

POSTMASTERS

NEW JERSEY

Norman H. Deshler, Belvidere.
 George W. Karge, Franklinville.
 Anthony De Staffen, Haskell.
 Vincent P. Meade, High Bridge.
 Wilmer Lawrence, Milford.
 Joseph A. Wolfrom, Mount Holly.
 Joseph F. Dempsey, Paulsboro.
 Theodore H. Reed, Pennington.
 William T. Snyder, Pittstown.
 Edward J. Shea, Rochelle Park.
 Christof Lindenmayer, Stirling.
 Alger H. Alpaugh, Succasunna.
 Timothy J. Lyons, Westwood.

SOUTH DAKOTA

James P. O'Neill, Spearfish.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Infinite and eternal Spirit, Thou of the crosier and the cross, it is sweet to know Thy whisper, to hear Thy still, small voice and the secret of the opening lips, to see Thy leaning face, to feel Thy pressing hand and the touch of Thy finger. Father of mercies, grant unto us these heavenly blessings. Enlarge our spiritual perceptions that they may be replete with the wonders of the soul. O love us and trust us, and may we ever love and trust Thee. Stimulate us with knowledge and with wisdom to apply it. Blessed Lord, forgive us our sins, dismiss any undue rivalries, unworthy ambitions, and petty jealousies. We pray Thee to link us with the big things of life; arouse us with eagerness to hallow in Thy name all that we do. Each day help us to guide and bless the common good of the Republic, whose servants we are. In our Savior's name. Amen.

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

AIR MAIL CONTRACTS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 932) authorizing the Postmaster General to extend certain air mail contracts for a further period not exceeding 6 months, to insert the following title to conform to the amendments of the House of Representatives, namely: "An act to postpone the effective date of certain restrictions respecting air mail contracts."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there has been promulgated lately by the Department of Agriculture order nos. G20A and T8½T, which take absolutely control of all the game and fish within the boundaries of the national forests. Seventy-two percent of the area of the State of Idaho is within the national forest. The State of Idaho has established a

game department. We propagate fish and game; we have hunting and fishing laws and charge a license for fishing and hunting. Under the operations of these orders, three-quarters of the game within our State, much of which has been propagated by the State, is taken over by the Department of Agriculture through its operation of the Forest Service. They can declare open and closed season according to their will, without any reference to the Idaho law. The Legislature of the State of Idaho has gone on record in this matter and is presenting a memorial to the House of Representatives asking for relief from these orders.

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

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Congress has conferred all these powers on the executive departments, has it not?

Mr. WHITE. They have conferred some powers on the executive departments which in my opinion should be restored to the National Legislature.

Mr. SNELL. As a matter of fact, the States have no more rights under laws which permit of this procedure.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a memorial from the State of Idaho.

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

There was no objection.

The memorial referred to follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Franklin Girard, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial no. 8 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the twenty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Idaho, and filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Idaho February 11, 1935, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all endorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise, the capital of Idaho, this 11th day of February, A. D. 1935.

[SEAL]

FRANKLIN GIRARD,
Secretary of State.

Received and filed February 11, 1935.

FRANKLIN GIRARD,
Secretary of State.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 8

(By Fish and Game Committee)

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Whereas, on the 29th day of March 1934, the Department of Agriculture of the United States propagated its orders numbered G20A and T8½T, by which the Department of Agriculture seeks to take to itself as against the rights of the State of Idaho and its State Fish and Game Department the absolute and exclusive control of all fish and game lying within the boundaries of national forests; and

Whereas by such orders vast areas of land and a majority of the waters in this State containing game fish are affected; and

Whereas by the said orders the labors and expenses heretofore incurred by the State of Idaho and its Fish and Game Department for the protection and propagation of fish and game are and will be largely nullified; and

Whereas the said orders have been held unlawful by the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of the State of Idaho, and are a manifest violation of the spirit of the Admission Bill by which the State of Idaho became a part of the Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the said orders G20A and T8½T issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, under date of March 29, 1934, be, and they are hereby, expressly disapproved and condemned; and be it further

Resolved, That the Department of Agriculture of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully urged to withdraw the said orders; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forthwith forwarded by the secretary of state to the United States Department of Agriculture, to the President of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 7th day of February 1935.

G. P. MIX,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 8th day of February 1935.

TROY D. SMITH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial no. 8 originated in the senate during the twenty-third session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

MORRIS STACY,
Secretary of the Senate.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. PARKS, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5913) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

Mr. PARKS. 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. 5913) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

Pending this motion, Mr. Speaker, if agreeable to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON], I ask unanimous consent that general debate run throughout today and perhaps up to 2 o'clock tomorrow, the time to be equally divided, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON] and one-half by myself.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of requests for time. I think we should wait until 2 o'clock tomorrow and see what the situation is at that time.

Mr. PARKS. That is perfectly agreeable.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas.

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. 5913, the War Department appropriation bill, 1936, with Mr. HILL of Alabama in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as may be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, considering budgetary principles, and I think all of us are agreed that, apart from strictly recovery demands, it is essential that we arrive at a balance between income and outgo at the earliest practicable moment, I should say that the bill which we are presenting, generally speaking, is a very creditable measure.

We have not gone as far in several directions, it is true, as some would have us go, but I think I may say that we have gone just as far as those identified with or responsible for the conduct of Government feel that our finances warrant. In other words, much of the urge upon us, and much of the importuning to which you Members have been subjected during the pendency of this measure in the committee, has come from persons and organizations concerned more with some particular phase of the military budget than with other phases of that budget or with the Federal Budget as a whole. According to the old adage, "a man cannot serve two masters"; neither can he serve special interests or selfish interests and all of the people.

I should like to make this further observation before addressing myself to the essential features of the bill. As to what I shall say, I am confident you will not hear a single dissent from any informed quarter. Any person who makes a study of the military budget in all its phases must come to but one of two conclusions. If it be the purpose to maintain a well-rounded efficient Regular Establishment, officered and recruited at proper strength, adequately and modernly

implemented, and fortified by reserves of personnel and matériel in number and quantity determined to be essential, we must reconcile ourselves to a military budget calling for vastly more than the budget here presented. How much more I should not be willing to hazard a guess.

On the other hand, if our people are unwilling to be taxed to support a larger military budget, then, just as promptly as possible, we should write another national defense act prescribing new strengths for the Regular Establishment and the civil components, new training programs, implementation programs for training, and reserve programs, all with the view to a balanced organization of the highest efficiency that the probable annual outlay would afford. There is no balance now, I can assure you.

I am not prepared, nor do I wish to take the time now, to elaborate upon that subject, but I feel that I should neither be fair to you nor to myself if I did not reveal my reaction after the studies I have made.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, carries more money for the Military Establishment than any War Department appropriation bill enacted since the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, except the Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1931. I should qualify that statement perhaps. No money is carried in this bill for Army housing. Some of the prior bills did carry considerable sums. Eliminating the money from prior bills for that single object, you will find the statement I have made to be correct.

For both the Army and Navy the 1936 Budget exceeds by about \$100,000,000 the largest regular annual appropriations made for national defense since the enactment of the Budget law.

For the military section of the bill, including the Department here in Washington, the Budget carries \$317,459,277. That sum exceeds current appropriations by \$48,815,548. Subtracting pay restoration, \$9,969,012, the increase is \$38,846,536.

Approximately 76 percent of that amount is allocated to matériel betterment, as indicated on page 6 of the report. The remainder is traceable to service-pay adjustments, increased commodity costs, ammunition owing to availability of P. W. A. funds the current year, travel, and a larger program for field exercises.

There is ample justification for every single item. There would be ample justification for millions more, I have no hesitation in saying, if the organization of the War Department's plans visualized is to be the basis of our future policy. But, even if not, I cannot point to a single item the Budget has increased that will not be needed or that could be affected by a less ambitious and less costly set-up. The committee has not disturbed a single one of the projects enumerated on page 6 of the report, with the possible exception of new airplanes, to which I shall refer later.

Ever since the responsibility rested upon our former esteemed and distinguished colleague, the Honorable Ross Collins, of directing the preparation of the War Department appropriation bill, the committee's policy has been that, with only a certain sum available for devotion to the military arm, every dollar possible should be earmarked for matériel betterment. I wish you would read what General MacArthur has to say as to our shortcomings, on pages 2 and 3 of the hearings.

However, Mr. Chairman, despite this substantial Budget increase, which, as I have said, is mostly in matériel directions, your committee was importuned from many sides to superimpose upon the Budget increase, very largely for or on account of personnel, not a temporary but an enduring annual charge approximating \$30,000,000, a portion of which, I might add, would later occasion the expenditure of a large additional sum.

The Chief of Staff himself urged some of the increases. Practically all of them, I might say. The National Guard Association was quite insistent that the guard's budget be enlarged. Various military organizations and associations had representatives appear before the committee urging larger appropriations for the civil components. Lastly, some of my esteemed colleagues presented pleas.

The more prominent of the propositions urged that would occasion the added expense I just indicated are:

An increase in the enlisted strength of the Regular Army from 118,750 to 165,000.

Before enumerating the others, I might say that General MacArthur laid the greatest stress upon this item. He gives it highest priority.

The others are:

The first increment of 5 annual additions of 400 commissioned officers.

A larger amount for the repair and preservation of military posts and stations.

A larger amount on account of fixed defense.

An increase of approximately 16 percent in the total amount estimated for the National Guard, including 5,000 additional enlisted men.

An increase for active training of Reserve officers.

An increase for extending the camp training of Reserve Officers' Training Corps students.

An increase in the number of citizens' military training camp trainees.

Provision for conducting the national matches.

Mr. Chairman, unquestionably each of these propositions has merit. Our problem was twofold. First, the money to finance them. Your committee was absolutely opposed to assuming responsibility for exceeding the President's Budget.

I may say that this bill is within a half million dollars of the Budget, although providing almost everything that was asked for by anyone interested in national defense.

Second. The committee's position of the past that a proper balance must needs be maintained between personnel and matériel with only so much money to go around and within which the Army's portion must be found. Of course, it must be borne in mind that the latter is a matter not wholly within the jurisdiction of your committee.

Every single proposal is within the law, and in some respects well within the law. Unless the law be rewritten in conformity with the thought I expressed at the outset of my remarks to accommodate our military preparation to a restricted pocketbook, we shall be confronted continually with demands unfounded upon a well-ordered and balanced military budget.

We have resorted to compromise to solve our dilemma. We have carefully examined the Budget recommendations with view to effecting adjustments within the total thereof that would occasion no hurt and at the same time finance, in large measure, but to a lesser extent in some instances, the demands I have mentioned which are extraneous to the Budget and which have been stressed the most. In consequence of that course the measure we bring to you is within the total of the military chapter of the Budget and at the same time will—

First. Meet every demand of the National Guard.

Second. Provide 14-day training for 20,000 instead of 16,000 Reserve officers.

Third. Provide 42 days at camp for Reserve Officers' Training Corps students.

Fourth. Permit of resumption of the national matches upon a slightly reduced scale.

Fifth. Allow the Air Corps to order 97 more planes than would be possible under the Budget.

Sixth. Permit of a larger expenditure than would be possible under the Budget upon the upkeep of military posts charged to the Quartermaster.

Of course, we could not find the money to finance the increases advocated in the enlisted forces of the Regular Army and the National Guard. Whether or not they should be made, wholly or in part, taking all things into consideration, I am not prepared to say. These two proposals alone would involve something like \$23,000,000. Our proposal is to provide indefinite appropriations, vesting discretion in the President as to whether or not all or any part of the increases advocated should be made. Owing to the President's expressed wish that his Budget be substantially adhered to, it would seem particularly appropriate at this particular time

to allow the President to choose between added enlisted strength and added expense.

Therefore, this bill, unless the President elects to increase the enlisted forces of the Regular Army and the National Guard, will not occasion the withdrawal of a single dollar from the Treasury during the fiscal year 1936 beyond withdrawals permissible under the Budget.

If you will turn to page 8 of the report you will find on that page and on page 9 the details of the procedure contributing to that result.

I see no occasion to elaborate on many of the items embraced by that statement. The first five items relate to the War Department here in Washington. As to them, our action results in a net reduction of \$7,712.

Dropping down to the reduction of \$96,780 under "Pay of the Army", you will see by turning to page 156 of the hearings that it is planned to have 76 medical officers drawing flying pay next year. The Navy only has two medical officers with flight orders. There is no rhyme or reason for the Army's liberal policy, and the committee has included in the bill a provision limiting the number to five, or three more than the Navy has.

While on this question of flying pay it will be recalled that last year a provision was inserted in both the Army and Navy appropriation bills limiting flying pay to nonflying officers above the grade of captain to the rate of \$1,440 per annum. Many nonflying captains in the Army, owing to the slow rate of promotion, receive flying pay well in excess of \$1,440. The result is as to that group that they are drawing more flying pay than nonflying officers senior to them as well as nonflying officers of their own rank. In order to correct that situation we have amended the provision at present operative so as to make \$1,440 the maximum rate for all nonflying officers.

Turning to page 9 of the report, the first increase of \$5,000 is small but quite important. It was quite well established by the various inquiries made at the last session and subsequently respecting military and naval aviation that it was essential that a number of aviation technicians should be developed in the interest of better production and procurement. This increase, which was asked of the Budget and refused, is in keeping with the recommendations growing out of such inquiries.

The increase of \$500,000 under "Barracks and quarters" is the first item we meet with of the increases urged upon the committee that did not have Budget support. Of the Budget estimate for "Barracks and quarters" but \$383,800 is allocated to the maintenance and repair of buildings which the Quartermaster General must look after. These have a value of \$176,500,000. The Budget allowance is less than one-fourth of 1 percent. Even with the increase the committee is recommending the amount is ridiculously low. Of course, it may be that some reconditioning funds may be allotted from recovery funds, but that is entirely problematical at this time.

Then we come to the first sizable amount we have been able to utilize in financing some of the proposed increases. I refer to the \$3,000,000 decrease shown under the Air Corps.

When the Budget went to press it was understood that the approved Air Corps estimate would be adequate for the procurement of 547 airplanes for the Regular Army and 25 for the Organized Reserves, the latter to be financed out of the appropriation for that component. It has since developed, based upon more recent probable cost data, that the estimate is no more than sufficient to buy 450 planes for the Regular Army and 19 for the Organized Reserves. The procurements estimated happen to be identical with the estimated number of washouts during the fiscal year 1935 (hearings, p. 550, pt. I). Hence, if predictions be accurate there will be no gain at the end of the fiscal year 1936 over the number—1,367—of serviceable planes estimated to be on hand at the end of the present fiscal year.

On the basis of 1,854 as the lawful allowance, exclusive of the National Guard, of serviceable planes and planes undergoing overhaul, the plane shortage on July 1 next and a

year thereafter will be 487. The shortage under the Baker Board allowance will be 782.

The committee is advised that all of the reduced number of planes will not be delivered prior to July 1, 1936, and that therefore \$3,000,000 of contract authorization might be substituted for a like amount of appropriation. This the committee has done, coupling with the authorization, however, an additional authorization of \$4,686,753, which, it is understood, will finance the cost of the numbers—547—and types of planes, including spare engines, which the Budget intended should be procured for the Regular Establishment. Under this course there will be at least some gain over attrition. In no other respect has the committee touched the total of the estimate for 1936.

While on the Air Corps I shall take occasion to mention two other changes we are recommending. We are proposing to pinch off a little sooner than otherwise would happen the lighter-than-air activities in the Army, apart from free balloons. There is \$601,142 in the Budget on account of lighter-than-air projects (hearings, p. 601, pt. I), exclusive of pay of military personnel. Twenty officers and 611 enlisted men are engaged with this activity. The lighter-than-air equipment is listed on page 590 of the hearings, part I. The committee's action is directed at reconditioning and prolonging the life of a number of relatively small semirigid airships. The enlisted personnel and the funds, in the committee's judgment, would be better employed in the heavier-than-air branch.

The current appropriation act requires the transfer from the Regular Army to the National Guard of 76 airplanes of the observation type, together with \$155,582 of the 1935 appropriation for the Air Corps for the maintenance and operation of such planes. To date 32 planes have been transferred. The National Guard does not desire any more. Therefore, the committee has inserted in the bill a provision that will render further compliance unnecessary.

I may say that the recent disaster which we had to one of our great rigid airships out on the Pacific Ocean had nothing to do with the committee's judgment in this matter. Long before this disaster, which very fortunately took the lives of but two men, our committee decided that these were non-essential and that the Army could get along without the great dirigibles which have been so expensive to the United States and which have cost so many lives. Our committee decided we would refuse to appropriate one single dollar for these dirigibles and balloons that have been such a miserable failure in the Army and Navy of the United States, unless this House demanded a policy to the contrary.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. One of the reasons that forced the committee to that conclusion was testimony of high officers to the effect that dirigibles are most vulnerable, and that any little bomber can put them out of commission.

Mr. PARKS. I think the gentleman, as usual, has stated the matter correctly.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JONES. Does not the gentleman think, then, that helium should be released for commercial usage, or for use by foreign governments?

Mr. PARKS. Of course, my opinion in reference to that matter would not be of any great value. The gentleman knows that a few years ago, and I think his State is the only State that produces helium, we had quite a contest in reference to confining the helium to these balloons or dirigibles. Of course, it has been of great value because of its nonexplosive character, but just what value it would have as a commercial project I am unable to say. If we abandon the use of these dirigibles, the Government will have no use for the helium, and it may be released.

Mr. JONES. The only reason that the exportation of helium was embargoed, and the only reason it was not released for commercial purposes, was because it was considered a national-defense measure.

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. JONES. If dirigibles are to be abandoned, it seems to me there should be no objection to releasing the helium for any commercial use to which it may be put or for use by any other government. We will still control the supply. The gentleman understands that other nations have wanted to purchase it for use in their dirigibles, of which they seem to have made somewhat of a success. The gentleman remembers that much of the terrorism over London during the war was caused by air raids during the night by dirigibles. If the use of dirigibles is to be abandoned by this country, I wondered if the gentleman had any reason to advance why the helium should not be released for commercial, scientific, or other use.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, the subcommittee that handles the War Department appropriation bills cannot formulate a policy on this matter for the Congress. After all, the Congress itself must formulate the policy, and the Congress has not yet formulated or expressed a policy.

Mr. JONES. I understand that; but Congress has adopted a policy to limit the helium to military and naval uses.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about the use of dirigibles. The Congress has not yet adopted a policy with reference to disuse of dirigibles.

Mr. JONES. It was largely at the instance of the gentleman's committee, the Naval Committee, and the legislative committee that a limitation was put on helium that it should be used only for military and naval purposes. The gentleman's committee, by abandoning that program, has seen fit to change the policy or to recommend this change, and it follows if the gentleman recommends the change, at least the question of removing the restriction should be gone into.

Mr. BLANTON. This committee merely provides the money for projects authorized by Congress. The policy, after all, must come from the legislative War Department committee through a bill passed by the Congress.

Mr. JONES. I agree to that proposition; but the gentleman knows that much of the legislation arises by virtue of questions that are brought up in connection with the appropriation. For this reason I wondered if the gentlemen in deciding that this policy should be abandoned, and when they considered recommending to the House the abandonment of a policy that carried as its corollary the restriction, did not feel they should go into the question of releasing those restrictions along with it?

Mr. BLANTON. I think that should come from the legislative committee, of which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] is chairman.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman has announced a policy of the Appropriations Committee relative to their attitude in regard to Army dirigibles, as I understand the situation. Does the same attitude and policy prevail in reference to Navy dirigibles?

Mr. PARKS. No. I only turned aside to explain that that was my own idea; but I do not think the Appropriations Committee has undertaken to lay down a policy, if you might term it such. They simply declined to make any appropriation at this time for these dirigibles. Of course, you may draw your own conclusions. Congress is the only one that has a right to lay down a policy.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is correct in that position; but I thought he had some testimony before his committee on this particular subject, and I wondered if they voluntarily made any suggestion as to that policy.

Mr. PARKS. Not as to helium gas.

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

Mr. PARKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WILCOX. I was much interested in the gentleman's statement and his reference to the tabulation of figures on page 9 of the report with respect to the appropriation for the Air Corps. Do I understand from the gentleman that it has been necessary to reduce the number of planes to be contracted for under that item?

Mr. PARKS. No; let me explain what we did. We were advised they could not expend that amount of money within the next year, so we then provided for a reduction of \$3,000,000. They can proceed to contract for these planes and obligate the Government for the expenditure of the money, but they will not need the money until after another session of Congress meets. This does not interfere at all with the program and it would be simply appropriating money that would lie idle for a year.

Mr. WILCOX. And it does not mean a reduction in the number of planes for the Air Corps?

Mr. PARKS. Not at all.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. I am not meaning to be presumptuous at all in this inquiry, but does the United States Government own the various helium plants, including, for instance, the one at Fort Worth, Tex.?

Mr. PARKS. I do not think the Government actually owns the plant, but I shall have to ask somebody who knows more about that than I do. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has always taken a great deal of interest in this matter and was instrumental in having the Government adopt helium and we have made an annual appropriation for it; but whether the Government actually owns the helium plant I do not know.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. I asked the question because I have been personally concerned in the operation of these plants in the State of Texas, although I live in Mississippi.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I may say that the Government owns the plant at Fort Worth and it is operated by the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. PARKS. I thank the gentleman for the information.

NATIONAL GUARD

And speaking of the National Guard, the next increase of any consequence in the schedule of money changes we have proposed relates to that activity.

In several respects the Budget is unsatisfactory to the National Guard, and, after hearing General Leach and the National Guard Association, your committee unanimously concluded that there was ample basis for the Guard's position. We are all agreed, I hope, that this component must have an efficient, effective status.

You will find on pages 20 to 23 of the report a rather full explanation of the changes we are recommending affecting this most valuable body of citizen soldiery. I shall enumerate for you the projects we have increased and the amount by which each has been increased: Compensation of caretakers, \$544,140.

I may say to you here that the Government has \$125,000,000 of property in these armories with very few caretakers. The report that came to us was that men like Dillinger and his crowd had broken into these armories and had stolen machine guns, ammunition, and revolvers. They met with very little resistance because of a lack of caretakers to protect this \$125,000,000 of property. We thought this was a very small outlay of money and I think the House will readily agree we ought to have somebody there to take care of this property.

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

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. Such an incident occurred a day or two ago in the gentleman's own territory.

Mr. PARKS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BLANTON. And if my colleague will permit, that occurred after this bill was marked up. They broke in and stole a number of rifles, and a lot of ammunition.

Mr. PARKS. That is true.

Attendance upon military service schools.....	\$200,000
General expenses, including maintenance and operation of motor vehicles.....	30,826
Armory drill pay.....	510,006
Articles of the uniform.....	475,000
Musical instruments.....	5,000
Miscellaneous quartermaster equipment and supplies....	48,013
Ammunition.....	200,000

Purchase of:	
Horses.....	140,000
Tanks.....	475,000
Helmets.....	121,540
Total.....	2,749,525
Subtract for a lesser amount than estimated of receipts from surveyed property.....	75,000
Net increase.....	2,674,525

The increase for caretakers will provide employment for approximately 1,000 men at \$50 per month each. The increase is urged because of the thefts that have occurred, particularly of firearms from armories, and also to prevent or check the spread of fires. These additional men, while primarily for protecting State and Federal property, will be occupied in the care and preservation of such property.

The increase respecting service schools will enable more officers and enlisted men to be sent to Regular Army service schools. Manifestly this is of paramount importance to the efficiency of the National Guard. This item, it will be recalled, was increased last year by the Congress, at the instance of the committee, in order that one National Guard officer from each State might be sent to the gas school at Edgewood. The Budget estimate would care for about 144 officers and 105 enlisted men.

The general expense and armory drill pay items are related. The Budget provides for 46 armory drills. These two amounts will take care of the added expense of providing two more, or 48 all told.

The increase of articles of the uniform will provide a total for that purpose of \$1,225,000. The shelves in the warehouses practically are bare, the committee is advised; so much so, in fact, that a portion of the appropriation proposed to be available immediately will be used for the purchase of clothing, shoes, and quartermaster supplies.

The increase of \$48,013 will be augmented by free issues from the Regular Establishment to the value of \$101,987, not contemplated when the Budget was prepared.

For ammunition, with this increase, there will be available a total of \$1,400,000. This year the guard is operating almost entirely with P. W. A. money, and under the pressure for economy it has drawn rather heavily upon the not too generous supply that was in the possession of some of the States.

The increase for horses will permit of the purchase of approximately 1,000 animals. The estimates provide for foraging 5,500 horses during the next fiscal year.

The increase for tanks grows out of the action of the Congress last year in outlawing motor-propelled vehicles of wartime vintage. This left the National Guard's 15 tank units without equipment. This money will provide each of these units with one of the new tanks adopted by the Regular Army and possibly more if some of the equipment, not immediately essential, were omitted from those supplied the National Guard.

Lastly, the additional amount of \$121,540 is to enable the guard to be outfitted with helmets in lieu of the present style campaign hat. This change is advocated by the National Guard Association. Owing to the estimated lesser cost for maintenance and replacement, the National Guard Bureau estimates that the cost of completely supplying the guard with a helmet would be wholly amortized in less than 4 years and after the fourth year would result in an annual saving of \$54,460 (hearings, p. 411, pt. I).

Mr. Chairman, these several increases, in conjunction with the indefinite appropriation we are proposing to enable the President, at his discretion, to add 5,000 men to the guard, would create an expenditure program for the guard of \$5,126,125 in excess of the Budget estimate.

I shall be both surprised and chagrined to hear from any quarter a request for a single penny more. In that I am sure I voice the sentiments of every member of the subcommittee which framed this measure. The only really non-essential item, in my judgment, is the helmet item. The money is made available for the substitution if it be determined to make the change. If not, the money can be used to advantage in buying other needed equipage.

