but that is not a constitutional requirement. A United States Senator must have attained the age of 30 years, have been a citizen of the United States for 9 years, and be an inhabitant of the State which elects him.

What oath do Members take?

The oath of office taken by the Members of the House is administered by the Speaker and by the Vice President to the Senators. It reads:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

The Constitution provides that the President of the United States, Senators, and Representatives, members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution.

When does Congress meet?

That question is often asked, although for more than a hundred years Congress, as provided in article I, section 4, of the Constitution, has always met on the first Monday in December every year until this year, when it met on the 3d day of January because of the ratification of the twentieth amendment. This is the first change in the date of the meeting of regular sessions since 1820. The ratification of this amendment to the Constitution shortened the terms of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Vice President John N. Garner and all Senators and Representatives. Had this amendment not been ratified, their terms would not expire until March 4, whereas the terms of the President and Vice President end at noon on the 20th day of January and the terms of the Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January.

What about extra sessions?

The President may call the Congress to meet in extraordinary session at any time he thinks the interests of the country justify it. When he does call an extra session, the Congress may transact any business it desires and stay in session as long as it wants to. There have been only

about 24 extra sessions in the 143 years since the Constitution was adopted. Five of these have occurred in the past 9 years. The Senate may be called in extra session without the House to consider treaties, try impeachments, and confirm appointments, all of which are considered exclusively by the Senate. The Senate nearly always meets in extra session after a new President has been inaugurated to confirm his Cabinet and other appointments. These special sessions of the Senate usually last only a few days.

How are vacancies filled?

Members do die in office, and occasionally one resigns, usually to take what he considers to be a better office. When a Senator dies or resigns, the Governor of his State may appoint his successor to serve only until an election is held, providing his State legislature has given him the authority. If a Representative dies or resigns, his place cannot be filled by appointment. The Governor of his State may call a special election to fill the place if he wants to, or as is done in most cases, the place may be left vacant until the next general election.

What are the duties of a Member?

They are many and manifold. He should study legislation and attend the meetings of his House. He should listen to a good deal of the debates, but not all of them by any means. Many Members are kept in committee meetings many hours of many days of every session. The average Member develops a large office business. This is particularly true of western Members. Their constituency is far away from Washington, so many problems are referred to the Congressman for assistance. The Members get a vast amount of mail. This requires much study, dictation of replies, and often visits to different executive departments down town. The departments are far away and often far apart. Many ex-service men bring their problems to their Congressman, and he is always glad to help them out when and wherever he can, although he has not the power always to do as much as he would like.

A Member will get a thousand letters or maybe several thousand letters in a session from citizens advocating or opposing proposed legislation. Usually a Congressman answers every letter, though he can not tell everybody what he thinks about every bill that has been introduced. He must wait development through committee hearings and give thought to those measures that are being brought forward by favorable committee action.

Most pension claims for soldiers and their widows go through the Congressman. Many post-office, land-office, and immigration cases are referred to him.

He likes it. The ambitious Congressman brags about his large office business and his heavy work. He seeks business and craves harder committee assignments—until he gets upon the Appropriations Committee where the appetite for work of the most ambitious will be fully satisfied. Many Members find it necessary to work nights and holidays.

What are the important committees?

There are several. The two most important are probably Appropriations and Ways and Means. All bills that relate to the appropriation of money must be considered by and reported out by the Appropriations Committee of the House. This committee consists of 35 members, 21 Democrats and 14 Republicans. It reports out several bills that carry appropriations for a little over \$4,000,000,000 each year. The Ways and Means Committee has to consider and report out all bills that have in any way to do with raising revenue, tariff, or any sort of taxes. This committee consists of 25 members, 15 Democrats and 10 Republicans. All revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives and come out of the Ways and Means Committee.

There are about 44 standing committees, 4 joint standing committees, and several select committees appointed for specific purposes. The 10 principal committees are called exclusive committees in that a majority member of any one of these committees cannot serve on any other.

How do committees work?

They meet regularly or on call. They consider the bills that have been referred to them. They sometimes hold

long hearings on important bills when those interested either for or against may come in and tell the committee what they think of the bills in question. Some hearings last several days and some several weeks. The committee then considers the bill and may report it out with or without amendments or may decide not to report it out. Sometimes the committee takes up several bills of a similar character, considers all phases of the question and writes a new bill and reports that out.

Who selects members for committee assignments?

Majority Members are assigned to committees by the Committee on Ways and Means. As a rule, once on an important committee a Member stays there as long as he is in Congress. If a vacancy occurs on an important committee, a Member from another committee may be given the place by the Committee on Ways and Means if he desires it and if he has the seniority and influence to get it. New Members get the places left available. The Republican committee on committees perform this function for the minority Members. All selections must be confirmed by election in the House.

Who appoints the chairmen of committees?

They are elected by the House and theoretically the Committee on Ways and Means makes the selections of chairmen. In actual practice, however, the Member of the majority party who has served longest on any committee is selected as chairman. Here seniority plays an important part. The chairmen, of course, all come from the majority party, and the majority of the members of all committees are of the dominant party—at this time Democratic.

What is the Committee on Rules?

This is one of the most important committees, as it controls the destiny of more proposed legislation than any other. Bills from the Ways and Means and Appropriations have the right-of-way, so to speak, and can always be brought up for consideration. Other committees have only a few calendar days in any one session. So many bills reported out cannot be brought up for consideration. The Rules Committee can report a rule for consideration of a bill any day. It can bring in a rule for the consideration of any bill that has been reported out of any committee any time. In the last days of a session special rules to bring out special bills are much in demand. The Rules Committee has much power, certainly has the power of selection, but it must be fair and discriminating, selecting what the majority of Congress seems to want most, as the rule it brings in must be adopted by the House.

What is the steering committee?

This is a committee not much heard of nor mentioned in the newspapers. And I dare say that hardly two dozen Members of the House can tell the names of all the members on the steering committee. This is a little party adjunct to help promote legislation the majority is interested in, and help to iron out a program of procedure, especially in the closing days of a session. It is composed of nine of the older Democratic Members. In addition, the majority leader acts as chairman. When important matters are up for consideration the Speaker and the Chairman of the Rules Committee sit in. This committee really has a great deal of influence in helping to shape up the legislative program.

What are conferences and conferees?

The House passes a bill, for instance. It goes to the Senate and may be much amended over there, as are appropriation and tariff bills usually. The House will not accept the amendments. So the bill is sent to conference. The House appoints three or five Members as conferees and the Senate appoints an equal number. These gentlemen meet and hold a conference and discuss the points in disagreement. The conferees of the Senate give up some items and the conferees of the House agree to some. Finally they get together on a bill somewhere between the position taken by each House. Sometimes the conferees do not give up easily; sometimes the conference drags on for days or weeks, and they have run for months. Usually they get together, and

usually the conference report is adopted by both Houses. Which end of the Capitol is the most stubborn? Well, the other end, of course.

How are bills introduced?

A Member writes up his bill and drops it in the basket on the Clerk's desk. It is then referred to the appropriate committee. Many bills lay in committee undisturbed and are never heard from again. In some cases they have served their purpose without further action. They have advertised the Member and the project. Many bills are introduced that have not the slightest chance of serious consideration or passage.

Stages of a bill of the House:

First. Introduction: By a Member by laying the bill on the Clerk's table informally. A Member sometimes introduces a petition only, leaving to the committee the drawing of a bill, such a petition referred to a committee having jurisdiction of the subject giving authority to report a bill. Sometimes communications addressed to the House from the executive departments or from other sources are referred to committees by the Speaker and give authority for the committees to originate bills. Messages from the President also are referred by the Speaker or the House and give jurisdiction to the committees receiving them to originate bills.

Second. Reference to a standing or select committee: Public bills are referred under direction of the Speaker; private bills are endorsed with the names of the committees to which they go under the rule and the Members introducing them. Senate bills are referred under direction of the Speaker. A bill is numbered and printed when referred.

Third. Reported from the committee: Committees having leave to report at any time make their reports from the floor; other committees make their reports by laying them on the Clerk's table informally. The bill and the report are printed when reported.

Fourth. Placed on the calendar: Occasionally a privileged bill is considered when reported; but usually it is placed with the unprivileged bills on the calendar where it belongs under the rule by direction of the Speaker.

Fifth. Consideration in Committee of the Whole: Public bills which do not raise revenue or make or authorize appropriations of money or property do not go through this stage. All other bills are considered in Committee of the Whole. The stages of consideration in Committee of the Whole are: General debate; reading for amendment under the 5-minute rule; order to lay aside with a favorable recommendation or to rise and report; reporting of to the House.

Sixth. Reading a second time in the House: Bills not requiring consideration in Committee of the Whole are read a second time in full, after which they are open to debate and amendment in any part. Bills considered in Committee of the Whole are read a second time in full in that committee and when reported out, with or without amendments, are not read in full again, but are subject to further debate or amendment in the House unless the previous question is ordered at once.

Seventh. Engrossment and third reading: The question on House bills is taken on ordering the engrossment and third reading at one vote. If decided in the affirmative, the reading a third time usually takes place at once, by title. But any Member may demand the reading in full of the engrossed copy, in which case the bill is laid aside until it can be engrossed. Senate bills come to the House in engrossed form, and the question is put on third reading alone. When the question on engrossment and third reading of a House bill or third reading of a Senate bill is decided in the negative the bill is lost as much as if defeated on the final passage. The question on engrossment and third reading is not made from the floor, but is put by the Speaker as a matter of course.

Eighth. Passage: The question on the passage of a bill is put by the Speaker as a matter of course, without awaiting a motion from the floor.

Ninth. Transmission to the Senate by message.

Tenth. Consideration by the Senate: In the Senate House bills are usually referred to committees for consideration and report, after which they have their several readings, with opportunities for debate and amendment. The same procedure takes place in the House as to bills sent from the Senate.

Eleventh. Return from the Senate without amendments: If the Senate passes a House bill without amendment, it returns it to the House, where it is at once enrolled on parchment for signature. A bill thus passed without amendment goes into possession of the Clerk, and is not laid before the House prior to enrollment. If the Senate rejects a House bill, the House is informed. Similar procedure occurs when the House passes a Senate bill without amendment.

Twelfth. Return from the Senate with amendments: House bills returned with Senate amendments go to the Speaker's table. If any Senate amendment requires consideration in Committee of the Whole, the bill is referred by the Speaker informally to the standing committee having jurisdiction; and when that committee reports the bill with recommendations, it is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, to be there considered and reported to the House itself. When no Senate amendment requires consideration in Committee of the Whole, the bills come before the House directly from the Speaker's table.

Thirteenth. Consideration of Senate amendments by the House: When a bill with Senate amendments comes before the House, the House takes up each amendment by itself and may vote to agree to it, agree to it with an amendment, or disagree to it. If it disagrees, it may ask a conference with the Senate or may send notice of its disagreement, leaving it to the Senate to recede or insist and ask the conference.

Fourteenth. Settlement of differences by conference: When disagreements are referred to conference, the managers embody their settlement in a report, which is acted on by each House as a whole. When this report is agreed to, the bill is finally passed and is at once enrolled for signature.

Fifteenth. Enrollment on parchment: The House in which a bill originates enrolls it.

Sixteenth. Examination by the Committee on Enrolled Bills: While the Committee on Enrolled Bills is described as a joint committee, each branch acts independently. The chairman of each branch affixes to the bills examined a certificate that the bill has been found truly enrolled.

Seventeenth. Signing by the Speaker and President of the Senate: The enrolled bill is first laid before the House of Representatives and signed by the Speaker, whether it be a House or Senate bill, after which it is transmitted to the Senate and signed by the President of that body.

Eighteenth. Transmittal to the President of the United States: The Chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills for each House carries the bills from his House to the President. In the House of Representatives a report of the bills taken to the President each day is made to the House and entered on its Journal.

Nineteenth. Approval by the President: If the President approves, he does so with his signature.

Twentieth. Disapproval by the President: When the President disapproves a bill, he returns it to the House in which it originated with a message stating that he disapproves and giving his reasons therefor.

Twenty-first. Action when bill is returned disapproved: The House to which a disapproved bill is returned has the message read and spread on its Journal. It may then consider at once the question of passing the bill notwithstanding the President's objections, or may postpone to a day certain, or refer to a committee for examination. The vote on passing the bill notwithstanding the President's objections must be carried by two thirds. If the bill fails to pass in the House to which it is returned, it remains there; but if it passes, it is sent to the other House for action.

Twenty-second. Filing with the Secretary of State: When approved by the President, a bill is deposited in the Office of the Secretary of State; and when the two Houses have passed a bill notwithstanding the President's objections, the presiding officer of the House which acts on it last transmits it to the Secretary of State.

Are many bills introduced?

Yes; too many. In the Seventy-second Congress 15,875 bills and resolutions were introduced in the House and 6,392 in the Senate.

In this Congress so far—the Seventy-third—the bills introduced total approximately 8,000 in the House and 3,000 in the Senate. The Sixty-fifth Congress holds the record for number of bills, 33,015 having been introduced.

How many bills pass?

Not as many as you would probably think, considering the number introduced and the length of the session. In the Seventy-second Congress 843 bills and resolutions were passed; in the Seventy-third so far 94 bills and 14 resolutions have been enacted into law.

What is a veto?

As has been said, after a bill has passed the House and Senate it must be signed by the President to become a law. If the President does not think the measure good public policy he may refuse to sign it. He writes a veto message and sends it with the bill back to the body from which it came.

Are many bills vetoed?

Not as many as you might think. In 8 years President Wilson vetoed 33 bills; President Harding vetoed 5; President Coolidge vetoed 20; President Hoover vetoed 20; and President Roosevelt has not vetoed any to date.

How does Congress override a veto?

When a bill comes back to Congress with a veto message, it is voted upon again, as to whether it shall be passed over the President's veto. If two thirds of the Members present and voting in both House and Senate vote to pass the bill over the veto, the bill then becomes a law.

Are bills often passed over President's veto?

No; not very often. Most bills that are vetoed by Presidents are not of great concern to the general public. President Grover Cleveland made a reputation for vetoing more bills than any other President, but the bills were mostly private pension bills. Bills passed over presidential vetoes are usually of interest to a great many people over all the United States, and consequently brought prominently to the attention of many Members. For instance:

In President Wilson's administration the three bills passed over his veto were:

First. Repeal of the daylight saving law.

Second. The Volstead Act.

Third. To cease enlistments in the Army.

None were passed over President Harding's veto.

The four bills passed over President Coolidge's veto were:

First. The so-called "bonus" or adjusted-compensation bill.

Second. The emergency officers' retirement bill.

Third. The bill to provide a differential in pay for night work in the Postal Service.

Fourth. Granting allowances to fourth-class postmasters for light, rent, fuel, and equipment.

President Hoover had three bills passed over his veto:

First. Spanish-American War pension increase.

Second. Philippine independence.

Third. Increase of the loan basis of adjusted-service certificates.

What is "unanimous consent"?

Many little actions are done in and taken by the House by unanimous consent. The Member asks for unanimous consent to do this or that—to correct the RECORD, to speak for 5 minutes or more out of order, to insert remarks in the RECORD, to change an amendment he has offered, to have a letter read. If there is no objection on the part of any Member, then consent is granted. Frequently a gentleman says, "I object", and that settles that.

The leader of the majority makes many unanimous-consent requests, and usually they are granted. He may ask

consent to meet at a certain hour, to adjourn over for a day or two, to hold a night session, to have so many hours for debate on a bill, to take up specified matters on certain days out of order, to set days for the Private and Consent Calendars. The granting of the request saves the passing of motions or the making of rules.

Many bills are passed by unanimous consent. All bills of a private character go on the Private Calendar. And another character of bills go on the Consent Calendar. On days when these bills are in order, the Clerk reads the title of the bill, the Speaker asks, "Is there objection?" Any Member may say, "I object", if he desires, in which case the bill cannot be taken up; and the next title is read. If no objection is made, the bill is read and passed very quickly usually. The theory is that if no one cares to object to a bill, certainly many would not vote against it, so it ought to be passed. Both party organizations have several Members who make it their business to study all bills on the Consent Calendar and be ready to object or insist on what they think to be the proper amendments before consent is granted for the bill to be considered.

Often a Member will arise and say, "Reserving the right to object", and ask questions about the bill. This gives the author of the bill a chance to explain or defend it, and sometimes quite a little debate is stirred up even on consent days. After a while somebody may shout, "Regular order!" The Speaker says, "Regular order is demanded." Whereupon the gentleman who started the trouble by "reserving the right to object" must immediately make his objection or withdraw it. He may be just as apt to do one as the other, and on his decision rests the destiny of some anxious Member's important bill—for all bills are important to their hopeful authors. On consent days Members with bills on the calendar are most patient, polite, and persuasive in their ways toward the gentlemen who sit at the table and whose business it is to inquire into the merits of bills coming up.

How are votes taken?

Four different ways. Usually the Speaker puts the question in this form: "As many as are in favor (of the motion) say 'aye'," and then, "As many as are opposed say 'no.'" In most instances the vote taken thus is decisive enough to satisfy. But if the Speaker is in doubt, or if it sounds close, any Member may ask for a division. In this case the Speaker asks those in favor to stand up and be counted. Then those opposed to the proposition to stand up and be counted. The Speaker does the counting and announces the result. But if he is still in doubt, or if a demand is made by one fifth of a quorum—that is, 20 in the Committee of the Whole or 44 in the House—tellers are ordered. The Speaker appoints one gentleman on each side of the question to make the count. The two tellers take their place at the head of the center aisle. All Members favoring the proposition walk through between the tellers and are counted. Then those opposed walk through and are counted. This vote settles most questions.

But a roll call may be demanded by anybody on any question in the House; and if supported by one fifth of those present, it is ordered. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution. The Clerk reads the names of the whole Membership, and as his or her name is called the Member answers "aye" or "no." The names of those not voting the first time are read a second time, so that all Members in corridors, cloakrooms, committee rooms, or offices, who have been notified of a roll call by signal bells, may come in and vote.

Roll calls are ordered sometimes to get a full vote on a measure, because of a lack of a quorum, sometimes because Members want to be on record on a measure, and sometimes to put the other side on record against the measure for imaginary political advantage. The roll calls are published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are sometimes quoted to a Member's advantage or disadvantage, as the case may be.

Many bills of lesser importance and some of greater importance are passed without a roll call. This can be done if a quorum is present when the vote is taken and as many as one fifth of those present do not demand a roll call. This

is done often to save time and sometimes to save Members the embarrassment of having to be recorded for or against a measure.

What is a quorum?

Everybody who ever attended a literary society knows that it requires a quorum to do business. In the House of Representatives a quorum is a majority of the Membership. When there are no vacancies in the Membership a quorum is 218. There are usually a few vacancies—Members who have died or have resigned and their places yet unfilled. So an actual quorum is usually a little under that figure. Much business is transacted without a quorum. But no business of any character, except to adjourn, can be transacted without a quorum present if any Member objects. All any Member has to do to get a full House is to arise, address the Speaker, and make the point of order that "no quorum is present." The Speaker says, "I will count." If he cannot count a majority present, the doors are closed, the bells are rung in the corridors and House Office Building, and the roll is called. This usually produces a quorum, and business proceeds.

When the House is in Committee of the Whole a hundred Members make a quorum.

Is legislation much influenced by oratory?

Not much. People back home may picture the House as a forum for debate upon the merits of the many bills they read about. It is in a way, but most of the debate is as potent as a sham battle. Very few bills that are brought up in the House for action under general or special rules are defeated. I think more than 95 percent of bills thus brought up are passed, despite the forensic display of oratory that may be directed against them, and usually is by the minority or the opposition. Hardly 1 amendment in 40 offered to bills on the floor is adopted unless offered or accepted by the committee reporting out the bill for consideration.

Legislation enacted by any Congress is largely that originating with or sponsored by the majority party. Important measures brought up have had thorough scrutiny and a favorable report by a well-organized committee. They have probably had strong backing from the country. Some have had the approval of the steering committee and some have been reported out by the Rules Committee. Such measures are on the program for passage and long debates and much oratory cannot defeat them. On the other hand, bills that are not slated for passage do not often get up for action in the House.

Committee responsibility is great and committee action influential. On most amendments and on most bills a majority of the Members vote most of the time with the committee—and it is difficult to break into that influence even with fine oratory.

What are the duties of the Speaker?

He presides over the House, appoints the chairman to preside over the Committee of the Whole, appoints all special or select committees, appoints conference committees, has the power of recognition of Members, makes many important rulings and decisions in the House. The Speaker may vote, but usually does not, except in case of tie. He may appoint a Speaker pro tempore but not for more than 3 days at a time without the consent of the House.

What is a party leader?

There is a majority leader and a minority leader. In talk on the floor we do not refer to Democrats and Republicans usually. It is more dignified, it seems, to refer to the majority and the minority. The majority leader now is a Democrat and the minority leader a Republican. The majority leader has the more influence, of course, since he has the majority of the Membership back of him.

The leader is all the title implies. He leads in party debate, brings forward party program and policies. His advocacy of or opposition to proposed legislation indicates the party preference. The majority leader has much control over what comes up and when, of the legislative program from week to week. When he makes a motion, it is nearly always carried. He usually makes the motion to adjourn,

and it always carries. If someone else, not authorized to do so, makes a motion to adjourn, it is nearly always defeated.

What are the Chaplain's duties?

Both the Senate and the House have a Chaplain, who offers prayer at the opening of each daily session, usually at 12 o'clock noon. Both are eloquent and godly men. The prayers are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the proceedings each day. The prayers offered by the House Chaplain during the Sixty-eighth and Sixty-ninth Congresses have been gathered together and printed in book form. This book of Chaplains' prayers can be purchased for 25 cents per copy by addressing the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

What are the duties of the whip?

The whip looks after all legislation and endeavors to have all present when important measures are to be voted upon. When the vote is apt to be close, he checks up, finds out who is out of the city, and advises absentees by wire of the important measure coming up.

What is printed that best tells of the Congress?

The Constitution of the United States is the best thing printed dealing with the Congress. It provides the authority for Congress, specifies its duties, powers, privileges, and much of the procedure in both Houses of Congress. The Constitution is not very long, is easily obtainable in any city or town, and should be read occasionally by every citizen. It will surprise you how much information it contains.

How old is the Constitution?

It was adopted by the Federal Constitutional Convention in 1787, ratified by the several States, and the new Government provided for by it became fully operative with the inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States on April 30, 1789.

How can the Constitution be amended?

A proposal to amend the Constitution must be passed by the Congress by a two thirds' vote of both House and Senate. The proposed amendment then goes to the legislatures of the several States and must be ratified by three fourths of them—at the present time by 36 of the 48 States.

Have many constitutional amendments been adopted?

No; not very many, only 21 in 143 years; and this question brings out some interesting figures and dates. The first 10 amendments to the Constitution were proposed by the First Congress in 1789 and were practically agreed to before the adoption of the Constitution. The eleventh and twelfth amendments were proposed in 1794 and 1803.

Since 1804, when the twelfth amendment was ratified, over a period of 128 years only nine amendments have been adopted to the Constitution, and one was repealed.

The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments relate to abolition of slavery, rights of citizenship, and the franchise, coming after the Civil War, and were proposed and ratified between 1865 and 1870.

Since the Civil War period only seven amendments have been ratified, as follows:

Sixteenth amendment: Provides power for Congress to levy a tax on incomes. Was ratified in 1913.

Seventeenth amendment: Provides that United States Senators shall be elected by popular vote. Previous to its adoption Senators had been chosen by State legislatures. Proposed in 1912 and ratified in 1913.

Eighteenth amendment: Provides for prohibition. Proposed 1917 and ratified in 1919. Subsequently ratified by all States in the Union except two.

Nineteenth amendment: Provides the right of suffrage of women. Proposed 1919 and ratified by 1920.

Twentieth amendment: Changes the commencement of terms of President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives.

Twenty-first amendment: Repeals the eighteenth amendment.

Are amendments sometimes proposed but rejected by the States?

Yes; that has occurred several times. Amendments were proposed in 1789 (2), 1810, 1861, and 1924, that were not ratified by the States. All these except the last one are

out of date, and of no use now, and time has shown the wisdom of their rejection. The one submitted to the States in 1924 was known as the child-labor amendment, and reads in part:

The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

A number of States have ratified this amendment.