ORGANIZED RESERVES

For the Organized Reserves the Budget contemplates summer camp training for 16,000 Reserve officers, which is the number provided for by the current appropriation.

In all respects, save 14-day training for Reserve officers, the Budget would seem to be quite liberal, considering the great importance at this time of holding down ordinary expenses of Government. The committee believes that the number to be given 14-day training should be increased from 16,000 to 20,000, and is providing for the latter number in the accompanying bill. The Reserve Officers' Association is urging thirty thousand 14-day trainees.

We have a total of 88,107 active Reserve officers—hearings, page 463, part I. Of this number 59,708 are of the "arms." It is vitally more important that this group should have training than the group attached to the "services." In practice, of the total given training 90 percent or more are officers of the "arms."

It should not be lost sight of that on December 31 last the number of Reserve officers in charge of the C. C. C. camps was 5,848. When the C. C. C. enrollees are doubled there will be need to use approximately twice as many Reserve officers. To the extent that rotation is practiced, as it is in some corps areas, some 12,000 or more Reserve officers will get this sort of active duty during the fiscal year 1936. It is not in any sense military duty, but as testified by The Adjutant General a year ago the experience materially increases the value of Reserve officers to the Government, since it gives them valuable training in mobilization processes and leadership.

Assuming that the entire number of assignable Reserve officers are so situated that all will be able to devote the time to take active duty training, which is a wild assumption, and considering the fact that 16,000 are receiving training this year and will not be eligible for training next year, 20,000 trainees will come within giving active-duty training for the 2 years to all but 26,308 of the group charged to the "arms." Continuing the 20,000 program next year the prospects are that all who will be able to respond to the call for training will have been given training over a 3-year period. If handled properly, such a program of training would give each assignable officer of the "arms" two camps during each 5-year-enrollment period.

It should be borne in mind that the committee's action conforms with the recommendation of the War Department to the Bureau of the Budget that training be provided for 20,000 Reserve officers.

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

The chief source of supply of Reserve officer material is the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. The law contemplates that advanced-course students of senior units shall be sent to a 42-day training camp. The Budget provides for but 28 days. In practice, students go to camp between their junior and senior years. The estimate contemplates that there will be 7,200 of them. The additional amount necessary to extend the camp period to 42 days is \$137,958.

The committee believes that the military training a 28-day camp would sacrifice and the bad psychological effect it would have upon students at present enrolled, who either this year or in the coming years may be participants in this training, more than outweigh the importance of effecting a saving of \$137,958, and it has restored that amount to the bill.

NATIONAL MATCHES

The last military increase applies to the national matches. By act of February 14, 1927—United States Code, Supplement VII, title 32, section 181a—it was provided that there should be held an annual competition, known as the "national matches", for the purpose of competing for a national trophy, medals, and other prizes to be provided, together with a small-arms firing school, which competition and school should be held annually under such regulations as might be prescribed by the Secretary of War. Pursuant to that law \$500,000 was appropriated annually up to and including the fiscal year 1932. Since then the matches have not been held and appropriations have been confined to

carrying out the provisions of the National Defense Act charging the Secretary of War with the responsibility of promoting rifle practice among able-bodied male citizens, which is accomplished through the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. The Board organizes the riflemen of the country into clubs and for their instruction maintains target ranges, provides ammunition, rifles, range equipment, and instructors.

The national matches proved a genuine incentive to riflemen to become expert marksmen. To be selected as a competitor in the national matches was the ambition of all devotees of small-arms firing. Selected teams from civilian clubs, from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, the civilian components of the Army, police teams, and so forth, formerly congregated at Camp Perry, Ohio, and engaged in shooting competitions at various ranges with different weapons and in different firing positions. The urge for their revival has been very strong ever since their discontinuance. This year the committee is assured that by practicing most rigid economy it will be possible to conduct the matches with an appropriation of \$350,000. It has yielded and has included that amount in the accompanying bill.

NONMILITARY

Now, dropping down to the nonmilitary in the schedule of money changes, you will first see a reduction of \$195,000 applying to the flood-control project, Sacramento River.

This is a cooperative project. Under the law Federal expenditures are required to be matched by contributed funds. It was because such contributions were not coming forward in proportion to Federal funds previously appropriated that it was unnecessary to provide any appropriation for the present fiscal year. In 1934 the contributions only amounted to \$301,295.60. According to the Budget, it is estimated that they will amount to \$805,000 during the fiscal year 1936.

The Federal appropriation recommended in the Budget for 1936 is \$772,256. It appears, however, that unused Federal funds on July 1 next will give a total availability of Federal funds of \$1,000,000. Since the Budget has estimated contributed funds at \$805,000, the committee has reduced the estimate by \$195,000 to bring the amounts that will be available from the two sources into balance.

SOLDIERS' HOME

The increase of \$80,000 for the Soldiers' Home is coupled with a legislative proposal. Owing to the provisions of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, the United States Soldiers' Home, situated in the city of Washington, is required after the present fiscal year to operate within appropriations annually made by Congress, except that the Home, by the terms of such act, intentionally or not, was left free to use the interest which it receives upon moneys to its credit on deposit in the United States Treasury. Next year this interest, it is estimated, will amount to \$90,000.

The Budget estimate for the maintenance and operation of the Home for 1936 is \$719,349. The estimate has had Budget scrutiny and has been examined by your committee. However, besides this amount, under existing law, the Home would be permitted to expend, without such scrutiny or examination, an amount approximately 11 percent of the total of the estimate. The committee can see no logic in such an arrangement and has increased the Budget estimate by \$80,000 and is proposing an amendment requiring such interest, effective July 1 next, to be appropriated annually.

PANAMA CANAL

The last item in the list of money changes shows a reduction of \$1,100,000. The Panama Canal, independently of the Panama Railroad Co., sets aside annually out of funds available to it for maintenance and operation a reserve for replacements and repairs, which it is free to use without action by Congress. There was a balance in this reserve fund on June 30 last of \$5,148,394. Since June 1930 the largest annual withdrawal was \$1,845,347. The Budget contemplates that the Canal administration shall use \$1,000,000 of this reserve fund for objects usually appropriated for in addition to the amount of the Budget estimate. Partly to finance the increases it is proposing, the committee's

recommendation touching the Panama Canal contemplates the use of the further sum of \$1,100,000 of this reserve fund.

That completes, Mr. Chairman, all, I think, I need say at this time respecting the money changes made by the committee and of the mode of financing the increases that have our recommendation.

I should like, briefly, to draw attention to two or three matters touching commissioned personnel.

RETIREMENT OF OVER-AGE OFFICERS

No phase of the Military Establishment needs correction more than the officer personnel. As pointed out in the committee's report on the 1935 appropriation bill, at that time 2,816 young men had entered the Army from West Point since 1920 and not a single one of them had gotten beyond the grade of first lieutenant. It was because of that intolerable situation that the committee's proposal was adopted directed at the retirement of a limited number of over-age officers, thus giving some of the West Point graduates an opportunity to move up the scale before over age should overtake them, if it had not already done so. The result of that action will about double for the present fiscal year the normal average annual attrition rate of approximately 300. Details respecting this matter of separations are given on pages 117-119 of the hearings, part I.

Until there is legislation providing for the orderly advancement in rank of Army officers based upon an appropriate age in grade arrangement, the committee believes that this piecemeal fashion of reaching the matter should be continued, which, as previously stated, had the approval of the Congress a year ago. The provision, therefore, is renewed under "Pay of the Army" on pages 9 and 10 of the accompanying bill.

The Department takes the position that this mode of procedure will be no longer workable because the same yardstick is applied in determining the physical fitness of the youngest officer in a company grade—all grades, in fact—as to the oldest officer therein. As a general proposition, that procedure negatives the theory of gradation of essentially military officers. Section 1245 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 931) provides:

When any officer has become incapable of performing the duties of his office, he shall be either retired from active service or wholly retired from the service, by the President, as hereinafter provided.

"Office", as used in the law, it is submitted, does not mean the particular job to which an officer may happen to be assigned. It has reference to his rank or grade. In this connection, in an Attorney General's opinion it was held that to be "incapable" an officer must be either no longer responsible for his own actions or subject to infirmities or disabilities which make the reasonable performance of his military duties impossible for him. "Military duties," as there used, it is further submitted, comprehends all classes of military duty that may attach to any rank or grade.

Of course, this is not an ideal approach to the problem, and the proposal no doubt will meet with opposition from those potentially subject to its application, but the course has a very wholesome effect upon that large group of West Point graduates who are marking time growing old in the grade of first lieutenant. As to expense, the difference between active pay and allowances and retired pay of officers over age in grade will more than cover the active pay and allowances of a replacement second lieutenant. Possibly it would be well to couple with the provision a requirement that a certain proportion of the resulting vacancies shall be filled by Air Corps training center graduates.

In this connection I might say that a bill has been presented by the War Department looking to the correction of the stagnated promotion situation in the Army. Hearings have been held upon the bill in another body, and, I understand, the bill, with certain amendments, is about to be reported. I just want to say this: That bill insures promotions, but it does not forcibly take anyone off the active list. The method of accomplishment is liberalized grade distribution. Over-age officers, many absolutely unqualified for field duty or general detail, will be permitted to remain on the active list until automatically retired for age by operation

of law and will be advanced in rank, although true, with little advancement, if any, in pay, because the pay they are now receiving is all out of proportion to what it would be if there were a proper flow of advancement through the several grades.

By providing for promotion of officers through elimination of officers found unsuited for general detail, it is demonstrable that in the great majority of cases the saving between active and retired pay would meet the cost of new material coming in at the bottom. In my judgment the bill to which I have reference is not the proper solution to the Army's personnel problem. It is not in the interest of acquiring an efficient organization of commissioned officers.

One of the best informed men who ever sat in this House upon military matters is our beloved colleague from South Carolina, Mr. McSWAIN, who is Chairman of our Committee on Military Affairs. I earnestly express the wish and the hope that he will give this matter his attention and work out a solution, even if it costs more, that will give us a list of active officers of ages commensurate with their grades.

I wish to address myself now to another personnel subject.

The committee has been urged to lift the 12,000 average limitation upon commissioned officers. The authorized officer strength is 12,403. The motive primarily is to make it possible to increase the number of officers attached to the Air Corps. Owing to the virtual standstill of flying equipment, it being estimated that airplane washouts during the fiscal year 1936 will equal accretions, it would seem unsound to add to flying personnel already too numerous for the flying equipment available. Furthermore, the committee doubts if the House would wish to add more than one-fourth of the entire authorized Air Corps strength—1,485—of flying officers at one time, which would constitute a hump for many years to come. The proposal does not have the approval of the Chief of the Air Corps.

As previously suggested, the committee is not aware of any reason why the Air Corps cannot get its quota in proper increments through the medium of the arrangement again proposed forcibly to retire over-age officers. The vacancies thus created in excess of normal attrition would be more than adequate to accommodate an Air Corps increment of the proper size.

NEED TO INCREASE NUMBER OF WEST POINT CADETS

In this connection it should be stated that the time is fast approaching when separations for age, without special stimulus, will be well in excess of available West Point material. This is apparent in the age table on pages 109-110 of the hearings, part I. In order to be prepared for that situation the number of appointments to West Point immediately should be increased. The committee would have provided for one additional appointment in the accompanying bill if the rules permitted. The additional annual cost, if this were done, when completely effective, would be \$863,870. For the first year, one-half of that amount probably would suffice. That amount could be added to the accompanying bill, as presented, without exceeding the Budget. It should be further stated, in connection with this matter, that the Chief of Staff indicated to the committee that he would be "perfectly willing" to drop his advocacy of an immediate expansion in commissioned officer strength if provision were made to increase the number of cadets at West Point.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes all I feel called upon to say at this time about the bill. I do wish, however, before taking my seat, to express my deep gratitude to my colleagues on the subcommittee who have labored long and diligently with me in the consideration and preparation of this measure. We had no party or other kind of division in our committee; nothing but the very closest cooperation and teamwork. I wish publicly to express to them my keen appreciation of their splendid constructive aid and support.

I thank you for your patience.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Does the bill appropriate for any additional National Guard personnel?

Mr. PARKS. The National Guard want 10,000 additional personnel. We have provided for 5,000 additional this year if the President shall agree to it; in other words, it is in the discretion of the President. We not only provide for 5,000 additional for the National Guard if the President shall approve it, but in addition to that, we provide for 165,000 men of the Regular Army and 14,000 officers if in the discretion of the President this should be done. In other words, the President being the Commander in Chief of the United States Army, we felt that with the Budget in the condition it is, we could very well trust the President of the United States to increase the personnel if he saw fit to do so.

Ordinarily, Mr. Chairman, this is a measure that is a very controversial one. This year the committee has been most fortunate in having not only men of splendid character and splendid ability, but men who were anxious to work for the public good.

We have on our side of the table the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], the distinguished and able gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], and the distinguished gentleman from California, a man who is very greatly interested in national defense [Mr. Dockweiler], and we are extremely fortunate in that on the other side of the table we have the able, patriotic, and diligent leader of that committee on the Republican side, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON], and with him the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS]. I want to say to you gentlemen that as rare as the breed is, there is not a man on earth that can go into that committee and find out whether the distinguished gentleman from Ohio or the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey is a Republican. We have labored together shoulder to shoulder and I may say to you that while we do not agree on every item in this bill, you are going to find two as patriotic men as ever stood in the well of this House when they discuss this measure.

But I have not told you yet where the brains of the committee are. I have not told you the man who does more to shape the national defense than any man in the United States, from the Chief of Staff down. We have as the clerk of this subcommittee our distinguished friend, Mr. Pugh. He has a character as pure and sweet as that of any woman and he has a disposition that will attract anybody on earth to him.

But above all that, he is one of the ablest men I ever knew in my life. When Jackson fell at Chancellorsville, Lee is reputed to have said that Jackson had lost his left arm, but Lee had lost his right arm. If Mr. Pugh goes out of the service of the committee, the committee will not only lose both of its arms but also its head. [Laughter and applause.] We owe him a debt of gratitude.

Now, gentlemen, one other thing I want to say. I might say that I am a pacifist, but I believe in national defense. [Applause.] The United States Army would be of no value if we had a million men and no guns. It would be of no value if it had 100,000 guns and no soldiers. Every war from the beginning of time has been won by man power. If I had my way, I would give the country every single soldier that they wanted. [Applause.]

In the last 4 or 5 years the man at the head of our Army has measured up to the men who have previously been at the head of the Army.

I want to give another cadet at West Point to every Member of Congress. I hope when this bill comes back from the Senate it will give us another cadet for each Member of Congress so that we can have a proper number of officers.

The Chief of Staff said to me:

You know, 4 years from now, if we do not recruit our officers, we will not have enough to head a parade.

General MacArthur says if you will give another cadet at West Point for each Member, that at the end of 4 years he will have all the officers he needs for 165,000 men.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. And in doing that the institution is prepared now without extra cost to train another cadet for each district?

Mr. PARKS. That is right.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAVERICK. Does not the gentleman believe that we have veterans, graduates from military colleges, who are all ready to go into the Army as officers?

Mr. PARKS. That may be true, but as I recall American history we have had only two or three great generals who did not come from West Point.

Mr. MAVERICK. How about General Funston and George Washington?

Mr. PARKS. There was no military college, no West Point when George Washington was at the head of the Army.

Mr. MAVERICK. How about General Wood?

Mr. PARKS. I want to give you my opinion of General MacArthur. I think he is one of the greatest soldiers that America has ever produced. [Applause.]

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

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If the officers who have been great, who did not have the advantage of going through West Point, had been given the advantage of training there, would they not have been that much greater officers?

Mr. PARKS. The gentleman has stated the whole case. Suppose Nathan Bedford Forrest had had a West Point education. I do not reflect on any man who did not have the opportunity to go to West Point, but I do say that the greatest soldiers this world has ever known were graduates of West Point. I asked General MacArthur what he thought of West Point as a training school for officers. He replied that if West Point had given only two men, Lee and Grant, to the country it would have justified every dollar that the American Government has ever spent upon it, and I agree with him.

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

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I am interested in the statement of the gentleman to the effect that he is a pacifist, although he qualified that by an immediate statement that so far as he is concerned, he would give to the United States Army all the men that is needed, and all the money that is needed. Lest the gentleman be misunderstood, I take it that he believes as I do, that adequate preparation for war is the surest guaranty of peace.

Mr. PARKS. I think the gentleman is right. I was here in 1921. I went down to the Pan American Building and there saw and heard the representatives of the great nations in that disarmament conference. I listened to them as they talked about disarmament, the day after we buried the Unknown Soldier out yonder in Arlington. I heard them say, "We are not going to have any more war." I saw them shake hands across the table, and then go back home and begin to build up their armies just as they are doing today. We went out to sea and saw them sink battleships that cost nearly \$50,000,000, that a sailor's foot had never touched, and we thereby left ourselves impotent and unable to defend ourselves today. Go talk to the men who know, if you want to see where we are. Go talk to the man our President has sent across the sea to discuss with those men over there what they are doing. I say to you that today you are on a volcano, abroad and at home. We cannot longer deafen our ears or blind our eyes. One hundred and sixty-five thousand men! Not enough to put down a strike or quell a riot. I do not want to build up any great Army. Just as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] has said, the surest way to maintain peace, as the great Teddy Roosevelt said, "is to speak softly and carry a big stick." You can heed the voices of the men of our Army. I admire them, all that I have known, and never from the day that our Constitution was written, and from even before, did the men who wear the uniform of the American soldier ever fail us in time of need. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I have been interested in the gentleman's remarks about increasing the enlisted strength of the Army to 165,000 men. I think we are all interested in the provision on page 10, which makes such an increase discretionary with the President.

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am wondering if the gentleman would support an amendment which I assume will be offered by some member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and which would make that provision mandatory?

Mr. PARKS. The committee discussed that at great length, and here is what we thought about it. We are not running wild in turning over everything to the President, as much as we admire him and as great as we think he is, but as the Commander in Chief of the Army, if he believes that he can so handle his Budget as to pay for 165,000 men, we think we ought to trust him with it. That is our attitude.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman is aware of the provisions of a bill reported favorably by the Committee on Military Affairs, after a unanimous vote, to increase the enlisted strength of the Army in five annual increments of 10,000 each, the cost of which would be not over \$10,000,000 a year.

Mr. PARKS. The committee thought that while under the National Defense Act we are authorized to increase the Army and provide for it in this appropriation, if the Committee on Military Affairs today should bring in a new bill directing the building up of this Army, we would be perfectly willing to bring in an appropriation that would cover it, but as our Budget is in such distress we felt we ought to leave the matter in the hands of the President.

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

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. Did I understand the gentleman to say this bill carries \$500,000 less than the Budget estimate?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. Then in view of the fact that the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, and men like Newton D. Baker, General Pershing, as well as the House Committee on Military Affairs, believe in an increase of 50,000 enlistments, spread over 5 years, why, inasmuch as the bill has a leeway of \$500,000, can we not take care of that number of men for this year?

Mr. PARKS. Here is what we have done. The gentleman knows that the Panama Canal is in business, and that it makes money. They have a reserve fund I think of \$3,000,000, which they have not been able to spend. We are taking out of that reserve fund \$1,000,000 to help care for this Budget.

In addition to that, as I said a moment ago to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Wilcox], we have taken \$3,000,000 off of the fund because they cannot spend it this year. We authorize them to go ahead and contract for those planes, but they are not able to spend the cash, so we let them go ahead with it and will appropriate next year.

Mr. WILCOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. Gladly.

Mr. WILCOX. I am very much interested in the development of the National Guard. I know the gentleman is interested in providing the National Guard with certain observation aviation. Was that provided for in this bill?

Mr. PARKS. Yes. Last year, I think, we provided for the planes for the National Guard. This year about the only thing we have done in addition to what we did last year was to give them two more drills. Last year they had 46 and this year they get 48.

Mr. WILCOX. There has been no increase in the provision for observation aviation, has there?

Mr. PARKS. I do not think there has been any increase. That is my recollection.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, after the statement of the able chairman of our subcommittee, I question whether it is necessary for me to go into the details of the bill, because he has explained the situation very well to the Membership of the House. There are a few observations, however, that I should like to make about the bill, and I am going to confine myself to two or three subjects only.

At the outset I desire to say that I and my colleague on the minority side appreciate the very great courtesy that the chairman and majority members of this committee have extended to us. Our hearings have been rather long. We have worked arduously, but during all of our activities there has been real harmony between us. As the chairman said, there were many times when we did disagree on various subjects, and there are one or two items in the bill that I personally am rather disappointed that the committee has not acted upon otherwise. Just the same, the result of our actions is incorporated in the bill, and I can say that I think the bill as a whole is a rather good presentation of the requirements of the War Department under limitations of the Budget.

Let me explain our problem. The War Department presented to the Director of the Budget estimates for the activities of the War Department for 1936 amounting to \$80,000,000 in excess of last year's appropriation bill. Those estimates were cut by the Director of the Budget by approximately half, or \$40,000,000. So that the estimate was presented to us \$40,000,000 less than requested by the War Department but, on the other hand, approximately \$40,000,000 greater than the Congress appropriated last year. Our problem was to fit the requirements of the War Department into that reduced Budget.

The War Department requirements fall into two great heads. One, the matter of personnel, and the other the matter of equipment. May I say right here I dislike to disagree with my chairman, but I believe he said that after all was said and done, war was won by man power. I call attention to the fact that, at least in modern warfare, war is largely dependent on fire control, and by rifles or artillery. There was a great statesman who once said we could raise an army of a million men overnight. That statement, I believe, was pretty well disproved in the last war. We know that we had sufficient man power, but it was the matter of training, matériel, and equipment which caused the delay to the United States Army 17 years ago.

First, I want to comment on the matter of personnel and then go to the equipment or matériel portion of our bill.

Although the National Defense Act calls for enlisted strength in our Regular Army of 280,000 enlisted men and 18,000 officers, Congress has for several years held appropriations down to permit of only 12,000 officers and 118,750 enlisted men, in addition to which there are approximately 6,400 Philippine Scouts provided for. Throughout the testimony, both of the Chief of Staff as well as other officers of the War Department, from the Annual Report of the Secretary of War, and the recent report of the Baker board, great stress and emphasis is laid on the necessity of increasing the enlisted strength of the Army to 165,000 men. This feature has been called to the attention of your committee many times by General MacArthur and, in fact, he has been emphatic in his statement that this increase is the most imperative of all the requirements of the Army today.

In the hearings, tables are shown indicating the strength of the Army as constituted today, but it may be interesting to note in connection with those that of our total strength there are in the continental United States approximately 91,000 enlisted men and 10,500 officers, whereas in the Insular Department, or the Philippines, Hawaii, and Panama, we find enlisted strength of approximately 35,350 with an officer strength of 2,320; this in addition to the 6,364 Philippine Scouts in the Philippines. However, of these figures we find in the United States a tactical, or field force of only approximately 50,000 men and 10,000 officers, a strength which

the Chief of Staff comments upon as being less than three times the number of men on the metropolitan police force in New York City, where there are approximately 21,000 policemen on duty. The detective force of the Federal Government today amounts to practically 23,000 people, whereas the whole Regular Army of the United States is less than three times that number.

The war strength of a division is today considered as 20,000 men. At present we have in continental United States 3 skeletonized divisions and 6 weak brigades, averaging 6,000 and 2,000 men, respectively, 1 division being located in the East, 1 in the Southwest, 1 on the western slopes, and none in the central portion of the United States. The increase so much desired in enlisted personnel would permit of bringing a fourth division in the Central States and putting the Regular Establishment in much better position to meet any contingency. The committee is fully in accord with the request of the War Department and of the staff in this matter, but the Director of the Budget has seen fit to reject this proposal, which was originally submitted with other War Department estimates sometime ago.

Testimony has been given that the increase desired of 46,000 men might well be handled over a 4-year period. The committee has considered the appropriation of an additional amount to cover the first increment of 12,000 men, but, realizing the necessity of keeping within the Budget allotment, has made an indefinite appropriation for this purpose instead of directly appropriating the amount required for the initial increase. In my judgment, it is regrettable that Congress has not taken definite action in this respect, but under the circumstances the committee has certainly indicated its belief in this requirement, and it is desired to see this policy put into effect.

I, for one, believe such action is most desirous in these times of internal dissension, but when we consider that in case of difficulties our Regular Army stands between us and danger until the larger forces of the country can be mobilized, we should realize the necessity of having at least a well-organized, if meager, force ready for action. I heartily agree with the recommendations of the Chief of Staff, and trust that action may be forthcoming in the not distant future whereby our Army is on the footing desired.

I have spoken of the military personnel of the Army, the proper provision for the pay of which has been taken care of in the current bill on the basis of reservation of full pay. In addition, we have a large personnel of civilians employed by the Army—23,345 with our military establishments, 19,528 with our nonmilitary establishments, the latter class being largely connected with activities under the direction of the Engineer Corps or the Panama Canal. In all, the personnel connected with our Military Establishment approximates 177,500 individuals. The current bill carries appropriations amounting to over \$141,000,000 for pay of the Army, over \$70,000,000 for pay of the civilian employees in both military and nonmilitary establishments, or a total of \$211,500,000 out of the entire appropriation is required for the pay of those connected with our military establishments.

In addition to the above we have a National Guard, who, in addition to the allowances made to them by the States, are paid by the Federal Government for drill and for their period while in camp. The expenses carried in the current bill for pay of 48 National Guard armory drills is estimated at \$13,828,000, and for expenses at camps of instruction and field training at \$5,375,000, which should be taken into consideration when estimating the total pay roll of our military establishments. Further than that are the Organized Reserves, the estimate for which this year amounts to approximately \$6,000,000, making another addition; consequently, we find that a very large part of the appropriations for the War Department are made up of pay for services.

While commenting on the strength of the Army in addition to our regular forces we find the National Guard provided for at a strength of approximately 180,000 and a Reserve Corps with officers on active-duty roll of approxi-

mately 85,000. In both instances the quota enrolled today is materially less than that designed in the National Defense Act.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLTON. I shall be very glad to.

Mrs. KAHN. Is not the ratio of our Army to our population almost laughable compared with the ratio of army to population in other nations of the world? Ours is almost like a toy army.

Mr. BOLTON. Yes; but I do not think the gentlewoman from California wants to see the Army of this country on the same basis as the Army of France, or the former Army of Germany.

Mrs. KAHN. Not at all, but I would like to see it bear a fair proportion to the population. It seems to me a standing army of 165,000 to 168,000 men is not too large to provide for; and this should be done by Congress without delegating its powers to some other authority. It seems to me it is our duty to exercise this power ourselves rather than to make another delegation of power.

Mr. BOLTON. I am very much inclined to agree with the lady.

Mrs. KAHN. How much would it cost to appropriate for such an army as that recommended by the General Staff and as desired by the committee?

Mr. BOLTON. Approximately \$21,000,000; and the Chief of Staff has testified that he would be glad to have that increase in four increments; in other words, over a 4-year period.

Mrs. KAHN. It could be done over a 4-year period; it need not be done at once.

Mr. BOLTON. Or it could be done through the provisions of the Thomason bill which has been referred to and which calls for the increase over a 5-year period.

Mr. THOMASON. And the cost of which would be only \$5,000,000 additional a year.

Mr. BOLTON. Yes; according to the testimony of the Chief of Staff. However, with an indefinite appropriation the President has the right to increase the number of men as he sees fit up to 165,000 men. On the other hand, if the committee had carried this \$21,000,000 in the bill, this increase would not be possible unless the President should instruct the Secretary of War to increase the Army. So it is really six one way and half a dozen the other way.

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

Mr. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I call the gentleman's attention to the language on page 10 regarding this discretionary appropriation. It reads:

Together with such additional sums as may be necessary under this and other appropriations contained in this act to defray the cost of increasing in the discretion of the President—

And so forth.

If the President were to decide to increase the Army over and above the number provided for in the pay item, would he have to decrease some of the other items carried in this bill in order to do so?

Mr. BOLTON. If I understand the gentleman, the wording of the indefinite appropriation is for the purpose of allowing the President to increase the Quartermaster Corps and other supply corps proportionately.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But where would he get the money?

Mr. BOLTON. From the indefinite appropriation; from the Treasury, of course.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If it does not inconvenience the gentleman from Ohio—and I assure him my inquiry is a friendly one—

Mr. BOLTON. I know the gentleman's interest in the War Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The appropriation made by the Congress for the support of the standard departments of Government are all specific. Surely the President could not take any money appropriated for the State Department, for the Treasury Department, or for the Department of Agriculture and use it for the increase of the Army. It would seem,

therefore—and I want this clarified, in my own mind, at least—that the only moneys which the President could use, if he decided to increase the Army, must be taken from emergency appropriations.

Mr. BOLTON. Yes; I assume that is exactly where they would come from—from the \$4,000,000,000 that is now under discussion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOLTON. I shall be very glad to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I take the liberty of calling the attention of the gentleman—perhaps it has already been done—but at least to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that if the President is to depend upon emergency or temporary appropriations for money with which to increase the Army of the United States, then the instant those appropriations lapse, or this 2-year period during which the \$4,000,000,000 is to be expended comes to an end, the Army drops downhill right away, and we will have accomplished nothing except as a temporary measure during the period while the President is using emergency moneys. So we are not changing the military policy of the United States by adopting this amendment, except for the moment.

Mr. BOLTON. Except this: In my judgment it would seem that the policy of the President in increasing the Army in this way would almost be a mandate to the next Congress to increase the regular War Department appropriation bill to meet the increased personnel.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that was just in line with a question I was going to ask the gentleman, if undoubtedly it would not be a mandate to the Seventy-fifth Congress to have this increase taken care of in the regular annual appropriation bill for this Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My own view is that the Congress should issue the mandate. [Applause.]

Mr. BOLTON. I am not in disagreement on that.

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

Mr. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. PARKS. I am sure the gentleman must have misunderstood the statement of the gentleman from New York, because almost the first line in the bill contradicts the statement the gentleman has made. This does not come out of any emergency fund, but it comes out of this common fund in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and certainly would not have to come out of any emergency fund.

Mr. BOLTON. That is quite correct; but, as I understand the situation in the Treasury today, we are faced with a deficit.

Mr. PARKS. Well, those things are imaginary. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman from Ohio—in fact, do not Members of the House generally—feel that it would be much wiser, cheaper, and better in every way, instead of doubling the number of men in the C. C. C. camps of the country, to double the size of our present Army?

Mr. BOLTON. I would not want to go quite as far as that, but I think it would be very fitting to give some of the men of the C. C. C. camps permanent employment in the Regular Army.

Mr. SHORT. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that I asked this particular question of Gen. Douglas MacArthur when he appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs, and his answer was an argument in favor of increasing the size of the Army instead of increasing the number of men in the C. C. C. camps.

Mr. BOLTON. I may add that throughout the testimony of General MacArthur he was most concerned with increasing the Army, as was the Secretary of War, and as is recommended by the Baker Board.

Mr. SHORT. It would cost the Government only one-third as much to maintain a man in our standing Army as it does to maintain a man in the C. C. C. camps. In addition, men would receive better training and better discipline in the

Army, and the country would have the added value for protection in case of emergency.

Mr. BOLTON. And I may say to the gentleman from Missouri that while I am not informed as to the views of the Chief Executive, the committee felt it wiser to give the President this opportunity in this manner than to override the Budget.

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

Mr. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Did the Chief of Staff of the Army recommend an increase in the personnel of the Army?

Mr. BOLTON. He did; yes.

Mr. RICH. Why did not the committee make a recommendation to Congress stipulating certain increases rather than placing it in the hands of an individual?

Mr. BOLTON. Because it has been the practice of the various appropriations committees during this administration to abide by the Budget figures insofar as was possible.

Mr. RICH. Then it was a question of not having the money that caused the gentleman not to recommend an increase in the Army personnel?

Mr. BOLTON. Exactly. The item covering the increase to 165,000 men was stricken out by the Director of the Budget and disallowed.

Mr. RICH. Then we can find \$4,000,000,000 to appropriate for anything that we seem to need in case of an emergency without taking the recommendation of the Army for an increase in their personnel in order that we may have the proper protection that we should have?

Mr. BOLTON. That might be inferred.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COLDEN. Is not the indifference of the public with respect to military preparedness largely due to our geographical isolation and the fact that we have no fear from our immediate neighbors rather than from any pacifist propaganda that may be put out in the country?

Mr. BOLTON. The gentleman may be correct, but I believe that the public today are realizing more and more the value of our Regular Establishment. The Regular Army, of course, is our first line of defense in case of attack from a foreign nation, and it also is our first line of defense in case of internal trouble.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman tell the Committee how many of the 118,000 of enlisted personnel are engaged in nonmilitary duties?

Mr. BOLTON. As I explained before, we have about 35,000 enlisted personnel in our oversea possessions. We have approximately 50,000 men in the various tactical units. The balance are engaged in various capacities in the Medical Corps, Quartermaster Corps, and so forth; but they are all enlisted men.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I know when we go to the War Department, as we frequently do, we always see some of the enlisted personnel in uniform on duty in the various offices. There must be a large number of the enlisted personnel of the Army doing nonmilitary duty, and, as a matter of fact, I for one do not believe that a large number of the enlisted personnel of the Army or the Navy should be engaged in anything other than the duties of that department, so far as activity is concerned.

Mr. BOLTON. I dislike to disagree with the gentleman, but this subject has been before the committee ever since I have been a member of the committee. I think the record shows the number which are engaged in civilian work, but my belief is you will find there is very, very few.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOEPEL. Unless we employ these enlisted men for the duties which the gentleman has indicated, in time of war

we would have to take the entire civilian population to the battle front.

Mr. BOLTON. That is very true in the case of enlisted men that have military duty to perform which may be considered a civilian duty, such as messengers, chauffeurs, and so forth. The War Department did use a number of enlisted men as clerks in days gone by, but I think I am safe in saying that has been largely done away with.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I for one am glad to hear that, and I hope we will totally eliminate that activity among the enlisted personnel.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAVERICK. I want to bring up the point that there are certain clerical forces that have to be with the military forces in time of war, but what does the gentleman think of Army labor being employed for maintenance purposes, such as plumbers, carpenters, plasterers, and so forth, depriving men who have been working at those trades from 10 to 25 years of what they thought was a gainful occupation?

Mr. BOLTON. Under the bill there are many mechanics which are carried and attached to the War Department; men that do exactly the work the gentleman is speaking of.

Mr. LUCKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. LUCKEY. Attention was called to the smallness of our Army a few moments ago, and I would like to find out what is the comparison in the case of our Army with other nations—say, England, France, and Japan?

Mr. BOLTON. I have not those figures at hand, but, of course, it is considerably more.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. What increase for the National Guard is provided?

Mr. BOLTON. In personnel?

Mr. MOTT. Yes.

Mr. BOLTON. There is no increase, except there is the same indefinite appropriation carried in the bill permitting the President to increase up to 10,000 extra, if the President sees fit to do so.

Mr. MOTT. What increase, if any, is provided in the way of training of Reserve officers?

Mr. BOLTON. The Reserve officers' training camps were cut by the Director of the Budget to 16,000 trainees. The committee has increased that to 20,000, as recommended by the War Department.

Mr. MOTT. And what is the number at the present time?

Mr. BOLTON. Sixteen thousand.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Referring to a previous question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], in testifying before the Military Affairs Committee, General MacArthur confirmed the fact that of the 118,000 enlisted strength of the Army only 88,000 are within the confines of the United States, and that the entire Regular Army, as such, could be seated in the Yankee Stadium in New York. Of the 88,000 in the United States, only 57,000 are actually with regular tactical units, and they comprise in strength approximately the same number of men as the New York City police force.

Mr. BOLTON. I may add to that comparison that, as I understand it, we have in our entire detective force all over the United States 23,000 men, and our Regular Army, subject to field duty, is about two and a half times that detective force.

Mr. WOODRUFF. That is the point I was going to make. Of the 118,000 enlisted men in our regular service, there are available in this country today, for actual military service, less than 60,000, and I make the point only for the purpose of showing how pitifully small our Regular Army is when we consider the size of this country and the problems that face us from time to time.

Mr. BOLTON. Correct, but the gentleman from Michigan overlooks the fact that the United States Army today comprises the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserves; and the National Guard of 180,000 men today is very efficient.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I understand that; and I may add in connection with the National Guard that nothing has been said about the material for the National Guard.

Mr. BOLTON. If the gentleman will permit, I am coming to that subject in a moment.

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

Mr. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman tell me what appropriation is provided in this bill for maneuvers, if any?

Mr. BOLTON. I am pleased that the gentleman has brought that up. There is a figure, I think, of \$195,000 carried in the bill for maneuvers this summer. This augments and supplements the figure carried last year for maneuvers of the heads of tactical units which were carried on in New York with such success. This year the War Department wishes to supplement these activities by having the troops themselves work under the men who were trained under the general officers last year.

Mr. CULKIN. Is there any specified area mentioned in the bill for these maneuvers?

Mr. BOLTON. No.

I want to touch a moment on the material or equipment side of the bill.

It is the duty of the committee not only to meet the expenses incident to the service of those attached to the Regular Army but in making available funds for the proper equipment and supplies of that body. In this field, while the Army, Guard, and Reserves are taken care of in part, Congress has during the past few years rather been dilatory in its duty, or at least has not kept step with the requirements which the forces of our establishment, and the demands upon it for keeping in first-class condition have made. Equipment and material is always an important item in the production of an armed force, and without proper equipment forces are not able to function as might be desired or expected.

Insofar as the efficiency of the Army is concerned, a report from the War Department indicates the Army to be in good condition within the limits of available appropriations. The present bill provides funds for continuing the training of the Army as has been conducted in the past, and has provided funds for maneuvers as well as ammunition for practice purposes, and in addition has appropriated a specific amount for field exercises whereby the experiment of last year of having the tactical heads of the various units of one field Army act together under one command, augmented this year by the presence of actual troops.

In equipment and supplies for the troops, funds are provided sufficient to carry on activities as heretofore, and in many instances improved equipment has taken the place of that previously issued. Increases in the cost of subsistence of the Army as well as in other activities of supply are very clear and represent a large part of the increase in this year's bill. In the Quartermaster Corps, for instance, there is an increase of 65 percent in the cost of food and fodder for animals, and this increase in varying amounts is indicated throughout all the bill where matériel or supplies are concerned.

Plans in the War Department call for modernization of equipment for our field forces through mechanization and motorization. Some modernization in our mechanization program has been made, although the amount is overly small in comparison to the total program. The mechanization is being accomplished insofar as funds will permit as rapidly as possible.

The bill presented to us after deducting appropriation for pay increases the previous appropriations by approximately \$39,000,000. Of that amount approximately 75 percent is allocated to matériel betterment, which is an indication of the importance given to this requirement but is indicative

of the relatively small amount of the total bill devoted for this very important purpose.

It is on the matter of supplying matériel, however, that I wish to call the particular attention of Congress. As stated before, appropriations for these two necessities for the successful operations of an army have been seriously cut during the past few years, not permitting the keeping up or replacement of wear and tear which might be expected, but, further, of replacing matériel used. It is true that the appropriations of the War Department have been augmented by P. W. A. funds, but of the large amount placed at the disposal of the War Department we find a great portion of this utilized for construction or housing purposes. Approximately \$100,000,000 has been allocated to the War Department from P. W. A. funds out of \$385,000,000 requested for military purposes. This amount by the P. W. A. might be compared with the request of the Navy Department for practically \$420,000,000 from P. W. A., of which \$318,000,000 has been granted to date.

The General Staff has developed a plan for the mechanization of the Army, which at present contemplates an expenditure of approximately \$31,000,000. For this purpose some funds have been made available in the appropriation bills of the last 2 years, and in addition \$6,000,000 has been allotted by the P. W. A. This year's bill carries an appropriation of \$3,500,000 for this purpose, which is approximately an increase of \$1,000,000 over last year's appropriation. It is significant to note, however, that at the end of the year 1934 there remained a balance necessary to complete the present mechanization program of the War Department of approximately \$23,000,000.

Similarly in motorization, the War Department program for extending motorization to new units or activities, a program which to complete will require approximately \$23,000,000, and in addition \$9,000,000 to replace worn-out vehicles, in all a total of \$32,000,000. Of this, \$10,000,000 has been allotted by the Public Works Authority, permitting approximately 25 percent of the program to be met but leaving a large amount required for completing the program.

Hand in hand with equipment or matériel is the importance of maintaining our establishments in proper condition. Very conservative estimates indicate the Government has invested in grounds, buildings, barracks, roads, and so forth, under the Quartermaster Department, approximately \$400,000,000, and in Government arsenals a sum of approximately \$130,000,000, which includes machinery—a total of well over \$530,000,000. The requirements at a most conservative depreciation charge of 2 percent per annum would indicate appropriations of at least \$10,000,000 for this purpose alone, which ratio has not been maintained anywhere near proper ratio for several years. True it is that P. W. A. funds have augmented the meager appropriations made by Congress, but still this feature of our Military Establishment is causing grave concern. It appears to be false economy to slight or overlook these activities, as the longer they are allowed to go in disrepair or lack of condition, the greater the expense is when the conditions must be corrected. Glaring examples of this are apparent at many of the Government arsenals, as well as the posts and barracks throughout the country. In the past 2 years the P. W. A. has allotted something over \$60,000,000 for construction purposes in the Army, but a great portion of this money has been utilized for new construction and only a small portion made available for maintenance so necessary.

Similarly in the matter of reserves, a policy of cutting appropriations in time of financial difficulties has made itself apparent during the last 2 or 3 years. Under the National Defense Act certain requirements for reserves to properly equip, supply, and maintain the large force of men in time of emergency was called for and both the Ordnance and Quartermaster Departments have attempted to meet this requirement, constantly hampered, however, with limited funds placed at their disposal. When it is realized that in ammunition with the loss to Government from deterioration and lack of proper care because of lack of funds amounting to approximately \$4,000,000 a year, it will be

seen what false economy our desire to hold down appropriations for this purpose means. The War Department requests for sufficient funds to meet the requirement of keeping our war reserves in proper condition and up to date have been constantly cut by both the Director of the Budget and by Congress, and the result has been very readily shown in the deterioration losses.

Under existing law sufficient reserves for emergency purposes in case of war are called for, and the Department has attempted to comply with these requirements, but because of lack of funds has been able to do so only in part. Reference has been made to the fact that many supplies for the C. C. C. enrollees have been supplied by the Quartermaster Department from reserves, thereby creating an unbalancing of those stocks on hand in that department. Similarly, in the Ordnance Department, where the requirements for our operations in times of war demand the tremendous reserves, because of lack of funds, ample facilities or care has not been possible for these reserves.

It is unnecessary to call the attention of Congress to the time necessary to supply ammunition or matériel in times of war, as the experience of 15 years ago clearly indicates the desirability of being up to date and ready to meet such emergency. Under the National Defense Act the Assistant Secretary of War is charged with the responsibility of a close survey and contact with industry for the purpose of utilizing private plants for the purpose of supplying essential matériel in times of need. It is felt that this activity might go further in closer cooperation with industry through the use of educational orders or the active enlistment of certain industries in this problem, whereby the necessity for carrying of these tremendous reserves might be obviated by the preparedness of industry to produce War Department requirements within a short space of time.

An excellent example of what I have in mind is the procedure today under the Chemical Warfare Department, where a certain amount of essential matériel is produced annually by the Edgewood plant, but where a close cooperation with private industry makes it possible for the Chemical Warfare Section to figure with certainty on increased production in times of necessity and in line with Army requirements from those plants. It is needless to go into a discussion of the necessity of proper master jigs, dies, gages, and so forth, in order to make such a suggestion possible with industry. It is essential, however, that these facilities be provided and that Congress appropriate ample funds for this purpose.

The matter of war reserve has been mentioned, and the situation at the suggestion of Congress has been carefully studied by the Department. I still believe that a closer cooperation between industry and the War Department is most desirable and could be effected to the distinct saving of the Government and to the distinct benefit of both the Government and industry. The so-called "educational orders" recommended last year, whereby a certain amount of money spent over the next 10 years with industry for the development of plant and machinery to meet military requirements of matériel within a comparatively short time, would save the Government from the necessity of carrying the tremendous reserves which are now called for, and would not only be of benefit to industry through an opportunity to meet in part Government requirements but would place at the disposal of the Government plants fully equipped and able to perform their part in times of necessity. A continuation of the study for this purpose is highly recommended, and I hope that some day legislation calling for educational orders will be adopted.

Last year I commented upon the necessity of being prepared to supply matériel and requirements of the Army and Navy promptly in times of emergency. Our experience during the past war has indicated full well the many delays and problems incident to proper production and the unnecessary expenses to which we are apt to go without proper preparation. It is unnecessary to go through that same period of adjustment again, provided proper planning is given in times of peace, and while the office of The Assistant

Secretary of War is constantly in touch with industry and while the Ordnance Department has its offices throughout the country for this very purpose, it is still believed that closer cooperation and closer activity between the Government and private industry would greatly overcome this difficulty. A study made last year of War Department requirements as well as a knowledge of those requirements by industry indicated that production should be accelerated by 2 or 3 months if closer attention were paid to this feature. No one denies the ability to finally produce our requirements in times of peace but in times of war it is essential that those requirements be met as promptly as possible, as, however great an army or the number of men called to the colors, it is impossible to handle these men efficiently or with any degree of success unless they are properly equipped. Equipment cannot be secured with the same degree of ease as manpower, and to be successful there must be a well-balanced program of both men and matériel.

Less than a year ago the Baker Board, composed of a group of citizens and civilians headed by former Secretary of War Baker, made their report with reference to the aviation situation of the Army. The report called for, among other things, an increase of planes in the Army to a total of 2,320; recommending the increase of flying hours to 300 per officer and a substantial increase among the Reserve officers. The aircraft program of the Army is rapidly being brought to the requirements of the Baker Board and has been augmented by a substantial appropriation from the P. W. A. Owing, however, to rising costs the full number of planes authorized by the Director of the Budget for purposes during the coming fiscal year was not found possible, and because of this the Appropriations Committee has recommended contract authorization to meet this difference between the number recommended and the number that could be provided with the funds authorized.

Reference has been made previously to the size of the National Guard at the present time. The necessity of bringing up the National Guard to full efficiency in matériel and equipment was emphasized more than once before the committee, and in the judgment of the committee was believed the proper policy to follow instead of attempting to increase the number of personnel at the present time. The bill carries ample funds to meet all of the requirements listed as essential for the maintenance of the guard on an efficient basis. Owing to the efficiency of the National Guard Bureau during the past year a saving was made for the National Guard through the substitution of motor vehicles in place of animal-drawn vehicles, and today with moneys still available the motorization program of the guard, insofar as transportation is concerned, will be practically completed. There still remains the problem of motorizing the artillery of the National Guard, and funds for this requirement have not been contemplated in the bill. On the whole, however, the guard is in a high degree of efficiency. It may be of interest to know that during the past 18 months the National Guard throughout the country has been of very valuable service in meeting local difficulties arising out of labor troubles. In many States the units of the guard have seen many months' service, with the result that their equipment, particularly clothing, is in desperate need of rehabilitation. Funds for this purpose are carried in the current bill. The example of the guard during the past trying months has been a splendid one of efficiency and service, and the value of this organization has been definitely demonstrated.

The Organized Reserves today aggregate approximately 85,000 officers on the active list. The bill under discussion carries appropriations for 14 days' training of 20,000 Reserve officers. When it is taken into consideration that approximately 6,000 officers have been on service with the C. C. C. camps for the past year, and an additional number will be essential with the proposed doubling of enrollees in this service, it will be seen that 10,000 to 12,000 additional officers will be given an opportunity for active duty. The R. O. T. C. contemplates 7,200 students for a 6 weeks' course of

training, and in addition the same number of enrollees is contemplated as last year at the citizens' military training camps.

An interesting feature of the hearings of the Appropriations Committee was in connection with C. C. C. activities and the proposal to double these activities during the coming year. While it is not directly a duty of the War Department, yet the War Department has been charged with the duty of feeding, clothing, and housing these men and general supervision of the camps. The War Department is ready and agreed to assume this continued responsibility, but in so doing it is, of course, desirable to know as far in advance as possible what the plans for this development are. In connection with this activity the War Department has successfully made use of Reserve officers, having utilized the services of approximately 6,000 during the past year, and with the increase of camps and number of C. C. C. enrollees will undoubtedly double that number. Heretofore the officers called for duty for C. C. C. activities have been of company grade, that is, captain or lieutenants, but it is understood in case of the requirement of additional officers attention will be given to those of the Reserve of the rank of major or even lieutenant colonel, with a view to utilizing the experience and ability of those higher officers and giving them an opportunity for the training and service which is so desirable.

Commenting upon the nonmilitary activities contained in the appropriation bill, these are confined almost entirely to the activity of the Engineer Corps and rivers and harbors and flood-control work and the operations of the Panama Canal. This year the soldiers and sailors' home has been placed under the jurisdiction of the War Department Appropriations Committee through the change in permanent and definite appropriations made last year by legislation. It is interesting to know that the river and harbor and flood-control appropriation covers almost entirely maintenance activities to the sum of approximately \$33,000,000. In this connection it is desirable to call attention to the fact that requests are made for maintenance of projects which have been created by the authority of the P. W. A. and from P. W. A. money, but which were never authorized or considered by the Congress. Reference is made to this fact as with the tremendous sums being spent by the P. W. A. for this type of construction, the country should fully understand that the initial cost, tremendous as it is, is not the full cost of these improvements, but that annually there will be heavy charges to properly maintain them. This applies not only to river and harbor and flood-control activities but also to the creation of the many blocks and dams which are being authorized by the P. W. A. in its program.

While the amount is comparatively small this year, it is but the beginning, and might well be subject to the careful scrutiny of Congress. In the past, when river and harbor legislation was presented to Congress, it carried with it not only a recommendation for the original cost of the project but also the annual estimated maintenance cost. The actions of the P. W. A. in appropriating these vast sums for this type of work means an added and continuing burden on the Federal Treasury in order to maintain it. It might be of interest to call attention to Congress that in the past 3 years there has been allocated to the Chief of Engineers for river and harbor and flood-control work the vast sum of \$346,000,000, of which \$69,000,000 is for expenditure for the fiscal year of 1936 and \$14,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1937, the plans having been already allotted to the Engineers and being in the process of expenditure.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLTON. With pleasure.

Mr. COLDEN. What is the amount appropriated this year as compared with the appropriation for last year?

Mr. BOLTON. It is \$4,000,000 greater this year than last year, and that is mainly for maintenance.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLDEN. I will.

Mr. THURSTON. Do the hearings contain tables showing the amount allocated the past 2 years for the regular establishment of guards and reserves?

Mr. BOLTON. Not in this bill. I have figures for last year for military activities and nonmilitary. I will put them in.

These do not include P. W. A. projects.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLTON. With pleasure.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand there is a shortage in the clothing in the Army, and especially for the National Guard. If that appropriation should be increased would it not help in the way of employment? People could be put to work in our cotton and woolen mills and in our hose and shoe shops.