Who pays for speeches Members mail out?

The Senator or Congressman pays for the speeches he sends out. They are printed usually at the Government Printing Office and are charged for at cost price. A Member will often send out another Member's speech on some subject he thinks will be of interest to his constituents.

In the fiscal year 1931 Members paid the Public Printer \$61,257.91 for speeches, and in 1932 the sum of \$47,567.73, and in 1933, \$40,445.99 was paid out.

PAYMENT OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it is a distinct honor and pleasure to commemorate the birthday of George Washington, the Father of our Country, by eulogizing this great statesman, soldier, and humanitarian. Just to hear his farewell address, delivered so ably today by the gentleman from Virginia, should cause every heart within the confines of these historic walls to throb with renewed patriotism and love for country and flag.

It might not be amiss at this high hour to remind Members that George Washington not only fought nobly to free his beloved country from serfdom and monarchical tyranny, but that at the conclusion of that historic fight he fought nobly also for just compensation for his comrades so that they should receive from the Government a fair remuneration and compensation.

To me, it seems that the conclusion of the signing of the petition to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of the Patman or so-called "bonus bill" by 145 Members of this House on February 21, the day preceding the birthday of President George Washington, might be considered also a tribute to the human sympathy and humanitarian motives that have coursed through the veins of his progeny down through the decades. To me, therefore, this is a day of rejoicing, since it means that again Congress shall have the opportunity of saying whether or not the veterans of the World War, the greatest conflict ever recorded in the annals of time, shall have their adjusted-service certificates paid now, when they need the money, rather than in 1945, when many of them will have passed away and those certificates in very truth can be called "graveyard insurance."

It is gratifying to me for another reason: In 1932, as a candidate for Congressman at large in the State of Ohio, I campaigned in every county in the State in the primaries in May, and again in every county in the fall election campaign. In every speech that I made, in every piece of publicity used in the newspapers, I stated unequivocally that I favored and would support legislation to pay the soldiers' bonus, and that I would oppose, with every effort at my command, any and every attempt to reduce the compensation of disabled, service-connected, and presumptive cases of war veterans.

To me a campaign pledge is a promissory note to be paid in full. In the special session of the Seventy-third Congress I was given the opportunity to pay in full the pledge I had given in regard to reductions of veterans' compensation. I voted "no" on the so-called "Economy Act." I voted "no" on each succeeding House compromise. I voted "yes" on the Connally amendment, which would have limited all reductions of veterans' compensation to a maximum of 25 percent.

Now, since that act was passed and I have personally observed dozens of cases, veterans 50-percent disabled or 100-percent disabled, men with no means of livelihood, men

with families to support, men with no homes of their own, men who served their country in its hour of need, whose pensions have been ruthlessly emasculated, I am more firmly convinced than ever that my vote of "no" on the Economy Act was one of the most humanitarian votes that I have or ever shall cast as a Member of Congress.

My friends, I resent the charge that I voted against the greatest President of all times, Franklin D. Roosevelt. I did not vote against my party; I did not vote against the President; I voted against the Economy League, one of the most damnable organizations ever created by the rich for the despoiling of the poor.

This league was formed to wreck the American soldier, to debauch his widow, and to ruin his orphan children. When I voted against the Economy Act I voted against John "Pirate" Morgan, who came to Washington during the senatorial investigation, with an army of lawyers, bankers, income-dodging experts, French chefs, maids, bodyguards, and flunkies. Old Morgan had to engage three floors in the Carlton Hotel to house his retinue. It is rumored that his hotel bill was \$100,000, yet this modern "Captain Kidd", who admitted on the witness stand that he owned \$240,000,000 worth of tax-exempt bonds, was too poor to pay income taxes to the Government that had made it possible for him to steal by legalized burglary that staggering sum.

John "Pirate" Morgan is said today to own or control \$40,000,000,000 of wealth and property, practically one sixth of all the Nation's wealth, to own or control practically all of the public utilities, to control most of the utilities in Ohio, the Ohio Power Co., Columbia Gas & Electric, American Telephone & Telegraph.

At a time when the Nation's finances are such that every man, woman, and child were taxed to the utmost, yet this modern Sir Francis Drake, this modern buccaneer, had the colossal gall and effrontery to sit smilingly before the Senate Investigating Committee and admit that he and his associates had not paid one cent of income taxes during the past 3 years.

As you recall, we were compelled to vote on the Economy Act under a drastic gag rule, the same as we are now compelled to vote for the revenue bill under a drastic gag rule. My vote on that gag rule was "no." My vote on this gag rule is "no." Such tactics cannot be justified by a mere recital of the facts that Republican leaders enforced the same kind of rules during the Hoover administration. These gag rules, with the adoption of such infamous legislation as the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, helped to wreck Herbert Hoover and the Republican Party. I hope that the zeal of our party leaders to hog tie and gag the independent Members of our side who were elected by an outraged people on the pledge of a new deal, not only in the White House but in Congress as well, will not lead our great President and our party to the same inglorious debacle.

The petition which 145 of us have signed—my signature was affixed to the petition during the first session of the Seventy-third Congress and is no. 26 on the list—gives me the opportunity to pay in full my second promissory note to the war veterans, namely, that I would support full payment of the bonus. Personally, I shall look upon this petition with the names of 145 courageous men as a roll of honor, which in generations yet to follow shall emblazon itself in the hearts and minds of men who want to see simple justice done the men who fight the country's battles, who go down into the blood-soaked trenches and fight arm to arm and shoulder to shoulder, while the yellow-bellied, silk-stockinged aristocrats of Wall Street stay at home, clip their coupons, and pile up more millions.

Many of us in our campaigns pledged inflation of the currency to our constituents. We still believe in inflation and expansion of the currency. The only question confronting us is what, in our wisdom and judgment, do we conceive to be the best plan of expanding the currency. Surely no better method can be found than that of distributing \$2,400,000,000 to these World War veterans, defenders of the Nation in its hour of need—to these boys who came from the factories, from the farms, from the skyscraper office buildings, and

from every walk of life, not only to make the world safe for democracy but, as it ultimately proved to be, to make Wall Street safe for plutocracy and for more legalized plunder, burglary, and rape by John "Pirate" Morgan and his bloody swashbucklers. Many of the veterans have borrowed as much as one half of the face value of their certificates. Interest is being charged against them. These men have no jobs nor earning power—no incomes. Eventually the interest will eat up the principal.

Nearly everyone admits that we need more currency. The chief objection to the issuance of new currency is that unless distributed properly to those who need it most, it will soon find its way into the hands of the capitalists, trusts, bankers, 36-percent loan sharks, and chain stores. This argument cannot be used effectively against the bonus bill, since the money will be used to pay a just debt to the boys who defended their country in its hour of need. It is not by any means a debt commensurate with the sacrifices that were made. In thousands of cases it can only ameliorate the distressed conditions and serve as a palliative rather than as a cure for the gaping wounds of disease and mental anguish caused by the savage conflict in no man's land.

Nearly all wars are commercial wars. They are wars fought by the poor for the benefit of the rich. Woodrow Wilson entertained high ideals and envisioned a modern Utopia when he sounded the war slogan, "To make the world safe for democracy." The real facts are that John "Pirate" Morgan and his fellow buccaneers from Wall Street bet on the wrong horse. They lent billions of dollars to England and her allies. So American manhood, American food, and American money jumped into the breach and saved the day for the Allies.

The melancholy note that now arises from the harp of time is proof positive that instead of fulfilling Wilson's lofty idealism, cold and pitiless realism convinces us that instead of making the world safe for democracy, we made it safe for Wall Street plutocracy.

When we entered the conflict the American wage worker, farmer, small business man, and producer were entreated and exhorted to buy bonds—Liberty bonds—to liberate free peoples from the iron-shod heel of monarchial despotism and autocracy. The \$13,000,000,000 of Liberty bonds turned out to be bloody war bonds now in the hands of the capitalists, a mortgage on the earnings of the present generation which compels us to pay approximately \$700,000,000 a year interest and tribute to the lustful bond grabbers.

Even now we are making huge appropriations to bring our Navy up to full treaty strength. I voted for this measure in the belief that full preparedness will prove to be the best insurance against future wars and conquests, especially in this great country of ours, which cannot be reached by a foreign enemy worthy of consideration except by bridging the foaming gap of 3,000 miles of water.

Before getting into another war, however, let us pay not only our respects but our honest debts to the boys who fought and won the last war. Let us pay the bonus now, and relieve the human misery of tens of thousands of our citizenry who but 15 years ago were the pride and flower of our youth. Let us help the aged mothers, the fathers unable to work, the veterans whose pensions were ruthlessly emasculated, who in suffering and distress now lie in cheap shacks instead of Government hospitals.

We have poured out billions to the big bankers, the railroads, the insurance companies, and the 36-percent loan sharks. The big bankers hoard the money to keep their institutions liquid. The railroads pay off the notes they owe to Morgan & Co. Insurance companies and 36-percent loan sharks foreclose and strangle to an economic death the farmers, home owners, and unemployed workmen. Payment of the soldiers' bonus now will ameliorate in some slight degree this wanton butchery, not only of war veterans and their dependents by the capitalists and privileged classes but will also relieve every individual who deals with or transacts business with the veterans. It will help immeasurably the proverbial grocer, butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker.

GEORGE WASHINGTON, FATHER OF OUR COUNTRY

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a statement about George Washington, the Father of our Country.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, the 22d day of February is the birthday of George Washington, the Father of our Country and the first President of the United States. His name is immortalized not only because he was the first President of the United States but because he was a man of indomitable courage and was very humane toward his fellow man.

Every Member of Congress has an opportunity to become famous like the Father of our Country. All that we need to do is to sponsor and support legislation which will benefit the citizens of our country.

We could, without question, enact legislation which would wipe out the slum districts, put an end to chain-gang systems, and all other forms of brutal and inhuman treatment of prisoners in penal institutions. We could also abolish the poorhouses, make it possible for every man and woman who is able to work to have a job at a living wage, to provide old-age pensions and a pension for widows, blind, and others who are physically incapacitated.

GEORGE WASHINGTON, AMERICAN CITIZEN—CALM, YET DETERMINED, WASHINGTON LEADS A CHANGING WORLD AND POINTS THE WAY TO A NEW PRINCIPLE OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address on George Washington delivered by one of my colleagues at 10 o'clock this morning.

Mr. TABER. A Member of the House?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to have inserted a radio address delivered on this, the two hundred and second anniversary of the birth of George Washington, by my colleague, Mr. ROGERS, who represents the entire State of Oklahoma in the House of Representatives. Mr. ROGERS' address was broadcast to the people of Oklahoma through the facilities of Radio Station KVOO. It was part of an extensive commemoration program of George Washington and was sponsored in Oklahoma by the American Legion.

Two centuries and two years ago today marks the birth of George Washington destined to become the first citizen of a great republic then unborn.

The history of the world commits itself to a distinct, self-evident tradition that in times of great national emergency there has invariably arisen a forthright leader able to command the loyal obeisance of his countrymen by the sheer genius of his personality and the profoundness of his program. Since the birth of our Nation, tracing our progress by the landmarks of critical emergencies overcome, we can pause and reflect in the security that America has, without fail, been equal to the exigency of every occasion. Whether it has been righteous reform or crucial revolution, there has always emerged some American who, by masterful precision, patriotic compassion, and keenness of intellect, has wrested calm out of chaos and order out of confusion. Whether it has been "taxation without representation", "imperialistic infringement" of other nations, "secession from the Union", "autocracy or democracy", or war against economic bondage, as now engages our attention, America has steadfastly been able to produce on every occasion "the man of the hour."

Today, the 22nd day of February, a month outstanding for its famous birthdays, I speak to you in humble reverence of America's most illustrious and pre-eminent figure, George Washington, the Father of our Country. Let us follow our imagination to that hallowed point where the tranquil Potomac, bending gracefully in long curves, blends naturally with the silent dignity of the verdant Virginia hills to form a national shrine and a world memorial in consecration of the deeds and spirit of George Washington. Let us imagine for a moment that we are standing in the midst of life at Mount Vernon as it was in the ancestral days of our beloved first American. Lord of himself, and always the tranquil warrior for truth and right, unyielding in integrity and tireless of energy, no man could have selected a more ideal haven in which to pursue his labors. Overlooking the historic Potomac River, where ply countless ships from every nation in the world, Mount Vernon has been the inspiration for perpetual tribute. Vessels

from every port in the world, plying the Potomac near Mount Vernon, dip their colors and toll their bells in reverence to the memory of George Washington. Majestic in its proportions, the mansion home, surrounded by expansive, well-groomed lawns, artistic gardens, stately trees, and productive fields, was the source of Washington's greatest joy and happiness. Mount Vernon is truly the parent of democracy. It was the brain and breast of George Washington that fathered and gave birth to the democratic form of government we now enjoy. His happiness was never more complete than during the years he spent at Mount Vernon.

Washington in his enduring greatness and simplicity is revealed in a statement once attributed to him when he said, "Agriculture has ever been the most favorite amusement of my life." He enjoyed having his neighbors speak of him as the "first farmer of America." He watched over his herds and his lands, giving attention to the smallest detail. Comparable to the celebrated Roman statesman, it is in the pastoral atmosphere that Washington reveals himself in the majestic simplicity of the Virginia farmer, the Cincinnatus of the West.

We venerate Washington for his indomitable courage and his self-sacrifice when, after repeated unwarranted insults and acts of suppression, he shouldered the responsibility of leading the Colonial forces against the powerful Crown head of England. What picture does that historical event recall? It brings to mind an epoch of cruel invasion of the rights and liberties of the Colonists. It reveals a period in our history of unwarranted oppression, when appeals were ignored and protests ridiculed; when civil rights and personal freedom were trampled in the dust by an imperialistic foreign power; when, finally, protest became remonstrance, when remonstrance became hostility, and hostility flared into open resistance. Washington discloses his true personality as a patriot and his forthright courage and spirit of determination by the first ringing statement he made presaging actual combat with Great Britain, when he dramatically proclaimed, "I will raise a thousand men at my own expense and march at their head to the relief of Boston." He spoke in the spirit of the real American, as one who holds an abiding faith in the proposition that American will remain loyal to American when our peace, liberty, and tranquillity are threatened. Whether that tranquillity of peace and liberty is invaded by a foreign nation or usurped by our own leaders, it is inevitable that American will join American in sustaining freedom.

If the spirit of George Washington had not prevailed, we could not today revel in the satisfaction that in America personal freedom is enjoyed in a measure not comparable to that in any other nation; that free speech and freedom of the press are prerogatives unquestioned; that the right to orderly redress the Government for its shortcomings is guaranteed by the Constitution; that trial by jury is irrevocable; that religious worship is dictated by individual volition; that wise conservatism embodies a watchful readiness to modify, and even to replace outmoded institutions and practices; and that intelligent liberalism incorporates a cooperative spirit in keeping with national perspective.

The eighteenth century work of George Washington, in leading the people of America boldly forward along an unfamiliar road, sets precedent for today's actions of President Roosevelt. Americans of today may ask, "Are we not departing from the wisdom of the founders of this Republic? Are we not forgetting and ignoring the philosophy of George Washington?" If we are to interpret the deeds and spirit of Washington correctly, we must conclude that his example is pointing the way for Roosevelt. The only contrast between the two lies in past and present machinery. As Roosevelt accelerates the facilities of the Government of the United States in its present form, meeting with precision the emergencies of the moment, so did Washington in the eighteenth century apply the whip and spur to the embryonic governments of the Colonial States to speed forward the establishment of the Union. Washington and his colleagues were the boldest of experimenters. He opposed the powerful and long-established Crown of Great Britain. He waged a successful campaign entailing war and bloodshed. He was foremost in overthrowing the old order of things. He burdened his shoulders with the exacting and difficult duties of formulating a new principle of government, and he assumed the responsibility of launching forth a campaign for its acceptance by the people.

Washington's age was an economic order of localism and a political system of imperialism. His every act was devoted steadfastly to a program of economic and political betterment. When it became apparent to him that the old system was inadequate to the needs of a changing world he dared to experiment with new and untried systems. He fathered a new cooperative democracy, destined to world leadership.

It is not idle illusion or presumptive fantasy to compare the present with the past. The Nation a year ago was caught in a maelstrom of devitalizing confusion and prejudice, with the forces of construction vesting their welfare in the sympathetic and responsive personality of Roosevelt. The President has launched forth in a manner comparable to Washington, to check and overthrow a political imperialism and a capitalistic oligarchy. Like Washington, he has promulgated ideas and changes that are revolutionary. The spirit of each was conceived in an ever-watchful and an ever-responsive attitude to safeguard American welfare.

In and near the National City that bears Washington's name, are many evidences of the esteem of his fellow countrymen. In the Capitol Building rests his imposing statue, in lifelike reality. His monument, in its stately dignity, paying perpetual tribute to his memory, is the loftiest of its kind in the world. In historic old Virginia, on a stately promontory in Alexandria, stands an

impressive Masonic memorial erected by the distinguished humanity-serving order of Masonry, and dedicated to the unselfish service of Washington.

Recently I visited Arlington Cemetery, where sleep the silent hosts, "who gave their lives that their country might live." Here, on the banks of the Potomac, in Virginia, directly opposite the Capital City, rests the remains of more than 25,000 of our most illustrious soldiers who fell in the war of the Union.

Near the center of the cemetery stands the Memorial Amphitheater. Across from the eastern stairway of the colonnade, is a solid block of marble, beneath which rests the body of an unknown soldier, symbolic of all the American heroes who gave their lives in the Great War.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is fitting that we have thus honored the brave men who struggled in the war of the Union, by making possible Arlington National Cemetery. It is proper that we have paid homage to those who, during the Great War, passed on to that bourn from which no traveler returns. But in thus honoring and paying homage to those who gave their all in these two great struggles, we have not forgotten our Revolutionary heroes. To me the most impressive feature of Arlington National Cemetery is the inscription on the archway above the platform of the amphitheater. Here, carved on enduring stone, in reference to his services in the Revolutionary War, are these words by George Washington, "When we assumed the soldier we did not lay aside the citizen." To me, no more important words were ever uttered.

A few days ago I visited Mount Vernon. In the mansion home I viewed the priceless relics that have been made dear to the hearts of every American citizen, because of the touch of Washington's own hands. As I stood at the door of the room where he died and gazed upon the very bed around which his loved ones gathered while his life ebbed away, I could imagine the sorrow, the grief, the woe, and the suffering that Washington might have spared his country, had he been immortal instead of man.

A moment later, with bared head, I stood beside the tomb of Washington. Above the vine-clad sepulcher, carved in stone of white marble, I read this inscription, "In this inclosure rests the remains of General George Washington," and I could imagine that had Washington been privileged to write his own inscription, he would have used these words, "In this inclosure rests the remains of Citizen George Washington."

THE INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY ACT AND ORGANIZED LABOR

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Industrial Recovery Act and organized labor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in the short time that I am privileged, by unanimous consent, to address the House, I shall deal with one of the outstanding legislative achievements of the present Congress, if not of all time—the Industrial Recovery Act, passed at the last session. I shall discuss that act in the light of its accomplishments and in its relation to organized labor with particular reference to section 7 thereof. I call attention to these objectives:

First. The act has for its purpose the encouragement and rehabilitation of industry rather than antagonizing it.

Second. It is the first act in the legislative history of America that is an outright, unequivocal recognition of the "principle of collective bargaining" between capital and labor.

Third. It provides a simple and honest method of overcoming obstacles to mutual understandings that for many decades has led to conflicts between capital and labor; and by the adoption of voluntary codes of fair competition, future strikes and disputes will be avoided if both employer and employee accept in good faith the purpose and intent of the act.

In short, labor, after many years of bitter and disappointing struggles, has come into its own, and capital has not been injured. If sober judgment and discretion with a reasonable degree of justice and fairness is permitted to prevail, I am persuaded that in American industry we are not far distant from a happy realization of the dawn of that day when "the sword shall be beaten into plowshares and the spear into pruning hooks, and the lamb and the lion shall lie down together in peace."

When the law became a living reality and was signed by a great Democratic President it was the new declaration of independence of American labor. It struck from the tired limbs of multiplied millions of American toilers the shackles of autocracy and substituted therefor codes of fair

competition and the rule of reason. It led the executives of both sides to the conference table, and as the years roll by the higher concept of the new deal will prevail, and the "forgotten man" will gradually and surely come into his own. Those who toil will be permitted "to sow and to reap where he soweth." This wholesome product of legislative wisdom of many minds working toward a great objective has already achieved much in the direction of a better day, but we are now just at the threshold of responsibility in a new venture that must in the course of events be measured in terms of the new philosophy of life and not by the old order of things.

When this new charter of freedom for American labor in every trade and vocation applicable to industry was ushered in, there were in my congressional district more than 10,000 men who mined coal for a livelihood, whose hands were shacked and tied in idleness because of a withering and blighting system of unfair and destructive competitive practices that had prevailed in the coal industry. Not only that, but some 25,000 women and children dependent upon these men who worked in the mining industry were largely in want. Their hopes and ambitions had been crushed; their wages were extremely low; working time was spasmodic and, as a result of all these destructive forces, thousands had been driven into bread lines and looked in many instances to relief rolls for means of subsistence.

Then came the United Mine Workers' organization with the provision of the Industrial Recovery Act recognizing the "principle of collective bargaining", and wage scales were raised on an average of 72 to 92 percent. The workers received more remuneration for their labor, and the operators a living return in prices of their product—all this the direct result of a single section of a great legislative act. The act applies with like effect, not merely to a single industry such as coal mining but to every form of our complex industrial system. It reaches out the hand of helpfulness to the factory girl the same as it does to skilled mechanics or the manager at the top. It is the great covenant between the employer and employee and constitutes the greatest forward step of any government in a thousand years. In it and through it is the cord of strength that will ultimately become the stay of our economic life and the hope of our social welfare. It is the one thing that has upset all our former ways of thinking and turned our eyes toward the mighty truth of economics that no small class of individuals can continue to exact exorbitant profits at the expense of the many and that the employer must recognize the just rights of his employee. It has in effect removed from our system of jurisprudence that odious old classification of "master and servant" and made the law, as it should be, the servant of all.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are not beyond our difficulties, for as in the past every law passed by the Congress that has for its object the protection of the humble and the poor, has had its opponents and they have, with few exceptions, been those of the favored classes, as against the masses and so it is in this, our day and time. The codes affecting the greatest and richest industry of our country, that of steel and iron, had been written; but the ink was not dry upon the document when the great and powerful United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries all down the line began to set up in the face of the law and in opposition to its spirit and purpose, unions of their own, known as "company unions." This was, no doubt, for the purpose of putting themselves and their hard-boiled executives in position to defeat the purpose of the law by retaining many of the advantages of their employees hitherto employed and which the design of the law was to correct. But to the well-informed student of history this is not new, because we find all through the passing decades the great captains of industry have been slow to grasp principles and proposals for the protection of our toiling masses, and in many instances have stood square across the road to progress in their own industries. I read that young George Westinghouse, whose alert and brilliant mind had conceived and developed a safety device in the form of an automatic air brake for railway trains many years ago, walked into the office of a

great and powerful railroad executive and proposed to develop his invention and asked an audience that he might explain how it would save thousands of human lives and multiplied thousands of human limbs and millions of dollars' worth of property for the railroads, but to be not merely ignored, but peremptorily dismissed with the rebuke that he was a mere idle dreamer. Yet history is replete with the 40 years of struggle by the Order of Railway Trainmen and other allied labor organizations for protection of their members against the hazards of the old system to which the railroads tenaciously clung for more than half a century.

The truth is that the "high command" of capitalism has always stood in the pathway of human progress, as a result of which their rewards have been measured not in mere shekels of glittering gold, but they have, as a by-product of their obstinate disposition and unreasonable opposition, sacrificed multiplied thousands of human lives and wrecked and ruined hundreds of millions of valuable property. They fought every inch of the ground against a constantly increasing demand for greater and better means of protection of their workers. The leaders of the railroad industry standing in the gloom and darkness of the old kerosene headlight, disregarding humanity, and looking ever for the shekels for their treasuries, fought the electric headlight to the steps, and on into the corridors of every State capitol in every State in the Union, and surrendered only when the patriotism and leadership of labor leaders and legislators had written upon the statute books of nearly every State in America that human life and property demanded that the fireman and engineer at the head of every train must have a means of seeing the obstructions ahead. God said, "Let there be light, and there was light", and yet the railroads continued to say "no" and stand in their own light. They not only fought that improvement, but for years they battled every inch of the ground around this historic Capitol against every effort of the Congress to enact safety appliance acts and finally succeeded in striking down in the courts the act of 1906 on a technicality in the wording of the statute wherein the courts had found it in conflict with a like statute of a particular State. They continued to fight every effort of the Congress to amend or rewrite the act of 1906, but the Employers Liability and Safety Appliance Act of 1908 was upheld, and from time to time amended until it now and for years has occupied a vitally important place in the character of legislation looking to the human side of our industrial life.

A brief statement as to the bloody trail that followed in the wake of operations under the old system, mercenary and vicious as it was, may be found in Senate report of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate on H.R. 17263, filed March 22, 1910, by that matchless statesman, WILLIAM E. BORAH, and I quote from the report:

The tremendous loss of life and limb on the railroads of this country is appalling. The total casualties to trainmen of the interstate railroads of the United States for the year 1908 were 281,645.

More than a quarter of a million men either killed or injured in the course of 1 year I say, my fellow countrymen, was too much of a price for society to pay for the stupidity and stubbornness of men who had become fossilized by the power of gold. It was too severe a penalty to be inflicted upon faultless women and children at the behest of the false gods of organized greed. I have given you these facts merely to call attention to the truth that capital has always taken the narrow view; and that even now under the provisions of that modern code of business ethics set up by this Congress, "the Industrial Recovery Act" is beginning to meet the same character of stupid, short-sighted opposition.

The great steel companies are setting up what they call "company unions", when there is no such thing, nor indeed can there be any such thing so long as such recognized organizations as United Mine Workers of America and the American Federation of Labor are in existence. There can be no unity of purpose or harmony where there is division, and the very name "company union" implies company con-

trol and domination; and besides, may I ask, how is a company union under the control of an employing company going to engage in collective bargaining with itself? Who is to make the bargain? Of course, as everyone will understand, the employer in that case will negotiate with those employees most favorably inclined to him.

Just as the railroads fought such progressive and beneficial legislation as the Federal Employees' Liability and Safety Appliance Acts designed to save millions of human lives and limbs, so the capitalists are beginning to contest the administration of the Industrial Recovery Act, notwithstanding its admitted purpose is to aid both capital and labor. All these difficulties will be overcome when capital realizes that all investments in industry are valuable only when and if labor is available to utilize capital and without labor, the money of the investor would yield no return whatever. But perchance the great captains of the steel industry in their dreams of the achievements of inventive genius have concluded that by mechanization of industry they can eliminate almost entirely the necessity of the human element. In that direction they have already accomplished so much that the question of mass production by machinery has become a living issue. When the employers of labor can see back of the singing high-speed electric dynamo the hand of labor and realize that it took the strong arm of the skilled mechanic to assemble and put into action the thoughts of the inventor, they will have some notion of the importance of human labor; when they can look upon the powerful and perfectly constructed locomotive as it goes speeding over rails of steel, pulling its long trains of valuable freight on to the market place, they must know that but for the trained mind and skillful hand of the engineer in the cab as well as the fireman by his side, the great machine would stand still, commerce would become stagnant, and the investors' millions in rail stocks and bonds would be a total loss. When they can realize that it is the purchasing power of the millions of American toilers in every industry and the farmers upon the farms that creates a market for goods and produces the commerce and business of this country, they will be able to understand why Abraham Lincoln, in his annual message of December 3, 1861, said:

It is not needed nor fitting here that a general argument should be made in favor of popular institutions; but there is one point, with its connections not so hackneyed as most others, to which I ask brief attention. It is the effort to place capital on an equal footing with, if not above, labor in the structure of government. * * * Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. * * * No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty; none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned. Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them till all of liberty shall be lost.

Again, in his inaugural address of March 4, 1865, he said:

It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces.

When they can take the Industrial Recovery Act and the codes of fair competition and place them beside that century-old rule, "do unto thy neighbor as ye would that he should do unto you", and the laborer can learn his obligation that "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread", the problem will be solved and all will have their daily bread. I shall, Mr. Speaker, point with pride to my vote in this House for that bill as the crowning achievement of my whole career.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—BUREAU OF MINES (H.DOC. NO. 262)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments and ordered printed:

To the Congress:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 16 of the act of March 3, 1933 (ch. 212, 47 Stat. 1489, 1517), as amended by title III of the act of March 20, 1933 (ch. 3, 48 Stat. 8, 16), I am transmitting herewith for the information of the Congress an Executive order transferring the Bureau of Mines from the Department of Commerce to the Department of the Interior.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 22, 1934.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. McREYNOLDS. 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. 7808) to authorize annual appropriations to meet losses sustained by officers and employees of the United States in foreign countries due to appreciation of foreign currencies in their relation to the American dollar, 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, with Mr. MONTAGUE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read the title.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, the bill before the House is a measure designed to rectify a condition that has arisen abroad due to the appreciation of foreign currencies as related to the American dollar. This measure has the unanimous and enthusiastic approval of every member of the committee, and Members of the House who were here yesterday heard the bill supported by the minority members just as vigorously as by the majority side.

The bill has been covered thoroughly—every member of the committee who has spoken heretofore has given facts and figures.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I will.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. I am going to support the bill, but I want to ask if between 1921 and 1929, when these people were living at a time before the depreciation began, did they rebate to the United States the excess that they got by the depreciated currency in foreign countries?

Mr. FORD. No, they did not; but there is a great misapprehension as to the advantage they had at that time. When the currency was depreciated they did not get the proportion of depreciation in prices that it was supposed they got.

Mr. CARPENTER of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. CARPENTER of Kansas. Does the gentleman know of any cases where employees in the Foreign Service have resigned on account of these low salaries?

Mr. FORD. I am reliably informed that there are quite a number of such cases.

Mr. CARPENTER of Kansas. Can the gentleman name them?

Mr. FORD. No; I cannot.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The record shows that there are 410 resignations by clerks.

Mr. CARPENTER of Kansas. I have a number of people in my district who are applicants for these jobs, and I have taken some of them to the State Department. Will the gentleman give me a list of those resignations?

Mr. McGUGIN. I should like to ask the gentleman if these 410 resignations were on account of depreciated currency or as the result of administration orders which cut down the service?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I understand that a majority were on account of appreciated foreign currency.

Mr. FORD. The purpose of this bill, as I have stated before, has been fully explained. That purpose is to protect the personnel in our Foreign Service, including those connected with the Army and Navy, from the hardships resulting from the appreciation of foreign currencies in relation to the dollar.

It has been shown that such hardships exist. It has been shown that unless the proposed action is taken, many well-trained and valuable people will be forced out of the Service. The fact has been established that a continuation of the present conditions will go far to wreck our policy of making the Foreign Service a career. It will in effect make it impossible for any but wealthy men to remain in the service.

And yet some sophists for partisan and for no other reasons are arguing that nothing should be done. I think the country has had enough of that philosophy, the philosophy of laissez faire. Freely translated into plain English, that means: "Let the country go to the dogs rather than take action to save it."

We tried this under the previous administration. Those in authority talked about cynical depressions, about natural forces making for recovery, about the law of supply and demand, and about that prosperity that hovered around the corner, to come out like the sudden sun in February if only it was not frightened away by reasoned effort and enlightened action.

The effects of such inaction have exploded the theories on which it was based.

The present administration has won the confidence and approval of the American people by taking vigorous and effective action in the face of national disaster. We believe in human will and human effort. We believe that we can and must act to right injustice and to restore fair living conditions.

This bill, as I see it, is merely an effort in line with our whole policy. It proposes to protect our personnel in the Foreign Service against the depreciation of the dollar abroad. It plays no favorites. It gives no favors or protection to one group of public servants that is not given to all. There is no suggestion of restoration of the pay cut to our people in the Foreign Service until and unless that restoration is made to all Federal employees.

The bill is in the interest of justice and common sense. It is asked for by the State Department and is predicated on well-authenticated facts as to the adverse conditions that call for action. The Secretary of State requests this action; the Foreign Affairs Committee recommends it; I am confident that the House will pass the bill. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I expect that taking the floor at this time and telling what I have found about this bill is going to make me very unpopular among those who are accustomed to taking the word of the State Department as gospel. I would not do it unless I felt, after very careful study, that the bill ought not to pass, certainly not in the form in which it is presented.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McGUGIN. And is not the gentleman taking the position which he is now taking more on account of his responsibility as the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations rather than merely as a Member of the House at this particular time?

Mr. TABER. That is my position at this time. I have been through this whole situation, all the hearings, and nowhere does it appear what the cost to the Treasury of the United States will be as a result of this operation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I can imagine that the cost on the part of the State Department alone, as a result of the hearings in the State, Justice, and Labor bill, will be approximately \$7,000,000. On top of that you have the Navy and the Army and half dozen other departments and representatives who must be taken care of as a result of it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I shall yield in a moment. I would not be at all surprised if the total amount would run into \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000. I do not like to see such a thing as that happen at this time. There is another feature that has not been discussed by the Committee or by anyone who favors this bill. You gentlemen know and I know that about the 1st of July 1928 all the countries were on the gold standard—or practically all. And you know that almost all of the other countries went off the gold standard before our country went off. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGUGIN] took the floor here yesterday, and his analysis of the situation appears on page 3025 of the RECORD. It appears from a table there that the currency of the other countries depreciated far more than ours. Our employees in the Consular Service receive a great big boost because of that depreciation of foreign currency, and now there are only a few cases where our currency has depreciated enough so that our Foreign Service officers are really worse off as a result of the change in the conditions of the dollar and the change in the condition of other things. It is not a pleasant task to come here and oppose a bill of this kind coming from such a committee, but it is a duty that I feel that I owe to the House and the country. I do not want to be in the position of opposing that people who are in the Foreign Service receive fair compensation, but I do not think that by subterfuge we should come here and attempt to raise their salaries.

I shall offer an amendment when the proper time comes which will correct the situation and which will give any of these Foreign Service officers any relief to which they were entitled where they really have been discriminated against. I shall offer an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "dollar", to insert:

Based upon the exchange rate of July 1, 1928.

Then, if they have been hurt as a result of this, they will get relief. If they have not been hurt and have actually profited as a result of it, they will not get a boost.

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts desires to ask a question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that not one penny of this money will be paid to any single person without the approval of the Director of the Budget first and then the approval of the President of the United States? I know the Director of the Budget and how difficult it is to get that "watchdog of the Treasury" to approve expenditures. He will not allow anything that is extravagant.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe that Congress should delegate any more functions or dodge any more responsibility. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman's committee will be the last hurdle that will have to be crossed before the appropriation is made.

Mr. TABER. I do not want to have any more bugbears thrown up in front of the Committee on Appropriations than we have to have.

Mr. McGUGIN. If these increases are granted, the gentleman's committee will have to make the appropriation to make up the deficiency.

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

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

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak briefly on this bill just to call attention to what has been regarded as perhaps the finest diplomatic achievement in the last 6 months. Our great Ambassador to Spain, Mr. Claude G. Bowers, recently succeeded in securing a pardon for four American citizens who had offended against the military laws in the island of Majorca. By most brilliant work, through his friendship with Spanish officials and the good will that he had created between America and Spain, he secured a special session of the supreme court. The Minister of State for Foreign Affairs in Spain, Mr. Rita Ramora, was the gentleman who presented to the supreme court of Spain the necessity of considering the pardoning of these citizens of the United States. The good will between Spain and the Republic of America was largely at stake. The newspapers of America were taking a tremendous interest in this case, and it was left by the State Department entirely in the discretion of Mr. Bowers as to the course that should be pursued. Mr. Bowers is the greatest living American historian. He left the employment of a great newspaper in New York and accepted the ambassadorship to Spain and now writes to this Congress that on account of the devaluation of the dollar his entire career in Spain is practically destroyed. As a token of our congratulation on his success in the Majorca incident we should vote for this bill. I support this bill because it gives an opportunity to our country to maintain in its service a man of the magnificent capacity and brilliant achievements of Mr. Bowers.

We should not let the occasion pass without heartfelt acknowledgment of our gratitude to the distinguished officials of Spain, who understood so clearly the appeal Mr. Bowers made. It was becoming to this great new Republic to act with leniency. Our citizens had offended a great arm of their military department. The punishment is traditionally severe. However, the offenders were treated in the end with a kindness unparalleled in the annals of Spain. America should be deeply grateful.

I speak for this bill because of another great historian who left these shores a short time ago to become Ambassador to Germany, Hon. William E. Dodd, of Chicago. He is another of the outstanding writers of American history. Those men know the fundamentals of America. They know the relation of America and the other countries of the world. Men such as those should not be lost to the service of the United States.

Out of their private means, which have been earned through their studies and their literary efforts, private means that are very meager, they have been compelled to pay to carry on the duties which have been imposed upon them as Ambassadors of the United States.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I yield.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Do I understand that Mr. Bowers and Mr. Dodd both favor such a measure as is before us?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I do intend to convey that understanding.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Do I understand it is the intention of Mr. Dodd and Mr. Bowers to resign unless such a bill as this is passed?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I have no such information, but knowing both of them personally, I do know that their own private means are now being exhausted, and it would be impossible for those men to continue in any service which impoverishes them. They earned a great deal of money yearly in the United States. Now they are drawing on their short reserves for the purpose of carrying on the duties of American Ambassadors.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I yield.

Mr. BACON. I want to endorse everything the gentleman says about both Mr. Bowers and Mr. Dodd. I was in Berlin last summer when Mr. Dodd was there. His salary

is supposed to be \$17,500. He is now getting the equivalent of about \$11,000, out of which he had to pay his rent and all of his expenses. I know it was worrying him tremendously. He was very, very anxious about the situation, and I know he was contemplating the possibility of coming home. They are able men and good ambassadors.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I am glad to hear the distinguished gentleman from New York make the statements he does. They verify in every particular the communications I have had from those gentlemen who happen to be friends of mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLIVER] has expired.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I yield.

Mr. BACON. I do not want to have the impression go out that our Ambassador to Germany has any house given him. He does not. We do not own any house for the Ambassador in Germany.

Mr. BRITTEN. Who is talking about Germany?

Mr. BACON. The gentleman from Illinois spoke about Mr. Dodd.

Mr. BRITTEN. We were talking about the Ambassador to Spain.

Mr. BACON. He has no house either. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRITTEN. If he has no house, he has one that is leased by the Government and is paid for by the Government.

Mr. BACON. That is not true, either. He has to pay his own rent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLIVER] has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, so much has been said about the poor, underpaid clerk and foreign officer that I think it might be well at this time to indicate very clearly just what they are getting.

According to the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, there are 4,200 officers, clerks, and employees in the Foreign Service; 2,044 of those are foreigners, practically 50 percent of them. We are going to raise their salaries 50 percent by this bill. Every clerk in our Foreign Service, everywhere on earth, either has a house furnished him, or a house that is leased by the Federal Government, or he is allowed certain compensation for rent. There are 16 ambassadors in the American service. They get \$17,500 a year. There are 2 ministers who get \$12,000 a year, 36 ministers who get \$10,000 a year, or a total of 54. According to the hearings before the gentleman's committee, 37 of them live in houses owned or leased by the Federal Government, 17 of them have rent allowances from the Federal Government in addition to their salaries.

There are 710 Foreign Service officers whose salaries range from \$2,500 minimum to \$9,000, and every one of them gets an extra allowance for rent if he does not live in a building that is owned or leased by the Federal Government. It is true those rent allowances are small. They must, of necessity, be small; but they get that as additional compensation. Of those 710 foreign officers, 102 live in houses owned or leased by the Federal Government and 608 of them have rent allowances. There are 606 clerks receiving from \$1,390 minimum up to \$4,000. Those are good salaries, gentlemen. Every one of those 606 employees either has a house or has a rent allowance; 49 of them have houses.

The military attachés get from \$1,866 to \$11,400 a year. That is very good pay, my friends. The American dollar is a good piece of money any place in the world.

The naval attachés get from \$6,000 to \$8,000, and, in addition to that, the naval attaché is allowed to spend \$4,200 for entertainment purposes—extraordinary expenses. I think that is pretty soft.

There are naval students, foreign-language students, receiving from \$2,500 to \$5,000, depending upon their grades.

While they are not allowed extraordinary expenses the attachés and assistant attachés are. Some \$50,000 is carried in the appropriation bill for the Navy for entertainment purposes and extraordinary expenses.

Each of our Ambassadors has a group of so-called "custodial employees." They are concierges in Paris; they are butlers, doormen, and otherwise.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; I cannot yield. What I do object to, Mr. Chairman, is the constant reminder that appropriations under this bill, which will probably run around \$7,000,000, should not be construed as salaries to our foreign employees; that it should be called an allotment or a bonus; but the fact is we are increasing the salaries of the highest-paid employees in the Federal Government, and I think it is a shame. Let us increase all Federal salaries if we are going to pass this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to weep any crocodile tears about ambassadors or their salaries. It is perfectly true that generally ambassadors are political appointees. Whether the Republicans or the Democrats are in power, the ambassadors are generally appointed because they had something to do with campaign contributions. It is an unfortunate situation, but it is a condition and not a theory with which we are confronted.

Most of these ambassadors know in advance that their salary will be \$17,500. Generally all of them are rich men and know that they will have to spend a good deal of their own money to make ends meet, so we do not have to shed any tears on the plight of our ambassadors. As compared with ambassadors of other countries, ours are very much underpaid. That is beyond dispute. Those we are concerned with primarily are the clerks in our service, some thousand or more clerks who are very much underpaid. The conditions in our Foreign Service today are disgraceful, for in it we find undernourished representatives of our country, badly clothed and badly housed, and sending their children to charitable institutions such as hospitals because they cannot pay the bills.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. Speaking of ambassadors, does not the gentleman think it is about time the United States Government paid decent salaries to our ambassadors, so that a poor man could have a chance to fill the office?

Mr. FISH. I am glad the gentleman has raised the question. I would have been suspected had I raised it, for, unfortunately, they think I am rich, but I am not; and they think I am representing some of these ambassadors, but I am not. Of course, they ought to have the same equivalent pay as ambassadors of other great nations. They ought at least to have enough to pay for the ordinary expenditures of running an embassy and entertaining a few foreigners once in a while. There is no question about that. But I am not going to waste any time shedding crocodile tears on ambassadors.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. My time is very limited.

Mr. CONNERY. I merely wanted to help the gentleman. The gentleman was a good soldier. These ambassadors in many cases by their influence or lack of influence may get us into another war.

Mr. FISH. Not if the gentleman from Massachusetts can help it or if I can help it.

Mr. CONNERY. We have not much voice in Congress, but at least we would have something to say about another war.

Mr. FISH. I would like to see the Service made a democratic service, where a person of even moderate means, or even a young man of great ability but no money, could become an ambassador. I would like to see ambassadors appointed because of merit. [Applause.]

I have tried to be fair on this side, and the distinguished chairman of the committee always is fair on his side. I have let the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] have the floor; both of them are against the bill. Now, I would like to say a few words in answer to their statements and particularly to the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MCGUGIN], one of the most useful Members of the House. Unfortunately, he has gotten into the "brain trust" class on this particular bill and has given us a lot of statistics and figures which nobody understands but himself.

What are the facts? The facts are very simple. He tries to make out that the exchanges in these foreign countries are favorable to us instead of being unfavorable. Many Members of Congress have traveled abroad and most of them know the situation. For a number of years past the franc has averaged about 24 or 25 to the American dollar. Today you can get only 16 francs for \$1. Today the pound is worth \$5.07, whereas for years past it was \$4.86 and less. I hold in my hand schedules for every country with which we have diplomatic relations, which show the name of the currency, the dollar allotments for salaries and living quarters in those countries, the par rate, the rate on January 10, 1934, the percentages of loss in dollars; and they average 40 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert this table at this particular point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
February 22, 1934.

For the Honorable HAMILTON FISH:

The tables marked "A" and "B" give the par rate of exchange and the actual rate of exchange as of January 10, 1934. Those countries mentioned in table marked "A" are the countries where the mint par-payment plan was in effect but that plan was canceled the 31st of January, after the devaluation of the dollar, so that at the present time all countries are in the same situation with respect to payments; that is, they can get only the commercial selling rate of their dollar at the time they sell their checks. The rates are, of course, stated in cents; that is, take France, for instance, the par rate is \$0.0392 where, as on January 10, a man converting his dollar salary into francs would have had to pay \$0.610 for 1 franc.

TABLE A

Country	Name of currency	Dollar allotments for salaries and living quarters	Par rate	Rate Jan. 10, 1934	Percentage of loss in dollars	Dollar losses
GROUP I. COUNTRIES UNDER TREASURY ARRANGEMENT						
Albania	Gold franc	\$24,490	19.3	30.175	56.35	\$13,800
Austria	Schilling	71,709	14.07	17.67	25.59	18,350
Belgium	Belga	94,206	13.9	21.68	55.97	52,727
Bulgaria	Lev	34,283	.72	1.3433	86.57	29,679
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	70,831	2.96	4.6343	56.56	40,062
Danzig	Gulden	10,376	19.3	30.175	56.35	5,847
France (continental)	Franc	424,159	3.92	6.1076	55.80	236,680
French possessions:						
Algers	do	13,168	3.92	6.1076	55.80	7,348
Martinique	do	4,225	3.92	6.1076	55.80	2,357
Saigon	do	10,823	3.92	6.1076	55.80	6,039
Tahiti	do	4,377	3.92	6.1076	55.80	2,442
Tunis	do	12,004	3.92	6.1076	55.80	6,698
Germany	Reichsmark	414,618	23.82	37.1092	55.79	231,315
Great Britain (Isles)	Pound	396,102	486.66	508.775	4.54	17,983
India	Rupee	84,441	36.50	38.295	4.92	4,154
Hungary	Pengo	51,813	17.49	27.60	57.80	29,947
Irish Free State	Pound	61,110	486.66	508.775	4.54	2,776
Italy	Lira	311,601	5.26	8.1787	55.49	172,907
Latvia	Lat	81,281	19.3	30.175	56.35	45,774
Lithuania	Litas	18,384	10.00	15.5	55.00	10,111
Luxemburg	Franc	5,523	3.92	6.1076	55.80	3,082
Morocco	do	40,043	3.92	6.1076	55.80	22,343
Netherlands (continental)	Florin	87,895	40.20	62.67	55.89	49,124
Netherlands possessions:						
Surabaya	do	9,580	40.20	62.67	55.89	5,354
Curacao	do	8,452	40.20	62.67	55.89	4,724

TABLE A—Continued

Country	Name of currency	Dollar allotments for salaries and living quarters	Par rate	Rate Jan. 10, 1934	Percentage of loss in dollars	Dollar losses
GROUP I. COUNTRIES UNDER TREASURY ARRANGEMENT—CON.						
Netherland possessions—Con.						
Batavia	Florin	\$21,113	40.20	62.67	55.89	\$11,800
Medan	do	12,350	40.20	62.67	55.89	6,902
Poland	Zloty	130,244	11.22	17.66	57.40	74,760
Portugal	Escudo	71,456	4.42	4.6552	5.32	3,801
Rumania	Leu	48,151	.60	.942	57.00	27,446
Switzerland	Gold franc	146,007	19.3	30.175	56.35	82,275
Syria	Syrian lb	31,060	78.74	81.75	3.82	1,186
Turkey	Lira	108,558	47.5	73.00	53.68	58,274
Yugoslavia	Dinar	54,605	1.76	2.16	22.73	12,412
Yunnanfu	Piaster	9,417	38.00	53.00	39.47	3,717
Total (group I)						1,304,196

TABLE B

Country	Name of currency	Dollar allotments for salaries and living quarters	Par rate	Rate Jan. 10, 1934	Percentage of loss (-) or gain (+) in dollars ¹	Dollar losses
GROUP II. COUNTRIES NOT UNDER TREASURY ARRANGEMENT						
Argentina	Peso	\$101,484	42.45	33.2733	-21.62	-\$21,940
British possessions:						
Gibraltar	Pound	9,432	486.66	508.775	+4.54	+428
Malta	do	8,119	486.66	508.775	+4.54	+368
Aden	Rupee	7,007	36.50	38.295	+4.92	+345
Colombo	do	10,835	36.50	38.295	+4.92	+533
Hong Kong	Dollar	32,462	34.12	37.6562	+1.03	+336
Penang, Straits Settlements	do	8,069	59.35	59.375	+0.05	+4
Singapore, Straits Settlements	do	31,016	59.35	59.375	+0.05	+12
Lagos	Pound	8,562	486.66	503.125	+3.83	+289
Nairobi	do	8,884	486.66	503.125	+3.83	+300
Australia	do	61,051	486.66	405.4166	-16.69	-10,189
New Zealand	do	28,718	486.66	408.50	-16.47	-4,730
Newfoundland	Dollar	13,116	100.00	99.8541	-1.46	-191
Barbados	do	9,224	71.00	100.00	+53.52	+4,937
Belize	do	8,405	100.00	100.00		
Hamilton, Bermuda	Pound	12,270	486.66	508.775	+4.54	+557
Kingston, Jamaica	do	12,610	486.66	508.775	+4.54	+573
Nassau	do	12,682	486.66	508.775	+4.54	+576
Trinidad	Dollar	9,219	71.00	106.00	+49.30	+4,545
Bolivia	Boliviano	31,475	36.50	21.367	-41.48	-13,056
Brazil	Milreis	144,494	11.96	8.61	-28.01	-40,472
Canada	Dollar	442,298	100.00	99.8541		
Chile	Peso	93,693	12.17	9.35	-23.17	-21,708
China	Yuan	436,349	22.5155	33.9843	+50.94	+222,276
Colombia	Peso	56,551	97.33	64.83	-33.39	-18,882
Costa Rica	Colon	36,064	46.53	21.00	-54.86	-19,784
Cuba	Peso	147,534	100.00	99.955		
Denmark	Krone	60,897	26.80	22.7158	-15.24	-9,280
Dominican Republic	Dollar	37,607	100.00	100.00		
Ecuador	Sucre	36,153	20.00	10.00	-50.00	-18,076
Egypt	Pound	72,867	486.66	508.775	+4.54	+33,110
El Salvador	Colon	31,176	50.00	35.00		
Estonia	Kroon	12,640	26.80	25.00		
Ethiopia	M. T. Dollar	22,735	21.23	28.00	+31.88	+7,248
Finland	Markka	42,287	2.52	2.26	-1.00	-227
Greece	Drachma	86,144	1.30	.882	-32.15	-27,695
Guatemala	Quetzal	33,312	100.00	100.00		
Haiti	Gourde	40,392	20.00	20.00		
Honduras	Lempira	37,947	50.00	50.00		
Iraq	Dinar	24,319	29.32	29.32		
Japan	Yen	210,402	49.85	30.32	-39.17	-82,414
Liberia	Pound	18,984	486.66	503.125	+3.38	+642
Mexico	Peso	357,903	49.85	27.736	-44.36	-158,765
Nicaragua	Cardoba	30,576	100.00	100.00		
Norway	Krone	69,859	26.80	25.5541	-4.65	-3,248
Palestine	Pound	27,332	486.66	508.775	+4.54	+1,241
Panama	Balboa	45,936	100.00	100.00		
Paraguay	Peso	20,690	1.38	1.80	+30.42	+6,294
Persia	Rail	35,606	4.87	5.68	+16.63	+5,921
Peru	Sol	64,309	28.00	20.00	-28.57	-18,373

¹ Although a number of countries still show a gain when comparing current rates with par, accurate information as to the currency which is quoted at par and the currency actually in use in the countries in question is not yet available to the Department.