Mr. BOLTON. We have increased the sum by \$500,000 at the request of the National Guard. And it may be interesting to note that this has been considered necessary because of the months of service the National Guard has had all over the country during the past 2 years. It is desirable and necessary that not only clothing but other equipment be furnished.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. How many of the C. M. T. C. will be trained this year?

Mr. BOLTON. The bill calls for \$1,000,000, and the same number will be trained as last year, 14,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is not what was recommended by the War Department?

Mr. BOLTON. No.

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

Mr. BOLTON. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman stated in regard to disbursements for river and harbor purposes by the P. W. A. that they carried no amount or estimate for the maintenance feature.

Mr. BOLTON. That is correct.

Mr. CULKIN. And those are carried in this bill?

Mr. BOLTON. Yes; the annual maintenance charge.

Mr. CULKIN. Can the gentleman tell what are the total disbursements for P. W. A. for river and harbor projects since its inception, and I mean by that not only the money already expended but the money that would have to be expended to complete the projects.

Mr. BOLTON. That amount is carried in the hearings. I think it is \$346,000,000 for river and harbor and flood-control projects.

Mr. CULKIN. And those projects never had the approval of Congress.

Mr. BOLTON. Some of them did, but not all.

Mr. CULKIN. How much had the approval of Congress?

Mr. BOLTON. I cannot answer that.

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

Mr. BOLTON. Yes.

Mr. COLDEN. Did the gentleman state there is no provision in the bill whatever for the completion of projects now under construction for rivers and harbors under the War Department?

Mr. BOLTON. Not under the War Department, no. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that Members have been compelled to listen to a rather rambling discussion. The bill is not only interesting, but I think, as I said at the beginning, it is fairly complete within the funds allowed by the Director of the Budget. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I have only a very limited time to discuss with you the War Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1936—a limited time to set before you the salient features of a bill which your committee spent weeks of painstaking effort to prepare.

It is impossible for me in this limited time to be complete. I can only hope to give you in outline this measure's most important points.

First of all, however, I want to pay tribute to our chairman, my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. TILMAN PARKS, for the capable and efficient manner in which he conducted these hearings. I also wish to compliment my friend and colleague, Mr. BOLTON, of Ohio, the ranking minority member of the committee, for the assistance he gave in the preparation of the bill. To the other members of the committee—Mr. BLANTON, of Texas; Mr. McMILLAN, of South Carolina; Mr. SNYDER, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. DOCKWEILER, of California—I wish to say that never during my more or less brief membership of the War Department Appropriation Committee has such a spirit of friendliness, patriotism, and cooperation been displayed as by them during the past weeks.

Your entire committee has worked diligently. I believe that as a result of our efforts we are presenting to you today a War Department appropriation bill which I think you will consider one of the finest ever presented to the Congress of the United States.

The bill itself calls for \$378,699,488 appropriation, of which \$268,103,969 will go to the Regular Army; \$33,487,323 to the National Guard; \$6,372,178 to the Organized Reserves; \$1,000,000 to the citizen's military training camps; \$3,461,204 to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and \$491,054 for conduct of the national rifle matches.

This is the essence of our bill; the groundwork of our measure.

I believe if the Members of this Congress will take the time to read General MacArthur's remarks they will be generally enlightened upon the problems that confront the military branch of our national defense. They will also be satisfied that the general's ideas are sound and feasible. They will also find that practically all of the general's recommendations for additional funds at this time are incorporated in the bill which you have before you for consideration today.

No one in this Congress has a higher regard for, nor a deeper appreciation of, the Regular Army than I. However, I wish to stress particularly, in the brief time given me, the National Guard and the civilian components of the Army as they are treated in this bill.

The National Guard Bureau, ably headed by Maj. Gen. George E. Leach, its chief, has been granted a most generous appropriation. You will note that in this bill 48 drills have been restored. This bill also permits the following increases for the National Guard over the Budget estimate: For caretakers, \$544,140; for attendance at military-service schools, \$200,000; for articles of uniform, \$475,000; for ammunition, \$200,000; for horses, \$140,000; for tanks, at least 19 of which are to be purchased, \$475,000; and for helmets, \$121,540.

In our appropriations we have provided sufficient moneys for the training of 20,000 Reserve officers. This is 4,000 in addition to the number suggested by the Budget. The committee feels that by training this number of Reserves, and that with approximately 6,000 being assigned at the present time to Civilian Conservation Corps units, together with the fact that plans are now in progress for doubling the Civilian Conservation Corps, which will mean an assignment of an additional 6,000 Reserves, the question of proper training of such officers has been correctly and adequately handled.

The training period for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as suggested to your committee by the Budget, was 28 days. This your committee increased to the usual 42 days. The amount asked for the citizens' military training camps, of \$1,000,000, which will take care of 14,000 trainees, has been incorporated in this bill.

In addition, your committee has undertaken a new departure in providing the sum of \$350,000 for resuming the national rifle matches which will be held at Camp Perry, Ohio, next summer. This is most important. These matches have been authorized and provided for in prior legislation, but no appropriation has been made for them since 1932. In making this allotment your committee feels the Government is performing its proper function in fostering and sponsoring competition which cannot but tend to raise the efficiency of our national civilian marksmen.

I am laying particular stress upon these civilian units of our national defense. They are necessary to our national welfare. They are imperative for the preservation of our national unity.

Many subversive organizations throughout the country are making strong and vicious attacks upon our civilian units. They know that under our present system our Regular Army is too small to protect our country in a crisis. The Regular Army of today in war time would be the foundation upon which a vigorous, effective, and impregnable machine of war would be built. The civilian units are the material which would be largely used in this construction. They would be called upon, and would be found willing and eager, to serve as the nucleus for the formation of such a mighty defensive and offensive military machine that our Nation would be practically invincible.

These subversive organizations know all this, and for that reason, through false propaganda, through deceit, through misrepresentation, they are attacking our civilian units. Many of these organizations are influenced by Communists, either directly controlled and subsidized by them, or are the unthinking and irresponsible dupes of Communists.

Communists within this country make no secret of their plans to overthrow our Government and establish the bloody rule of an American Lenin at such time as it may be done without effective protest from our citizenry. These civilian units are our bulwark against such a catastrophe, because the Communists know that as long as this country is adequately protected by a responsible and highly organized military force they must give up their "red" vision of a government of despair by force, and must content themselves with merely dreaming their vicious dreams.

These civilian units cannot be neglected. They must receive their full and due consideration in the scheme of our national defense. Anyone, any Communist group, or anyone influenced by such a group, who attacks our civilian units is attacking patriotism, love of country, and our American ideals.

We, your committee, have finished our deliberations on this bill. It is in your hands now. My hope is that you may see eye to eye with us, and may put the stamp of your approval upon this measure. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, on January 28 last I invited your attention to the difficulty experienced by small businesses, both manufacturing and commercial, in their efforts to secure credit. I called attention to the seriousness of the situation and included in my statement a factual summary of the findings and the recommendations included in the report of Dr. Theodore N. Beckman, consulting expert of the United States Bureau of the Census, based upon his study of credit problems of small commercial enterprises.

Small manufacturing and commercial establishments are the backbone of American industry and commerce. They are the balance wheel to our economic order. Ninety-seven percent of all manufacturing establishments in the United States employ less than 250 wage earners each and almost 75 percent employ less than 21 persons each. In the field of distribution about 85 percent of all wholesalers do less than \$500,000 worth of business annually and employ approximately one person to each \$20,000 of sales. Retail and service organizations will show that more than 85 percent are small establishments. After 4 years of depression, these concerns found their continued existence threatened with extinction. Their capital structures were being depleted to a dangerous point. Many of them had already collapsed, and others with large unfilled and bona fide orders were on the verge of bankruptcy.

The Seventy-third Congress enacted legislation which made industry and commerce look forward with new hope. With increased orders and renewed activity, they sought credit from the banks from which they had always borrowed. These sources of credit were no longer available to them. Security requirements were so rigid as to leave the man helpless and distracted. Indeed, had they been able to

meet these requirements, they would have had no need for credit.

I am proud of the work I did in securing the adoption of a law which permitted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Federal Reserve banks to make such loans. The failure of this legislation to provide the required relief is now a matter of history. During its present session Congress has attempted to give additional assistance by further amending the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, but I am assured through the experience of firms in my own district within the past few days it has been clearly indicated to me that this will not give the needed relief. The requirements of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are still too stringent. We must go further. We must not think of this question in terms of relief but we must think of it in terms of recovery. Industry and commerce do not ask for relief but they do rightfully demand that the Federal Government take immediate steps to assist it to recovery by the enactment of such legislation as will remove the dangers and conditions which it has been forced to face during recent years.

I cannot accept that school of thought which believes that the dole will bring about recovery. The expenditure of billions of dollars to provide sufficient employment, either governmental or otherwise, to meet the bare necessities of life, will not effect recovery. We must start the wheels of machinery and the flow of commerce and then trade will take care of recovery. Workingmen must have sufficient wages to purchase other than the bare necessities. Full-time employment is required in productive, self-supporting enterprise. Thousands of small American manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, as well as service establishments, are ready and want to give this employment if they can secure the working capital to do so. We must, therefore, be concerned with providing the source from which this intermediate and long-term credit can be had in order to give impetus to employment.

There is no cure-all for our present economic difficulties. Nevertheless I do believe that there is no other single piece of legislation we can possibly conceive that will do more to bring recovery than one which provides a means for small business and industry to secure under proper and reasonable safeguards the credit with which to purchase raw materials, to meet pay rolls, to replenish stocks, to expand their output, and to market their products.

Mr. McLEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I yield.

Mr. McLEAN. Will the gentleman tell us what relationship those loans will have to recovery, if the small business man, to whom the gentleman refers, is still subjected to foreign competition?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That is a question that is far afield from the matter I am presenting to the House at this time.

To this end I have prepared and am introducing today a bill establishing an intermediate industrial credit corporation, which shall have a minimum of 12 branch offices and 1 branch office in such State or territory where it is found necessary. The bill provides that it shall be administered by a board of nine directors, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, who are experienced in the fields of intermediate and long-term credit and who at the same time understand the problems of our smaller industrialists, wholesalers, retailers, and service establishments. This board, under my bill, cannot be controlled by the bankers. The intermediate industrial credit corporation will have a revolving fund of \$1,100,000,000, \$100,000,000 of which will be in capital stock subscribed to by the Treasury of the United States and \$1,000,000,000 to be obtained through the sale of its debentures or bonds.

Under reasonable and proper safeguards outlined in the measure, and with the elimination of hampering regulations in the making of applications and the granting of loans, it is authorized to loan sums up to \$500,000 to smaller manufacturers, commercial, and service establishments either directly or by rediscounting loans made through financial institutions.

Mr. BETTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I yield.

Mr. BETTER. The gentleman suggests loans to small business men, manufacturers, and so forth. Does he not think it would be well to also include hospitals and colleges?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. The purposes of my bill are directly concerned with assisting industries, business, and trade for economic recovery and consequent employment. Your query would be better covered by other legislation.

This bill eases up credit restrictions by granting loans secured by mortgages on plant and equipment, by warehouse receipts, shipping documents, and other evidences of probability of repayment of the loan when due up to a maximum of 75 percent of the appraised value of the security offered for the loan, thereby assuring reasonable and businesslike treatment of applicants. It shall by this means establish a permanent national credit policy that will prevent the recurrence of the conditions now facing these establishments.

The bill also stipulates the maximum amount of interest that may be charged, so that those concerns already in difficulty through the need of credits shall not in addition suffer because of exorbitant rates of interest.

Mr. LORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I yield.

Mr. LORD. I want to ask the gentleman if these proposed bonds are going to be free from tax? Will they be tax-free bonds?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That would be a matter for consideration when the committee studies my bill.

Mr. LORD. Would it not be well to determine beforehand that they are not tax free?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That is a matter that can be taken under consideration by the House when my bill is presented to it.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman has given this subject of loans to industry deep thought and consideration. Can the gentleman tell the committee why it was that the provision made in the last Congress did not work?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. The quickest answer to that is that it is in the hands of bankers whose understanding of the troubles and difficulties of industry and business is not sympathetic, and therefore loans have been withheld that should have been made.

Mr. CULKIN. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that that bill had dual phases to it? One was the Federal Reserve and the other was the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That is correct.

Mr. CULKIN. Why did not the R. F. C. phase of it work?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. For the same reason I have just given.

Mr. CULKIN. The attitude was unsympathetic in both instances?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That is right.

Mr. McLEAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I will.

Mr. McLEAN. I have observed that the gentleman is very much in the confidence of the Democratic Party and has attained positions of prominence on many of the committees. No doubt the gentleman can give us some of the ideas of the present administration. All of this program that he has advanced so far calculates plans for loaning money to people. What plan has the gentleman for small industry paying this money back so long as the small industry is unable to compete with foreign producers?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That is, in effect, similar to the question that was propounded to me a moment ago. I would ask my good friend from New Jersey to read my bill, and I am sure that he will agree with me that while it is not a cure-all, as I have said in my statement a few moments ago, it does offer a tremendous relief, and to my mind is one measure that stands out in this respect.

Now, I only have a few minutes to close.

May I add that this general type of legislation has been enacted to assist farmers through the Farm Credit Administration; to assist home owners through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; and to assist large enterprises through both the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Federal Reserve System. But we have utterly failed to give help to the small industrialist and merchant, that group which comprises one of the most important in our economic structure.

Remedial laws, necessary as they are, do not constitute the only type of legislation which the people of America are looking to Congress to enact. The crisis has been passed. We are on the forward road. What the people want now from Congress is the assurance that there shall never be again a return to the chaos that came upon us in the last several years. So far as law can give that assurance the Nation expects it from us.

The faith of the people in our administration has been constantly increasing since the day we first took hold. There seems to be a complete trust on the part of the Nation that the Roosevelt administration, supported by Congress, will give the people the real things they are praying for.

My bill is not only concerned with the immediate needs of business and industry, in order that they may expand their operations and replace men on the pay rolls. The motive underlying my measure is one which looks many years into the future and calls for the enactment of a law for which I believe the business of the Nation and the people will be ever grateful. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today for the purpose of making due and proper reply to a communication recently received from Mr. Samuel Untermyer. The gentleman in question is one of the outstanding international lawyers of America and I am somewhat loath to cross swords with him. The issues, however, are so vital to America and to the district which I represent that I am emboldened to do so.

On January 16, I charged on the floor of the House that a meeting held at Graystone, Mr. Untermyer's palatial home on the Hudson, was for the purpose of resuscitating the corrupt Kreuger Match Trust and obtaining for it the American match market. In that speech, while not questioning the personal integrity of Norman H. Davis, our itinerant Ambassador and all-time internationalist, I vigorously contended that the part he played in this conspiracy against an essential American industry was improper and in an economic sense disloyal to America. As a result of that discussion, Mr. Untermyer has written me the letter in which he takes exception to my statements concerning himself and Mr. Davis. He states that the charge that the meeting had anything to do with the tariff on matches is the "purest, most unadulterated fiction." With characteristic energy he protests most vigorously against my giving the meeting held at his summer home a political complexion. I will endeavor to give the House a birdseye view of this situation so that they may be able to give due weight to Mr. Untermyer's protest and to the propriety of Mr. Norman H. Davis lending his prestige, gained from official connection with the administration, to this situation.

In 1927 and 1928 Ivar Kreuger, through certain American banks and brokerage concerns, sold \$350,000,000 in worthless securities to the American people. As a preliminary to the sale of these securities the houses of issue caused the personality of Kreuger to be ballyhooed by the American press. Kreuger was represented as an industrial Napoleon who was in every sense an empire builder. After the banking houses and investment concerns had the people Kreugerized they proceeded to unload these fraudulent securities. Time went on and it appeared that Kreuger was the greatest swindler in the history of the world. Preliminary to his death he had corrupted and made venal many of the republics of the south, as well as most of the countries of Europe.

He is said to have committed suicide in Paris with a pistol furnished him by the head of the Paris police. Over in France, when the Government permits a swindler to run loose and he wipes out the savings of a considerable portion of their people, governments are overturned, and rioting ensues. Here in America we are more passive and conventional, so that when the Kreuger empire fell the houses of issue formed protective committees for the alleged purpose of recouping the losses of the investors. That was the ostensible purpose of the proceeding, but, as a rule, these outfits victimize their investors anew and through receiverships and high-priced attorneys absorb what salvage is made. There is no question in my mind that an action would lie against these houses of issue in this instance for outrageous misrepresentation of the earnings of the Kreuger concern. It was important, therefore, that the houses of issue should have some buffer between them and the sorrowing investor, and in this case the conventional practice was followed.

Kreuger protective committees were formed, ostensibly for the purpose above set forth. It was really for the purpose of lulling the investor into fancied security until the statute of limitations had run against his right of action. Into this picture stepped the virile international lawyer, Mr. Untermyer. He is familiar with bankruptcy proceedings, as the records of the United States Supreme Court will attest. His retainer was ostensibly to salvage something for the widows and orphans who had been defrauded, but his real, grim, fighting purpose was to represent the houses of issue and to enable them to ward off and thwart the results of the threatened litigation by the unhappy investors.

As part of the scenery of this situation, Mr. Norman H. Davis was formally installed in Ivar Kreuger's room of silence in Stockholm. I am frank to say that I do not believe that Norman H. Davis had any real knowledge of the far-flung corruption of the Kreuger regime when he got into this picture.

The next act of this drama transpired at the palatial Untermyer home, Graystone-on-the-Hudson. Here he entertained at lunch on November 10, 1934, some 24 empire builders, 15 of whom came from England, Sweden, and other European countries. This gathering included Mr. L. A. Steinhardt, United States Minister to Sweden, and Mr. Norman H. Davis, as represented by Price, Waterhouse & Co., a firm of international accountants. I charged in my remarks to the House on January 16, to which Mr. Untermyer took exception, that one of the purposes of this meeting was to write a tariff for the match industry of America.

Let us consider the personnel of this outfit. There was present Mr. Jacob Wallenberg, director of the Swedish Match Trust and member of the Davis committee. There was present Mr. Kinnersly, of Lazare Freres, London, an international banking house. There was present Mr. Fred Ljungberg, who is the managing director of the Swedish Match Corporation. He was at one time the managing director of Trummer's, Ltd., of London, for many years the principal export house and world distributors of matches. Mr. Ljungberg yearns for a successful invasion of the American match market and the necessary destruction of our own industry. There was present Mr. Assar Gabrielsson, administrator of the Kreuger interests. It will be seen that the international type was largely dominant in this gathering.

As a result of this meeting a statement as to its purpose was prepared and published in the New York Times, in which these big names were paraded. Mr. Untermyer says the tariff was never mentioned at this conference, although a short time afterward the treaties with Finland and Sweden began to be negotiated. Obviously, the only thing America had to give in this conference was tariff concession. The control of these concerns is international and these 15 empire builders would not have crossed the sea for the sole purpose of enjoying lunch with Mr. Untermyer. Without the American market being opened to the Swedish Match Trust, which includes the International Match Corporation, no possible advantage could come to this group of international promoters. The gentlemen at this

conference were selected for their knowledge of the world markets, yet Mr. Untermyer would have us believe that the world markets were not even discussed or considered.

It strains the credulity of a lowly Congressman like myself to believe this even when it comes from the lips of such a distinguished internationalist as Mr. Untermyer. The purpose of that meeting, I again make bold to assert, was to obtain tariff concessions from the United States to the end that the corrupt Kreuger empire might be rehabilitated by getting access to the American match market. With world conditions as they were, it was the one avenue of escape for the houses of issue from the results of their fraud upon the American people. So I again assert with all the force of which I am capable that one of the purposes of this meeting was to steal the American match market. I am content to leave this question of veracity to all and sundry who have reached the mental age of 12. While I am on that subject of internationalists, may I suggest that the internationalists in Europe are not so vocal and blatant as our international breed here in America. Incidentally, there is a decent loyalty to their home country and to the localities where their industries are located on the part of the average Frenchman or Englishman. Over there capital is not permitted to take flight to some foreign area where labor may be had for a song. These groups who are always ready to sell America short or stab it in the back industrially would find short shrift in Italy, France, or England.

This whole proceeding brings out in all its nakedness the futility and absurdity of Congress delegating blanket and plenary powers to the administration to negotiate trade treaties. This group of internationalists who are conspiring against the American match industry would be brought to book by the Ways and Means Committee of the House. This would be true whether the majority of the committee were Democrat or Republican. These treaties written in the dark, with the springs of action hidden, cannot be for the benefit of America. Our standards of living are so much higher than no one except an idealist or a lawyer under retainer could honestly consider that we had any common ground of adjustment.

Let me give you an illustration of this. On February 11 of this year there appeared before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, in connection with the negotiations of a reciprocal trade agreement with Finland, Mr. George K. Hourwich, an attorney representing the Irving Trust Co. of New York, trustees in bankruptcy for the International Match Corporation. This gentleman is not a match manufacturer, is not an importer of foreign matches, nor did he represent any group of importers. He is a Wall Street lawyer representing the Irving Trust Co. of New York, an outfit of international bankers. He said before the committee:

Perhaps we are immodest, but we are of the opinion that the trustee in bankruptcy of the International Match Corporation is in better position to express an impartial judgment as to what should be done in the case of match tariffs and a reciprocal trade treaty in respect to Finland than anyone else, for the very good reason that while the estate in bankruptcy has wide-spread foreign investments, it also has very extensive investments in the American match industry.

The gist of the witness' evidence is that the international bankers should write the tariff laws and make the treaties because they, in their own humble opinion, know more about what is good for the people of the United States than Congress does. Mr. Hourwich, after having given this cheerful appraisal of his client's technique, continues, concerning the investors in the International Match Corporation:

These investors represent a cross section of the United States probably as good, if not better, than any other outside foreign interference. It was organized by Ivar Kreuger, but managed, directed, and controlled by the trustee in bankruptcy. Creditors' committees cooperate with the trustee. It is wholly American and wholly independent.

The usual definition of perjury is "a deliberate misstatement of a material fact." Mr. Hourwich perjures himself when he says that the International Match Corporation functions entirely independently of any outside foreign influence and that it is wholly American and wholly independent. The fact is that today the Swedish Match Co.,

which is a corporation controlled 100 percent by Swedish capital, is by contract exclusive export sales representative of the match products made by the International Match Corporation. Before the Ways and Means Committee of the House this perjury would not have been tolerated. Under the present auspices this Wall Street lawyer simply sends a fat bill to his clients, thus commercializing deliberate perjury. I do not intend to permit this perjured statement to go unnoticed. I am going to call this evidence to the attention of the proper authorities and see that a certified copy of this record is sent to them. At least this discussion should have the effect of sending the whole question to the bar association where Mr. Hourwich practices.

There is not a single American factor to the International Match Co., except the money received from the unfortunate American investor, which has been long since dissipated. The International Match Corporation is dominated by foreign influence. Through this Wall Street attorney they come asking for a reduction in tariff on an American product, for the benefit of foreign production. This glib attorney continued:

The position which we hold is that the match tariff, in respect to Finland, should be reduced 50 percent, and that from such reduction Russia and Japan should be excepted.

This testimony of Hourwich's before the Committee on Reciprocal Relations is the fruit of the conference at Mr. Untermyer's home on November 10, 1934. The whole aim of this group was to save the American houses of issue who had foisted the worthless Kreuger securities on the American people. To do this they were willing, and it was their avowed purpose, to throw American industry and American material men to the foreign wolves. Its purpose was and is to revive the dead Kreuger "empire" and to rear it anew upon the ashes of the American match industry.

I am extremely pessimistic about the possibilities of the American investor being reimbursed or recouped. Even if the American match industry is thrown into the scales and more of our citizens are compelled to walk the streets, nothing will come to the American investor. The money received for this purpose will go to the creditors of the Kreuger organization, which indebtedness runs into hundreds of millions of dollars. There will not be a sou marquee for the deluded American investor.

I have endeavored to give you a picture of this situation in all its implications. The Kreuger debacle was one of the contributing causes of the depression. It should not now be permitted to destroy a growing American industry. So I say to Mr. Untermyer that I cannot apologize, and I express the hope that he will devote his remaining days to the restoration of America rather than the advancement of foreign groups. I trust that Norman H. Davis, with his background of service, will see the evil of his ways and his duty to America and withdraw from this unhappy situation in which he has placed himself.

It is indeed time that disloyalty to America should be called by its right name and those whom America has fed should cease to bite her hand. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, on last Thursday my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] stated in the RECORD, and I quote:

Regardless of claims continually made to the contrary, but by persons not in favor of stopping immigration, I have reliable information and statistics to show that there are now over 20,000,000 aliens in the United States, and that of these 20,000,000 there are at least 10,000,000 of these aliens who are here unlawfully.

Mr. Chairman, I have been endeavoring to secure official statistics to verify my colleague's statement, or otherwise. I have those figures.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I cannot yield until I complete my statement. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman at the proper time.

Mr. BLANTON. I was going to furnish the gentleman certain data.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. After I have completed my statement.

The United States Census Bureau advises me that official compilations of the facts secured during the 1930 census show that in continental United States in that year there were exactly 14,204,149 foreign-born persons of all ages, regardless of color, race, or nativity, and no more. My colleague overestimated only about 5,795,851, and he failed to account for the naturalized foreign-born.

The Census Bureau further informs me that of these 14,204,149 foreign-born persons in the United States in 1930, more than half of them, or 7,919,536, were at that time naturalized citizens of the United States, according to official records of that enumeration of our population.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman should not make a challenge on the floor of the House to a Member to give him information when he refuses to yield. The gentleman refused to yield to my colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES], and he has refused to yield to me. The gentleman should leave our names out of his statement and not challenge us if he will not yield.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I wish to finish my statement before I yield.