TABLE B—Continued

Country	Name of currency	Dollar allotments for salaries and living quarters	Par rate	Rate Jan. 10, 1934	Percentage of loss (-) or gain (+) in dollars	Dollar losses
GROUP II. COUNTRIES NOT UNDER TREASURY ARRANGEMENT—CON.						
Portuguese possessions: Lourenco Marques.....						
	Pound.....	\$7,852	486.66	503.125	+3.38	+\$265
Siam.....	Baht.....	28,432	44.24	44.24		
Spain.....	Peseta.....	167,526	19.3	12.85	(?)	(?)
Sweden.....	Krona.....	76,691	26.80	26.2336	-2.11	-1,618
Union of South Africa.....						
	Pound.....	70,875	486.66	503.125	+3.83	+2,397
Uruguay.....	Peso.....	45,470	103.42	74.5833	-27.89	-12,681
Venezuela.....	Bolivar.....	49,288	19.3	20.00	+3.63	+1,789
Total (group II).....						+294,986
Grand total.....						1,599,182

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. FISH. I yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. McGUGIN. Is that average loss of 40 percent based upon a comparison of the value of the dollar today with the value of foreign money as of a year ago, 3 or 4 years ago, or back in 1928, before any of these moneys had depreciated?

Mr. FISH. I understand the comparison is on the values as of a year ago.

Mr. McGUGIN. At that time these moneys had depreciated 40 percent and the employees of the Foreign Service had a 40 percent advantage on them.

Mr. FISH. I do not yield further. While I generally agree with the gentleman from Kansas I do not agree with him at all in this matter.

Let us consider the effect in the silver countries. You members of the silver bloc know something about it. The price of silver has gone way up recently. The currency of silver countries has appreciated over 100 percent in the last year, the currency of such countries as India and China; yet our currency has depreciated 40 percent. So you can see there is a great difference there. I have given you today's difference, not that of a few years ago, between our currency and the currencies of the other great countries of the world. Great Britain, France, and so forth.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. HENNEY. Assuming that the currencies of foreign nations has depreciated 50 percent—which they have—and that the currency of this country has depreciated approximately 50 percent—which it has—this simply means that we are sending our employees abroad 50-cent dollars, that they are buying 50-cent dollars over there. So it follows, naturally, that they are getting but half their previous salary.

Mr. FISH. The fact is that the French, German, Italian, and other foreign currencies have depreciated but very little since 1928. The British, of course, has, but very much less than ours. Of course, the object of the bill is to provide living salaries for our foreign officials. Nobody claims that the clerks in our Foreign Service today receive living salaries. You can talk about statistics with regard to the exchanges of the various countries all you want to, but you will get nowhere, because the disgraceful conditions existing in our Foreign Service today speaks louder than statistics and unsound comparisons.

The purpose of the bill is to provide living wages for those in our Foreign Service; and we place the sole authority in the hands of the Director of the Budget to make his recommendations to the President of the United States.

If you cannot trust the Director of the Budget and your President, then vote against the bill. As a Republican I intend to vote for it and vote for living wages for those in our Foreign Service. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to all of the arguments presented on this bill, outside of a few delivered this morning. Unfortunately, there has been a false impression created against this bill. The whole thing to me is very simple, and I know if the matter is brought to the attention of the Members of this House in the right way, they will see just what the bill does.

In line 8 of the first page of the bill it is provided: "To meet losses sustained" by these foreign representatives and the officers of the Navy. Note the language, "losses sustained" by these people.

This is merely an exchange of the salary that this Congress voted to these people and the difference that they would receive in foreign exchange. There is no advantage one way or the other. There is a stabilization fund set up in the Treasury Department or in some department of the Government that equalizes the salary of everyone. No one is going to be benefited, whether they are in China, Mexico, or any other place. Whatever benefit is received by the exchange profit goes into the stabilization fund. If a man is to receive \$2,400 a year, he gets the equivalent of the \$2,400 a year in the country to which he is assigned. That is all there is to this bill. There is not a profit to a representative in one part of the world and a loss to one in another part of the world. This is all regulated by the one thing, namely, the mint par of exchange. This does not raise the salary of anyone. No one gets any more than he was originally supposed to receive, but he will receive under this bill the amount of money that his salary calls for. If there is a gain in one part of the world and a loss in the other, the differential goes into this fund.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman spoke about a salary of \$2,400. Is the purchasing power of the \$2,400 less now than it was in 1928?

Mr. BLOOM. What difference does it make? I do not want to answer such a question in my favor or against myself. What difference does it make? These people were to get \$2,400 or \$1,200 or whatever the salary may be.

May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that this bill permits the Navy to receive \$50,000 a year for expenses. The gentleman says that is all right. He does not object to this for the Navy, that he is so much concerned about, but when anyone else receives a dollar for entertaining he is very much concerned. This does not raise the salary paid to anyone in the Government service one dollar. No one gets an advantage of one single dollar by this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that among the principal reasons living costs are found high for Americans residing abroad, and for employees of the Foreign Service in particular are, except in the countries of the Northwestern Hemisphere, a reasonable American standard of living is practically impossible of achievement; available foodstuffs are not palatable in many instances, and must be supplemented by imported canned goods, local tinned products being in many cases of inferior quality and oftentimes the canning process is inadequate and dangerous to health. Imported American, or other high quality canned stuffs, are expensive, and many times local import duties make them prohibitive. Bottled milk is the exception, and is most difficult of obtainment. Cereals and other prepared foods are exceptionally high priced, ranging in price from 4 to 75 cents per package, which retails here for 15 cents at the outside.

Clothing with but few exceptions must be imported, or an inferior grade purchased locally at prices comparable to those paid for the better-grade clothing available in the States.

It is also the exception that first-class facilities are available for medical and dental services, although the rates paid compare to those charged for high-grade professional services. Educational facilities are generally unsatisfactory and constitute a real hardship. Few local schools are conducted in English, and children must be sent either to American or European schools with consequent extraordinary expense.

Transportation facilities are oftentimes inadequate and it is incumbent upon officers to maintain automobiles to facilitate the conduct of their offices. Automobiles are invariably expensive, Fords and Chevrolets being listed at from \$1,200 to \$2,000 and accessories in proportion. Tires for these cars have been listed at upward of \$20 each. Gasoline, except where special circumstances or privileges obtain, is expensive, being sold at upward of 40 cents per American gallon. Local taxes are also burdensome, in Great Britain the tax being a pound per unit of horsepower.

At many of the posts in the Foreign Service all amenities of civilization and living comfort must be imported at considerable expense. Housing conditions are acute at many posts. Small unfurnished or furnished apartments are only occasionally available, and oftentimes quarters that are obtained must be adapted, having no modern facilities and almost impossible to heat.

At other posts the unbearable heat and humidity necessitates trips to the hills to maintain one's health, and at others special clothing must be purchased to protect against the cold. A complete restocking of one's wardrobe is often necessitated by change of assignment, and the laundry methods available take a heavy toll. Special precautions must be taken for reasons of health to guard against cholera and typhoid, which often occur in epidemic form.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. We are paying these people engaged in the Foreign Service in gold dollars, are we not?

Mr. BRITTEN. Certainly we are.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from Illinois is interrupting me.

This means at the mint par of exchange last April, when we went off the gold standard. They take this exchange rate and they pay them in the amount of money that they should receive in their respective countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there are authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary to enable the President, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe and notwithstanding the provisions of any other act and upon recommendation of the Director of the Budget, to meet losses sustained on and after July 15, 1933, by officers and employees of the United States in foreign countries due to the appreciation of foreign currencies in their relation to the American dollar, and to cover any deficiency in the accounts of the Treasurer of the United States, including interest, arising out of the arrangement approved by the President on July 27, 1933, for the conversion into foreign currencies of checks and drafts of officers and employees for salaries and expenses: *Provided*, That such action as the President may take shall be binding upon all officers of the Government: *Provided further*, That no payments authorized by this act shall be made to any officers or employees for periods during which their checks or drafts were converted into foreign currencies under the arrangement hereinbefore referred to: *Provided further*, That allowances and expenditures pursuant to this act shall not be subject to income taxes: *And provided further*, That the Director of the Budget shall report all expenditures made for this purpose to Congress annually with the Budget estimates.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 1, in line 9, after the words "United States", insert "while in service."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McREYNOLDS: On page 1, in line 9, after the words "United States", insert "while in service."

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment and of this bill is to place every safeguard possible, so that no moneys will be spent except for the pur-

poses intended for officers and employees actually in service in foreign countries. A gentleman a while ago asked the question whether or not this would be paid in gold dollars. Everyone knows this will not be paid in gold dollars.

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

Mr. McREYNOLDS. No; I will not yield. I am sorry.

Mr. COX. The payment is in the equivalent of gold dollars, is it not?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The rate is based upon the exchange at the time that we went off the gold standard and the difference in the exchange at that time and the exchange at the present time. At that time France was on the gold standard, and is still on the gold standard. We are seeking to authorize an appropriation merely for the difference in exchange between that date and this time. I may say that every safeguard is placed around this bill. If there is a difference, this is brought to the attention of the Director of the Budget. If he approves it, it then goes to the President, and then, if it is approved by the President, it goes to the Committee on Appropriations of the House for its consideration.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a practical question?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Gladly.

Mr. SNELL. Take, for instance, the situation at the present time of our representatives in Canada, where our exchange is at a premium of 1 percent. Would the people who are there at the present time get any additional allowances or anything of that sort?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Absolutely not.

Mr. SNELL. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Succinctly stated, is not this the situation? These representatives of ours abroad received a 15 percent cut in their salaries, the same as employees at home, and is it not the purpose of this bill, on account of the differences in the value of exchange, merely to see to it that such foreign representatives shall not have their salaries cut more than the 15-percent cut which our Government employees here sustained?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. If such conditions arise, yes; and that has to be passed on by the Committee on Appropriations and then has to come to the House for its approval before any such differences are adjusted.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I really am not opposed to the amendment of my distinguished friend, Mr. McREYNOLDS, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but the gentleman from California [Mr. HOEPEL] is going to offer an amendment, as follows:

SEC. 2. As used in this act the term "officers and employees" shall be held to include individuals now abroad who are in receipt of retired pay or pension and who, because of physical disabilities, age, or other impediments are, in the discretion of the President, unable to return to the United States.

I am in entire sympathy with the bill in general as to employees of the United States Government who are in the Foreign Service; but the disabled veteran who is abroad, who married abroad or who is now unable to get back to the United States, is going to suffer even worse than these Government employees, and there are 1,174 of such veterans in all.

Mr. Jack Connolly, the general manager of the Pathé News in the United States, who was a buddy of mine in the Twenty-sixth Division, has recently returned from Paris. He knows all about these veterans over in France, and he told me they are suffering extremely as a result of the appreciation of foreign currency and the depreciation of our currency in France. He brought up this matter several times in letters to Members of Congress.

I think if we are going to do this for the Government employees, the least we can do is to take care of these 1,174 men over there, who are disabled veterans, many of them battle casualties, and some of them blind.

I understand a point of order will be made against the amendment of the gentleman from California when he offers it. I want to say now that I am not against the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], because I think this should be confined to the service and to Government workers while they are in the service, but I think in addition we should do something for the 1,174 disabled men who fought for their country in France and are over there now and cannot get back to the United States.

So I hope the body at the other end of the Capitol will take cognizance of what we are saying here today, and if this amendment is ruled out on a point of order, I hope the Senate will put this provision in the bill, because if we are going to take care of Government employees, we ought to take care of those disabled veterans to whom I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment, on page 2, in line 8, after the word "all", add "executive" before the word "officers."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McREYNOLDS: On page 2, in line 8, after the word "all", insert the word "executive."

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of seeking information from the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Why does the gentleman include all executive officers? Is this for the purpose of tying the hands of the Comptroller General, so he will have no control over such disbursements?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. No; this amendment was suggested by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], who stated the word "executive" should be placed in the bill so that there would not be any question about the Committee on Appropriations having the right to use its discretion in the matter of passing on the appropriations.

Mr. McGUGIN. Would the gentleman from Tennessee have any objection to an amendment to his amendment providing that this shall not include the Comptroller General?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Does the gentleman want to include the Comptroller General?

Mr. McGUGIN. I refer to an amendment so that this would not apply to the Comptroller General.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I do not want to include the Comptroller General.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer as an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee: "Provided, That the term 'executive officers' does not include the Comptroller General of the United States."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGUGIN to the amendment offered by Mr. McREYNOLDS: Insert, after the word "executive", a colon and the words "Provided, That the term 'executive officers' does not include the Comptroller General of the United States."

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will yield, is not his amendment inserted at the wrong place and, if adopted, would make the language ambiguous? Should not the gentleman's amendment be inserted after the word "Government", in line 9?

Mr. McGUGIN. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee is to include all executive officers, and I want to except the Comptroller General. I ask unanimous consent to change my amendment as presented.

My amendment is a simple proposition. We have a Comptroller General whose duties have been prescribed by law. His power is above that of the President or any other officer of the Government in passing on the legality of expenditures of the Government. We made one far-reaching exception in the bank bill which was passed, in which we provided that the Secretary of the Treasury in the administration of the \$2,000,000,000 equalization fund should not be subjected to the orders of the Comptroller General.

If in specific bills we are going to provide that the Comptroller General shall not have jurisdiction over specific ex-

penditures, we might as well abolish that safeguard over the expenditures of the Government. That is a bad policy to establish. [Applause.]

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, this bill has already been ably presented by the chairman of the committee and other well-informed Members. My one apology for speaking at this time is to correct a false impression which I fear has resulted from the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

I am one of the new members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House, and what I do not know about foreign affairs and relations would fill a book and perhaps several volumes, but I do know something about this bill. This bill does not change salaries; this bill does not raise salaries; this bill does not lower salaries. All this bill does is to maintain the existing salary, as fixed by law.

Now, I want to address myself to what the gentleman said about money, with a view to correcting the impression I fear he left upon the committee.

Some good people in this world are color blind; they are not able to distinguish between different colors. Some very able people in the world are judicially blind; they have no capacity for applying the law to a given state of facts. Many able people are blind to other conditions and relations. It is said that there are not 12 men in Congress, including both the Senate and the House of Representatives, who understand the money problem, and I regret to say that I cannot claim to be one of those 12.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. Not just now, but I will at the proper time.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois said that the gold revaluation plan was brought about to restore, raise, or increase the buying power of the dollar. That statement is erroneous; it was predicated upon directly the opposite theory. It was to restore the paying power—the tax-paying power, the interest-paying power, the debt-paying power, the mortgage-paying power of labor, of commodities, the products of labor. It was brought about for the purpose of restoring the relative value relations of money and commodities, labor, and labor products.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. When did I ever say anything about the gold dollar?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman referred to it yesterday. If his memory is so short as that, I suggest that he refresh his memory from the RECORD.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRAY. Not now. I want to say something with regard to money. There is no such condition as high money and high commodity values. If money is of high value, prices are low; if prices are high, money is low. There can be no such condition as high money and high prices at the same time. This gold revaluation plan was to reduce the buying power of the dollar and increase the tax, interest, debt and mortgage power of labor, and of commodities and the products of labor. People do not make or create money, they do not raise money. They have labor and products to sell, and must buy money with which to pay taxes, interests, debts, mortgages, and contracts payable in money.

Mr. McGUGIN rose.

Mr. GRAY. Briefly speaking, I am pretty close to Kansas, but not close enough to have the gentleman interfere with me at this time. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for a brief time to answer some of these interrogatories.

Mr. McGUGIN. I did not want to ask any questions of the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Then, why the interruption?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, how much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. GRAY. Five minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. I want to talk to the Committee now in regard to this revaluation of gold.

It is being contended that this bill discriminates against our public officials and employees here and in favor of the Foreign Service. This contention results from a failure to comprehend the gold revaluation plan and its operation under the first preliminary step taken to reduce the gold content of the dollar. The revaluation step taken, reducing the gold content of the dollar, has devalued the dollar externally, that is abroad, but not internally here in our domestic relations, trade, and exchange. The dollar paid to employees here will buy as much as ever here, but 40 percent less when paid to our foreign officials and employees and used abroad. This bill is to make up to our Foreign Service for this loss of purchasing power which our officials and employees here do not suffer. This bill is to make up to the Foreign Service what is lost to them in making exchange. There is no discrimination against our home employees in favor of employees abroad. This erroneous contention being made here results from a want of knowledge of the facts and a failure to comprehend the problem of money.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I will yield to the lady in just a few minutes. All things come to him who waits, even to a lady. This revaluation of gold is a misnomer. It is a reduction of the gold content of the dollar rather than the appreciation of gold. This first step that has been taken has had the effect of reducing the value of the dollar abroad, but it has had no appreciable effect here and will never reduce the dollar value here appreciably or raise the value of commodities in the price level until another step is taken. We must issue an increased volume of money upon the increased value of gold before there will be a rise in values and the price level which means devaluation of the dollar.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. Presently. The reason for this bill is that the dollar externally, abroad, will be accepted for the gold that there is in it, and as there is 40 percent less gold in the dollar, that is all they will take it for. This bill is to equalize the exchange as between our money and the money of other countries; that is, make up the difference in the dollar here and the dollar abroad.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. GRAY. Oh, pardon me; I decline to yield. I desire to yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman wants to yield now, I withdraw the point of order. I just wanted the gentleman to yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GRAY. I always defer to the ladies.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has spoken of the great importance of a proper understanding of money. Does not the gentleman feel it is vitally important to keep the diplomatic, commercial, and other personnel who have a proper understanding of foreign affairs in the Foreign Service. Diplomats can make or prevent wars. They are the eyes and ears, really, of our country. They are our first-line national defense. They know what is going on in foreign countries; what propaganda is being sent out. They know how to protect our rights. They speak foreign languages—they do not have to depend upon interpreters. The gentleman knows it is vitally important to give our well-trained employees over there a chance to live and stay in the Service and represent us properly.

Mr. GRAY. I think it is very important, and I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman gets off the question of money, will he tell us, if he knows, who

are the alleged 12 people in the Congress who know something about the money question?

Mr. GRAY. I have not a very special acquaintance with the gentleman who is addressing me. He may know something about it. I do not know. I have just made the observation that it has been said that there are not 12 men in the American Congress—the House and Senate—who understand the money question and I regret that I am not one of them.

Mr. MOTT. My question is, Who are the 12 men who know something about money?

Mr. GRAY. I greatly regret that I would have to exclude the gentleman, though I am sorry. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I want to say in conclusion that the dollar has been devalued externally, abroad, and that to maintain existing salaries of people abroad, according to law, we must pass this bill to make up the difference to those men engaged in foreign service. I do not know whether these salaries are right. I think probably if some of these positions were open upon the merit system I would accept one of them and probably condescend to take a smaller salary, but I am not a small-salary man. I believe in good salaries, good wages, and good prices.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman answer the question as to who are the 12 men, even though he excludes me?

Mr. GRAY. I am sorry I must exclude the gentleman, though I regret it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOTT. Oh, be a good sport, and tell us who they are.

Mr. GRAY. If there was any way in the world to include the gentleman amongst those 12, I would do it. But from the character of his remarks relative to money, I see no way to bring him in even within remote striking distance. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the House may be interested in some facts that were brought to the attention of the subcommittee handling the appropriations for the State Department. Last summer, just after Congress adjourned, members of our committee were consulted by the Bureau of the Budget, with, I assume, the approval of the President, in reference to shipping gold abroad for the purpose of paying the salaries of Foreign Service officers, who, because of foreign exchange, were sustaining heavy losses in pay. It will be remembered that the President did in July last authorize the shipment of gold abroad to pay salaries in certain countries. When the committee met this year the President, we were informed, desired to discontinue the shipping of gold abroad for this purpose, and he later sent to our committee a Budget estimate for an emergency appropriation to cover the losses suffered by our representatives abroad due to the depreciation of the dollar. That recommendation of the President, in effect, was a request for an emergency appropriation, such as the terms of the pending bill seek to authorize. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGUIRE] that the emergency recommendation authorized the appropriation to be expended under such regulations as the President might determine—and the Comptroller could have been excluded by such regulations, if the President desired. All of the other safeguards over the expenditure of the emergency appropriation, so recommended by the President to our committee, are found in the pending bill. The subcommittee held hearings on the emergency appropriation asked for by the President; and learning, as we were informed, of his interest in its passage, the committee tentatively approved the Budget estimate, and reported it to the full committee. We then learned that the legislative committee of the House preferred to submit first a bill authorizing the appropriation and since it was not our desire to ask for a rule to make the emergency appropriation in order on the appropriation bill, the emergency appropriation, which was clearly subject to a point of order, was not approved by the committee.

This pending bill now seeks to authorize the Committee on Appropriations to do what the President requested. Of

course, if this bill is passed, it will carry no appropriation. I think the discussion of the bill today will be very helpful to the Committee on Appropriations if the bill should pass, because it will definitely inform the Budget Director and the officials in the State and other Departments that they must submit in support of all Budget estimates a clear justification for the sums asked to be appropriated for the Foreign Service personnel.

The Committee on Appropriations will be glad to read the RECORD today in order that they may carefully check all estimates later submitted for appropriations and which the House will have full opportunity to consider and pass on before there can be any obligation imposed on the Government by the pending bill. So the legislative committee of the House in reporting this bill is only doing what the President requested the Appropriation Committee to do, and which the committee was without authority to do. This is to do away with the point of order to which the emergency recommendation submitted by the President would have been subject, had the committee reported it against the objection of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. Has the gentleman made any estimate as to how much will be necessary to carry out this provision?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The President in his estimate to our committee, as I now recall, estimated a sum approximating \$7,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] has expired.

Mr. MCGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which I offered to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. I will offer my amendment later at another place in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that this bill which is now before the House will be passed, because I believe it to be one of the most important pieces of legislation presented to this honorable body at this session of Congress.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] maintained that the salaries of our Federal employees abroad is insufficient to maintain them. I maintain it is the duty of the Federal Government to compensate its Federal employees adequately. Our Government has no right to send men into foreign lands and expect them to transact the business they are to transact in behalf of their country when they are not paying them sufficient compensation for the valuable services they are rendering.

I also wish to state that our Government should compensate the Federal employees of the United States, those men and women who come into this building and render valuable service in behalf of their Government. Every Member of Congress knows there are men and women working in these halls whose compensation is insufficient. The salaries paid our poor women who scrub and dust is \$50 a month. The men who act as policemen receive \$85 a month. Some gentleman made the statement that if those men would resign from their positions they could get hundreds of other men who are willing to take their positions. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that those of us who are in Congress, who were willing to discontinue our offices in Congress, could find men and women willing to come here and work for the Government for less than we are now receiving.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say we should support this bill, because the men who are abroad are entitled to more money than they are getting now; so are the Federal employees in the United States. I want to see the Federal employees of the United States get back their 15 percent. In fact, I have a bill in Congress which will increase their salaries 25 percent, especially those who receive under \$3,000 a year. We Members of Congress demand a living wage. So, do unto others as you would have others do unto you.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNN. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman says he wants to see Government employees get their full pay back. I hope the gentleman will cooperate in the movement to concur in the Senate amendments when that bill comes back to the House and not allow it to go to conference on that proposition.

Mr. DUNN. I am willing to do anything that will benefit the employees and also the Spanish-American and World War veterans 100 percent. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS]. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is now at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGUGIN: On page 2, in line 9, after the word "Government", insert "except the Comptroller General of the United States."

Mr. MCGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I most assuredly had no idea when we came here today that we would be involved in any controversy over the powers of the Comptroller General. I think the bill as a whole is discrimination in favor of foreign employees and against home employees, and I think the bill itself is not justified on the proposition of the depreciation of the money; but when the gentleman from Tennessee offered his amendment, "all executive officers", it occurred to me that possibly it included the Comptroller General.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGUGIN. No; I cannot yield now.

Mr. FISH. We may be able to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MCGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield. My time must not be used up in this way.

Now, that which I wanted in the first instance was only a safeguard to meet a possible contingency growing out of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. I now find, after the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama, that it is the avowed purpose to take any control away from the Comptroller General that might be involved in the expenditure of the money carried in this bill.

Certain safeguards have been built up around the expenditure of the people's money. One was the constitutional provision that appropriations should come from the Congress. We have destroyed that provision in the last few months by the making of lump-sum appropriations for the Executive Department to spend very largely as it sees fit. Then we have come along and passed authorizations without limitation, and now we find ourselves trying to destroy the statutory safeguard, the Office of the Comptroller General. If there is no necessity for the Comptroller General to demand that the moneys under this bill be expended according to law, then there is no necessity for a Comptroller General to overlook the expenditures of any moneys which are being expended by this Government.

The gentleman from Alabama says that the President asked for the provision that the Comptroller General should not have control over the expenditure of this money.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGUGIN. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I said that in the recommendation submitted by the President the Comptroller General was excluded. Of course, the President would have the absolute right to refer all expenditures to checking by the Comptroller if he so desired. The appropriation to which the gentleman refers was an emergency appropriation to be expended under and by the direction of the President. Inasmuch as this money is to be expended under and by the direction of the President, the committee in framing the bill has followed the language governing the emergency appro-

priation which has been carried in the regular appropriation bill for years.

Mr. McGUGIN. Very well. Congress might as well today make its decision whether or not in specific bills it is going to start a policy of providing that the Comptroller General shall have no control over the expenditure of public moneys. If that is done, then Congress might just as well abdicate so far as control over the expenditure of money is concerned. Ten or fifteen years ago Congress in its wisdom saw fit to create the Office of the Comptroller General and place into his hands power which would be final, and placed him in a position independent of Congress, the President, or any other political department of this Government. We ought not now to destroy that policy bill by bill. I leave it with the Congress today whether or not it wants to dehorn the Comptroller General in the matter of supervising the expenditure of the moneys provided under this bill.

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

Mr. McGUGIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The recommendation referred to by the gentleman from Alabama was just for the current year, an emergency matter. This is permanent legislation, is it not?

Mr. McGUGIN. Surely.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is that marked difference between the two. It would therefore occur to me that the gentleman's amendment is in order and ought to be adopted.

Mr. McGUGIN. For my part, I am opposed to tearing down these safeguards which have been built up around the expenditure of the people's money. [Applause.] These expenditures should be submitted to the Comptroller General. The Constitution provides that Congress shall have power over appropriations. We should stop the destruction of these safeguards.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a splendid speech, and, as far as I am concerned, his amendment is acceptable.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee accepts the amendment. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment; and I want to congratulate the gentleman on his sound and logical argument.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, line 2, after the word "dollar", insert "based upon the exchange rates July 1, 1928."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in my opposition to this proposition I am not following tactics which sometimes are pursued, to make the bill as bad as possible; but I am trying to make the bill as good as possible.

We all know that here in the United States, in England, in France, and in the other countries of the world when there was depreciation of the currency there was not a corresponding rise in the prices people had to pay for things. When the currencies of foreign countries depreciated the prices of things there did not rise correspondingly. The result was our foreign officers received—and many of them still are receiving—a marked increase in the purchasing power of what they had to spend, their salaries.

I have gone back to a time when practically all countries of the world were on a gold standard and have fixed that date as the date to work from. I have given the people who are in the Foreign Service such advantage as would accrue to them as a result of loss of purchasing power from the time all foreign countries were on gold.

Without my amendment the bill as drawn gives the officers in our Foreign Service an increase in salary from the date we devaluated the dollar by Executive order, about the 20th of January. It takes no consideration of the depreciation that had occurred in foreign currencies from July 1, 1928.

Now, the crux of this bill has not been discussed, except as it has been touched upon by the gentleman from Kansas

and by myself. Very largely the crux of the bill is not what most of the gentlemen have been talking about, to wit, the fact that our salary scale for foreign officers is too low. That is not the situation.

This bill pretends to hand them a bonus because of the depreciation of our dollar. If we are going to hand them a bonus for that reason, we ought to take into consideration the depreciation of foreign currencies that has occurred since they went off the gold standard and since we went off the gold standard; we ought to take into consideration the whole picture. That is what I am asking. You know and I know that the 15-percent reduction in the salaries about which much has been said here and which is mentioned in the report, was practically wiped out by the action of the Senate yesterday. You know and I know that that is not a factor we should take into consideration.

Now, I am sorry our foreign officers increased their scale of living when the purchasing power of their dollar was increased as a result of the depreciation of foreign currencies; but I do not think that is any reason for our failure to take account of the situation when we are passing legislation of this kind for their benefit, and I hope this amendment will be adopted; that we will do what is fair by these people but not hand them a bonus amounting to an increase in salary as a matter of favoritism to them and against the interest of the taxpayers of the United States.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand, the purpose of the gentleman's amendment is to equalize these matters so that despite the depreciation of foreign currencies the employees of the Foreign Service will still get the benefit of the American dollar.

Mr. TABER. Yes; as they should get it, without giving them a bonus.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman understand that this is a fluctuating matter, that the exchange varies from month to month?

Mr. TABER. Certainly; but I do not want them to get a bonus without taking into consideration the benefits they have already had as a result of the depreciation of foreign currencies.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They will not receive a bonus, merely compensation for losses due to the appreciation of foreign currencies.

Mr. TABER. They will by the terms of this bill. It is a bonus; nothing but a bonus.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think there is some misunderstanding about the purpose of this bill. The bill merely allows the President under such regulations as he may prescribe to pay the Foreign Service officials from month to month on the basis of the fluctuation of currency in the countries to which they are assigned. That is what is in the bill, and that is all that is provided in the bill.

Furthermore, I think the gentleman from New York is under some little misapprehension. He is generally correct in his statements before the House, but when he claims that the currency in foreign countries has depreciated as compared to ours since 1928, he is not stating a fact. The French currency back in 1928, which he refers to, was such that at that time \$1 would bring 24 or 25 francs. Today it will only bring 16 francs. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, in 1928 the British pound was equal to \$4.83 of our money. Today the English pound is worth \$5.07 in our money. All we are trying to do is to place in the hands of the Comptroller General, on recommendation to the President, the authority to rectify the changes in currency in foreign countries from month to month in connection with the salaries paid our Foreign Service officers. It is

therefore absurd to try to go back to 1928, and I hope this amendment will not prevail.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not fair to the Federal Treasury, because it selects July 15, 1933, the date we went off the gold standard, prior to which time we were on the gold standard and our money was the topside money on earth. Many of the other countries had gone off the gold standard prior to that time. The gentlemen on the other side do not want to call this a salary increase, and they do not want to call it a bonus, but this bill provides that the Foreign Service employees or officers should be compensated, we will say. The compensation, it is estimated, will be about 50 percent. What difference does it make, Mr. Chairman, whether this is called an increase of 50 percent in salary or not? The President estimated this would amount to \$7,000,000 for 1 year. Whether this is called a bonus of \$7,000,000 or whether this is called an allotment of \$7,000,000, the fact of the matter is that our Foreign Service officers, men already highly paid, will get \$7,000,000 more for this present year than they are entitled to. This is the reason for the legislation, but the cunning of it is that a date is selected to our very great disadvantage, and when I say that, I mean to the disadvantage of the Federal Treasury and to the interest of the Federal employee.

The pending amendment selects July 1, 1928, when all countries on earth, practically, with the exception of China, India, and one or two others, were on the gold standard. That is the time to equalize your exchange money values. That is the time to give consideration to the so-called "increase", or whatever you want to call it. This is a bonus. Certainly you are not going to vote to select this date in July 1933, and then make this retroactive to boot, something we never do in connection with pay bills or private bills. The amendment of the gentleman is fair, because it takes a normal condition and accepts a normal time. The amendment provides a date when all nations of the world practically were on a normal gold standard and exchange was understood as it should be throughout the world irrespective of your country. This bill, this subterfuge, is entirely in error, because this gives the Treasury all the worst of it and gives the Federal employee all the best of it and you are giving this to an employee who is today the highest paid employee or officer in the entire Federal Government.

You are doing an injustice to the men at home. If this bill provided, and I have an amendment which may solve the matter, that because our three-, four-, five-, six-, and ten-thousand dollar men on the other side suffered because the purchasing power of the dollar is not as great today as it was a year ago, and that the Federal employees in the United States should be governed by the same fluctuations of the dollar, and we all know it has fluctuated in the United States, then this bill would be fair. But this is not what the State Department fellows want. They want to tickle the foreign officer under the chin. These foreign officers have houses, employees, special rental allowances, all of which is unimportant to the foreign officer. This bill seeks to give him more than you give to anyone at home. May I say to you that this is not fair. I have never been for small salaries. I have frequently tried to lead in the fight for more pay and would not be opposed to this increase if this was styled an increase in pay for all State Department employees. Why single out a \$4,000 clerk in Berlin for a 50-percent increase, when we are not giving the same 50-percent increase to the \$4,000 clerk at home and in the same Department and who may be within the next 6 months on the other side?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am going to take but a moment to answer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. The gentleman referred to the \$4,000 clerk. I would not dispute what he said if I had not read a reference to the \$4,000 clerk in the hearings a

moment ago. Mr. Carr, of the State Department, is on the stand. Now, here is what he said in regard to the \$4,000 clerk:

Mr. CARR. Yes. Let me put it this way: Of course, say you had an officer abroad in a very expensive country with a salary of \$4,000. Before the economy legislation, let us say, that officer would have had \$4,000, and he might have had the rent allowance of \$1,200, which would have made \$5,200; he might have had a post allowance of, say, \$400, which would make \$5,600.

Mr. KLOEB. May I interrupt right there to ask what do you mean by "post allowance"?

Mr. CARR. By post allowance I mean an allowance made to offset the difference in the cost of living in the expensive place in which the officer is stationed and the cost of living in an average post. Now, when the economy legislation was enacted it cut off 15 percent of the \$4,000 salary, all the post allowance, and 65 percent of the rent allowance, so that out of a total income of \$5,600 the officer had only \$3,820 remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the \$4,000.

Mr. CARR. Of the \$5,600, the aggregate salary and allowances. Congress struck out all the post allowance of \$400, 65 percent of the rent allowance of \$1,200, and suspended all promotions and imposed an income tax upon the officers.

The gentleman from Illinois is generally in possession of facts when he talks; but in this instance, if Mr. Carr knows what he is talking about, the gentleman from Illinois retains his reputation for being "all wet."

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] has been against this bill and has been fighting it consistently. Now he is trying to offer amendments to destroy the purpose of the bill, if possible.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said that nobody had discussed the purpose of this bill except himself and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGUIRE], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] stated on yesterday or gave the impression that there was hardly anyone on the committee who knew anything about the bill and he was the only one outside of the committee. This reminds me of the time when I was a boy and reading Caesar. The first line was that all Gaul had been divided into three parts. From these statements I am satisfied that the gall of these two gentlemen has not been divided at all.

I ask the House to vote down the amendment. The exchange will have to be figured. This has to go through every safeguard—the President, the Director of the Budget, and the Appropriations Committee of the House—so that no injustice will be done to the Federal Government or to our foreign employees.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on the amendment and all amendments to the section do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER and Mr. BRITTEN)—ayes 28, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRITTEN: Page 1, line 8, after the word "officers", insert a comma and add the words "enlisted men."

Mr. BRITTEN and Mr. McREYNOLDS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. To make a point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. The amendment is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. We will discuss that question with the Chair. Just like the gentleman knows all about the bill, and no one else, he knows all about the point of order. I hope the gentleman will allow the Chair to pass on the point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. I hope the gentleman will not get cross, as he did yesterday.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I am not getting cross; I am just trying to be emphatic.

I reserve a point of order on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, is not this amendment offered to the section on which debate was just closed?

Mr. BRITTEN. There is only one section.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The bill has not been read since debate was closed on this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is correct.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee was that all debate be closed on the amendment that was pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moved to close debate on the section and all amendments to the section and the motion was carried.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the House, I will say to the gentleman that I recall his motion very distinctly and I know he will have no objection to the reporter reading what he said.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois that he can offer his amendment, but there can be no debate thereon.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee—

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is not fair. It is all right to be funny, but there are a number of amendments to be offered, and will not the gentleman be good enough to have what he said read?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am not anxious to hear any speeches, but, in all fairness, I was sitting right here near the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman said, "The amendment and all amendments thereto." If this is an amendment to the amendment, debate is not in order. But if it is a new amendment debate is in order. The reporter's notes will bear out my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is in order, but no debate thereon can be had.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHOEMAKER: Page 2, line 2, after the comma, insert the following language: "And to officers and employees of the United States within this country, due to the depreciation of our domestic currency."

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment embodying a new section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEPEL: Page 2, after line 8, add the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. As used in this act the term 'officers and employees' shall be held to include individuals now abroad and who are in receipt of retired pay or pension and who because of physical disabilities, age, or other impediments are, in the discretion of the President, unable to return to the United States."

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the amendment is not germane.

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

Mr. HOEPEL. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I will argue the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized to discuss the point of order.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, in this bill we are living up to the principles of the new deal. While I have not always followed the policies of the new deal I recognize in this bill the principle of justice, therefore, I favor the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that out of courtesy the gentleman should direct his remarks to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is correct. The Chair is trying to expedite matters with all due courtesy. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment provides for disabled veterans who are unable to return to the United States. In this amendment I propose the same restrictions which are contained in the first paragraph of the bill, providing that the entire administration shall be in the discretion of the President of the United States. This is in accordance with the letter sent by the Secretary of State. He has included in his letter provision for various classes of individuals whom I have covered in my amendment.

I think if the Chairman, whom I highly respect, insists upon the point of germaneness of an amendment of this nature, so human in its application, an amendment which seeks to protect the interests of blind and disabled veterans, of whom 580 are battle scarred, I will say that he is, in my opinion, not following the precepts of the new deal.

There is no provision anywhere whereby these worthy individuals can be provided for. I do not wish that the Democratic Party shall be placed in the category of robbing the blind or other disabled men who served under the colors in war.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I will concede the point of order; it is only another gag by the Democratic Congress of the United States.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill specifies only one class. The amendment of the gentleman from California seeks to add another class, and under the rule where a bill provides for only one class an additional class is not germane. The Chairman therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to challenge the statement of the Chair, but I was listening to the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, and as I caught it, it was to close debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto, but not to any future amendment that might be offered to the bill. I should like to ask the Chairman now if he intends to cut off all debate on further amendments or any question that may be asked about the bill.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, my motion was, "I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto now close."

Mr. SNELL. That is what I understood, and I did not oppose it.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I now move that all debate on this bill be now closed.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman propose that we cannot ask any further questions about the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is clearly within the discretion of the Chairman, after there has been rather full and free discussion of the bill, and amendments have been offered, to move to close debate.

Mr. SNELL. But there are one or two questions I should like to ask.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is within the discretion of the Chairman.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, do not run over us too roughly all the time. The chairman himself said that he did not intend to make the motion as the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole understood him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not debating that, but it is not an unusual practice for the Chairman of the Committee to move to close debate.

Mr. SNELL. I appreciate that, but here is a bill that we have been considering, and we are entitled to get information in respect to it. I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee why he exempts these men from the payment of income tax.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the Committee, I should be very pleased to answer that I am sorry to say that evidently the gentleman was not on the floor yesterday morning.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I object to the gentleman from Tennessee using any time in debate.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the motion to close all debate.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman may be permitted to answer the question of the Republican leader.

Mr. BRITTEN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the motion?

The CHAIRMAN. That all debate on this bill do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRITTEN) there were—ayes 78, noes 28.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois demands tellers. All in favor of taking the vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Two gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Oh, the Chair has just counted a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote just taken discloses the presence of a quorum.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BRITTEN: Line 8, page 1, strike out "July 15, 1933", and insert "the passage of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BRITTEN: Line 13, page 2, strike out "Provided further, That allowances and expenditures pursuant to this act shall not be subject to income taxes."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BRITTEN: Line 15, page 2, strike out the word "and", and on line 18, page 2, change the period after the word "estimates" to a colon and add the following: "And provided further, That no part of this act shall apply to officers and/or employees of the Foreign Service whose pay and allowances are in excess of \$2,500 per annum."

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 7, page 1, after the word "Budget", strike out the following: "To meet losses sustained on and after July 15, 1933, by officers and employees of the United States in foreign countries due to the appreciation of foreign currencies in their relation to the American dollar" and insert the following: "To equalize the purchasing power of the American dollar abroad with the purchasing power of the dollar within the United States for the benefit of officers and employees of the United States who are attached to the Foreign Service of the Government."

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BRITTEN: Line 18, page 2, after the word "estimates", change the period to a colon and add the following:

"Provided further, That when an American Ambassador or Minister or Foreign Service officer or clerk indicates to the Secretary of State that he cannot live comfortably on his annual pay and allowances, he should be forthwith transferred to duty in the United States."

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the "noes" appear to have it this afternoon. I have one more amendment. I move to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The amendment is not in writing.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, yes, it is; and I am sending it to the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BRITTEN: I move to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion is not in the correct form. It should be that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. If there are no further amendments, the Committee will rise under the rule.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the House have an opportunity to vote on the bill ultimately?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that that is not a parliamentary inquiry. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MONTAGUE, 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. 7808) to authorize annual appropriations to meet losses sustained by officers and employees of the United States in foreign countries due to appreciation of foreign currencies in their relation to the American dollar, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 270, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered on the bill and all amendments to final passage. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRITTEN) there were ayes 114 and noes 11.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I question the presence of a quorum.