Mr. FOCHT. I would just like to inquire whether they were unnaturalized foreigners.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The total foreign population as appears from the census figures was 14,204,149.

Mr. FOCHT. Are they unnaturalized?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No. I will come to the next point in a moment if the gentleman will just permit me to finish my statement.

Mr. DIES. I would like to give the gentleman accurate information.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have the figures.

Mr. DIES. I was going to tell the gentleman why.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I shall be glad to answer the gentleman's question if the gentleman will wait a moment. I think I shall cover the very point the gentleman is getting to.

The Census Bureau also states that when the 1930 census was taken there were only 6,284,613 foreign-born persons who had not become naturalized and were therefore aliens. Here, again, my colleague overestimated the number of aliens, he said "aliens", by 13,715,387. But my colleague failed here to take into account those aliens who in 1930 had already indicated their purposes by filing their declarations of intention to become citizens as soon as our laws would permit them to do that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, further figures I received from the Census Bureau show that out of that 6,284,613 unnaturalized foreign-born population in 1930, there were 1,266,419 who had already filed their declaration of becoming citizens, and in the cases of only 499,853 persons do the official census records fail to show whether the persons counted were naturalized, first-paper holders, or unnaturalized aliens. This leaves, Mr. Chairman, only 4,518,341 persons shown by the 1930 official census to be actually aliens who have not taken any steps toward becoming citizens of the United States. My colleague stated there were only 20,000,000. I wonder where he secured his reliable information and statistics.

That is not all, Mr. Chairman, the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Labor has advised me that since the compiling of the 1930 census figures, the number of foreign-born persons and of aliens in the United States has actually decreased since the 1930 census was taken, and I am pretty sure my friends will agree with me.

Mr. BLANTON. No; we do not agree.

Mr. DIES. Does the gentleman want me to answer that?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. DIES. We must take into consideration the number of aliens we have no record of. The gentleman recalls there are any number of aliens of whom we have no record.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I appreciate that; but do all of us take into consideration that it is a fact that there has been an excess of the number of aliens who have departed from the United States since 1930 over the number of aliens who have

been admitted to the United States since 1930 to the total of 229,363?

Mr. DIES. Legally?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Legally; that is correct. It has been estimated that perhaps 251,384 aliens have died in the United States since the 1930 census was taken.

There have been 507,127 aliens in the United States naturalized as citizens since the 1930 census was taken.

It is estimated that perhaps 150,000 aliens have acquired United States citizenship through the naturalization of their parents since the taking of the 1930 census.

Altogether, Mr. Chairman, these figures and estimates given me by the Department of Labor, based upon their officially known facts, would seem to show that the number of unnaturalized aliens in the United States at the present time is not far from a total of 5,146,739, and perhaps 1,546,739 of these have now taken out their first papers or their declarations of intentions to become citizens of the United States.

This would leave a total of approximately 3,600,000 unnaturalized aliens without first papers toward citizenship who are now in the United States. That, Mr. Chairman, is a long way from the figure my colleague gave you—he said 20,000,000.

Now, of course, Mr. Chairman, this does not take into account any estimates of the aliens who are here without lawful status under our immigration laws.

My colleague informed you there were 10,000,000 of them. I do not know where he got his figures, because I have not found any way to estimate that. However, I cite you to the fact that the 1930 census indicated a total of only 499,853 persons who did not indicate to the census enumerators whether they were citizens or first-paper applicants for citizenship or aliens outright. It may be assumed that a large part of these were unlawfully here.

If these 499,853 persons of foreign birth were all here unlawfully, which I doubt very much, I fail to see how any estimate of ten million could be arrived at to indicate the number of aliens unlawfully here at the present time. I will be quite generous, I think, when I concede that there may be 1,000,000 now here unlawfully. I do not concede that figure; but I say if I do concede that figure, then I would be quite generous.

I have some figures from the Immigration and Naturalization which may throw some light on this question of aliens now unlawfully in the United States.

In 1927 there were about 23,447 seamen who deserted their ship in United States ports; in 1930, there were only 9,117 deserting seamen, while in 1934 only 972 seamen deserted here.

In 1927, 1,906 stowaways were found on ships arriving at United States ports; in 1930 there were only 1,048 stowaways, while in 1934 the number of stowaways dropped to only 425.

Mr. Chairman, I just desire to read into the RECORD the tables I have prepared, which illustrates just what I have been speaking about this afternoon:

From the Bureau of the Census

All foreign-born (regardless of age, race, color, or nationality), 1930 census.....	14, 204, 149
All foreign-born (naturalized citizens), 1930 census.....	7, 919, 536

All foreign-born (first papers taken).....	1, 266, 419
All foreign-born (status not stated).....	499, 853
All foreign-born (aliens—that's all).....	4, 518, 341

All foreign-born (unnaturalized alien).....	6, 284, 613
---	-------------

All foreign-born (regardless of status), 1930 census.....	14, 204, 149
---	--------------

From Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Labor

All foreign-born (unnaturalized alien), 1930 census.....	6, 284, 613
--	-------------

Foreign-born naturalized since 1930 census.....	507, 127
---	----------

Foreign-born unnaturalized alien died since 1930 (estimated).....	251, 384
---	----------

Foreign-born acquired citizenship through parents' naturalization since 1930 (estimated).....	150, 000
---	----------

From Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Labor—Continued

Excess of foreign-born alien departures from the United States over the foreign-born alien arrivals into the United States since 1930.....	229, 363
--	----------

Total deductions to be made since 1930 census.....	1, 137, 874
--	-------------

Total foreign-born (unnaturalized alien), 1934 (estimated).....	5, 146, 739
---	-------------

Personal calculations from above:	
Total foreign-born (first papers taken) in 1934.....	1, 546, 739

Total foreign-born (unnaturalized alien—that's all), 1934.....	3, 600, 000
--	-------------

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there for one question?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I shall be pleased to yield if it is to be a question.

Mr. BLANTON. In 1932 did the gentleman know that Bruno Hauptmann was in the United States, or did anybody else connected with his committee know that he had come here illegally? And there are just thousands of aliens unlawfully in the United States like Bruno Hauptmann of whom the gentleman does not know anything.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman wants an answer, he should confine his question to the issue before us now.

Mr. BLANTON. I think that is a very pertinent matter.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I will answer that question at some other time. I would like to confine myself to my statement to the House. Now, the gentleman wishes to ask a question. What is the gentleman's question? I do not want a speech; I want a question.

Mr. BLANTON. I said, are there not aliens here like Bruno Hauptmann that the gentleman knows nothing of?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have no use for Bruno Hauptmann or any alien who is illegally in the country. If the gentleman would work with me, we could bring out legislation that would destroy the very evil the gentleman makes speeches about here year in and year out.

Mr. BLANTON. And if the gentleman would work with me we would give 12,000,000 jobs back to that many Americans and take them from that many foreigners.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Now, I shall depart from my prepared statement if the gentleman wants to debate that.

A year ago I had a bill before this Congress that would deport alien gunmen, dope-peddlers and the like; yet the gentleman from Texas voted against that bill. That bill was not intended to open up the doors of immigration at all; it simply tried to clear up a situation in this country which has grown up in the last 30 years whereby aliens in this country who have committed a number of misdemeanors could not be deported because they had not been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude or convicted of a felony. The bill I brought up for consideration last year would deport just such aliens, but the gentleman from Texas voted against it.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to get time of my own in a few minutes and tell all about those makeshift excuses of bills, and I will answer the gentleman in my own time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I be not interrupted until I have completed my statement.

This committee brought out a bill last year to remove from the shores of this country, from California, Illinois, and Texas, a number of Filipinos, totally about 30,000, who seemed to be unable to establish themselves as self-supporting; they are stranded and in that way may seem to be undesirable and want to go back to the Philippine Islands. The Resident Commissioners for the Philippine Islands came before the committee and begged for that legislation.

The Department of State and the Department of Labor and all other patriotic organizations endorsed the bill which provided a means to let them go back home and stay home, but the gentleman from Texas voted against that measure.

Then I brought out an identical bill this year and the gentleman last Thursday objected to it being given preference for immediate consideration. This is all a matter of record. I am not quarreling with the gentleman, I am

simply presenting the record. There is nothing personal in my remarks.

Mr. DIES. I think the gentleman will agree that there are a number of aliens in this country illegally who ought to be out of the country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DIES. I think our committee has found that to be a fact time and time again.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is no question about the gentleman's statement.

Mr. Chairman, under the 1917 law we can repatriate any alien who finds himself stranded in the United States within 3 years after his admission. The committee unanimously reported another bill and I am sure the bill would repatriate to their own native countries 200,000 or more people who are now on the relief rolls of the big cities of this country. In other words, 1½ months' relief given to them from public funds would send them back to their native country and make them stay there. Under the 1917 act this must be done within 3 years after entering, but we struck out the words "within 3 years", giving these persons an opportunity to get out immediately.

Mr. DIES. Will the committee agree to fix it so they cannot reenter the United States?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We have done just that.

Mr. DIES. In the act of 1932 the gentleman provided that aliens who are driven out of the country or who are deported may reenter.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman. I had that in mind, and with the consent of the departments and the committees I have safeguarded that very thing. They cannot return. I think the gentleman will be assured of that point if he will read the last three lines of that bill, H. R. 3472.

This bill was unanimously reported and it had the support of patriotic groups. When I got it to the floor of the Congress the gentleman from Texas objected to its immediate consideration and also objected to the bill when it was called up on the Consent Calendar yesterday.

Am I to be understood as trying to open the doors to immigration? I have never attempted to open the doors; on the contrary, I want to keep them closed as tightly as does the gentleman from Texas. But I do not want any American citizen to be prevented from uniting his own wife and their own children in his home on American soil.

In all fairness to the House and in fairness to the committee, may I say that we cannot bring restrictive legislation to the floor of this House and then have people object to its consideration, particularly people who pose as restrictionists.

Yes, the gentleman from Texas may have all the time he wants, but the fact of the matter is the RECORD shows, and I say this without fear of contradiction, that every constructive restrictive legislation that has been brought to this Congress has been objected to by the gentleman from Texas. Why? He made a charge against me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last Friday in the form of extension of remarks. He probably could not have done this if I were on the floor because I would have had something to say. The gentleman stated he had introduced a certain bill to suspend all immigration for 10 years. Mark you, he charges me, and I would not do this against the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], that I was the one who killed the legislation because I had the deciding vote.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, is that not so?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

Mr. BLANTON. I was told that by members of the gentleman's committee. Ask my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who was a member of the committee, if the gentleman from New York did not cast the deciding vote against our restriction bills.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It was not true, so the gentleman owes me an apology and he owes the House an apology.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman leave it to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who was on the committee?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That vote was on the bill of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. The gentleman owes me an apology.

Mr. DIES. That was on a bill introduced by myself, which provided for a reduction in quota to 60 percent and undertook to do what the gentleman from New York always said he wanted to do.

Mr. BLANTON. And his vote killed it?

Mr. DIES. That is true.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. May I say that there was a bill introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE]. There was also a bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. These two bills were considered together. They were H. R. 4114 and H. R. 8222.

Mr. Chairman, those two bills dealt with some pretty difficult problems. The Secretary of State presented certain facts to the committee that there were certain negotiations pending to consummate a number of treaties with South America. The bill purporting to fix a quota for Mexico was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE], and the bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] attempted to reduce the quota to 60 percent. The Department of State, through the personal appearance of the Secretary of State himself, made representations to the Democratic Members, asking them to withhold action, so that your humble servant did not report the bills out.

The two bills were beaten by one vote in committee and I was simply carrying out a message from the American people through the Secretary of State to carry on the administration work in that Congress.

Mr. DIES. In order to get it accurately, is it not a fact that the opposition came largely from the Secretary of Labor and from Mr. MacCormack, as well as from an Under Secretary of the State Department? I do not think the Secretary himself, either by letter or testimony, opposed the bill. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman knows I have been trying to be accurate.

Mr. DIES. My bill, which was endorsed and supported by practically all organizations in the United States, would have accomplished what the gentleman stated he wanted to accomplish, which was, among other things, the reuniting of families.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to be as fair as I can. I am not quarreling with anyone who expresses an opinion on this question.

I have the same right to express an opinion as any other Member of the Congress, and I am not quarreling with anybody.

Mr. DIES. But is the gentleman for excluding—

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In all the years I have been here I have tried to keep peace with the world, including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. DIES. Is the gentleman in favor of excluding all new seed immigration, if we reunite families?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am in favor of reuniting families.

Mr. DIES. Is the gentleman in favor of excluding all new seed immigration?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. To a great extent; yes. Practically to a very large extent; but let me call your attention to one thing here.

In 1932 only 35,576 immigrants came to the shores of the United States and, against that number, 103,295 went back. So there were three aliens who went back for every one that came into this country. Therefore, you do not need any restriction in that situation.

Mr. DIES. But the gentleman is not taking into consideration illegal entries. Illegal entries are not taken into account in the figures of Mr. MacCormack, which the gentleman is reading from. The gentleman is reading from Mr. MacCormack's figures, is he not?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; I am giving some personal figures where I personally made a check-up in the last 10 days.

Mr. DIES. But the gentleman is not stating that his figures take into account illegal entries?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

Mr. DIES. And the gentleman knows that in 13 years 500,000 alien seamen alone deserted various steamships and surreptitiously got into the United States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman and I agree that we do not want any smuggled aliens in this country, and so far as that goes I am prepared to bring out any bill to stop smuggling in some way or other. The gentleman knows this, and he was kind enough to say a word for me about 2 years ago when I presented a resolution to this Congress, and then even my good friend BLANTON voted for that resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. I did that under the gentleman's promise that he would give me a hearing on my bill that would stop immigration and then, after you gave me a hearing, you chloroformed it. [Laughter.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Wait a minute—the gentleman from Texas will admit that I gave him that hearing.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; the gentleman did that, and then killed my bill in his committee.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And the gentleman made a most fiery speech about oxen and about the cowboys and everything else, and told us about conditions on the Rio Grande. It was fine and I enjoyed it, but the committee unanimously refused to report his bill. Does the gentleman charge me with that?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I said nothing about oxen and cowboys, but only about stopping aliens, and my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was helping me on it, and I am sure he was not a part of the unanimity.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For the gentleman's information, I have the original roll call here, so please let us not dispute that. [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman is wrong. It was unanimous, and the gentleman again owes me an apology, because the gentleman has stated to this House that I was responsible for killing his bill that would stop immigration for 10 years, and that is not a fact.

Mr. BLANTON. If it were unanimous, then the gentleman controls that committee even to a greater degree than I gave him credit for doing.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In 1934—

Mr. DIES. I want to correct the gentleman there.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If it is an honest correction, I will take it.

Mr. DIES. I think the gentleman needs to be corrected in that respect. The gentleman says the committee voted unanimously to do what?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman will sit down, I will answer.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, may I raise a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PALMISANO. If this roll call was secret—

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is not going to be made public.

Mr. BLANTON. Why not make it public?

Mr. DIES. I think it ought to be read here.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not want to violate the rules of the House. If the gentleman will just be patient—

Mr. DIES. I will say now that there never has been a vote on the Blanton bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman will please wait a minute, I will answer.

Mr. DIES. I want the gentleman to clarify it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I will clarify it. I would not do an injustice to anybody, and if I am wrong in any statement here, I want to be corrected.

After a public hearing on several bills and joint resolutions, all dealing with the general subject of general immigration restriction, including H. R. 4114, H. R. 8222, and H. R. 109, and several others introduced during the Seventy-third Congress—

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, by regular action, concentrated serious committee consideration to H. R. 4114 and H. R. 8222, and eliminated from further committee consideration all other general restriction bills and House joint resolutions, including H. R. 109, which my colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] had introduced and advocated before the committee in public hearings.

The committee, therefore, eliminated from consideration all other bills, including H. R. 109, and confined consideration to only two bills, namely H. R. 4114 and H. R. 8222. Since both of these bills had been opposed by both the Department of Labor and the Department of State before the committee, both in public hearing and in executive session, I think the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization did the wise thing when by regular action it decided to not report them to this House.

As to the details of the vote on these two bills, I may say that the vote was taken in executive session, and I do not propose to publicly disclose the details of how the votes were cast. I am sure every Member of this House will be satisfied when I say that the official record of the committee on each of these two bills shows that the vote of the committee on March 12, 1934, was against reporting them to the House.

There were a number of bills before the committee, and we unanimously agreed to put all the other bills in "the dead house", if that is the proper term, and take up House bill 4114, which was the Dies bill, dealing with all the questions.

Mr. DIES. That is right.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. This bill dealt with all the questions we found in all the bills, except complete restriction.

Mr. DIES. I will say to the gentleman that that is an accurate statement.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And the bill of my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] was for complete restriction. It did not even attempt to unite families. That is correct, is it not, I will ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]?

Mr. DIES. I think it was for 10 years.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For 10 years a complete restriction; in other words, cutting off mother from father, and mother from child, and almost putting a high fence around the United States by some of the wood we find around the gentleman's district.

Then we took up the bill numbered 8222, which is the Schulte bill.

The committee had already disposed of all the other bills by having them laid on the table.

I am not going to disclose the confidential vote, but for the information of the gentleman I have made this statement.

Now, let me get back to my argument. What about restriction?

In the last 5 years no immigrants have come in except those who came to close family ties, like children of American citizens, wives of American citizens. There is no new seed immigration coming in, or, if there is, it is very small, indeed. They have to establish the fact that they have enough money to take care of themselves for the next 5 years.

What is all this clamor about restriction when you have practically every restriction you want under the present law?

Mr. DIES. To be fair, that is the result of the administrative action in which the Department strictly construed the public charge provision. And also there is the fact that there is more than 500,000 alien seamen alone that have come illegally into the United States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman has served with me in Congress, he has served with me on the Committee, and I claim that he cannot maintain or say that I have been unfair in my conduct.

Mr. DIES. Except I do not think the gentleman is bona fide in favor of restriction, and I do not blame him; he represents a district where 80 percent are opposed to it. We might as well be frank about it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Suppose I told the gentleman that there is not a family in my district that has a relative on the other side. The only difference between the gentleman and myself is that I am not a professional restrictionist.

I repeat that appeals from my district in behalf of relatives abroad are less numerous than appeals which I get from citizens residing in other districts.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman always votes against anything in favor of restriction.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman will wait a moment and give me a chance to answer his question—I am not asking to change the public-charge clause. I am not asking you to open the doors, but I am going a step further than some restrictionists in this House by saying let us clean the house first within. There are thousands of aliens here that ought to be removed. [Applause.]

Mr. DIES. Yes; there are 3,500,000 illegally in the country, but the gentleman is not offering to exclude them, he is not in favor of that, he is in favor of their becoming American citizens regardless of how they came into the country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I will answer the gentleman in a moment. We have a number of people that entered the United States 10 or 15 years ago whose names were misspelled on what is called a "certificate of arrival." Now they cannot find that certificate, so that they can be deported at any time because the statute of limitations does not apply.

We have a number of such cases where there is no record of the entry, and they are subject to deportation.

These people, the most of them, have been married to American women, raised American families and American children, children that are going to school, and it is this kind of people that I want to give the right to remain in the country and be a part of the community, because every community respects them.

I sincerely believe it is good social policy to permit these law-abiding aliens, who cannot now take even the first step toward becoming American citizens, to take advantage of some procedure which will make it unnecessary for them to pay the steamship companies large amounts of money for passage abroad and at the same time permit them to adjust their immigration status so that application for naturalization is possible.

This will keep in America an entire family, the greater part of which may be American citizens, without the loss of time and money a long trip abroad seeking an immigration visa today would require. But I am with both gentlemen from Texas, and I am ready to deport every racketeer that you can pick up. I will go further than that. I am ready to go as far as any of you will go to clean house right within our own country. I propose to leave the quota alone or even cut it.

Mr. DIES. What about the provisions for cutting it 60 percent, and using 40 percent of the quota for the purpose of reuniting families, and then excluding from the United States all aliens who enter in violation of law? I do not mean technical defects, but aliens who were smuggled in across the borders. What about that?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman will present a bill excluding aliens who were smuggled across his border into Texas, he can have a hearing on it tomorrow.

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

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Bring a bill in before this committee that will relieve this country from smugglers and dope peddlers and gunmen, and I am with you. I have been begging this Congress to give me a chance to present such a bill before this House. Only a week ago that was done, and it was objected to.

Let us be fair about it. The Committee on Immigration has not had a day on the calendar in 9 years. In 9 years the Committee on Immigration has not had a call on Calendar Wednesday for consideration of bills under the general rules of the House. We have got to beg for our legislation when we report it out. We have either to go to the Committee on Rules, or we are out of luck, and then the Rules Committee has not given us a regular day in the last 5 years. So that the legislation which has been brought out was not controversial. It was something for the Government, something for the people.

I want to see that every American who is out of a job gets a job, but we gave you the opportunity when we brought out a bill that would repatriate some 300,000 aliens who have

been here, who are ready to go back, and in signing their pauper's oath, they make it so they can never return. Why keep them on our relief rolls? Why keep them in our communities? Let them go if they want to, but no, my friend objected to it.

Mr. DIES. What friend?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. DIES. Objected to what?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. To repatriating these people, to letting them go home. I hope it is not anything personal, although he may have his reason for it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the reason advanced by anyone in opposition to a proposal of that kind?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. When my good friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] takes the floor, the gentleman may ask him that question.

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell the gentleman all about it in a few minutes. That was a foolish bill, and set a foolish precedent. It proposed for the United States to pay all of the expenses for 30,000 Filipinos to take a trip home. They would have come back, and many times more than 30,000 would have come with them when they learned that they could get their expenses paid back home. Of course, I objected.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I give you my solemn word that I do not know. Everybody who appeared in the committee, including some of the gentleman's friends, honestly supported it 100 percent. In New York today we have at least 100,000 people on the relief rolls, who are prepared to go back home to their native country and stay there. The cost of a month and a half of relief would forever dispose of those aliens, so far as the money is concerned.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the gentleman want to ask me a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; because I know he will want to ask me a question when I have the floor and I want to yield to the gentleman. Referring to the bill which the gentleman said did not pass in the last session, did not that come to a vote of the House and did not the House defeat it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. The House defeated it by a decisive vote. Then it was not just the gentleman from Texas, but it was the Membership of this House who thought that was a bad bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to answer that question, and I do not like to make such a confession, but I am going to make it. I really think that the Members of the House could not absorb all the fine restrictive features in that bill when consideration of it was taken up under a motion to suspend the rules. That was brought up in that way on the last day of the Congress. The bill contained a number of pages, and I say now that that was purely a restrictive measure. Under your present law you cannot deport an alien gunman, you cannot deport an alien smuggler, or you cannot deport a dope peddler. Under that bill, that could have been done. That bill did not permit additional immigration to this country and did not open any doors to let down the present restrictions imposed by the quota system we now have. In short, it was a restriction measure.

Mr. DIES. To be perfectly fair, it was not those provisions of the bill that we opposed. We opposed the provision that gave to the Secretary of Labor discretionary power to deport or not deport, as she saw fit. That was the part of the bill that we opposed and not the other provisions to which the gentleman refers. I think, in fairness, that that ought to be stated.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think you did not want the Secretary of Labor to afford relief to an innocent man or woman because of the fact that 10 or 15 years ago they crossed the border and came in here illegally. You did not want to place in the Secretary of Labor discretionary power to leave that man or woman alone, who otherwise had not committed any crime at all.

Mr. DIES. But that is not an accurate statement. Mr. MacCormack testified before our committee that not more

than 5 percent of all the deportation cases were hardship cases. In view of that fact, we were not willing to turn over to any official the deportation laws of the United States.

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

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall refer to some excerpts briefly, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to embrace those excerpts in the remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no unkind feeling toward my friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]. Probably if I were in his shoes, I would feel on this question just as he feels, and probably I would vote and take action just as he has done.

There are 435 Members of this House, and the funniest thing about it is that no two of us are alike. We are different in our physiognomies, in our viewpoints, in our environments, many of us in our manner of living, many of us as to where we were born, and the various ideas that have been inculcated in us from childhood. Naturally, subjects arise here upon which all of us cannot agree.

I repeat what my friend from Texas [Mr. DIES] has said. He did not say it behind the back of my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], because they are friends personally. My friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], for several years served ably on this committee of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is chairman. Mr. DIES has lately been promoted and placed on the great Rules Committee of the House. I wish to say for MARTIN DIES, of Texas, that all during his service on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization he put in the very best that was in him. I served with his father here. He was an able representative of the people, and he made one of the finest speeches on this floor on the service of Congressmen that I have ever heard. His worthy son, our present colleague, MARTIN DIES, has performed valuable service on this committee.

All of his purposes and intentions were to stop immigration to this country; to save American jobs for American citizens. He learned to know well our friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] during that service. Did you not hear him tell the gentleman a moment ago that he did not believe he was really and heartily in favor of stopping immigration at all? That is the thing that impressed him from serving with the chairman of the committee during all these years. And I repeat that as my belief.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] made a very damaging admission a while ago. I want to quote the gentleman correctly, and any time that I quote my friend incorrectly, to show him how fair I want to be, I want him to know that I will yield to him any time I misquote him. The gentleman said: "There is not an alien in my—(his New York)—district who has a relative on the other side."

Is that not a damaging statement? Why, he has made it so easy for them, in collaboration with the Department of Labor and the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, that all foreign relatives of aliens in his New York district have been able to reunite in his district. That is "uniting families" gone to seed.