Mr. McGUGIN. And I challenge the vote on that ground, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 297, noes 52, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—297

Adams	Bacharach	Beedy	Bloom
Allen	Bacon	Beiter	Boehne
Allgood	Balley	Biermann	Bolleau
Andrew, Mass.	Bakewell	Black	Boland
Arens	Bankhead	Bland	Bolton
Ayres, Kans.	Beam	Blanton	Boylan

Brennan	Durgan, Ind.	Lambeth	Richardson
Brown, Ky.	Eagle	Lamneck	Robertson
Brown, Mich.	Eaton	Lanham	Robinson
Browning	Edmiston	Lanzetta	Rogers, Mass.
Brumm	Ellenbogen	Larrabee	Rogers, N.H.
Brunner	Eltse, Calif.	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, Okla.
Buchanan	Englebright	Lee, Mo.	Rudd
Buck	Faddis	Lehlbach	Ruffin
Buckbee	Fernandez	Lesinski	Sabath
Bulwinkle	Flesinger	Lewis, Colo.	Sanders
Burch	Fish	Lindsay	Sandlin
Burke, Nebr.	Fitzpatrick	Lozier	Schaefer
Burnham	Flannagan	Luce	Schulte
Byrns	Fletcher	Ludlow	Sears
Cady	Ford	Lundeen	Secrest
Caldwell	Frear	McCormack	Seeger
Cannon, Mo.	Fuller	McDuffie	Shallenberger
Cannon, Wis.	Fulmer	McFarlane	Shannon
Carden, Ky.	Gambrill	McGrath	Simpson
Carmichael	Gasque	McLean	Sisson
Carter, Calif.	Gavagan	McLeod	Smith, Va.
Carter, Wyo.	Gifford	McReynolds	Smith, W.Va.
Cartwright	Gillespie	Maloney, Conn.	Snell
Cary	Gillette	Maloney, La.	Snyder
Castellow	Glover	Mapes	Somers, N.Y.
Cavicchia	Goss	Marland	Spence
Celler	Granfield	Marshall	Strong, Tex.
Chapman	Gray	Martin, Colo.	Stubbs
Chase	Green	Martin, Mass.	Studley
Chavez	Gregory	Martin, Oreg.	Sullivan
Church	Haines	May	Sutphin
Claiborne	Hancock, N.Y.	Mead	Swank
Cochran, Mo.	Hancock, N.C.	Meeks	Sweeney
Cochran, Pa.	Harlan	Merritt	Taylor, S.C.
Coffin	Harter	Millard	Terry, Ark.
Cole	Hartley	Miller	Thom
Collins, Calif.	Healey	Milligan	Thomason
Condon	Henny	Mitchell	Thompson, Tex.
Connery	Higgins	Monaghan, Mont.	Tinkham
Connolly	Hildebrandt	Montague	Traeger
Cooper, Ohio	Hill, Ala.	Montet	Truax
Cooper, Tenn.	Hill, Samuel B.	Moran	Turner
Corning	Holdale	Mott	Turpin
Cravens	Hollister	Muldowney	Umstead
Crosby	Holmes	Musselwhite	Underwood
Cross, Tex.	Hooper	Nesbit	Vinson, Ga.
Crosser, Ohio	Hope	O'Brien	Vinson, Ky.
Crowe	Howard	O'Connell	Wearin
Crump	Huddleston	O'Connor	Weaver
Culkin	Hughes	O'Malley	Weideman
Cullen	Imhoff	Oliver, Ala.	Welch
Cummings	Jenckes, Ind.	Oliver, N.Y.	West, Ohio
Darden	Jenkins, Ohio	Parks	West, Tex.
Darrow	Johnson, Okla.	Patman	Wigglesworth
Dear	Johnson, Tex.	Peavey	Wilcox
Deen	Johnson, W. Va.	Perkins	Willford
Delaney	Kahn	Peterson	Williams
DeRouen	Keller	Pettengill	Wilson
Dickinson	Kelly, Ill.	Peyster	Withrow
Dies	Kelly, Pa.	Plumley	Wolcott
Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Polk	Wolfenden
Dobbins	Kennedy	Powers	Wolverton
Dockweiler	Kinzer	Ramsay	Wood, Ga.
Dondero	Kleberg	Ramspeck	Wood, Mo.
Doughton	Kloeb	Ransley	Woodruff
Drewry	Kniffin	Reece	Young
Driver	Knutson	Reed, N.Y.	
Duncan, Mo.	Kopplemann	Reilly	
Dunn	Kramer	Richards	

NAYS—52

Adair	Duffey	Lloyd	Sinclair
Arnold	Eicher	McClintic	Smith, Wash.
Blanchard	Elzey, Miss.	McGugin	Stokes
Britten	Focht	Morehead	Swick
Brown, Ga.	Gilchrist	Moynihan, Ill.	Taber
Busby	Guyer	Murdock	Tarver
Carpenter, Kans.	Hill, Knute	Owen	Taylor, Tenn.
Christianson	Johnson, Minn.	Parsons	Terrell, Tex.
Clark, N.C.	Jones	Pierce	Thompson, Ill.
Colden	Kocialkowski	Rich	Walgren
Cox	Kurtz	Romjue	Walter
De Priest	Kvale	Scrugham	Whittington
Doxey	Lemke	Shoemaker	Zioncheck

NOT VOTING—83

Abernethy	Douglass	Hastings	Norton
Andrews, N.Y.	Doutrich	Hess	Palmisano
Auf der Heide	Dowell	Hoeppel	Parker
Ayers, Mont.	Edmonds	Jacobsen	Pou
Beck	Evans	James	Prall
Berlin	Farley	Jeffers	Randolph
Brooks	Fitzgibbons	Kee	Rankin
Burke, Calif.	Foss	Kennedy, Md.	Rayburn
Carley, N.Y.	Foulkes	Kerr	Reid, Ill.
Carpenter, Nebr.	Frey	Lambertson	Sadowski
Clarke, N.Y.	Goldsborough	Lehr	Schuetz
Collins, Miss.	Goodwin	Lewis, Md.	Sirovich
Colmer	Greenway	McCarthy	Stalker
Crowther	Greenwood	McFadden	Steagall
Dickstein	Griffin	McKeown	Strong, Pa.
Dingell	Griswold	McMillan	Summers, Tex.
Disney	Hamilton	McSwain	Taylor, Colo.
Ditter	Hart	Mansfield	Thomas

Thurston	Utterback	Warren	Whitley
Tobey	Wadsworth	Werner	Woodrum
Treadway	Waldron	White	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Pou with Mr. Wadsworth.
 Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Hastings with Mr. Beck.
 Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Dowell.
 Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Crowther.
 Mr. Warren with Mr. James.
 Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. McFadden.
 Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Stalker.
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Ditter.
 Mr. Rankin with Mrs. Clarke of New York.
 Mr. Douglass with Mr. Andrews of New York.
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Edmonds.
 Mr. Collins of Mississippi with Mr. Reid of Illinois.
 Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Whitley.
 Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Jeffers with Mr. Lambertson.
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Foss.
 Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Waldron.
 Mr. McSwain with Mr. Thurston.
 Mr. Griffin with Mr. Goodwin.
 Mr. McKeown with Mr. Tobey.
 Mr. Prall with Mr. Doutrich.
 Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Evans.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Thomas.
 Mr. Werner with Mr. Kee.
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Randolph.
 Mr. White with Mr. Carley.
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Auf der Heide with Mr. Brooks.
 Mr. Disney with Mr. Foulkes.
 Mr. Ayers of Montana with Mr. Hamilton.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Berlin.
 Mr. Burke of California with Mr. Farley.
 Mr. Fitzgibbons with Mr. Carpenter of Nebraska.
 Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Lehr.
 Mrs. McCarthy with Mrs. Greenway.
 Mr. Kerr with Mr. Lewis of Maryland.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH, is unavoidably absent today. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Michigan, Mr. LEHR, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY CONTRACTS FOR CARRYING MAIL BY AIR

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 278.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 7966, a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to make temporary contracts for carrying the mails by air, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire some time?

Mr. RANSLEY. The usual time, and we will try to cut it as short as possible.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will yield the gentleman 30 minutes, but I hope he does not use it all.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 7966, a bill which was discussed to some extent on the floor yesterday. We understand it is of an emergency nature, required by the recent taking over of the carrying of air mail by the War Department, and that the bill pertains chiefly, or will, when amended, to the personnel, their pay, rank, and so forth, rather than going into the merits of contracts, or devising any new plan of letting contracts for the carrying of the mails. I understand that matter will be

taken care of by future legislation and that private contractors will again be employed.

The rule is a wide-open rule, providing for 2 hours' general debate, and permitting the offering of amendments by any Member interested. The Committee on Rules, with its usual liberality [laughter], provided for 2 hours' general debate. This was at the request of the minority. Of course, while under the rule the debate must be confined to the bill, we anticipate certain subjects will be discussed relating to air mail contracts and individuals, famous and otherwise, during the course of the 2 hours of general debate.

In adopting the rule in the Committee on Rules and reporting it to the House, the committee overlooked the necessity of a provision in the rule waiving points of order. Section 2 of the bill provides for the transfer of appropriations from one department to another department, to take care of this transfer of personnel. It is thought by some of our parliamentarians that section 2 might be subject to a point of order, although other Members feel the point might not lie. In order to prevent any doubt about the subject, I am proposing an amendment to the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules, and, Mr. Speaker, I now offer that amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: On page 1, line 6, after the word "purposes", strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following language: "and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived."

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SNELL. I am not opposing the gentleman's amendment, but it seems to me that under previous authority given to the President by the Congress, he has absolute right to change these commissions, change the arrangement, and also the appropriation that follows along with them.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I recall it, the original economy bill did give the President certain authority to transfer appropriations from one department to another, within certain limitations. I think the limitation was 15 percent, if I recall correctly. That existing power has been suggested as a means of taking care of the situation.

Mr. SNELL. But where an entire service is transferred from one department to another, I understand that the appropriation for that service went with it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am not sufficiently familiar with that matter to discuss it, nor do I recall particularly the provisions referred to. I agree with the gentleman that there is some doubt as to the necessity of this amendment I propose, but section 2 is, in effect, a reappropriation and may change the provisions of two appropriation bills.

Mr. SNELL. To a certain extent, that is true, but it is a specific transfer. Individually I think it is all right, but I think the gentleman is protecting himself by offering the amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I want to make it very clear that I have no relations whatever with any of the air mail companies, have had no communications with them, do no business with them, and own no stock in any air mail company.

My main protest is that these air mail contracts have been canceled in an arbitrary, high-handed, dictatorial manner, without a hearing or a trial. Any American charged with crime, whether it be murder, kidnaping, high treason against the Government of the United States, or any other contemptible crime, is entitled to a hearing and trial before conviction. The Postmaster General of the United States, without in any way giving any of these 14 domestic air mail companies a hearing or a trial, canceled their contracts in a

ruthless and unprecedented manner, and has already done a great deal to bring ruin to the greatest air mail and commercial airplane service in the world. He now comes before the House asking in this bill that you support in a way what he has done and authorize him to use the Army Air Corps to fly the air mail.

Eddie Rickenbacker, one of the great aces of the World War, one of the great authorities on aviation, has stated recently in the public press that this drastic action, this turning over to the Army Air Corps without preparation or warning the duty of carrying the air mail on routes with which they are not familiar, in the midst of winter, in open machines, is legalized murder.

Any of you who know anything about aviation and who want to fly the air mail in open machines in this weather across high mountains, whether in the daytime or the nighttime, may do so; that is your privilege; but to order the Army to take on this function in open machines is exactly what Eddie Rickenbacker said—legalized murder—and I am not inclined to place my stamp of approval on it without some better reasons than I have read in the press.

I have not risen, however, to oppose this legislation. I suppose the air mail has to be flown. I presume the committee that held the hearings on this bill must have determined that to their own satisfaction when they brought in the bill; and the bill is 100 percent better than the original bill which was introduced, because certain sections were stricken out by the committee. The original bill would have permitted Postmaster General Farley to make contracts with air mail companies without recourse to bidding, the very reason he gave for the cancelation of the contracts made in 1930 with domestic air mail companies, that there was no real competitive bidding and that favoritism was shown.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Is the gentleman aware that night before last a young Army officer flew the mail over the Allegheny Mountains in an open plane with the temperature 12 below zero?

Mr. FISH. I am not aware of that particular fact, but I imagine a great many other young Army officers, graduates of West Point, were doing the same thing and risking their lives because Postmaster General Farley canceled these contracts without a hearing.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BACON. This morning a young Army officer flying the mail between Chicago and Cleveland in a snowstorm found himself off his course, crashed and was killed, making the fourth officer to be killed since this venture was started.

Mr. FISH. I admit I am in a quandary. I honestly do not know how to vote. I would like to listen to the debate before I decide how I should vote on this bill. I have three alternatives: To follow the committee and vote for the bill, to vote "present", or to vote against the bill; and at the present time I am absolutely uncertain which way I should vote. I think I shall not make up my mind until I hear the members of the committee who brought in the bill. However, this additional death of a young Army officer inclines me to vote against the bill as a protest against the autocratic and high-handed action of Postmaster General Farley and also not to assume any responsibility for what Eddie Rickenbacker calls legalized murder.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the contention of the gentleman that the personnel of the Army air force, trained for all the hazards of warfare, are incompetent to fly the mail?

Mr. FISH. Oh, no. The gentleman knows that is not so. Our Army Air Corps is just as good as any air corps in the world, but they cannot be sent an order from General Farley of the Post Office Department, our new air corps general, to fly routes with which they are not familiar, on which they do not know the landing places, and with which they have had no experience whatever, some of the most difficult routes in the world, and have to fly them in

open machines, in the middle of winter, with the thermometer around zero or below. That is what I mean. I want to be absolutely fair, and if I make any statements that are unfair I hope somebody will correct them.

Mr. LEE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. LEE of Missouri. What would the gentleman have to say about letting this same bunch of thieves continue to carry the mail? Would he or would he not have put them out of business?

Mr. FISH. I want to be fair, but it serves no purpose when gentlemen use such unfair language. As I understand it, the gentleman is speaking the language of the Postmaster General about fraud which is unproven and against American citizens who have had no hearing or trial.

Mr. LEE of Missouri. No; I am speaking the truth.

Mr. FISH. No; you are speaking the language of the Postmaster General, who claims there is fraud and then is unable to present an iota of evidence. I say as a Republican and speaking, I believe, for every member of my party that if there has been any wrongdoing, whether the offender be Republican or Democrat, he should be tried, condemned, and sent to jail if he has defrauded the Government of the United States. That is the attitude of my party, that no guilty man escape.

However, these charges of fraud, collusion, and favoritism have not been proved. We expected some form of proof; so did the public back home. What did we get? Glittering generalities from the Postmaster General, just the same old political stuff: Throw the rascals out; not a word of proof, not a semblance of proof. But instead he hides behind the Federal court and refuses to permit an action to be brought against the Government. I had not intended to talk on this phase of the matter, but if that is going to be the crux of it, I am willing to defend those contracts although I have not done it hitherto; but I am not defending any individual, whether he be Republican or Democrat. These contracts are defensible, and, of course, every one of these companies are entitled to a hearing and trial. The matter should have been handled the way Woodrow Wilson handled the airplane scandals that came out of the World War. What did he do? He chose an outstanding Republican, Charles Evans Hughes, and told him to dig into the matter and get the facts. That is what ought to be done here. But there was no investigation except an ex parte investigation by the Postmaster General, the man who canceled these contracts, who was unwilling to permit the air company officials to be heard. Why this undue haste; what were his motives? It begins to look like politics and an attempt to control these contracts for political purposes.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. Was there any provision in these contracts between the Government and the air mail companies which gave the Government the right to cancel these contracts without a hearing?

Mr. FISH. In the contracts of 1930?

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I shall have to yield to a better authority than I.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will permit, those contracts provided that in case any regulation, any ruling of the Postmaster General, were violated the Postmaster General could cancel them upon notice of cancellation and the reason therefor after a 45-day period.

Mr. FISH. That is the point, a 45-day notice; but, as I understand it, with a hearing. I may state for the gentleman's benefit that the Watres law governing the letting of air mail contracts specifically limited the bidding to those companies which had operated a scheduled daily air transport service of 250 miles in length for 6 months. That limitation was not imposed by the then existing transport companies or by the Post Office Department; it was imposed by the law which was passed only after extended con-

sideration and on the unanimous reports of both the Senate and the House committees, which specifically declared the congressional intention to limit the bidding.

Congressman LaGuardia's statements of the intent of the law which he made during the debates in the House were clear and definite to the effect that only thoroughly experienced companies should be permitted to bid. So far as I am concerned, and I am trying to take a position that is non-partisan, from reading the press, and that is the only information I can get, I cannot see that any fraud whatever has been substantiated upon which these contracts have been annulled or abrogated. At least we are all agreed that these companies have had no form of hearing and no trial. As I said the other day, this is typical of the most arrogant methods of a dictatorship, such as fascism, communism, or Hitlerism, taken at their worst.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman said they were all canceled by Postmaster General Farley arbitrarily and without hearing. Of course, the gentleman knows that a committee of the Senate has been hearing this matter for many, many months. It is information, as I understand it, obtained by the Senate committee, which was the basis of the action taken by Postmaster General Farley. Before this committee the heads of many of these companies appeared, were examined, and testified, and it was the information as to collusion, fraud, or whatnot brought out before the committee, which was a hearing and investigation of the matter, that laid the foundation upon which Postmaster General Farley canceled these contracts.

Mr. REED of New York. The hearings have not been concluded.

Mr. FISH. I was about to say to the gentleman that the hearings have not been concluded. The officials of these 14 companies have not been heard. No recommendations have been made. I have read the reports in the press, just as the gentleman has, as a result of those hearings in the other body, and I have not seen where they have proved one iota of fraud in connection with any of the air mail contracts. It has gotten down now to a question of favoritism, not fraud.

I desire to take up another phase of this situation. There was one air mail company, the Pan American Co., that carries mail to South America, whose contract was not annulled. I am not going to stand up here in the House and ask that this contract be canceled. I think that the Pan American is doing good work and helping our South American trade. I think these other companies have done splendid work and have rendered a great service in building up aviation in the United States, and I refer to the ones that have been canceled. But what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

I will make some comments, and you can draw your own conclusions. The Pan American Co., which has an absolute monopoly on the carrying of all the air mail into South and Central America and Mexico, got its contract also without competition. This company bought up its competing companies, which is contrary to law. I am not asking that the contract be annulled myself, although it receives today \$2 per mile and six million a year from the Federal Government, which is as much as the three largest domestic air mail companies combined, whose contracts have all been abrogated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FISH. The Pan American Co. receives \$2 per mile, whereas the domestic companies, whose contracts were canceled, received an average of about 35 cents per mile. We have not only subsidized the Pan American Co. but we have actually endowed this company. They have held their contract and are continuing to receive over \$6,000,000 a year from the Treasury of the United States.

The chairman of the board of the company is a very fine American citizen. He is a man who ran on the Democratic

ticket for Member of Congress 2 years ago and is a big contributor to the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Who is he?

Mr. FISH. Everybody knows him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Name him.

Mr. FISH. He is a very fine American citizen—Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney. He and his family were large contributors, to the extent of \$20,000. On the board is Mr. David Bruce, another contributor. Also on the board is Mr. Robert Lehman, a partner of Lehman Bros., another prominent Democrat. I am not charging that this is the reason this company's contract was not canceled. I am just making certain observations in reference to this company receiving \$2 per mile and pointing out that their contract has not been canceled. This company has a complete monopoly, having bought up its competing companies. The 14 domestic companies, receiving 35 cents a mile, have had their contracts canceled. You can draw your own conclusion. So far as I am concerned, I am not advocating that this company's contract be canceled, but I venture to state that there are numerous air companies that would like to get this contract at less than half the present rate of \$2 per mile.

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. FISH. I would rather proceed. I have only 3 or 4 minutes left.

What is the main reason given for the cancelation of these contracts? Personally, I do not believe that it is the main reason; but the main reason given for the cancelation of the domestic air mail contracts is that there was no competition. You can draw your own conclusion by reading the reports in the press of the investigation now going on in the Senate. The former Postmaster General, Walter Brown, claims that there was competition and made a very sound argument before the committee and showed that the so-called "closed conference" was held in accordance with law and referred to in the press at that time.

I hold in my hand the bidding on some motor compressors at the navy yard at Pearl Harbor and other naval stations, awarded on February 17. There were 7 bidders on 6 items and 6 of the companies had exactly the same bid on all 6 items. The names of the companies bidding are as follows: The Ingersoll-Rand Co., of Washington, D.C.; Sullivan Machinery Co., Chicago, Ill.; Hardie-Tynes Manufacturing Co., Birmingham, Ala.; Nordberg Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co., New York City; and the Bury Compressor Co., Erie, Pa. All the bids for the air compressor for the Naval Air Fleet at Pearl Harbor were identical. There were also some other items for Mare Island, Calif., likewise the same in amount. The bids on all the items by these six companies were identical.

This is the most striking example of prevision in competitive bidding that I know anything about in my 14 years' experience in the Congress of the United States. Every single item is the same. I am not charging collusion, and I am not saying that the contract should be turned down. But it must seem a little strange to an honest Democrat. This contract was awarded to the company located at Birmingham, Ala. It must be self-evident to everyone that this does not represent honest or above-the-table competition. It represents the N.R.A. at its worst.

Mr. PERKINS. That was an accident.

Mr. FISH. Of course, there was no collusion in this. This is not an accident but a coincidence.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. When the gentleman talks about Birmingham, Ala., may I say that I hope they get their share of the contracts. What inference does the gentleman offer? Were these contracts let?

Mr. FISH. The inference I draw is that there is no competition when all bids are the same.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the Government closed a contract on these bids?

Mr. FISH. Yes; the Birmingham concern got the contract.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Did they get all of it?

Mr. FISH. I am not objecting to that. They got the whole contract.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not objecting, either, if that is what happened.

Mr. FISH. I am merely saying that there was no competition. I am glad to see the gentleman's city get anything they can, and I am quite sure that no southern city will be overlooked in this administration.

Mr. MOTT. May I ask the gentleman if the contract he read the bids on was canceled?

Mr. FISH. Oh, no; the gentleman from Alabama is not going to ask to have that contract canceled. For the gentleman's benefit, I shall insert the exact list of bidders and amounts bid.

Specification 7571, 2 horizontal 2-stage motor-driven air compressors at the naval fleet air base and navy yard, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii, and 1 horizontal 2-stage motor-driven compressor at the navy yard, Mare Island, Calif.

Item	Ingersoll-Rand Co., Washington, D.C.	Sullivan Machinery Co., Chicago, Ill.	Hardie-Tynes Manufacturing Co., Birmingham, Ala.
1.....	\$49,340	\$49,340	\$49,340
2.....	30,365	30,365	30,365
3.....	9,895	9,895	9,895
4.....	9,080	9,080	9,080
5.....	2,125	2,125	2,125
6.....	20	20	20

	Nordberg Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.	Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co., New York City	Bury Compressor Co., Erie, Pa.
1.....	\$49,340	\$49,340	\$49,340
2.....	30,365	30,365	30,365
3.....	9,895	9,895	9,895
4.....	9,080	9,080	9,080
5.....	2,125	2,125	2,125
6.....	20	20	20

	Gardner Denver Co., Washington, D.C.	Pennsylvania Pump & Compressor Co., Easton, Pa.	Worthington Pump & Machinery Co., Washington, D.C.
1.....			\$49,850
2.....			30,575
3.....	\$9,895	\$9,895	10,045
4.....	9,080	9,080	9,230
5.....			2,125
6.....	20	20	20

Item 1. Entire work.
 Item 2. 3,270 cubic foot compressor for Pearl Harbor.
 Item 3. 750 cubic foot compressor for Pearl Harbor.
 Item 4. 750 cubic foot compressor for Mare Island.
 Item 5. Deducted from items 1 and 2 for motor operating at 80 percent loading power factor for 3,270 cubic foot compressor.
 Item 6. Price per day for erector.
 The contract was awarded Feb. 17, 1934, to the Hardie-Tynes Manufacturing Co. of Birmingham, Ala.

Mr. MOTT. No; I asked if the gentleman canceled the contract.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Alabama is going to see to it that the Government does not cancel the contract. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. For a very brief question; yes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Does not the gentleman know that, so far as the purchase of aircraft and aircraft material are concerned, during these latter years there has been practically no competitive bidding on any of these contracts?

Mr. FISH. This was not aircraft. I did not refer solely to aircraft.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. I understood the gentleman to refer to compressors on an airplane.

Mr. FISH. No; it was air compressors for different navy yards.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Used for what purpose?

Mr. FISH. There was one for Mare Island and one for the naval air fleet at Pearl Harbor. There were six different items and they did not all have to do with airplanes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Contrary to the intent and purpose of the Congress and what the members of the Committee on Military Affairs believe to be the purpose of the act, we have been having no competitive bidding on any of our aircraft or aircraft material.

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman that there should be. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

I want to conclude by saying it is a hard proposition we are facing in how to vote on this measure. I am not anxious to turn over to General Farley, the Postmaster General, the Army Air Corps and have him operate it for the next 6 months. That may be a new deal, but it is not a square deal. Without reflecting in any way upon the character or the integrity of Postmaster General Farley, whom I have known for many years, it is very difficult for him to be a statesman on Monday morning and Chairman of the Democratic National Committee on Monday afternoon, dispensing favoritism and patronage, which it is his duty to do; and he is the man who canceled these contracts, based, as he says, on favoritism. "He whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." I say to you that he should resign from one or the other position, either as Postmaster General or Chairman of the Democratic National Committee. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one half minute to ask him a question.

Mr. FISH. I am very pleased to have the time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Did the gentleman ever hear of a man named Will Hays, who held both of those jobs, and many other men who were Postmasters General under Republican administrations?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I know that, but they did not cancel contracts like these.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; they made the contracts.

Mr. FISH. They did not cancel contracts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

INTOXICATING LIQUOR IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. McDUFFIE submitted the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6574) to make inapplicable in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands certain Federal laws relating to intoxicating liquors.

THE AIR MAIL SERVICE

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am satisfied that if the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who preceded me, would follow closely the activities of the Postmaster General, and could be fair, he would have to admit that the Postmaster General is ably performing his duties as national Democratic chairman as well as Postmaster General. He has demonstrated that by canceling these contracts. [Applause.]

The gentleman from New York did not know, or is trying to make the country believe, that the Postmaster General acted without any information.

The gentleman should have known that 2 years ago this House passed my resolution authorizing the Post Office and Post Roads Committee to investigate the dishonest activities in the Post Office Department, to investigate the dishonest contracts in the Air Mail Service, to investigate the dishonest leases and dishonest purchases of post-office sites. That committee held hearings 2 years ago.

The hearings conducted by the committee were without the services of a special assistant or investigator. Nevertheless, the committee was able to ascertain that these contracts were let through connivance. It was on their recommendation that this House has reduced the appropriation for that service by \$7,000,000.

Now, it was brought out in the evidence that these companies had been working in conjunction with one another, agreeing on routes and upon prices, which action to my

mind has since that time caused the country to lose over \$100,000,000, or that the Government has been defrauded by this collusion to the extent of \$100,000,000.

I am thankful to the Senate committee for further investigating and to the Postmaster General for canceling the contracts. On the 24th of last month I made a speech on the floor of the House requesting that the President and Postmaster General, upon the evidence which had been produced, order the cancelation of these contracts. I feel that the Postmaster General would not have been honest or honorable and would have been lacking in courage if he had not on the evidence already presented to him canceled the contracts.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] says he is not interested in any of these companies, but he complains bitterly because they are trying to save the country and the administration millions and millions of dollars in the future. [Applause.] I know the country will not take the gentleman's statement seriously, as it is merely a political smoke-screen aimed at that courageous official who, time will tell, will prove the greatest that has ever filled the office of Postmaster General. I know that in the near future when the evidence will have been submitted to him as to the Pan-American Airways or any other contracts where fraud or collusion may be shown, he will have the courage to again face his duty and order cancelation of such contracts.

The gentleman from New York gives the names of two or three men who happen to be Democrats who are interested in the Pan-American Airways. Does he not know that the House of Morgan, the Mellons, the Harrimans, the du Ponts, the Vanderbilts, and others own or control the corporation that had all the contracts that have been canceled? But the gentleman has not said a word about that.

I do know that it will not matter to the President or the Postmaster General whether two or three Democrats are interested in the Pan-American Airways; if it is shown that their contract was obtained through fraud or collusion, I am satisfied that it will be canceled. I say to the gentleman from New York that the President and the Postmaster General in the carrying out of their policies look not to the right or to the left, but go straight ahead, regardless of party affiliations, in their program to protect the Government, to eliminate abuses and to put an end to collusions, as will attain their objective, namely—honesty, efficiency, and economy in government.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I will yield for a brief question.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. Have any findings been made by anybody in authority that fraud was committed, or was it left entirely to the Postmaster General?

Mr. SABATH. There was much evidence produced before the House committee and additional evidence before the Senate committee that clearly proved that these contracts were let by collusion, without competitive bidding, and at prices that were criminal. When this evidence was presented to the Postmaster General he was compelled and obliged to cancel these contracts regardless of who the beneficiaries were in order to protect the American people.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. What I want to know is whether anyone in authority made any findings.

Mr. SABATH. I have only 10 minutes, and I wish I had enough time to answer the gentleman, but I should like to know what he means by findings? Does he mean court findings? I say no to that, but direct the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the committee of this House as well as the Senate found that these contracts were fraudulent.

Mr. BUCKBEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BUCKBEE. Does the gentleman mean to imply that any air mail contracts were not let in accordance with the Watres Act?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman, who has been a member of the committee, has the facts and he knows how these contracts have been let, because he has talked with me about various matters in that Department several times before.

Mr. BUCKBEE. The gentleman has evaded my question, and well knows that air mail contracts were let in accordance with the Watres Act.

Mr. SABATH. Whether they were or not, the gentleman should know. All those who heard the testimony know that there was collusion and fraud in the giving out of these contracts.

I now call attention to the complaint of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] about transferring these duties to the War Department. If the gentleman recollects, it was the War Department that originally started the Air Mail Service. It was Capt. Benjamin B. Lipsner who resigned his commission in the Aeronautical Division of the United States Regular Army to accept the position of Superintendent of the United States Aerial Mail Service, and under whose direction in the first year of operation out of 1,261 contemplated trips between New York and Washington 92 percent were completed. Out of a possible 138,092 miles, 128,037 were flown. During the Aero Mail Service of the first year 7,720,840 letters were carried, with a revenue of \$159,700 and a cost of operation of \$137,900.06. The inauguration of the Service was in 1918, under a Democratic administration, and during that same year we extended the Service, and there was a profit the first year under the direction of the War Department of over \$21,000.

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

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman a moment ago referred to Mr. Harriman as one of the interested parties. I call attention to the fact that the particular Mr. Harriman, the one the gentleman had in mind, who used to be president of the aviation company, is now one of the leading officials of the N.R.A.

Mr. SABATH. We are not making exceptions or drawing the line between Democrats and Republicans. It is the aim of this administration to obtain the most experienced men in their respective lines to bring about efficiency and to give real service to the Nation. The President being a broad, liberal-minded man feels that there are some honest Republicans that could cooperate with the administration, and I regret he has appointed, in fact, too many of them to important positions, believing them honest and ready to aid him in his great efforts to reestablish or put the country back on its feet. If my advice would be taken, I would advise him not to rely too much on them because my experience has taught me that they cannot be depended upon or to be relied upon for real, honest cooperation, as was proven during the war.

But the President, being appreciative of the support given him on the part of many Republicans, is reciprocating; yet I am fearful of the old adage, "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts." In that I do not wish to be misunderstood that Mr. Harriman is not an honest man, but even many honest men have been used and utilized by those conniving aviation corporation manipulators in unloading at high prices thousands upon thousands of shares in companies that were incorporated on air and had no actual value.

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

Mr. SABATH. Not now; but at this time I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert in my remarks a letter that I have written to the Postmaster General upon this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The gentleman from Illinois asked the gentleman a moment ago if these contracts he complains of were not all let in accordance with the Watres Act. I think it is only fair that the gentleman should answer the question "yes" or "no."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is thoroughly familiar with the situation; he is a member of the committee, and he asked the question, I presume, because he expected me to answer substantiating the statements that have been made to him and to me before.

Mr. MOTT. Is that the best answer the gentleman can make.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know all of these contracts and I do not like to make a misstatement and say that they were

all let under the act or not. The gentleman knows it, and it was merely a catchy question, I presume.

Mr. MOTT. Then the gentleman's answer is that he does not know whether these were let under the Watres Act or not?

Mr. SABATH. I do not.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

FEBRUARY 22, 1934.

HON. JAMES A. FARLEY,

Postmaster General, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: Early in 1929 my attention was called to the many dubious and what appeared to be fraudulent transactions in the Post Office Department in connection with the domestic air, ocean, and foreign air mail contracts, fraudulent leases and unjustifiably high prices paid for post-office sites. I demanded that the Appropriations and the Post Office and Post Roads Committees investigate, but unfortunately nothing was done. Therefore, I renewed my demand the next year for an investigation, that an end might be put to the conspiracy against the Government. Upon the failure of the committee to act, I introduced a resolution to investigate, and in January 1932 my resolution, no. 226, was adopted, as follows:

"That the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads is authorized to investigate (1) if the contracts entered into for carrying mail, whether by air, railroad, or water, are excessive, and to what extent they should be reduced; (2) if the prices paid for land or sites acquired for post-office buildings in the last 10 years are reasonable or exorbitant and to ascertain the actual amounts paid for each site in excess of \$10,000, and the names of those who have negotiated the purchases as well as the leases; (3) all contracts entered into for the construction of all post-office buildings wherever the cost of such buildings was in excess of \$100,000; and to secure the names of all contractors; (4) to what extent collusive agreements have been sanctioned by the Treasury and Post Office Departments."

The committee started its investigation, but for lack of money precluded its engaging trained investigators to ferret out and properly present the mass of evidence showing many fraudulent transactions.

Therefore it was with a great deal of pleasure that I have followed the Senate committee investigating air mail and ocean mail contracts under the leadership of Senator BLACK, and I am gratified that my efforts have brought before the country and to your attention these wanton criminal machinations and practices which, unfortunately, cost the Government upward of \$50,000,000 annually.

I exceedingly regret that when the House committee makes its report it will disclose additional frauds in the purchasing of sites and the hundreds of leases entered into since 1922, the total of which, I am sure, will reach the tremendous sum of more than \$50,000,000 during the last 10 years. And, strange to observe, notwithstanding that fact, certain Members of the Congress and the Senate astonishingly criticize your action in canceling these unlawful, corrupt, tainted air mail contracts, most of which were identified with your two predecessors.

I feel that if these Members of the Congress and the Senate, including Mr. FISH, of New York, and Senator FESS, of Ohio, who have been criticizing you for taking this courageous step, were thoroughly familiar with the extent of these frauds, they would refrain—in fact, would be compelled to approve your action against these corrupt, vicious, profiteering, conniving plunderers.

On January 24 of this year I stated on the floor of the House, while the Post Office Department appropriation bill was under consideration, that the committee familiarize the Postmaster General and the President so as to aid in bringing about the cancellation of all these fraudulent contracts. If proper steps are taken, it will mean the saving of millions and millions of dollars to the Government, and it will not be necessary for us to reduce the salaries of the low-paid employees.

Therefore, I am deeply delighted by the position you have taken, and I congratulate you most heartily upon your courageous discharge of duty; but, dear General, though I am much pleased by your action, I will not be completely satiated until a criminal prosecution is instituted against these contemptible manipulators, who have without blush or shame defrauded the Government, as I have said, of hundreds of millions of dollars, and who largely brought about the necessity of reducing the salaries of 270,235 employees of the Post Office Department, most of whom were low-priced, deserving men and women.

Further, I venture the confident hope that none of the companies who owned, controlled, or managed any of these companies whose contracts have been justifiably and obligatorily canceled will be awarded any mail contracts in the future. And the same policy should be adopted, in my humble opinion, when dealing with all the contractors who have improperly and reprehensibly obtained contracts for supplies and for construction of post offices.

In conclusion, I most seriously urge immediate cancellation of all leases found to be fraudulently entered into from 1922 to March 4, 1933.

With continued good wishes I am, as one who for nearly 5 years has endeavored to put a stop to this ill treatment of the Government,

Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH.

Mr. SABATH. I feel that this letter will more thoroughly explain my views and my position.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] questions the ability of the War Department to handle this mail. As I stated before, the Air Mail Service was organized in 1918 by Capt. Benjamin B. Lipsner, of the War Department, who supervised its maintenance and operation the first year, and which showed a profit of over \$21,000. I honestly believe that if we give that cooperation and aid to the able and efficient Postmaster General that we can within a short space of time conduct that Service more efficiently to the advantage of the country and with a profit to the Service.

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

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOPER].

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, I see no objection to this rule and I intend to vote for it. I presume also that I shall vote for the bill as well. I rise for two purposes. One is to say that no matter what may be the outcome of the situation which has brought this bill upon the floor of the House, nothing will tarnish or diminish the fame of America's best and most popular citizen, Charles A. Lindbergh. [Applause.]

The other thing that I rose to say is that I am glad that the committee which brought out this bill has had the good taste and the good sense to strike out of it the words "the present emergency." There is no emergency here except a manufactured emergency, manufactured deliberately for the purpose of bringing more and more power into the hands of an administration already teeming over with power which has been abjectly surrendered to it by the Congress of the United States in the short space of 11 months last past. I think that it will be a fine thing when the bills which come down from this administration no longer preface themselves by a stump speech declaring that an emergency exists upon every question upon which they seek to force the vote of this Congress. It has been under the guise of emergency that we have seen, one after another, powers delegated to the Congress of the United States by the people of the United States in their Constitution shorn away from them.

The word "emergency" has become a mere shibboleth of this administration; it has become a mere slogan for the purpose of forcing a ready Congress to enact measures amazing, extraordinary in every sense of the word, and I have been wondering month by month how much further this is to go. Perhaps when the next inauguration takes place, perhaps when once more the pageant rolls down Constitution Avenue, the name of Constitution Avenue will have been changed to Emergency Avenue. [Laughter.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise only for the purpose of asking the Chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads a question. I assume that the aviators who are to carry the mail under this proposed transfer of the Air Mail Service to the Army Department will retain unimpaired their military status as a part of the military forces of the country.

Mr. MEAD. We have a committee amendment protecting their status in that connection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My question goes to this point: Some crack-ups have been experienced thus far, and it is only fair to assume that there will be additional difficulties arising, and that some of these gentlemen who fly the mail will be disabled and in some instances killed. If they are a part of the military forces, their disabilities and death compensation will be measured by the terms of the so-called "Economy Act." Is that going to prevail, or is some special provision going to be made, because of the fact that under military order they will be projected into an extra hazardous occupation, and therefore they and their families are entitled to some special protection? I assume they are not

amenable to the provisions of the Federal Compensation Act. If that matter has not been provided for, it occurs to me it would be eminently unfair to these inexperienced aviators, in some cases, flying the mail under unknown conditions, to be placed in a position of particular hazard without making proper provision for indemnity in case they are disabled or killed. I simply make the suggestion and seek information on the point.

Mr. MEAD. The War Department has sent us an amendment covering that subject, and I shall read the amendment and explain it in my time, if that will be sufficient reply to the gentleman. I may say that according to General Foulois they are to be adequately protected in their military status, and it is to be made retroactive as of February 9, 1934, so as to cover expenses and obligations that have already occurred.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With that in mind, I will hold any further questions in abeyance until the amendment is submitted.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7966) to authorize the Postmaster General to make temporary contracts for carrying the mails by air, 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 consideration of the bill H.R. 7966, with Mr. Brown of Kentucky in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman I yield myself such time as I may require within the hour.

Mr. Chairman, the so-called "emergency bill" which our committee has been considering for the past week is, as you all know, for the purpose of authorizing the use of Army equipment and personnel for the flying of the mail, and also to authorize, out of the current domestic air mail appropriation, payment to the Army for that service.

The committee, in considering the bill, has stricken out sections 3, 4, and 5 of the original proposal, so that the bill, as amended, contains but two sections, one section authorizing the use of the equipment and personnel, and the second section authorizing payment for that service.

The committee also limited the time of the emergency to 1 year, there being a 2-year limitation in the Senate bill. Your committee, assuming that this was a service for an emergency period only, thought it best to define the length of the emergency and thought it wise to eliminate from the bill those sections which permitted contracting for additional service from private corporations or individuals. It is, therefore, an emergency bill to authorize the Postmaster General to carry mail by use of the Army personnel and equipment.

We are going to suggest several amendments which have been presented to us by the War Department. The first amendment, on page 2, line 6, of the bill deletes the comma following the word "thereof", at the end of the line, and adds the following: "incurred from and after February 10, 1934."

In explanation of this amendment, let me say that the War Department, the day after the issuance of Executive Order No. 6591, on February 9, 1934, began to take steps to prepare for this emergency task, and in connection therewith necessarily made commitments and incurred expenses. We believe, therefore, this bill should be amended to make its terms retroactive as to such expenses to February 10, 1934. The War Department believes such amendment to

be highly desirable, if not imperatively necessary, to insure efficient performance of the carriage of air mail by the Army.

The second amendment to be offered is on page 2, line 8. We change the period after the word "hereof" to a colon and add the following:

Provided, That officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army on duty hereunder, while away from their permanent posts of duty, shall be paid the same per diem as is payable to civilian employees of the United States under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended.

In explanation of this amendment, you will see it is obvious that in carrying on the work in question, much of the Army personnel will, of necessity, be on temporary duty at points along the air route and elsewhere, and thus away from their permanent posts of duty, in many instances. Civilian personnel of the Government so circumstanced will receive per diem allowances under the provisions of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926. Unless the military personnel is to be unjustly discriminated against, to their great financial harm, it is necessary that some provision be made for a per diem for them also. Being engaged as they are on a civil duty, when carrying the mails by air, it is thought that the provisions of the subsistence act referred to might appropriately be applied to such military personnel.

It might be stated that unless some provision is made for an allowance of this kind for military personnel while on such temporary duty to cover additional expense to them while away from their homes, it will become necessary to arrange for a change of permanent duty stations of such personnel with increased cost to the Government on account of the movement of their dependents and household furniture at Government expense.

The third amendment is as follows:

The performance by military personnel of duty hereunder shall in no way disturb or change their military status under their respective commissions, warrants, or enlistments, in the Army, or any right, privilege, benefit, or responsibility, growing out of said military status.

In explanation of this amendment, I may say that in view of the possible application of section 1222 of the Revised Statutes, and in order that there may be no question of jeopardizing or changing the military status of the military personnel engaged on the work of carrying the mail by air, and any rights, as well as responsibilities which flow therefrom, it is believed that the pending measure should be further amended. For instance, certain designated relatives of deceased military personnel are entitled to a gratuity where the death was in the line of duty of such personnel. Again, the War Department must be sure there is no escape of such military personnel from Army discipline because of such civil duty.

These amendments were suggested to us in a letter of transmittal from the Secretary of War, and they cover various points that were developed during the committee hearing. General Foulois was in attendance and worked with the committee in preparing these amendments.

Then there is a further amendment changing the title of the bill, which the committee has authorized. This amendment reads as follows:

Amend the title of the bill so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to accept and use equipment, landing fields, men, and material of the War Department for carrying the mails by air, and for other purposes."

The title in the original bill referred to the contracting for mail, advertising for bids, and for other purposes. In view of the fact that this bill restricts this operation to the Army alone it was thought well to change the title of the bill.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Is the gentleman going to offer all amendments suggested either by the War Department or by the Chief of the Air Corps, General Foulois?

Mr. MEAD. I may say to the gentleman from Alabama that all amendments which I read are amendments offered

by the War Department, General Foulois, and the committee. They are one and the same amendments.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. But there is no suggested amendment of the War Department or of General Foulois that the committee is not going to offer, is there?

Mr. MEAD. No; there is not.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. In other words, the committee and the Chief of the Air Corps are in full accord?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. Now, in connection with the history of air mail legislation, let me say that your committee was authorized nearly 2 years ago to make a complete investigation of the activities of the Post Office Department.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Did the gentleman's committee have time to go into the matter of what, if anything, the private airplane companies have done for the dependents of deceased pilots killed in line of duty? Has it made any comparison between the treatment of this matter by private companies and by the Army?

Mr. MEAD. No; we have not; but our committee has certain information that pilots in the employ of private companies are not given any retirement or compensation insofar as the law is concerned. I do not believe there are any arrangements between the personnel and the companies which call for a uniform or definite allowance either for injury or death.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Of course, though, the gentleman recognizes that the pilots of the private companies receive much larger salaries than are paid to the Air Corps officers who will operate the Air Mail Service.

Mr. MEAD. That is true with the possible exception of those in the higher ranks.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Most of these planes, however, will be piloted by lieutenants, who receive much smaller salaries than the average private-company pilot.

Mr. MEAD. Pilots in the employ of private air transport companies are not allowed the privileges granted to pilots in the Army or the Navy; that is, they do not receive the subsistence pay, retirements, and other privileges which those in the Army and Navy enjoy, and their task is probably more difficult in that it is constant. They are away from home a great deal of the time, and they fly many, many more miles than does the average pilot in the military service. This is a hazardous occupation; there is a fatality in the flying personnel every 29 days. Further, these men devote only the very best years of their lives to this work. The average active life of a pilot is about 15 years, from the age of 25 to the age of 40. After 40 it is very hard for a pilot to secure employment with another concern. So what appears to be high pay in their case turns out to be but reasonable and warranted under the circumstances.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEAD. Certainly.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Did the gentleman's committee give any consideration to the matter of the replacement of planes that might be cracked up or destroyed through air mail use?

Mr. MEAD. No; we have not.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. The gentleman realizes, of course, that the Air Corps is very short of serviceable planes?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; and I favor increasing their equipment.

As I was saying a moment ago, your Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads made an investigation for the purpose of recommending legislation, and in doing so we made exhaustive study of the air mail set-up. In our report which is available to members of the committee, we recommended legislation which would have repealed the Watres Act and would have substituted for the space basis of payment contained in that act a definite fixed-pay basis for carrying the mails. Had this legislation been enacted a year ago when it was recommended, nearly 60 percent of the lines would now be on a revenue-producing basis, and

substantially 40 percent of the remainder would be at the end of a period of 5 years.

Because of the present emergency, because the Watres Act is very unsatisfactory, and for the added reason that after the passage of this bill the Army will be operating under an emergency law of limited duration, I want to suggest to the consideration of the House the air mail legislation which our committee recommended some time ago.

The reason for this emergency legislation, as you all know, is based upon the order of the Postmaster General canceling existing contracts on the ground of fraud and collusion. These charges were based on agreements growing out of a series of meetings which were held in the former Postmaster General's office, and by revelations resulting from the investigation at the other end of the Capitol.

The question has been raised on the floor as to whether or not fraud or collusion was established. Of course that is a responsibility for the Postmaster General to assume, but it must be stated also that whenever fraud or collusion has been established the Postmaster General is duty bound to cancel such contracts. When he was satisfied in his own opinion and by reason of advice given to him by the Attorney General and the solicitors of his Department, it was his duty to cancel the contracts. Once the contracts were canceled it was then his duty to consider the emergency operation of the mail, and for that reason this legislation has been suggested.

The question has been brought up on the floor of the House as to whether or not a trial has been given to the air mail contractors. The answer to that is the investigations made by the Department and the revelations made by the Senate committee may be termed a trial. The Postmaster General, I understand, has prosecuted an investigation of his own and, in his judgment, is satisfied that fraud and collusion occurred.

Another question has been discussed on the floor, as to whether or not the Army can fly the mail. I realize the efficiency of the present personnel, the wonderful flyers that have been flying the mail for the past several years. To my mind they are the most efficient transport flyers in the world. Their record stands out among the nations of the world without an equal. But the United States Army has a wonderful personnel, too. Their flyers are not trained in a correspondence school or brought up on the diet of pampered or coddled children. They are prepared for the trying experiences and hazards of warfare. They may not have the modern equipment necessary for flying the mail, but they are an efficient personnel. A crack-up may occur, but the Army, with proper equipment, in my judgment, is an efficient instrument for this work. They will give a good account of themselves and make America more proud than ever of the Army Air Corps. This experience will be beneficial to the Army pilots, just as the experiences of those in the Air Mail Service would be beneficial if as members of the Army Reserve they were taken for several weeks each year into the Army for military training.

Mr. HAINES. In that connection, will the gentleman tell the committee how the majority of the pilots in the Air Service are trained and what contribution the Army has made in the past to the training of these pilots?

Mr. MEAD. I will be glad to touch upon that subject. The majority of the pilots in the private transport service are trained by the United States Army at Army air fields. This training costs the United States Government approximately \$24,000 for each pilot. Sixty percent of the pilots in the transport service are members of the military Reserve. Many of them have excellent war records. One that I know of carries a Congressional Medal of Honor. They are splendid men and a great asset to our Government. I believe in a short time all of these pilots who were flying planes for the private transport companies will be again carrying the mail; but I do not want anyone to make a statement that will in any way reflect against the personnel of our Army. They are out there now in all kinds of weather carrying the mail into every section of the United States. All they need is the

proper equipment, and this legislation will help provide the things they require.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. It is not the gentleman's contention that one reason for canceling the contracts and turning this work over to the Army was to give experience to the Army flyers?

Mr. MEAD. I do not think that had anything to do with the matter.

Mr. MOTT. It is also the gentleman's idea that the carrying of the mail by the Army is only a temporary emergency. May I ask the gentleman if he thinks that the experience given the Army pilots by turning over to them the carrying of the mail and the results that have happened thus far have been justified? Let me put it in another way. Has the sacrifices which have been incurred by the Army mail flyers been justified?

Mr. MEAD. In order to answer that question we would probably have to take into consideration the pioneering adventures in every line. Human sacrifice has preceded progress which permits us to enjoy the comforts and luxuries of our day.

Accidents happened and they will continue to happen, perhaps because of the fact that this work is strange to the Army pilots, or because they have not all the devices for safety found on the private air transport lines. Again may I say that the life of an Army pilot is a hazardous one, more hazardous when called to active duty than any other occupation I know of. The experiences that they meet with in these times likewise call for courage and sacrifice. I cannot say that death in this case or any other case is justified. I would not want to be called upon to answer that question as it pertains to this particular case either in the affirmative or in the negative.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman has fully answered, will he permit another question?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman has stated that the carrying of the mails by the Army is an emergency matter and that it is his intention to bring in permanent legislation as soon as possible which will put the carrying of air mail into the hands of private companies?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. Will that be done in a very short time?

Mr. MEAD. We are now reading the bill in committee.

Mr. MOTT. Let me ask the gentleman if he thinks the turning over of the air mail to the Army, entailing the sacrifices that we already know about, has been justified in view of the fact that within a very few days he is going to bring into this body legislation calling for the abandonment of air mail carrying by the Army flyers?

Mr. MEAD. I answered the gentleman's question when I said that the moment the Postmaster General was satisfied that fraud and collusion existed, there was no escape from the duty he had to perform.

Mrs. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. KAHN. The gentleman casts no reflection upon the efficiency of the Army pilots. The casualties have been due to the fact that we put these men into insufficiently equipped planes and not from a spirit of pioneering, because the air pilots have done their pioneering and are now continuing to do it when we ask them to risk their lives with inefficient equipment. All of this would have been averted had the 45 days' provision, as appears in the contract, been taken advantage of by the Postmaster General and proper notice given, because by that time a bill could have been drawn up and every requirement of the law fulfilled. I heard the gentleman describe what, in his opinion, constituted a trial of these companies, and I was rather astonished at his explanation. I would hate to be on trial for my life in a procedure of that kind.