You will remember that he favored "uniting families", and that was another damaging statement the gentleman made. I took it down word for word as he spoke it, and you will find it in the RECORD, unless he changes it when he revises his remarks. When the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] asked the gentleman from New York if he were in favor of stopping immigration to this country, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] said, "I am in favor of reuniting families." He certainly has been diligent and active in his district, where many aliens live. He has reunited them all, because he says not an alien in his—alien—district has got a relative across the water. They have all been able to come in.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does the gentleman believe it wrong for families to be reunited, and un-American and detrimental to the economic welfare of this Nation?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not, if they will reunite in their own mother country. I do not want foreigners from other countries to do their uniting and reuniting in the United States. I would like for all of them to have a regular old-fashioned home-coming back in their native lands. I would wish them Godspeed.

This is the first opportunity I have had to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] for the faithful, loyal work he performed in trying to help my old friend and pal, Fiorello H. LaGuardia, who is now mayor of the city of New York. I am grateful to my friend for what he did for LaGuardia. And if he fills LaGuardia's shoes in representing LaGuardia's old district, he has a man's job to perform here.

I have no prejudice against people of foreign extraction. Many are my close friends. When I first ran for Congress away back yonder before the war, in one whole precinct settled by foreigners, I got one vote in that box against the old Congressman. That shows how loyal they were to the sitting Member. I tried my best to find out who that one voter was, so I could thank him. [Laughter.] The next election, 2 years thereafter, a former Member of this House ran against me, who was an able and vigorous campaigner—yet the tide changed and in that primary he got one vote and I got all the balance in that box. It just changed around over one election term. They became my loyal friends, and proved to be as good friends as a man ever had.

When I was a boy I lived in old Fayette County. Most of my associates there in school were children of foreigners. Old Fayette County was settled with foreigners. I played with them as schoolmates, went to dances on Saturday nights and danced with Bohemian and German girls many times until nearly daylight. [Laughter.] They were my good friends. I used to visit in their homes. They were good citizens. They were hard-working, thrifty, and enterprising. They paid their debts. Whether they made little or much they saved part of it. I have no feeling whatever against any foreigners who come to America lawfully and who have made such good citizens as many of them have.

But more aliens have come here from foreign countries than we can assimilate. More have come than we can provide with jobs, without depriving native Americans. We must call a halt. They are starving Americans. In our hour of necessity I have seen this Government vote billions of dollars for relief because 12,000,000 heads of families were out of jobs.

When it develops that criminal aliens like Bruno Hauptmann can come into this country illegally without my friend from New York knowing anything about it, and save from his wages \$1,000 per year, it is time something should be done to stop it.

I called up Mr. Daniel W. MacCormack, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, down at the Department of Labor, about an hour ago, and I said: "Back in 1932 did you or your office officials then know that Bruno Hauptmann was here in the United States? Did your Department of Labor then know he was in this country unlawfully?" He said: "No; never heard of it until he was apprehended for committing murder and various other atrocious crimes." There are thousands of criminal aliens just like Bruno Hauptmann who have come into this country unlawfully and are unchecked and unknown.

Commissioner MacCormack told me over the telephone about an hour ago that there are 16,000,000 aliens now in the United States, and that there are 40,000,000 people in the United States of "alien stock." He stated that we had no registration laws by which we could check the aliens that got into the United States illegally, and that no one had

any way of definitely determining the number of aliens here unlawfully. He stated that the last census showed that on April 1, 1930, there were 6,284,613 aliens in the United States, and they were ones who made returns to census enumerators.

Of course, all of us know that the aliens who made returns to our enumerators were aliens who got into the United States lawfully, for the ones who smuggled themselves into the United States unlawfully would not have made their identities known to census enumerators. Hence we know that on April 1, 1930, there were 6,284,613 aliens here who were lawfully admitted to the United States, and I have just as much grounds for guessing correctly as my friend from New York as to the number of illegal aliens there were then in the United States.

An alien is a foreign subject. An alien is one who owes his allegiance to a foreign country. An alien is not one who has taken out his papers to become a citizen of the United States. An alien is one who prefers not to become a citizen of the United States. An alien is one who owes no duty to the United States flag. An alien is one you cannot make fight to protect the United States.

The 6,284,613 aliens who made returns to census enumerators in 1930 were subjects of foreign countries. Why had they come here? Why, to get jobs, of course. They came here to find work. And they found work. And the jobs they were holding were American jobs that belonged to American heads of families. They got jobs by being willing to work for less than Americans were charging. And when they came here from foreign countries and got jobs, they took such jobs away from our own Americans.

I do not subscribe to all of this gossip we have heard that Daniel W. MacCormack, just because he was born in Scotland, is a foreigner unsympathetic with our laws and institutions and wanting to open the doors and let all foreigners into this country. That gossip is not worthy of belief. While I do not agree with the ways deportations have been handled, and the way undesirables have been allowed to come into this country, I have great respect for Commissioner MacCormack, and I admire the record he has made as a soldier. This idle, untrue gossip about him should stop. If we don't agree with him, and want to criticize the way he has handled deportations, and visiting anarchists, let us criticize, but we should do it fairly, and not do him an injustice. In many of the things he has done regarding deportations, he has been in perfect accord with our friend from New York, who has been promising him to pass a bill to give him full discretion on all deportations.

From page 85 of the hearings on the Department of Labor appropriation bill for 1936 I want to quote some of the testimony given by Commissioner MacCormack before the Committee on Appropriations. He said that out of 465 cases, representing a total of 546 deportable aliens—now, they were ones that were deportable that he had up under his investigation, and he admits that they were deportable—he says that “439, or 80 percent, would immediately be eligible for return to the United States on a nonquota or preference visa issued at the instance of their citizen or legally resident relative” in accordance with the terms of the bill that my friend from New York had passed here in 1932.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question without being excited about it?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; I never get excited. I do get out of patience when I have sat here in Congress 18 years waiting in vain for a bill that would stop immigration, that would save American jobs for American citizens. And I have seen all such bills die in the committee. I have waited all this time in vain for such a bill to be reported, and I am getting tired of it. Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There should have been a quota law during the time that Columbus came to this country, or at the time he discovered this country. Had there been, I think we would be all right and in good shape. The gentleman would not be here himself.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yielded for a question—

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let me ask the question—the gentleman says that a certain percentage of these people liable to deportation would be eligible for readmission. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. I said under the bill the gentleman got through here in 1932. Mr. MacCormack stated that 80 percent of these deportable aliens that he had up for deportation could come back under the terms of the gentleman's bill. That bill should have been killed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And I want to give the gentleman the answer to it.

Mr. BLANTON. All right.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What Mr. MacCormack said was accurately true; what this statement says is accurately true. There are a number of people who, technically, could be deportable, but who would, upon their arrival abroad, be entitled to exemption from quota restrictions because of marriage to an American citizen; so why deport them and let them come back? Why not legalize their entry right now? They are not criminals.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, that brings us right back to my friend's position—that he believes in uniting alien families. If he could unite all the alien families he wants to over here, we would have to buy Mexico and Canada, too, to take care of all the aliens.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I want to finish this first; then I will yield. You know the gentleman's position about uniting families reminds me of a big cowman once who operated in Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and in Arizona. I told him that he ought to be the happiest man in the world, having cattle on a thousand hills and ranch lands everywhere; but he said he never would be happy until he could own all of the adjoining lands that were contiguous to his own. [Laughter.] My friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], the Chairman of the Committee on Immigration, who believes in uniting families, never will be happy until with respect to all the rest of the United States it is just like his New York district, where not an alien family has any relatives abroad, because all of the relatives of all aliens have been brought over and reunited in the United States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I was in favor of bringing them over before I came to Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. I have no doubt of that; the gentleman is consistent, because he has been in favor of bringing them over ever since.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Not with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] around.

Mr. BLANTON. I am watching this alien situation with both eyes open constantly.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BLANTON. I will let my friend ask me any question he wants to.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to ask a pertinent question.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. Whether pertinent or not, the gentleman cannot ask me one that can embarrass me any on this matter.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am not seeking to embarrass the gentleman by any question.

Mr. BLANTON. All right; what is the question?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I just want an answer, that is all.

Mr. BLANTON. Ask the question.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In uniting families what blood relationship would the gentleman consider close?

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell my friend, I would consider the blood relations of Americans closer than the blood relations of foreigners, when considering this question.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let us not get away from that.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to get away from it. I am not in favor of uniting alien families right now. I am in favor of saving American jobs for American citizens. [Applause.] That is the thing of first and greatest importance to me. If we could at this time remove every alien from the United States and send him back home we would

have a job for every unemployed American in the United States.

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

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute; I want to answer this question first. When I rang up Colonel MacCormack just before we began this debate he admitted that there was no way for anyone to check up and determine just how many aliens are now unlawfully in the United States. He admitted that all we could do was guess. I believe that I can guess just as accurately about it as can my friend from New York.

During the war I saw the liberty parade in New York. I sat in the mayor's grandstand at the juncture of Broadway and Fifth Avenue from 9:30 a. m. until 4:30 p. m., and all day long I saw an unbroken procession of foreigners marching 20 abreast parade down the street. They were all dressed in their native costumes. I saw that sight. As I have mentioned before, I did not know there were that many foreigners in the whole world. I am wondering just how our friend from New York is better prepared to guess than I am at the number of aliens who are here unlawfully. And I wonder if in carrying out his policy of reuniting alien families in the United States he would like to bring here from foreign countries all of the close relatives of all those foreigners I saw in that liberty parade in New York during the war.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I regret I haven't the time. This is a debate between the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] and myself. He started it. I must finish it. I see he is on his feet. I shall have to yield to him first after I have answered his question. In the Seventy-third Congress, during the last session, there was pending before the gentleman's committee a bunch of bills—a whole stack of bills—all seeking to restrict and register the aliens in the United States and getting a check-up on them so that we could find out about these Bruno Hauptmanns.

That big stack of bills had been introduced by many different Members, all seeking to restrict immigration, and to deport aliens who had gotten into our country unlawfully. One of those bills was my own, which sought to suspend all immigration for 10 years. One was H. R. 4114 of my colleague [Mr. DIES], which he says sought to do just what the chairman of this committee has been protesting that he wants to do, yet has not done. One was by my colleague from Florida [Mr. GREEN], H. R. 2841, to provide for the registration of all aliens, and was a good bill and should have passed. One was H. R. 6964, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON]. There were many, many of these bills, a whole stack of them, that were sent to the committee, of which our friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] was chairman.

Not a single one of those restriction bills did Chairman DICKSTEIN ever report to the House. He smothered them all in committee. First the gentleman said my bill was killed by unanimous vote; then when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] caught him on that, and made him admit that no vote was taken on it, the gentleman stated, "Oh, no." So, it is the committee chairman who owes me an apology. There was not any roll-call vote taken on my bill. The committee did not vote unanimously against it. They merely sidetracked it with the Dies bill. The actual fact was that they had a whole lot of bills there before the committee, including mine. A member of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] had one, and the committee usually gives the prominent members of its own personnel the right of way. They gave the Dies bill preference, and then killed it, and Chairman DICKSTEIN cast the deciding vote against it. So it was, after all, Chairman DICKSTEIN who cast the deciding vote against alien restriction.

I want to repeat the language which the gentleman used. I remember it word for word by heart. Chairman DICKSTEIN said they voted to put all those bills into the deadhouse. Oh, it was a deadhouse! It was a deadhouse, I will say to the gentleman from New York, because whenever he puts a bill in his "deadhouse" it never comes out.

Now, I want you to know just what kind of a bill it was, this Dies bill, H. R. 4114, that Chairman DICKSTEIN killed with his deciding vote last Congress. I quote its provisions as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after July 1, 1933, the quota in the case of any nationality for which a quota has been determined and proclaimed under the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be 40 percent of such quota, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100.

SEC. 2. From and after July 1, 1933, no immigration visas shall be issued under subdivision (c) of section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 204 (c)), but all the provisions of the immigration laws shall be applicable to immigrants born in any of the geographical areas specified in such subdivision as if each of such areas had at that time quota equal to 40 percent (but not less than 100) of the number of nonquota immigration visas issued, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, to immigrants born in such area.

SEC. 3. That subdivision (a) of section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153), as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VI, title 8, sec. 204 (a)), is amended to read as follows: "An immigrant who is the unmarried child under 21 years of age, or the wife, or a citizen of the United States, or the husband of a citizen of the United States, by a marriage occurring prior to January 1, 1933: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, nonquota immigration visas may be issued to otherwise admissible fathers or mothers over 60 years of age of citizens of the United States who are 21 years of age or over."

SEC. 4. That section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153), as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VI, title 8, sec. 206), is amended to read as follows: (a) "Immigration visas to quota immigrants shall be issued in each fiscal year as follows: (1) 75 percent of each nationality for such year shall be made available in each year for the issuance of immigration visas to the following classes of immigrants: (a) Quota immigrants who are the fathers or the mothers or the husbands by marriage occurring after January 1, 1933, of citizens of the United States who are 21 years of age or over; and (b) quota immigrants who are the unmarried children under 21 years of age, or the wives, or husbands, or the mother, or the father, of alien residents of the United States who were lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"(2) Any portion of the quota of each nationality for such year not required for the issuance of immigration visas to the classes specified in paragraph 1 shall be made available in such year for the issuance of immigration visas to other quota immigrants of such nationality.

"(b) The preference provided in paragraphs 1 and 2 of subdivision (a) shall, in the case of quota immigrants of any nationality, be given in the calendar month in which the right to preference is established, if the number of immigration visas which may be issued in any such month to quota immigrants of such nationality has not already been issued; otherwise in the next calendar month."

SEC. 5. The provisions of this act are in addition to the provisions of the immigration laws now in force, and shall be enforced as a part of such laws, and all the penal or other provisions of such laws, not inapplicable, shall apply to and be enforced in connection with the provisions of this act. An alien, although admissible under the provisions of this act, shall not be admitted to the United States if he is excluded by any provision of the immigration laws other than this act, and an alien, although admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than this act, shall not be admitted to the United States if he is excluded by any provisions of this act.

Now, the foregoing is the Dies bill (H. R. 4114), which Chairman DICKSTEIN killed with his deciding vote in the last Congress, and that is the reason that in reply to questions asked today by Chairman DICKSTEIN as to whether he had been fair, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] said to Chairman DICKSTEIN:

I do not think the gentleman is bona fide in favor of restriction. He represents a district where 80 percent are opposed to it. The gentleman always votes against anything that is in favor of restriction.

Now, I want to put my friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] on notice now that tomorrow is the thirtieth legislative day of this Congress.

After tomorrow petitions may be filed to discharge committees. Day after tomorrow I am going to file at the Clerk's desk a petition to take my bill, which will stop immigration to this country for 10 years, from his committee. If we can pass this bill it will give us a chance to assimilate the foreigners that we already have before we let others come in. This will give us a chance to retake American jobs and redistribute them from foreigners back to American unemployed citizens. It will take this bill out of the gentleman's "death house" and put it on a live calendar in this House, where we can take it up and pass it.

The bill is a short one, and I am going to include it in my remarks. I want you to get a copy of the RECORD in the morning and read it. This is H. R. 2733, introduced by myself on the first day of this Congress, and reads as follows:

A bill to provide for the suspension of immigration of aliens into the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That for the period of 10 years beginning 30 days after the enactment of this act, the immigration of all aliens into the United States is prohibited.

Sec. 2. The Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe rules and regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this act.

Sec. 3. The provisions of this act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws, and shall be enforced as a part of such laws; and all the penal or other provisions of such laws, not inapplicable, shall apply to and be enforced in connection with the provisions of this act.

I am going to give the Members of this Congress a chance to vote on that measure. If 217 of you day after tomorrow will walk up to the Clerk's desk and sign your "John Hancock" to that petition, you will let your people back home know that you are in favor of keeping American jobs for Americans.

How many of you are going to stand up and be counted on the question of stopping this immigration?

Mr. COLDEN. If the gentleman will yield, I will answer his question.

Mr. BLANTON. I regret I have not the time. I want to get these facts before you. How many of you are going to help us pass this bill?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am going to sign the gentleman's petition, but I want to ask him a question.

Mr. BLANTON. You know, the gentleman from Kentucky served over in the Senate at one time, and they have a courtesy over there that whenever a Senator gets up they have to yield to him; and I would yield, if I had the time.

There is the Rio Grande down in my State that flows for many miles along the United States-Mexican border. The Rio Grande in lots of places is so shallow that you can wade across it. Aliens come across there by the thousands and are taking bread and meat out of the mouths of the little children of America every year. Aliens from all countries come across the Rio Grande. I want to stop that, and I am going to give you the opportunity to stop it. You cannot go back home and say that you did not have a chance to stop immigration. I know the rules of the House, I have studied them, and I have seen them applied for 18 years. If you walk up there Thursday and sign that petition to take this bill out of the gentleman's deadhouse and put it on the calendar, I will bring it up in this House in a way that you will have a chance to pass it, if you want to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does it take 218 signatures?

Mr. BLANTON. It requires 217 besides my own.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not 145?

Mr. BLANTON. If a proposition is good, I have found that it is mighty easy to get 218 men to sponsor it. Of course, if it is not salutary and if you are like the gentleman from New York, who believes in the uniting of all foreign families over here, you will naturally not sign it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was born here.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman had not been, I would feel just as kindly toward him. One of my colleagues here had to wait a few months before he had been here long enough to take the oath of office. He and I are good friends. We get along fine. I have nothing against him because he came from a foreign country. He is a very able Member of this House, but I want to stop aliens from coming in until we get American jobs back into the hands of Americans.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry; I have not the time. I want to get Mr. MacCormack's statement in the RECORD. Back in 1917 we deported two of the most noted anarchists in the world, who had been causing much trouble in this country. They were both deemed dangerous anarchists. It took us a long time and cost us a lot of money to deport them. One of them was named Emma Goldman and the

other Alexander Berkman. We put them back in Russia, where they belonged.

In my friend's subcommittee, when they got after Mr. MacCormack about letting her come back, here is what he said:

I am frank to say that the Strachey admission was at my own instance. The first of those cases was, as I recollect it, that of Emma Goldman. She applied for permission to come to this country to speak on literature.

A noted anarchist, deported from the country because she was an anarchist and a dangerous anarchist, and deported back to Russia, wanted to come back here and speak on literature. What kind of literature do you suppose?

We were given definite assurances that she would speak on literature and keep off the political subjects, and particularly subjects dealing with anarchism. I took the position—and on that position urged her admission—that it was very much better, as long as she was not going to discuss subjects which are prohibited to an alien under our law, to let her in than to give her the publicity for her books and writings which would attend her exclusion; and after discussion in the Department, it was agreed that that be done.

Emma Goldman had been a great figure, and so we let her into the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I quote further:

She was a wild-eyed anarchist, but when she came into the United States we permitted her to move around freely. We held her down to a gentleman's agreement that we had with her and with the people who were sponsoring her stay, that she was merely a nice old lady who was traveling around the country telling her past experiences.

Then a Member asked Commissioner MacCormack:

How about Tom Mann?

Mr. MACCORMACK. There was a case of Tom Mann, a British Communist labor leader. He applied for admission into the United States to address a conference on peace—specifically on that—a conference against war, or something like that, it was called. I looked over the group of organizations participating in this peace conference, and I saw the usual group of labor organizations, parlor Socialists, and many serious organizations, all concerned in this conference. I inquired whether Tom Mann was going to talk communism or discuss anything that would be received with displeasure in this country. They said, "No; he was going to talk on peace." And again I urged that he be permitted to come in.

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

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute, if I have the time.

In this connection I want to read you from our own hearings on this bill about what happened last summer in the general strike out in California.

We had before our subcommittee that framed this bill a very distinguished military man from California, Adjutant General Howard. I read from the printed report of the hearings, beginning at page 435. General Howard is testifying and telling about a strike called out in California and about the trouble it put them to. He said, and I am quoting from the hearings on this bill:

We immediately sent out a call and assembled about 5,000 of our troops on the San Francisco front and across the bay at Oakland and Berkeley.

The malcontents tied up the entire outside country so no food could be brought in and no gasoline for the trucks. We had out there a condition of absolute revolution for a period of 3 days.

At the same time, at Los Angeles, we had a similar strike and some longshoremen went out.

It was necessary, in making our demonstration in San Francisco, for us to pull the troops out of Los Angeles and take them to the northern city, which left the city of Los Angeles, a territory with well over 2,000,000 people, absolutely destitute of protection.

Of course, the city and county of Los Angeles wanted us to replace those troops, or get them back there.

The police department immediately added 1,200 policemen to their force. But you can imagine what 1,200 policemen would be able to do in a serious situation. That is about the size of a regiment of infantry.

They took charge of the situation insofar as that particular strike in that part of the State was concerned. But we were utterly helpless to go down there to help them.

We would have had to resort to the drafting of men. We would have had to resort to calling for volunteers and trying to get arms and ammunition, but, of course, they had no uniforms, to try to save the State of California, as we were really in a situation of revolution.

I think the question of national defense should be given consideration as a national proposition, and I should like to say something about our position as the frontier of the Nation on the west coast, in the case of any trouble with a foreign country.

Mr. BLANTON. Before you leave that subject, let me ask you this question: How many men were there who caused that trouble—that revolutionary condition? Approximately how many union men were there?

General HOWARD. In the neighborhood of 1,300.

Mr. BLANTON. Then 1,300 union men put California and the country to all that trouble and expense.

General HOWARD. Yes; there were only a very small number of actual agitators originally; less than 300, I should say.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a situation, in my judgment, that is ruining and menacing the whole world.

Mr. BOLTON. What has been done with those men?

General HOWARD. The ringleader, who went around in San Francisco with a bodyguard of 14 men, is now the president of the union. He is a citizen of Australia, and we have never been able to topple him from his high perch. He still controls things out there.

Mr. BOLTON. Has the Department of Labor taken any steps in reference to that matter?

General HOWARD. No, sir; we inquired during the trouble of the Department of Labor and the Secret Service as to what could be done with this man, because I wanted to pick him up. I was told it would be better to let him alone, because the Federal authorities were trying to get something on him.

Mr. SNYDER. You said he was the president of the union; what union is that?

General HOWARD. The Longshoremen's International Union.

Here is one other statement General Howard made:

I would say that at least 60 or 70 percent of the people who actually caused this trouble were not American citizens.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 more minutes.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I regret I cannot. I am going to use this 5 minutes myself.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman promised to yield to me for a question, but he has not answered the last question I asked him—what is a blood relative?

Mr. BLANTON. Just now I am not concerned about blood relatives of foreigners. I am concerned about Americans and their blood relatives.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am concerned about Americans and what would the gentleman call a blood relative? I too am concerned about Americans—Americans who seek to have with them in America the members of their family by blood relationship. What would the gentleman call a blood relative?

Mr. BLANTON. I am calling attention to the fact that it is more important to our country to protect the rights of Americans and their blood relatives than it is to protect the rights of foreigners and their blood relatives abroad. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a satisfactory answer to myself, and now I want to show you about deportations.

I am reading from page 88 of the hearings on the Department of Labor for the 1936 appropriation bill.

Mr. MacCormack says:

We have stayed deportation in approximately 1,200 cases of persons of good character who would be the beneficiaries of the legislation if enacted.

He means the bill he is expecting Chairman DICKSTEIN to pass. That is one I stopped. I want him to deport those 1,200 aliens. That is why I stopped his bill.

He is counting on the gentleman from New York to pass a bill to back him up in his arbitrarily refusing to deport 1,200 aliens who should be deported. I am here to tell him that he ought to obey the law as now written, and when the law required these 1,200 aliens to be deported, he ought to have deported them and not take the chance of the gentleman from New York passing a bill interfering with it—he ought to deport them.

Now, I did not start this debate. It was started by the gentleman from New York. I was going to talk about the war bill, but the gentleman from New York challenged me to debate, and whenever anybody challenges me to debate they get something started. [Laughter.]

I want to tell the gentleman that there are a lot of people in New York back of me who want to stop immigration. The American Federation of Labor wants immigration stopped. The Daughters of the American Revolution want immigration stopped. Are they patriotic?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All those people whom the gentleman refers to want the bill for repatriation.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to vote for any make-believe bill. I want a real bill; I do not want to vote for any chicken feed put up to stifle real legislation. I never started anything yet that I did not finish. This is one of the things that I am going to finish with God's help.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. One question more—the gentleman had a petition filed in the past session of Congress to discharge the committee, and how many signatures did he get?

Mr. BLANTON. I did not have time then, but I will get them this time. The gentleman need not worry; we are going to take that bill out of the gentleman's "death house."

Mr. LUCKEY. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. For a short question.

Mr. LUCKEY. Would the gentleman favor a law which would prevent a man from coming here or remaining here simply on account of the misspelling of his name?

Mr. BLANTON. When it comes to a law favoring anybody I want it to favor Americans and not foreign families. I am going to take care of the American family first.

Now, the following is the statement made by my colleague [Mr. DIES] today when he introduced another bill, H. R. 5921, that contains the identical provisions in his bill H. R. 4114 last Congress, which Chairman DICKSTEIN killed in committee with his deciding vote as chairman, to wit:

Mr. DIES. I have just introduced a bill that will not only end the organized and even subversive propaganda called attention to by the Dickstein Nazi committee, but will strengthen existing deportation statutes as urged by the Department of Labor, deport gangsters and racketeers convicted of possessing machine guns, permanently exclude aliens convicted of crime and lawbreaking, require eligible aliens to become citizens or depart, further restrict immigration by reducing the existing quotas 60 percent, and applying them to countries of this hemisphere, take care of law-abiding aged parents and near relatives of foreign born in this country by reserving the quotas for them, and deport aliens engaged in smuggling and bootlegging aliens into this country.