Mr. MEAD. I may say in answer to the gentlewoman from California that the Postmaster General conducted his own investigation and had the benefit of assistance from the Attorney General and the Senate committee. When he sat-

ified himself that fraud and collusion existed in respect of these contracts, it was his responsibility and at the same time his duty to cancel the contracts.

Mrs. KAHN. It strikes me that it is a sort of star-chamber proceeding when one person out of the 120,000,000 in the United States is the one individual in the country to be satisfied whether fraud or collusion exists. I think we have gone back about 100 years.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. May I ask the chairman of the committee this question? In view of the fact some of these Army fliers—I do not know whether they were directly executing orders to report for this air mail service or not—unfortunately met with disaster, and one famous flier has gone to the extent of saying that, in his opinion, it constituted legalized murder, is it the gentleman's observation that even if this order had not been made and if the contracts had not been annulled, under the rigorous and severe flying conditions we have had in the country for the last few days—is it not probable there would have been some casualties among the employees of these private companies?

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman is quite right, and, as I said a few moments ago, on the average there is one fatality every 29 days in good weather and in bad in the operation of ships by private companies. In severe weather private lines keep their ships on the ground and the Postmaster General asks the Army to follow this example.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. If the gentleman will yield, the truth is that ordinary military flying is more hazardous than ordinary air mail flying, because in military flying the fliers often have to fly in formation with many planes. Sometimes these planes have to land one right after another, with, perhaps, only a minute between the landing of the different planes. For this reason ordinary military flying is much more hazardous than ordinary air mail flying.

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I believe it is.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Where you have the proper equipment ordinary air mail flying is not very hazardous; is not that true?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; and as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] stated a few minutes ago, the severe storm that covered almost the entire country was in great measure responsible for crack-ups. In many instances private lines would have kept their ships out of the air. Probably the Army, eager and anxious to go through with the mail, regardless of the storm, took unnecessary chances. The Post Office Department gave no such orders.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is quite familiar with the law with reference to the air mail situation. Would it not have been possible for the Postmaster General, immediately after the cancelation of these contracts, to have advertised under the Watres Act and let contracts to go on with this work?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; under the Watres Act any company with 6 months' flying experience would be eligible to bid on a contract offered by the Post Office Department on a given line after the bid was advertised for a period of 30 days. So he could not do it immediately, but he could do so after a period of 30 days.

Mr. TABER. And that would be about halfway run out if the advertisement had been entered in the newspapers immediately.

Mr. MEAD. If the advertisements were out February 9, on March 9 a number of private operators could take over the mail; but we have not very many that can qualify by reason of the limitations in the Watres Act.

I now want to discuss the situation with regard to the Pan American Co.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GOSS. I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILL] with reference to damages; and if the gentleman has the bill before him,

may I call his attention to line 6, on page 2, "and for the incidental expenses thereof." In fairness to the War Department, would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment providing for loss and damage to all War Department equipment used in the transportation of the mails? We are using our bombers, as the gentleman knows, and some of our most expensive equipment. Of course, any loss of such equipment the War Department sustains, unless some such amendment is put in the bill. This would be a fair charge to the cost of carrying the mails, because I may say to the gentleman that even private companies have these mishaps, and undoubtedly the cost of carrying the mail includes the cost of the replacement of some of this equipment.

Mr. MEAD. It is my understanding that much equipment is being allowed the Army as a result of the necessary work in connection with carrying the mail.

Mr. GOSS. I may say to the gentleman that that simply refers to radio equipment, and there are only 150 ships involved, according to the testimony of the general, and that is a very infinitesimal amount compared to losing a bomber that cost \$50,000 or \$75,000.

Mr. MEAD. The War Department assumes the risk and has made no such request of our committee. I do not believe the committee would recommend legislation which the War Department did not see fit to request.

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman would have no objection to such an amendment if the War Department suggested it?

Mr. MEAD. If the War Department suggested it, the committee would consider the amendment; and if it was approved by the committee, I would be very pleased to advocate it.

A few moments ago the question was asked why the contract of Pan-American was not canceled.

Pan-American is a distinct organization, separate from the organizations that fly in the domestic field. It operates under an entirely separate act, and was in no way connected with the questionable conferences held at the former Postmaster General's office upon which the charges of fraud and collusion were based. Therefore the Postmaster General had no right to cancel the Pan-American contract. They are two separate and distinct cases and are not in any way related.

While I am making this observation, I may say that my distinguished colleague from New York mentioned the fact that Mr. Whitney, a prominent Democrat, is a member of the board of Pan-American and made a contribution to the Democratic Party. Not very long ago another gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], who was the successful candidate for Congress against Mr. Whitney, made a speech in which he praised the Pan-American Air Line. So the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] did not take offense at the political activities of the candidate who ran against him for Congress.

Mr. BACON. I am glad to say that the Pan-American Co. is the most efficient operating air line in the world. A little while ago I had a conversation with Dr. Merkle, president of the Lufthasa Co., of Germany, and he told me that he considered the Pan-American Co. away and far ahead of anything in Europe—that it was the most efficient air company in the world.

They are doing a splendid job in carrying the goodwill of North America to South and Central America. I hope nothing will occur to cause their contract to be canceled.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I will yield.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. Is it true that the Pan-American received \$2 a mile while these other companies only received 35 cents a mile?

Mr. MEAD. The Pan-American Co. is operating under an entirely different act and under entirely different conditions. The Post Office Committee has analyzed the cost of the domestic service, and the companies have been treated liberally. I understand Pan-American has not paid any dividends; they are not making money, but they are

doing a good job, as stated by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. Why is there such a wide difference in the cost?

Mr. MEAD. Because they have not the field, they have not the volume, they have not the opportunity to make the revenue other companies have.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. But there seems to be a wide difference between \$2 and 35 cents.

Mr. MEAD. The cost now is 38 or 39 cents for every mile flown in the United States. In the beginning the cost was much more than that. We are paying less in this country for our service per mile than any country in the world. Pan-American is doing more for less money each succeeding year.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I will yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD. Our Army could not carry the South American mail because the foreign country would not permit an Army plane to cross its country, would it?

Mr. MEAD. There is a delicate situation in the foreign Air Mail Service that must be ironed out by the State Department and the company negotiating the contract. It would be difficult for them to operate unless they were in a position to make concessions to municipalities and governments all along the line.

I now want to talk about the Watres Act and our former Postmaster General. Appearing before the Senate committee Mr. Brown was asked who had an interest in establishing a new air service between Buffalo, N.Y., and Detroit, Mich. Mr. Brown replied, "Chairman MEAD, of the Post Office Committee." Therefore, I am going to refer to the record. In the course of our investigation we discovered that Postmaster Brown intended to make extensions in sections of the country, and that this was to be done just before he went out of office.

Immediately we brought the matter to his attention, and he replied that he intended to do no such thing. Rumors persisted, however, and we called the Postmaster General before our committee. The Postmaster General, among other things, said that he had in mind taking care of a number of very necessary sections of the country. He said he had in mind making Buffalo the air mail hub of the country. I told him I was not interested in Buffalo's securing added air mail service from him at that time. I told him that it was not only poor sportsmanship on his part, but it was unethical for a man going out of office to make such extensions to the service, to incur added obligations which would have to be carried out by his successor, I said, "at this particular time, with the appropriation bill pending in the Congress, you are going to place the entire air mail in jeopardy, and I ask you not to do that."

The appropriation was reduced by the House and eliminated entirely in the Senate although the Postmaster General said that these extensions would make more friends for the air mail in the Congress. I had the committee adopt a resolution and I brought the resolution to the floor of the House, with a report from my committee asking that the Postmaster General be prevented from giving Buffalo or any other city added service at that time. The resolution reads in part as follows:

Whereas it has been reported that the Postmaster General in the closing days of his administration contemplates the issuing of new air mail route certificates, new air mail contracts, and the extension of existing air mail contracts, some of which will provide for service that will parallel and duplicate service now given by existing lines; and

Whereas before further contracts or extensions be made it is desirable that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House, which has been authorized by House Resolution 226, be given an opportunity to complete and submit its report on the subject of air mail; and

Whereas this committee, after holding exhaustive hearings and making a complete survey of the air mail lines, is now about ready to transmit to the House its findings, together with such recommendations as it believes will prove beneficial: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Postmaster General rescind such action as he has already taken in connection with issuing new air mail

certificates, contracts, or extensions until such time as the committee, which has been authorized by the House of Representatives, submits its report.

I did everything within my power to stop him and yet he could not be stopped.

His actions brought on our present difficulties. They resulted from his administration of the Watres Act. Up until the enactment of the Watres Act the air mail in this country was operated under the Kelly Air Mail Act. The Kelly Act gave the air mail carriers a specific amount of money for a specific poundage of mail carried, but Postmaster General Brown, anxious as he was to develop the service, changed it from a poundage basis to a space basis.

The Watres Act was brought before our committee and hurriedly rushed through without sufficient consideration. Together with my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. MOREHEAD] I filed minority views against it, and with the support of Representative KELLY of Pennsylvania we had the bill taken from the calendar. It was amended so that limitations which would govern the administration of the act were inserted in the bill. One limitation, for illustration, prescribed that the Postmaster General should limit the payments to passenger planes to 40 cents a mile. The trouble with the administration of the law was this: We gave authority in the bill to effect consolidations, and to grant extensions, but we prescribed specifically that competitive bidding be maintained. The Postmaster General read the bill as it was finally passed and interpreted it as though it was the bill he originally sent to Congress. In my judgment he exercised to too great an extent the authority to grant extensions and effect consolidations. He forgot all about that provision that limits the amount paid to passenger-carrying ships to 40 cents per mile, or that provision pertaining to competitive bidding. True, they had conferences in the Postmaster General's office, and, while the contractors are at fault, yet the principal fault lies with the Postmaster General. He called those conferences, and if any air mail contractor defied him, he would not be allowed to carry the mail, and so, while they contributed to some extent to their present predicament, there are extenuating circumstances; they can be found all through the maladministration of Postmaster General Brown. If he agreed with our committee and sponsored the strict interpretation of the law, we would not be in the difficulty we are in today, and while Members may blame the Army or the Post Office Department, the blame, in my judgment, goes back to the former Postmaster General and to no one else.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the gentleman from New York, he has now consumed 45 minutes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I shall consume no more time and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. In view of the time, would it not be better to adjourn and continue consideration of this bill tomorrow?

Mr. MEAD. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brown of Kentucky, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7966) to authorize the Postmaster General to make temporary contracts for carrying the mails by air, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S.J.Res. 80) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International

Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held May 12 to May 19, 1934, inclusive.

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

Mr. SNELL. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what this resolution is.

Mr. DISNEY. As in all of these general exposition resolutions, it provides that the President, by proclamation, may invite the various nations and individuals to participate in the exposition.

Mr. SNELL. And then we have said that if the President authorizes that, we have to pay a part of the expense?

Mr. DISNEY. No. This resolution provides that the Government shall not be liable for any expense.

Mr. SNELL. I would like to have a full explanation of the matter and would like to see a copy of the resolution. I think if resolutions of this importance are to be called up, we should have notice of it, and they should not be brought up just as we are closing at night. If the gentleman will hold that over until tomorrow, it is very likely there will be no objection to it.

Mr. DISNEY. I will be glad to withdraw the request at this time. The reason for the emergency is that the time is getting rather short.

Mr. SNELL. One day will not make any difference.

Mr. DISNEY. Not a bit.

Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the request at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

BONUS—BONDS AND BONDAGE

Mr. DEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a statement which I gave to the press today in connection with my signature on the bonus petition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I gave to the press today in connection with my signature on the bonus petition:

At the request of the press I gladly state my reasons for signing the petition to discharge the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in consideration of the bonus bill.

In the first place, I stated in my platform on which I was elected that I believed one of the best ways of putting money in circulation would be to pay the adjusted-service certificates. My action is therefore in harmony and in line with my printed platform. The bonus bill provides for the issuance of sufficient currency with which to pay the adjusted-service certificates without the issuance of bonds and without interest charges to the Federal Government.

With approximately \$25,000,000,000 outstanding in Federal bonds at the present time and with the impending necessity of issuing several additional billion dollars' worth of bonds, the cash of the country is rapidly being taken out of the channels of trade and is being placed in these Government securities. The Federal Government is now contemplating that it will shortly be necessary for the Federal Government to go into the banking business in order to get money in the channels of trade. Agriculture, commerce, and industry require money as a medium of circulation, but the investment of billions of dollars in bonds in almost every county and State in the Nation is seriously handicapping the recovery of the administration's program.

Again, billions of dollars have been loaned to banks, insurance companies, railroads, and many other corporations, in addition to enormous appropriations to public works, civil works, the Army and Navy, and additional millions have been appropriated for direct doles. All of these appropriations either come out of the Treasury or are being raised by the issuance of tax-exempt securities in which the rich are placing their money and on which little or no taxes are paid. Bonds to the holders mean dividends, but to the masses and to the great majority of the people they mean bondage.

The adjusted-service certificates, if paid with new money as provided in the bill, can be placed in the Treasury as a basis for the issuance of the currency. They represent the honor and obligations of the Federal Government, and when due they can be canceled and the currency issued against them redeemed if necessary. To say that they are not bona fide security for the new currency to be issued against is to discredit the faith, honor, and credit of the American people and the Federal Government.

Still another reason why I signed the petition is that committees in the House of Representatives frequently pigeonhole, kill,

and destroy bills, which are of interest to the American people. Of course, committees must necessarily consider legislation referred to them. However, the power and authority to study bills, make investigations, and hold hearings does not empower them to sit as a court of equity in their "holier-than-thou" attitude and destroy legislation by failure to report measures to the House of Representatives. A measure should stand on its merits on the floor of the House of Representatives and not be killed in committee rooms.

Another important reason which prompted my action is that something has been done for practically every class and group of people except the taxpayers. All of the billions we are now spending means multiplied and increased taxes, not only in the present but for a generation or two yet unborn. Onerous and burdensome taxes are the yoke that is tied around the neck of every citizen. If people cannot pay the present tax burdens, bond issues and other public assessments for government, how is it to be expected that they can suddenly pay these enormous increases in taxes?

Again, payment of the adjusted-service certificates will place \$2,927,676.90 in my district, as follows: Appling County, \$161,099.40; Atkinson County, \$83,417.40; Bacon County, \$85,365.40; Brantley County, \$83,426.50; Coffee County, \$238,841.90; Cook County, \$136,863.10; Camden County, \$76,689.80; Charlton County, \$53,010.10; Clinch County, \$84,881.50; Irwin County, \$147,607.90; Jeff Davis County, \$98,227.80; Lanier County, \$62,799; Lowndes County, \$362,927.40; Pierce County, \$151,516.50; Telfair County, \$181,463.70; Wayne County, \$153,028.70; Ware County, \$321,351.80; Glynn County, \$234,740; Echols County, \$33,202.40; Berrien County, \$177,216.60.

The statute of limitations of Georgia's Constitution restricting bond issues to 7 percent of the assessed valuations of property has made it practically impossible for Georgia to acquire any of the Public Works funds. Also, either because of apparent discrimination against Georgia or a lack of understanding of the needs and requirements of citizens of Georgia, little consideration has been given by the Public Works Administration. Georgia will be required to pay its share of all the billions that have been spent throughout the country and from which it is receiving an infinitesimally small allocation. The payment of the adjusted-service certificates will therefore guarantee an equitable distribution of the proposed billions yet to be spent.

Following the policy and procedure of the Federal Government, counties, cities, and States have piled up enormous bond issues. The situation is so serious that there was passed at the last session of Congress the Wilcox bill, no. 5954, empowering counties, cities, and special tax districts to appear in bankruptcy courts for the purpose of scaling down and obtaining relief from their indebtedness. Two thousand and nineteen counties, cities, and special tax districts in the United States are now faced with bankruptcy. This situation is working an undue hardship on the remaining towns, cities, and counties which are solvent and which are trying to carry on. Credit is wholesome and when properly used is an asset. However, debt is a hard master, and there is a limit to the amount taxpayers will submit to. That limit has been reached in many instances.

I am supporting the administration and have done so on 99 percent of all legislation. I will continue to support the administration and to uphold the program of President Roosevelt, whose every energy and ambition are directed toward recovery and permanent perpetuity of our great Nation. If a Member of Congress is to be censured with slander for having an opinion of his own or trying to uphold his oath of office and to represent his constituency on an honest and conscientious basis, then representative government is imperiled with a threatening and impending collapse.

If the President insists that he will veto the measure should it be enacted by Congress, then I shall not be one to cause or bring about any embarrassment. If he firmly states that he will veto the measure, I will do as I have heretofore done, comply with his request and support his viewpoint, sacrificing my own official convictions, in order that his program may be given a sufficient opportunity for hopeful and successful restoration of normalcy.

It is my hope, however, that the President will permit consideration of the legislation. If he instructs the leaders of the House and Senate that he will veto the bill, then I will not vote for it. What I am hopeful for is that we shall soon emerge from the midnight of despond and shall presently come into the dawn and light of a new day, and to this end my every effort has been pledged.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2660. An act to amend the Radio Act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, as amended (44 Stat. 1162); to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on February 21, 1934, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 890. An act for the relief of Henry M. Burns;

H.R. 5241. An act to authorize the settlement, allowance, and payment of certain claims, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5242. An act for the relief of William C. Campbell;

H.R. 5243. An act to provide for the reimbursement of Guillermo Medina, hydrographic surveyor, for the value of personal effects lost in the capsizing of a Navy whaleboat off Galera Island, Gulf of Panama;

H.R. 6370. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near South Omaha, Nebr.;

H.R. 6492. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N.Y.;

H.R. 6794. An act authorizing the State of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Delaware River at a point between Easton, Pa., and Phillipsburg, N.J.;

H.R. 6799. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Weldon Spring, Mo.;

H.R. 6909. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.;

H.R. 7291. An act authorizing the city of Hannibal, Mo., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Hannibal, Marion County, Mo.; and

H.R. 7928. An act to amend subsection (b) of section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a corporation to aid in the refinancing of farm debts, and for other purposes", approved January 31, 1934.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 23, 1934, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

(Friday, Feb. 23, 10:15 a.m.)

Hearings continued on H.R. 6462 (grazing bill) in room 328, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE, RADIO, AND FISHERIES

(Friday, Feb. 23, 10 a.m.)

Hearings on H.R. 7800 in the committee room.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Friday, February 23, 10 a.m.)

Continuation of hearings on national securities stock exchange bill, H.R. 7852.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

360. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the First Annual Report from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (H.Doc. No. 261) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8046. A bill to provide a penalty for the knowing or willful presentation of any false written instrument relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the Government with intent to defraud the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 829). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H.R. 5013. A bill for the relief of the Omaha Indians of Nebraska; with amendment (Rept. No. 830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H.R. 5633. A bill to permit relinquishments and reconveyances of privately owned and State school lands for the benefit of the Indians of the Acoma Pueblo, N.Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H.R. 5911. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cancel restricted fee patents and issue trust patents in lieu thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H.R. 5912. A bill for the benefit of Navajo Indians in New Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. House Joint Resolution 278. A joint resolution to amend Public Act No. 81 of the Seventy-third Congress, relating to the sale of timber on Indian land; without amendment (Rept. No. 834). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1807. An act to provide for the exchange of Indian and privately owned lands, Fort Mojave Indian Reservation, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 835). 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. BROWNING: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4398. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, consider, and render judgment on the claims of Edward F. Goltra against the United States arising out of the taking of certain vessels and unloading apparatus; with amendment (Rept. No. 828). 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. BULWINKLE: A bill (H.R. 8206) to resume payments in presumptive cases disallowed by special boards and to modify the provisions pertaining to eligibility for domiciliary or hospital care, including medical treatment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM: A bill (H.R. 8207) to provide for the establishment of regional industrial credit corporations by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILL of Alabama: A bill (H.R. 8208) to provide for the exploitation for oil, gas, and other minerals on the lands comprising Fort Morgan Military Reservation, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: A bill (H.R. 8209) to amend an act entitled "An act granting a charter to the General Federation of Women's Clubs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FERNANDEZ: A bill (H.R. 8210) for the relief of Mrs. G. A. Brannan; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H.R. 8211) granting insurance to Maybelle M. Hannan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOEPEL (by request): A bill (H.R. 8212) for the relief of Samuel J. Scharf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOIDALE: A bill (H.R. 8213) granting a pension to Mrs. Leslie C. Karn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: A bill (H.R. 8214) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to

hear and determine the claim of Marion L. French; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H.R. 8215) granting an increase of pension to Mattie Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H.R. 8216) granting a pension to Jennie Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 8217) granting a pension to Irene H. Holbrook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H.R. 8218) for the relief of Raymond John Wrinn; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2490. By Mr. AYRES of Kansas: Petition of citizens of Wichita and Newton, Kans., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 2000 and its companion bill in the House; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2491. By Mr. CARPENTER of Kansas: Petition of Chloe M. Willis and 19 others of Manhattan, Kans.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2492. Also, petition of Walter H. Flagg and 69 others living in and around Manhattan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2493. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the National Marine Cooks, Stewards, Head and Side Waiters Association, Inc., New York City, approving and urging the enactment of the Wagner-Costigan antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2494. By Mr. HOWARD: Petition of members and friends of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Plainview, Nebr., protesting against war and preparation for war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2495. By Mr. KINZER: Resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kennett Square, Pa., petitioning for higher moral standards for films entering interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2496. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Stephanie Braun, 120 Broadway, New York City, protesting against the National Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2497. Also, petition of National Marine Cooks, Stewards, Head and Side Waiters Association, Inc., New York City, urging the enactment of the Wagner-Costigan antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2498. By Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut: Petition of Albert T. Pierson, president of the Railroad Employees and Taxpayers' Association of Connecticut, and 37,718 citizens of the Third District, protesting against the unjust, unreasonable, and discriminatory operation of inadequately regulated and taxed busses and trucks engaged in transportation, and against the subsidizing with public funds of any form of transportation, and further petitioning that suitable laws be enacted to prevent this unjust discrimination of agencies of transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2499. Also, resolution of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in New Britain, demanding complete repeal of the Economy Act of March 20, 1933, and immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2500. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Construction Workers' Industrial Union, regarding labor conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2501. Also, petition of the teachers of Granite City Community High School, of Granite City, Ill., requesting immediate financial aid for the schools of Illinois; to the Committee on Education.

2502. Also, petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2503. Also, petition of the city of Manila, P.I., regarding Philippine independence; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1934

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Again, our Heavenly Father, Thou art a blessed Providence, manifesting mercy in rich abundance. May we rejoice in Thy loving kindness and thank Thee for the precious gifts of life. We bear our country to the throne of prayer. O, let that glorious day come whose recovery shall be more than the tremulous twilight upon the hill-tops. May it be a radiant splendor bursting from the noon-day sun, lighting up the dark, discouraged, and remotest parts of every section. Compassionate Father, again the Congress is in sorrow; a fine and splendid type of public servant has fallen. Do Thou bend down under the great burden of the afflicted loved ones; may they rest in the sublime trust that He who made us will order all things aright. Blessed be Thy holy name for all the treasures that are to be revealed in that hour when the day star shall dawn beyond the hills. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6574) to make inapplicable in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands certain Federal laws relating to intoxicating liquors.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6951) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 90. An act for the relief of Mick C. Cooper; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 176. An act for the relief of Harry Harsin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 254. An act for the relief of Fred H. Cotter; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 405. An act for the relief of Anna W. Ayer, widow of Capt. Asa G. Ayer, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 489. An act for the relief of the J. M. Dooley Fireproof Warehouse Corporation, of Brooklyn, N.Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 620. An act for the relief of Catherine Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 828. An act to prevent professional prize fighting and to authorize amateur boxing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1401. An act to pay a gratuity to Emma Ferguson Starrett; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1430. An act for the relief of M. Thomas Petroy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1506. An act to amend the United States mining laws applicable to the Mount Hood National Forest within the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1516. An act for the relief of Michael Bello; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1568. An act to repeal certain provisions of the act of February 25, 1929, entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes", and the act of July 3, 1930, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and prior