Last year's immigration statistics show an increase of 50 percent in quota immigration; that is, new seed immigrants, an 8-percent increase in total aliens admitted and a 60-percent decrease in alien deportations. During the last 10 years of quota restriction over three and a half million aliens have entered the United States, and our last census revealed the largest number of foreign born, over 14,000,000, the largest foreign-stock population, over 40,000,000, and the most aliens, nearly 7,000,000, in our history. While the alien departures reported by the steamships and railroads do exceed the alien arrivals counted by our immigrant inspectors, our alien population has continued to increase by surreptitious entries and by the atrocious, alien deserting seamen hole in our existing legislation that my bill would plug up.

The bill I have just introduced would also deport alien Communists by making any alien deportable who is a member of communistic organizations. Most of the leaders of indefensible strikes like the recent general strike on the Pacific coast are aliens with red records, and of such we have quite enough of our own naturalized and even native born without importing any more or permitting them to operate in this country, just as we have enough unemployed and dependents without importing any more or permitting aliens to swell their ranks. Each country should care for its own dependents, delinquents, defectives, and unemployed. Charity should begin at home, just as employment should.

Now, in closing, I want the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] to get this, and I am sorry that I could not yield to him, for he is always very kind to me.

The deportations in 1931 were 18,142. In 1932 they were 19,422. In 1933 the deportations were 19,865.

But since my friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] put into operation his policy of uniting of alien families, deportations dropped down from 19,865 last year to only 8,879 this year—less than half. Are you colleagues not concerned about this momentous question, America for Americans?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSON].

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of my friend, Mr. BLANTON, of Texas,

and I made a number of unsuccessful efforts to have him yield to me, as I desired to propound to him a question and to call attention to some pertinent facts that are now matters of history, relative to the question of restricting foreign immigration.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Kentucky can do it now in his own time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The question that I desired to propound to Mr. BLANTON was, Why did his party the other day when we had up for consideration here in the House the President's so-called "\$4,000,000,000 work bill", kill the amendment offered giving American citizens preference for the jobs to be provided by that large sum of money?

My friend from Texas says he is more concerned in providing jobs for American citizens than he is for foreigners. I am in full accord with him on this declaration, and this is now and has been at all times the policy of the Republican party.

My friend from Texas says there are 12,000,000 heads of families in this country out of employment. The President and the most optimistic of the Democratic leaders assert that the \$4,000,000,000 work relief bill will provide employment for not more than 3,500,000 of these people out of work.

When the bill was up for consideration two most significant amendments were offered to it and were objected to and knocked out by the Democrats, who are in control of the House. As pointed out above, an amendment was offered to give preference in these work jobs to American citizens. I have never yet been able to understand why the Democratic majority in the House objected to that amendment and caused its rejection. Another good American amendment was offered proposing that preference in the expenditure of this money should be given for American products and American materials, and this amendment was objected to and its rejection brought about by the Democrats.

I understand that the Department of Labor contends there are more than 16,000,000 aliens in the United States that can be accounted for by the Department of Labor. There are other millions of aliens in the United States who were smuggled into this country. If they were smuggled into this country, they are subject to deportation. Mr. DICKSTEIN, Chairman of the Committee on Labor, declared in his remarks that there were between 200,000 and 300,000 aliens in this country who are deportable for one or more valid causes. We all know that there are millions of these aliens on relief in this country, and they entail a tremendous burden upon the taxpayers and relief organizations of our country. Instead of expending large sums to provide relief for them, it seems that a part of the money could be well spent in returning them to their own countries. Millions of these aliens have been in this country many, many years. They have failed to take steps to become naturalized.

During the World War it appeared there were more than a million able-bodied men within the draft age in this country from the allied countries. Due to the fact they were aliens, we could not force them into our Army or Navy, and the allied countries could not force them into their armies or navies because they were in this country. They remained behind the lines with good positions and jobs at high salaries and wages while American boys were in the camps or in allied countries serving and fighting for a pittance to preserve those allied countries.

I have always held to the position that no alien should be permitted to remain in this country and enjoy its privileges and opportunities unless he was willing to become an American citizen and put himself in position where in time of war he could be called to the colors to defend the country that had given him protection and support.

REPUBLICAN PARTY FOR RESTRICTION AND PROTECTION

I served under the Wilson administration. A large majority of the Republicans in the House and Senate and some Democrats tried to protect our country from the great influx of foreign immigration, but we were unable to accomplish anything. We had to wait until the Republican Party came into power in 1921, and it was then that the first real anti-immigration law was passed. It was passed by a Republican

Congress and signed by a Republican President. It was in 1924 when a Republican Congress passed that wonderful measure further restricting foreign immigration and it was signed by a Republican President. It was said to be the "second Declaration of American Independence" and it was fought by the same Democratic leaders who have been for the last 2 or 3 years and are now trying to break down and destroy our immigration laws.

My position and the position of the Republican Party on this important issue, as I understand it, is not one of offense to any nation or any people; it is a matter of defense to our own country and our own people.

I wish it were possible that every man, woman, and child on the earth could have and enjoy a country like ours, with its liberties and its opportunities. Holy Writ declares that "He who provideth not for his own household hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." I am opposed to this country being filled up with people from foreign countries, because I feel it my duty as a Representative in Congress to provide for the household of America first.

WILL NOT PASS

My friend Mr. BLANTON, from Texas, says that Chairman DICKSTEIN, of the Committee on Labor of the House, has been throttling and killing bills against foreign immigration. Mr. DICKSTEIN is a very capable and splendid man. However, I do not agree with him on this important subject. I like the attitude of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] says that he cannot get his bill out of Mr. DICKSTEIN's committee, and the insinuation is that the committee is badly packed. If it is packed, it is packed by the Democratic Party. I am willing to sign a petition to help bring this immigration bill out on the floor, that we may have an opportunity to discuss it and vote on it; but let me say this to the gentleman from Texas: His bill will never pass and become a law under a Democratic administration.

The powerful Labor and Immigration Committees of the House are against it, and I am sure that the Honorable James Farley, national chairman of the Democratic Party and the Postmaster General, is against it; the leadership of the Democratic Party is against it; and Tammany is against it; and these forces in the Democratic Party will never permit it to pass and become a law.

A bill similar to this, with some amendments, should be adopted, and I hope that the gentlemen from Texas and other Democrats who are like-minded will also bring out a bill and have these aliens who are deportable sent out of this country. If we should use some of this \$4,000,000,000 for that purpose, the relief burden would be greatly cut down and there would be less unemployment and more jobs for American citizens who are out of work. I venture to say there are more than a million men who served this country on land or sea, in the air, or under the sea that are out of work and are walking the streets and highways looking for jobs that they cannot find.

The gentleman from Texas also takes the Department of Labor to task for not deporting people who are deportable and for pursuing a policy that is breaking down our immigration laws; and I repeat that my friend from Texas, in trying to get through an immigration law, is not only met with a lot of hostile leadership in Congress but is met with the powerful influence of the executive branch of the Government.

One of these days the American people are going to turn again to the Republican Party, that is the real champion of American labor, and measures will be passed that will relieve this country from the tens of thousands of Bruno Richard Hauptmanns and others who have been smuggled into our land.

KEEP OUT FOREIGN PRODUCTS

I am glad to cooperate with the gentleman from Texas and others to further restrict foreign immigration and to deport a lot of aliens. The gentleman from Texas says that he wants to do this in order to provide jobs for American citizens. That is a most laudable purpose, but my friend from Texas and other Democrats do not go far enough. It will

not do our working people much good to keep foreigners out of this country and send aliens back to their home countries where they will produce shoes, clothing, pottery, machinery, and hundreds of other articles in industry and agriculture—working long hours with low wages and using the materials and products of their own country to produce these articles and then dump them into our country. Restricted immigration and the protective tariff must go hand in hand. Why keep the Italians in Italy producing hats and other articles, the Swiss in Switzerland manufacturing watches, the Belgians in Belgium manufacturing cement and other articles, the Japs in Japan manufacturing pottery and silks, the people of India in India manufacturing jute and other articles under long hours and low wages of those countries and using the raw materials of those countries and ship them into our country in competition with our workers and our business people? America, with its codes providing for a decent wage and shorter hours, cannot compete with foreign countries that have no codes, insist on long hours and low wages. We should not permit anyone to come here to work so long as there is anyone in this country who desires to work and is unable to find employment; neither should we permit any products that can be produced in this country to be brought in from foreign countries. Therefore may I urge that my distinguished friend from Texas join with us not only in restricting foreign immigration and deporting aliens but stand with us for a protective tariff? If those two policies are adhered to, there will be very little unemployment, and the recovery of our country from this terrible depression will be assured.

Let me say to my friend from Texas that I am going to sign his petition, but he will not get it through.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman signs and enough others sign to discharge the committee, I will pass the bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman will not get it through. The folks in control of the gentleman's party will not let it go through.

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

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the National Recovery Act, through its textile code, has abolished child labor in those sections of the country where it existed; it has aided in eliminating the payment of starvation wages by some concerns; it has brought about a better uniformity in the work week. These are gains toward stabilization and uniformity which everyone appreciates. But the codes have not brought about the thorough uniformity which is essential for peace in the great cotton textile industry, the second largest in the United States.

The minimum wage differential is \$1 in favor of the South. Why there should be any differential has never been clearly established. But unfair as this is, it would not cause any great concern if this was the only differential which was tolerated in the code.

The report of the inquiry recently concluded by the Department of Labor shows there is a much wider discrimination. On the basis of a full 40-hour week, allowed under the code, the mill workers of the North earn from \$1 to \$5.64 more per week than they do in the South. The percentage of difference varies widely and ranges from 7.1 percent for section hands to 27.8 for loom fixers, and 30 percent for picker tenders. Most of the jobs in the northern mills pay 20 percent more than the same jobs in the South.

The Government study, made in August 1934, shows the average loom fixer in the North, for a full 40-hour week, earns \$25.92, while in the South the average pay is \$20.28. Female weavers in the North, according to the Government report, average \$17.40 for a full 40-hour week, while the southern women weavers average \$15.28.

Male weavers in the North average \$17.63, and in the South, \$16.04. Picker tenders in the North average \$16.28, as compared to \$12.52 for the same workers in the southern mills. Slubber tenders in the North get \$19.52 per week, while in the South the average wage is \$14.96. Speeder

tenders in the North receive \$16.08 for female operators, as compared with \$14.12 in the South. Male speeder tenders in the northern mills average \$18.16, while in the South they get \$14.72.

Women spinners in the northern mills average \$15.12, against \$12.84 in the South. Warper tenders in the North get \$15.96, while in the South the average wage is \$13.32. Doffers in the North average \$17.28 per week, while in the South they earn \$13.96. Oilers average \$14.48 in the northern mills and \$12.60 in the southern plants.

Truckers, watchmen, and laborers averaged from 25 to 30 percent more in the northern mills than in the South.

In brief, it is estimated the difference in wages paid in the North amounts to \$40,000,000 more annually than corresponding wages in the southern mills. This is \$40,000,000 which southern manufacturers take out of the pay of their employees with which it is possible to shade prices below the price at which the northern competitor can sell. In the spirit of fair competition, this situation should not be permitted to exist with the sanction of those who form the codes.

We who live in the North appreciate the contribution to the Nation of the higher-waged employees. We would not for one moment have the situation reversed. Rather would we delight to see the position of the millions of toilers everywhere improved. We believe the wage differentials are worthy of more consideration than they have had in the past from the code authorities.

If the Government is to regulate an industry the regulations must be uniform. No section of the country should be given a distinct advantage over another section, as is permitted under the cotton-textile code. The present situation works to the disadvantage of both the manufacturer and the worker in the North. A worker can enjoy a higher wage scale, but if the firm for which he works is unable to sell to advantage, it of necessity means a curtailment in operations which will materially affect his earnings. The South has the natural advantage of being in close proximity to the cotton fields and lower fuel costs. It is entitled to no more than the natural advantages; certainly none derived through Government support.

Water will seek its own level. So eventually will industries which are in direct competition. Either the wage scales of the South must come up to the North, or those of the North will eventually descend to those of the South.

I believe it is infinitely better for every section of the country, and for the country, that the wage scales of the South shall be increased. It will mean more wealth and greater purchasing power in the South, and it will inevitably contribute to better conditions among the masses everywhere. For this patriotic reason, I hope the textile-code authorities will take cognizance of an opportunity to stabilize the textile industrial life on a higher and better scale, to bring about a uniformity in conditions which will generally promote happiness and contentment.

If the code officials are genuinely interested in improving the condition of the workers, they will move promptly to remove the present unfair discriminations. Bring the southern textile worker to a parity with his brother worker of the North and you will bring more sunshine to the South; you will help recovery by increasing the purchasing power of millions, and you will give every section of the country an equal opportunity to live.

Through uniformity will be established a more satisfactory situation for everyone. The code authorities are given the opportunity, if they will take advantage of it, of performing a real constructive work in harmonizing the industry on a uniform basis.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. KLEBERG. Being from the South, I am interested in the gentleman's discourse. I wonder if it ever occurred to the gentleman that possibly one of the best things to do in respect to any discrepancy as between wages paid in the North and in the South, in a desire to help labor, would be to have the industries of the North move down to the

South where there are cheaper fuel and better climate conditions?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Oh, but we have a better class of labor in the North.

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

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I know it is a fact every Democrat, Republican, Farmer-Laborite, and Progressive Congressman is receiving letters daily from his constituents telling him they are losing their homes. I also know it is a fact that unless this Congress does something to save the homes of the unemployed, thousands of homes will be sold by the sheriff. I received a telegram this morning from Pittsburgh, which I ask unanimous consent to have read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the telegram.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., February 19, 1935.

Congressman DUNN,
Washington, D. C.:

Pittsburgh H. O. L. C. applicants need relief at once. We are in H. O. L. C. office tonight; after 3 weeks now H. O. L. C. functioning. Our situation desperate. All facing immediate sheriff-sales evictions. Will stay in office until relieved. Act in behalf of your unfortunate constituents at once.

SMALL HOME AND PROPERTY OWNERS' PROTECTIVE
ASSOCIATION OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of the Federal Government to provide enough money to extend loans to those who are in need of financial assistance. Many men and women who have applied for loans have not received assistance from the Corporation because they could not guarantee the officials of the said institutions that they would be able to pay the principal and interest on the money which they desired to borrow in order to save their homes. I maintain it is the duty of the Federal Government to prevent the homes of the people from being sold by the sheriff. This also includes the farmer and the business man who owns a small business establishment.

I do know that, if Congress at this session will appropriate sufficient funds to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, every home in the United States will be saved. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, since addressing the House before on this subject I have followed the advice of my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], and have been to the Emergency Relief Administration and interviewed Mr. W. I. Myers, Director; I have interviewed Mr. Harry L. Hopkins, Emergency Relief Director; I have interviewed his assistant, Col. Lawrence Westbrook; I have communicated with Norman Monaghan, Director Emergency Crop and Feed Section of the Farm Credit Administration. From all of this effort no results have been accomplished, and the condition in North Dakota remains unchanged.

On February 12, Senators and Congressmen from the drought States met representatives of the A. A. A., the F. E. R. A., and the F. C. A. in the caucus room of the old House Office Building.

Colonel Murphy represented the A. A. A., Col. Lawrence Westbrook represented the F. E. R. A., and Mr. Estgate represented the F. C. A.

Some interesting facts were established, but no change in the present system of relief was agreed to. The facts established were: Up to January 31, 1935, the A. A. A. had purchased 3,200,000 head of cattle. That 20,000,000 bushels of seed wheat had been purchased and was stored in 600 elevators throughout the drought area.

One hundred and twenty-five million dollars had been allocated to the purpose of human relief and that this amount was about gone. That this department was not responsible

for the distribution of feed, except in amounts not involving over \$25 and that applications in excess of this amount came under the jurisdiction of the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section of the Farm Credit Administration, and that the office in charge of this distribution for Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota is located in the city of Minneapolis, Minn., and that one L. J. Paulson is regional manager.

The Farm Credit Administration denies that they are responsible for the presence of L. J. Paulson as such manager, but admits that his authority is derived from Norman Monaghan, Director of Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section of the Farm Credit Administration.

Here are the statistics of loans in the various Western States:

Year	State	Families served	Amount in money
1933	North Dakota.....	18, 616	\$395, 000
	South Dakota.....	33, 329	708, 000
	Minnesota.....	36, 535	1, 035, 000
1934	North Dakota.....	38, 340	1, 460, 255
	South Dakota.....	60, 742	2, 641, 000
	Minnesota.....	111, 570	5, 052, 000

That 60 percent of all the relief of this character in the United States had gone through the Minneapolis office. That the hay on hand and stored around in the various States had been paid for by the Government.

There are two obstructions to the granting of emergency relief that all officers representing the various administrations agreed were still in force and were no part of the acts creating the administrations but were merely regulations. Those two obstructions are:

First. When the feed loans are granted under the authority of the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section, Farm Credit Administration, nondisturbance agreements are required to be signed by all mortgagees regardless of whether the mortgage refers to the livestock to be fed or not.

This regulation gives machine companies and others a chance to line the farmer up. Most of the mortgagees have wanted to do this for a long time, and this regulation permits them their golden opportunity. Some will not release unless the farmer will pay them some money on the claim. Of course, the farmer has no money, and they know it; and if the farmer cannot pay money, the mortgagees, like the International Harvester Co., demand that the farmer surrender the machinery upon which they hold a mortgage. The Farm Credit Administration claims that this regulation was made so that the machinery would be left for the farmer to use. As the rule has worked, it has had the opposite effect. It has given the machine companies an opportunity to clean up on the farmer, who, rather than see his livestock starve, gives up the machinery, when, under the law of most States, he is protected in the possession of the machinery. When these nondisturbance agreements cannot be obtained the livestock is left to starve.

The Federal Emergency Relief Administration announces that no such agreements are asked for; that they advance the feed on plain notes. That is true; but, remember, the F. E. R. A. does not handle any feed except in cases where the amount asked for is not more than \$25.

This confuses the public to have one bureau say nondisturbance agreements are necessary, and then the next bureau announce that this statement is all wrong and no such agreements are required.

The next bar to getting feed for suffering livestock is that there are only two places where this can be done. First, to apply to the emergency crop and feed section of the Farm Credit Administration for a feed loan, or second, to apply to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration where the amount involved is not over \$25.

Should the application be for more than \$25, then the Farm Credit Administration under the emergency crop and feed section requires that waivers be obtained, but it is not necessary to borrow elsewhere; should the amount asked for

not exceed \$25, then the Emergency Relief Administration does not ask for waivers or nondisturbance agreements to be signed, but if your livestock is not mortgaged, this division requires the farmer to get credit by mortgaging his livestock. He is told to go to some Agricultural Credit Corporation and make a loan. The amount he can borrow is so pitifully small that, with hay averaging \$20 per ton and alfalfa \$26 per ton, he cannot secure enough feed to last him more than a few days. If his loan is rejected, and it is quite often done, he is without any avenue of escape whatever. Besides this it takes weeks to get one of these loans passed, and in the meantime the livestock dies.

My principal criticism is that there is no one responsible head to which any farmer can go. There is too much division of responsibility. There should be an immediate reorganization of the entire set-up. Secondly, the rules and regulations should be changed to meet the emergency situation.

For all of these reasons I have asked in a resolution now before the Committee on Rules that the Speaker of the House appoint a committee of five to interview these various departments with the hope of having the rules and regulations changed without any congressional action, and, in the event of the failure of the committee to accomplish this objective, that the committee recommend to Congress such appropriate action as they deem necessary to make relief effective.

That, in reference to human relief, the committee review the complaints coming to Members of Congress and attempt to secure effective service or recommend the dismissal of local administrators who fail to take appropriate action in the cases complained of.

At this point I desire to include in my speech various exhibits supporting the statements made in the speech.

On January 15, through messages received from various commercial clubs of North Dakota, we learned that the Emergency Feed and Seed Division, Minneapolis, Minn., demanded that the farmers give them security on the 1935 crop for all prior advances of feed and seed. I obtained the original documents which were going out from the offices of local emergency feed and seed directors. Both Congressman LEMKE and myself took this matter up with the Farm Credit Administration, and on the 21st of January Governor Myers advised WILLIAM LEMKE by letter that the farmers were not required to give any such mortgage, and he further wrote that this position had been telephoned to the Minneapolis office.

I supposed that would settle all the trouble, but the complaints kept coming in, and since the 21st day of January thousands of mortgages have been placed of record in North Dakota in violation of the instructions issued by Governor Myers.

I have endeavored to determine who is responsible for this, and I now place the responsibility on L. J. Paulson, manager of the Feed and Seed Loan Division of the Farm Credit Administration. If he received the communication from Myers on the 21st of January, why would he write the following letter on the 28th of January?—which reads (exhibit 1):

We have for consideration your supplemental application for an emergency seed loan dated January 22. We have been informed that you have refused to execute a renewal of the seed loan which you obtained from this office. If you are not willing to cooperate with us in placing your past due applications in good condition, we see no reason why you should receive consideration from this office.

This letter was directed to R. J. Augabirgh, Rugby, N. Dak.

I am advised that as late as Saturday (Feb. 16) that in one county alone in North Dakota 300 mortgages went on record in 1 week, mortgaging the 1935 crop for all prior advances for feed and seed.

Nathaniel P. Patzen, Carrington, N. Dak., writes (exhibit 2):

I have no work, and if I ask for work they do not give me any. I have nothing to pay my bills and no money. I am 58 and my wife is 60. I have nothing on which to live. I will give you a deed to my house if you can get me something so I can live for the next month.

Chester Moffit, Dunn Center, N. Dak., writes (exhibit 3):

Hay is \$22 per ton. Bran and shorts \$31.50, and cottonseed cake \$52 per ton. We were over to Peterson's place and he has lost all of his horses, but he has four cows and chickens. He is hauling straw from an old straw pile—on a wheelbarrow from a straw stack 8 years old. He was told by relief officers at Killdeer he could get no feed, because his stock wasn't mortgaged. Another of my neighbors was turned down for feed because a mortgagee had a mortgage on a piece of machinery and would not release.

It really does not accomplish results by making complaints to the Emergency Relief Administration here in Washington, because they in turn refer the matter back to the administration of North Dakota. Here is a sample of what is done:

We are today forwarding this correspondence to the Seed Emergency Relief Administrator for his information and appropriate action in the hope that something may be done to assist your constituents.

Mrs. Albert Brandt, of Sanish, N. Dak., writes (exhibit 4):

We have no feed for our stock. The Government has hay piled up as high as stables here, but we can't get it. They say that we must mortgage our livestock, and we can't get a loan. We got an old-age pension from North Dakota this year, and the total amount for the year was \$3.10. If the feed is not given to the farmers, it will be rotten next summer.

A case from Benson County—The International Harvester Co. had a mortgage on a plow, but before they did sign up an agreement they demanded the return of the plow. At the same time they also took the rest of the machinery on which they had a mortgage, being a wagon and a grain binder. They could not haul the binder through the snow, so they took off the bull wheel and left the rest. This farmer writes (exhibit 5):

You can see all they wanted was to break up the machinery so that it could not be used. Then they signed the nondisturbance agreement. I have had no crop for 3 years and have six children.

His application for feed at the Minneapolis office was turned down.

Mr. Peter Friezen, of Cathay, N. Dak., reports (exhibit 6):

Under date of February 11, I saw five horses in a small creek next to the barn eating old straw. All five were skin and bones. One horse was down and couldn't get up. These poor horses, half starved, and they are within 20 feet of the Government hay stores. That is the God's fact. Only 20 feet from this good feed. I call this rotten. The mortgagees will not release their mortgages on machinery, and the Government will let the stock starve unless they get the release. For God's sake, see if you can't get this changed.

John Jones, of Golden Valley, N. Dak., writes (exhibit 7):

We cut our livestock down last fall to 3 cows, 4 horses, and 35 chickens, and 2 turkeys, and for these we thought we would get feed from the Government, and we executed the release, but they won't give us any. If we don't get any help, our stock will die from hunger. We lost 2 horses, 20 chickens, and 2 pigs already. If we don't get any help soon, we will lose everything.

Here is a report from McKenzie County in regard to human relief made by two women instructed to conduct an independent investigation (exhibit 8):

I have visited another place, and this case is terrible. There is a family of 12 (but 2 are absent at present), so there are 10 besides the parents, and all 10 are at the age to be in school, but have not attended school for nearly 2 years. Their name is Wing; the father's address is Charles Wing, Fairview, Mont. They live in a "dug-out", in a terrible condition. I was there yesterday and did not know that humans could endure such a life.

There is one room with dirt floor and dirt walls, like a cellar, then there are two beds in this room—common, wire beds with no mattresses. There is a small heating stove and a cook stove; this is the living room for 12 people. There is a tunnel running back about 10 feet, and at the end of this a room with two beds; in one corner some potatoes are stored. There is no ventilation of any kind. Mrs. Grzanie was with me and we went through this tunnel and saw the place by the light of matches. There was a member of the family asleep on one of the beds. There could not be any air fit to breathe in that place. There were several little children running around barefooted. The snow had melted around the door and the entrance was a pool of mud and water. These little children ran in and out, through the mud and water. These little children ran in and out through the mud and snow barefooted. I asked the parents if these children had any shoes. The father said, "Yes; they have shoes but no stockings."

The father has been sick for years and his pale, drawn face was evidence enough. This man has a terrible condition in his mouth, it appears to be a cancer. He has had this for several years and it is growing worse.

I could multiply examples by the hundreds where the complaints are now in my possession but more is unnecessary. I will be glad to furnish the committee appointed with full information in regard to everything said in this speech.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, with the hope that some of the Members will read the facts which the Prairie Committee has assembled.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following radio address delivered at Washington for the purpose of electrical transcription:

OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Since Congress opened, my time has been almost entirely occupied with relief complaints coming in from the Northwest States. I realized that in the drought area the relief situation would be most desperate and therefore prepared as soon as I arrived here to do whatever lay in my power to strip the system of redtape and get relief out to the people.

My first official act was to introduce House Joint Resolution No. 15, asking for the immediate cancellation of all feed and seed loans heretofore made and those hereafter made and have these obligations recognized in the nature of national-defense expenditures instead of claims against the farmer. Such a resolution naturally drew much opposition because it calls for a cancellation of a debt, and in spite of the fact that most Members of Congress know that there must be a general cancellation of all debts, either directly or through the process of inflation, they cling to the old doctrine of rights fixed by contract.

This resolution is generally misunderstood, and I am not sure whether I shall be able to make it clear to the Congress. This cancellation is based upon an entirely different theory than the general cancellation of debts. This resolution maintains that food is our greatest national defense. This resolution states that armies and navies are wholly powerless as weapons of national defense when not supported by food. No major war in all our history was won except by the preponderance of food on the part of the successful party. In our unfortunate Civil War it was food that finally brought victory to the North. When Lee's army in Virginia surrendered it was the lack of food that compelled that surrender. His soldiers were living on the shoots of trees, and their food supplies were exhausted. They still had men and guns, but no food. When the flower of the French Army marched into the heart of Russia and captured Moscow under the leadership of the great Napoleon it met no resistance. The Russians retreated before the advancing columns, but in retreating the Russians burned and destroyed all food and supplies and stores. Moscow was captured, but what of it? It meant nothing but the destruction of the greatest army that Europe had ever seen. In attempting a return to France with food destroyed, the French Army perished; and only a few stragglers ever reached their native land. For the next quarter of a century the bleached bones of men and horses once constituting the French Army could be seen strewn across the prairies of Russia, indicating by that trail of bones the course of the retreat. The army perished because there was no food.

In the great World War, food again won the victory. Germany surrendered before any single enemy set foot on German territory. Why, simply because the German people were starving because their food supplies had been consumed. Germany displayed the greatest army ever assembled in the history of the world. Her men were trained; she had the best guns; the best air fleet; the most modern equipment in the destruction of human life; she had an inexhaustible supply of men, but she overlooked the one strategic element—food.

We are about to be asked to appropriate a billion dollars for the maintenance of our Army and Navy. No American wants this country wholly unprepared in case of invasion. But what is the best way to defend this country? Can it be done by the building of more battleships costing as much as \$20,000,000 only to become obsolete after a cruise around the world? Can we do it by maintaining a large standing army, engaged in no useful occupation, but merely waiting for the declaration of war to distinguish its men and officers? Can it be done by compelling people already overburdened with debt to carry annually another billion dollars in expenditures for our defense?

Why can we not profit by the lessons of history? Why can we not understand that if we follow the course of being content with our own possessions and refuse to wage war on foreign countries, to collect private debts, debts which this Government did not make or sponsor, that our national defense will not require this lavish annual expenditure? Why can we not understand that in the event of any defensive war that food again will be the final determining factor. It will not be our men or our guns—but our food.

Where is the mighty defense produced? It is produced on the farms of America, and besides that, most of the men who are called upon to be shot down in war have been produced on the farms. Can we afford, in days of great calamities, over which we have no control, and which lay waste great empires of our country because of drought or storms, to let our farms perish? Do we not owe a

national duty to keep these food depots intact and in working order? When the droughts come the farmer still remains at his post. He is ready to produce when God Almighty will permit it. The farmer does not abandon his farm, but clings fast to the hopes of a better day to come. Should this Nation, then, under these circumstances, leave the farmer to protect himself the best he can without the help of the Government? If perchance we do furnish him seed and feed in his days of pestilence, shall this Government fasten a claim against his property for the support offered that will contribute to the loss of that business? Would it not be a more sane, a more logical, and more intelligent thing to do, if we would spend a portion of our billion dollars defense fund, in furnishing feed and seed to the farmers in their days of distress, as a means to keeping intact the greatest element of our national defense? The answer must be "yes", but who will understand this program? It will be laughed at and stormed at, until we are actually in some war of defense. Then the truth will come home to the people.

If we had 2 years' food supply on hand in this country segregated into a national defense account withdrawn from all markets, do you believe other nations would understand that we had the greatest national defense of any country on earth? If we had such a defense of food, and days of drought came, we would have a supply on which to draw. We would not be paying \$1.02 for wheat and in the spring be compelled to charge the already bankrupt farmer \$1.65 per bushel for the same wheat. If people were hungry, we could feed them from our defense fund. We would not then have to force families of six to live on \$2 per week, as we are doing today. We would have no imaginary surpluses to deal with. We would not be compelling farmers to sign a contract in which they promise to refuse to raise all the wheat they can; we would not be shooting down our pigs and destroying the meat, when there are over 40,000,000 people in America who want meat and can not get it; we would not be plowing up a third of our cotton rows, while there are 20,000,000 people so abjectly destitute as not to be able to buy a shirt for themselves.

We would not be plowing under the material for clothing and at the same time appealing as Government agents over the radio to the rich people to save their old clothes so they may be given to the poor.

No; if this resolution were only understood and if we would follow the plain facts of history in reference to food, we would know wherein our greatest defense lies. We would be immensely glad and happy to spend some of our billions spent on armies and navies to keep the food forts of this country intact and in working order.

This resolution was introduced by me on January 3, the opening day of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, where it still remains without a hearing.

This next official act of mine was the introduction of House Joint Resolution No. 83, introduced January 11, 1935, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, where it peacefully reposes without any hearing.

This resolution empowers the President to declare a 2-year period moratorium preventing foreclosures and execution sales of homes and business establishments within the territory of the United States. This concerns all debts financed by the Government directly or indirectly, or by the guaranty of the Government.

While we are striving to bring about our economic balance there is no one so blind to our situation as will make any other statement than that it will take time to make a recovery. We were 155 years getting into the situation where we owe three times as much as all of our property is worth, and it will take more than a few months to right the wrong. While we are all laboring, without party consideration, to the accomplishment of this task, we will only make the situation worse if we permit the Federal land bank, the Federal Land Commissioner, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the barnyard loan corporation, the feed and seed department of the Farm Credit Administration, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the intermediate credit banks, and the Agricultural Credit Corporations to rush in and force collections when people cannot pay, due to our general economic situation.

This act is particularly needed in the States serviced by these various organizations in the Northwest; Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota are supervised from the Twin Cities. Since these institutions were set up, dating back to the days of the War Finance Corporation in 1922, the administration of them has been entrusted to reactionary bankers and men who are for the most part out of sympathy with the efforts of recovery and the financial plight of farmers, home owners, and business men. They have been reared in the school of foreclosures and dispossessions and of execution sales and are devoid of human sympathy and patriotic vision.

In a great many instances these Government finance agencies have been operated by banking racketeers, who have positively defrauded the United States Government to the advantage of institutions with which they were affiliated. They came into office under the Coolidge and Hoover administrations, and, for the most part, are still there under the Democratic administration. One of my main objects in taking the public platform advocating the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt was to rid the Northwest of these racketeers. But they are still there, and by this resolution I mean to curb their natural appetite to foreclose and dispossess and drive business men and home owners out on the public roads and streets.

I will only incidentally particularize on the above statement, but later in the session I purpose to give a full history of these Government and semi-Government finance agencies located in Minne-

apolis and St. Paul and name the men in charge to show how they actually did defraud the United States Government.

I will state now that apparently no one can control these agents. Those who appointed them cannot control them and they become bigger than the Government. L. J. Paulson, of Minneapolis, is manager there of the feed and seed department of the Farm Credit Administration, and farmers all over the four States have sent complaints to me and other Members of Congress objecting to the demand being made by the Minneapolis office that farmers must give security on the 1935 crop for all prior advances of seed and feed. I made a speech on that subject in Congress on the 21st day of January—page 741 and following pages. I extended my remarks in the RECORD again on this subject on the 30th day of January. The Farm Credit Administration here assured my colleague, WILLIAM LEMKE, on the 26th of January, that no such requirement was demanded. They assured him further that the Department had sent out directions to Paulson to discontinue the practice. The result of all this labor and effort is that the farmers are still being required to give such mortgages. I have asked for the removal of L. J. Paulson, but he is still there on the job and the farmers are being coerced and sandbagged into giving these mortgages. The field men under Paulson have a new attack. They say to the farmers about as follows: "Of course, you do not have to give a mortgage on the 1935 crop for prior advances, but if you do not your chances of getting seed this spring will be jeopardized." This is a sore spot with the impoverished farmer, who has neither seed nor feed, and he feels that he is in no position to hold out longer and consequently gives a mortgage as requested.

I hope all farmers within the sound of my voice will stand up for their rights, and I assure you now that all of such mortgages are void and of no effect. You can set those mortgages aside in any court in the land, and my guess now is that this is what you will have to do this fall if you raise a crop. With those mortgages on your grain there will be nine Government men under each grain spout when threshing starts, and your local creditors will not get a red nickel. If your crop looks like anything, go into court and cancel these mortgages. Your local business men should help you do it.

Another example of the racketeering of the Twin City operatives of the Federal finance agencies can be found in the old War Finance Corporation. We must remember in this connection that the entire depression in the Northwest was precipitated on May 18, 1920, when the Federal Reserve Board at Washington voted such a rediscount rate as would compel the paying up of indebtedness. We all started to pay, as that was the command of the Federal Reserve Board. We all started selling at once, and in a few short months the price of all farm commodities dropped, and with that the bottom dropped out of the price of farm lands. Sheep in a few months fell from \$11.50 per head to 50 cents per head.

By January 1922 it became apparent that very few local banks in the Northwest could stand up under the constant hammering for payments by their Minneapolis correspondents. The large banks in the Twin Cities also became distressed. These banks were linked up with the Federal Reserve bank, and, of course, some way out must be found. In February 1922 the War Finance Corporation was set up in Minneapolis. Under the act creating it, it was designed to loan money to the farmer to hold his cheap livestock and feed up his great stores of feed, but the War Finance Corporation was set up, with the racketeers of the Twin Cities in charge.

Officers of the big banks became officers of the War Finance Corporation, and instead of loaning money directly to farmers this Corporation devised the subtle scheme of buying farmers' notes that had already been executed some years before. These notes had been handed over to the big Minneapolis banks as collateral to loans, and the War Finance Corporation began a great scheme of buying these notes. You may ask what notes. The notes held by the big banks as collateral. As fast as the Government bought these notes the proceeds went into the big banks to retire what the country banks owned. The country banks received no money, the farmers received no money, but the big banks collected their debts against country banks by selling the paper to the Government.

When this scheme was launched in February 1922, the Twin City and Duluth banks owed the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis \$28,800,000, and in 5 months' operation, when there was no crop coming from the Northwest, these banks had paid up \$28,800,000 of this indebtedness. It was accomplished through this scheme of having officers in the War Finance Corporation who were also officers and directors and friends of the big Twin City banks. The Government received all of these notes, and still have a great amount of them on hand which are worthless, and were worthless when sold to the Government, but most of the no good notes were refinanced through the barnyard loan racket, or some Government finance agency.

In later addresses I propose to show that the same men, for the most part, those friendly to the Twin City banks, are still in control, and that the Democratic administration either cannot get rid of them or actually permits them to remain in control.

What can the people of the Northwest expect? What about the barnyard loan of 1933 and 1934? That was another sandbag scheme to protect the big banks and corporations like the International Harvester Co. and other representatives of the inner circle.

The country banks of the Northwest were literally bailed out and left to close through this manipulation to save the banks of the great centers. This Government was cheated and defrauded in 1933 and 1934 through this same process by the same kind of men,

but through a different agency—through the Crop Production Loan Division of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Who knows what the losses will be resulting from the operation of the barnyard loan?

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I beg that you return, if you will, to the subject matter of the War Department bill, which is before us, particularly to the section on page 10 thereof, which gives to the President discretionary power insofar as increasing the enlisted strength of the Army to 165,000 is concerned. As a minority member of the Military Affairs Committee, I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, reintroduced in January a bill, the substance of which is, to increase the enlisted strength to 165,000; to allow the President to call into active service annually 2,000 Reserve officers for service not to exceed 1 year; and to increase the regular authorized strength of the Air Corps to 1,514 officers, which would absorb approximately 380 officers of the Air Corps Reserve, a great many of whom have had training in the Regular Army and who have been placed on the inactive list. A similar bill was before the Military Affairs Committee last spring but too late for any action upon it by the House. Extensive hearings on this proposed bill were held by the subcommittee on Military Affairs, of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] was then chairman. At that time there appeared before the committee Hon. Newton D. Baker, the war-time Secretary of War, Secretary Dern, General MacArthur, representatives of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Reserve Officers' Association, all of whom gave their approval to this bill.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to remind the House to what degree our Army has dwindled in size. This has been covered in the debate of today. We hear a great deal about the Budget and about economy in the departments, and at the same time we know that a great deal of money is being spent and that a great deal more money is going to be spent later on in some manner over which we can have no control. I may simply state in connection with the proposal to increase the C. C. C. camps by 100,000, that the present figures for the maintenance of one man in a C. C. C. camp today, giving effect to the increase and taking advantage of the overhead, is about \$1,250 a year.

On the other hand, the approximate figure of cost for an enlisted man in the Regular Army is between \$800 and \$900. We hear that more men are going to be absorbed into the C. C. C. camps. How much better it would seem to be to increase the enlisted personnel of the Regular Army by annual increments of 10,000 men at a cost of \$400 a year each less than the cost of additional men in the C. C. C. camps. I believe it would be of advantage to the Members of the House before this bill is considered for amendment to review the provisions of the Thomason bill, H. R. 5232, which has recently been unanimously reported by the Committee on Military Affairs and which I understand will be brought before the House if its provisions are not included in this appropriation measure. I have not been able to find out exactly what the real function of the Committee on Military Affairs is. It seems to me that a unanimous report from the Committee on Military Affairs should have some weight with the Members of the House, particularly when that report represents the best thought of a war-time Secretary of War, of the present Secretary of War, and of the various patriotic organizations such as I have mentioned.

I think at this point, with the permission of the House, it is pertinent to read a statement sent by General Pershing to the House Committee on Military Affairs in connection with this bill. At that time General Pershing wrote:

APRIL 30, 1934.

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,

Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Although, as stated in my conversation with you, it is impracticable for me to appear before your committee, I appreciate the courtesy of your invitation and I am glad to

send you a brief summary of reasons for my strong approval of the provisions of H. R. 9136.

In general, this bill closely parallels by own idea, based upon experience, many times expressed while I was Chief of Staff, as to the minimum for Regular Army strength, below which we should not go. In the years that have elapsed since then the Army has been permitted to dwindle in size far below that number, although the necessity for maintaining an adequate army has grown more and more important.

There are certain fixed demands made upon the Army's strength which must be met regardless of its size. These include garrisons for our oversea possessions; the maintenance of an overhead of administrative and supply agencies capable of meeting peace-time needs and of providing a sound basis upon which to expand in emergency; and instruction for civilian components and maintenance of an essential school system. These demands consume a considerable portion of the Army's strength. As a result, the remainder of our establishment is so small and is spread out so thinly that the forces that can fairly be classed as available for internal emergencies are lowered to a dangerous level, and their usefulness as a nucleus of expansion for war is greatly diminished. Lack of personnel likewise impedes progress in modernization of which the Regular Army must serve as the chief exponent. The difference in the Army's efficiency and readiness for emergency that would be represented by the addition of some 40,000 or 50,000 enlisted men can therefore scarcely be over-estimated.

So far as the officers are concerned, it is obvious that under our professional-civilian system of preparation, in which I firmly believe, an adequate and well-trained corps of regular officers is the very foundation upon which the whole structure must be built. Not only must an efficient professional leadership be present in the initial stages of any emergency, but the manifold instructional, training, research, and administrative functions that devolve upon the permanent officer corps both in peace and war make this a matter of the utmost importance.

I am in complete accord with the proposal for acquiring additional officers by increments. With respect to utilization of Reserve officers during the period of acquisition, I believe that in general they should be rotated on this duty by relatively short periods, say for 6 months each, and that such use should, so far as possible, be confined to those recently graduated from our Reserve Officers' Training Corps institutions. Under these methods the invaluable training imparted would be wisely distributed and would longest effect the efficiency of the Officers' Reserve Corps. At the same time opportunity would be accorded the War Department to select from among these young men those best suited for permanent commissions.

Enactment of this bill into law would accomplish a most essential step toward providing the Regular Army with the means of fulfilling creditably the important missions assigned to it under the National Defense Act. It would also provide a reasonably adequate land defense establishment, though relatively insignificant as compared to foreign armies. World conditions as they exist today indicate the wisdom of the increase proposed. This bill has my unqualified approval.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. PERSHING.

I wish to remind you that approximately 7,000 young men are being graduated each year from the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in the colleges throughout the United States, many of them in your own districts. We have heard something said here today about additional appointments to West Point which may have seemed more important to you in your districts than the provisions of the Thomason bill for selection of 2,000 Reserve officers from among the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and otherwise, for not to exceed 1 year's Regular Army service. I wish to remind you that many of these men just graduated from the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the colleges, are unemployed today. There are many more unemployed Reserve officers in your district today than there are candidates for additional appointments to West Point, remembering also that it would be at least 5 years before an additional cadet at West Point would be available for service. The bill of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] would rotate Reserve officers for a reasonable Regular Army training period in accordance with the recommendations of Generals Pershing and MacArthur. It seems to me this is a splendid way to absorb some of our unemployment, and at the same time to train many fine young men for officerships, among them chiefly those who would have the greatest expectancy.

I cannot see, with these strong recommendations to the Military Committee of the House—recommendations made by the war-time Secretary of War, by every patriotic organization in the United States, by the present Secretary of War, by the present Chief of Staff, and by the commanding

general of the American Army in the World War—why we should give this discretionary power to the President instead of keeping it where it belongs and where it ought to remain—in the House, the body which has the power to declare war.

The Military Committee is charged with national defense—at least insofar as the Army is concerned. Your House committee has been in unanimous agreement in reporting the Thomason bill, and I assume proper amendments to this appropriation bill will be offered to incorporate in it the provisions of the Thomason bill. Such amendments will certainly deserve the support of any Member who does not want to see our Regular Army left in its apparent depleted organization and who at the same time should be interested in relief for the unemployed. [Applause.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to invite the attention of the House to two matters that I have projected before the House by means of bills that I have introduced.

First, I know of no problem more important today than the one regarding seed and feed loans. Realizing the need of farmers in my district for Federal aid, I took this matter up with interested Congressmen before coming to Washington. At meetings which we held in Sioux City, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr., I called attention to the fact that hundreds of farmers in the Third Congressional District of Nebraska were entirely out of feed and due to the excessive droughts, they had no seed on hand for spring planting. I also called to the attention of the Representatives the fact that hundreds of these farmers had no money with which to buy this feed and seed and that an emergency existed which should be brought before the attention of the Government. Through Representative SHANNON, of Missouri, during the Sioux City conference, we sent a telegram to the Department of Agriculture bringing out these facts. We found that livestock was starving due to the lack of feed; that farmers had to drive many miles for hay and that the horses hauling their wagons became so exhausted they died on the road, due to lack of sufficient feed.

It is necessary that I call the attention of the Government to these conditions and although feed and crop production loan legislation was finally passed, nevertheless the hopeless conditions of our farmers have not been relieved.

In some parts of the district there has been an exodus of farmers to the towns and cities where they endeavored to secure necessities of life through charitable organizations. Many have lost their farms through no fault of their own and many who are still on the farms are faced with deplorable conditions in their endeavor to save their livestock as well as their homes. These farmers have been the victims of grasshoppers and drought for 5 years. They are sinking deeper into debt until the debt burden is intolerable. It is impossible for them to secure seed and feed to carry on their farming operations without the debt burden becoming so great that they can never hope to repay it.

Knowing these conditions to exist and feeling that Congress must determine some reasonable assistance to these farmers who for years has supplied the Nation with food, and, knowing their inability to pay the high prevailing prices for seed and feed, I introduced a bill in the House on February 12, House bill 5598, asking that feed grain and seed be provided to farmers with the provision that the same can be paid back bushel for bushel in kind and that in the event of another crop failure be paid for in work.

There are hundreds of farmers in the State of Nebraska who have no feed to start the spring work, or seed, or even money to buy the supplies, even the necessities of life. In one county more than 300 farmers met recently, urging Congress to give some attention to the actual conditions which exist in this drought area and urging the passage of some bill which would bring some hope to these farmers—some promise that the Government would make it possible for them to exist on their farms, their only homes and the homes of their fathers. These farmers do not believe it unreasonable to ask that they repay the Government bushel

for bushel in grain and seed which they would borrow at this time, and in case of a crop failure repay the seed and feed loan in honest labor.

From personal contact with these farmers of Nebraska, I should like to give you a few examples of conditions as they really exist—an observation of the future results of the present problem as it is related to the financial outlay and remuneration. I will add to these examples the words of a farmer who is in contact with these suffering farmers at this very moment:

Take the price of seed grain and the quantity required for each acre. It is plainly visible that the expense for feed and seed for the coming season is going to eclipse all other periods in the history of agriculture, notwithstanding the fact of the high prices of 1918-20, taking our economic condition for the two periods into consideration.

For example, it requires $2\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of seed oats per acre. According to the present price of seed oats, this amount of seed oats will cost the farmer \$1.90 per acre.

It requires 2 bushels of barley per acre. At the price of \$1.25 per bushel, it would cost the farmer \$2.50 per acre for barley seed.

These two items are the principal small-grain crops of our average farmer.

The average yield of these grains in Nebraska for a term of years is: Oats, about 27 bushels per acre; barley, about 25 bushels per acre.

In view of the fact that there is but a small portion of livestock left or produced on the farms, compared to previous years, to feed, it is reasonable to assume that the prices of grain that will be produced this coming season will be sharply lower or be comparable to crops-surplus years, should the reward of the coming season be a normal crop.

In this illustration we must deduct one-third of the entire crop for rent. This leaves 18 bushels of oats for the farmer's share. This 18 bushels of oats, figured at a price of 25 cents a bushel, equals \$4.50 per acre. Deducting the cost of seed, or \$1.90, would leave a balance of \$2.60 per acre. From this amount should be deducted the cost of planting, harvesting, and threshing, estimated at \$1.60 per acre. This leaves a sum of \$1 as a balance left above the actual expense on the farmer's oats crop.

Barley can be figured on practically the same basis as oats, except there is a little more expense in raising barley, due to higher costs of threshing.

You can plainly see by this illustration that the farmer has for his net return on his small-grain crop a very small margin to pay for his portion of the pasture land and for his needs to carry his stock through to another season.

The question of corn should interest every Congressman who comes from a farming community. The price of seed corn in my district ranges from \$4.50 to \$6 per bushel. A bushel of corn will plant 8 acres—the cost per acre based on \$5 seed is about 65 cents per acre for seed. Then there is the cost of preparing the ground, plowing, planting, and tending, and harvesting, which very conservatively means an acreage cost of \$3 to \$3.50.

With the average yield, for the illustration, of 27 bushels per acre the country over—there would be no question but what that would be termed as a surplus crop. Taking this for granted, it is reasonable to assume that the price of corn would take a decided drop and reach a low point.

Because of the elimination of considerable livestock and the fact that farmers were forced to sell or ship out much of this stock, there would be little livestock left to feed for market, and with these facts facing them these farmers feel that there will be a depression in corn prices.

Taking past experiences as a guide, many of these farmers feel that they must expect low prices for corn as compared with other grains.

From the 27 bushels per acre yield the farmer must deduct one-third to two-fifths for rent. This leaves the farmer or share cropper a net of 16 to 18 bushels per acre.

Assuming that the price of corn in the winter is at normal or, say, 25 to 30 cents per bushel, he has a return of \$4 to

\$5.40 per acre. From this amount he must deduct the cost of expense, and has left \$1 to \$1.90 per acre. From this sum he must pay the balance on pasture, taxes, and many small items of expense that cannot be adequately enumerated, together with keeping his foundation stock through the winter season and have it in good condition for the coming crop season.

Careful consideration of the existing farm situation, based on close contacts with farmers who have been in the farming business for half a century, leads to the inevitable conclusion that the future for the farmer is discouraging.

Our farmers feel that there never has been a surplus of farm produce and that they are the victims of maldistribution. Because they felt it was the patriotic thing to do in the great depression, they joined hands with the Government by working harmoniously for those things which the Government felt was needed at that time. They signed the corn-hog contracts, but watched the destruction of livestock with horror. Our people have been cradled in the homes of thrifty pioneers—builders of a nation.

People who came from the more thickly populated parts of the Nation and went west to turn raw prairies into fertile fields of waving grain. They were taught early the sinfulness of food destruction. They felt that a greater power than ours would bring some punishment for this destruction of food at a time when humanity was hungry. They see in the ravages of the grasshoppers and the 5-year drought some of this punishment. They suddenly awakened to the reality that the grain and corn which they were told was too plentiful and had to be destroyed became so scarce that their little means were too small to buy it. They saw their livestock starving in the fields for want of this feed. Their reserve cash dwindled away; they face the reality of being unable to pay the mortgages on their homes, and they have seen their neighbors lose their homes because they could not pay these mortgages.

Those who have been able to weather the storm and hold on to small herds of livestock find they cannot buy feed and seed which costs more money than they can raise. They sense the coming of lower prices if the next grain crop is abundant. They have facts and figures indicating that they cannot raise this money no matter what their land will produce after the next planting. They do not want charity. They want to pay back in kind the things they borrow to plant in the ground.

These farmers are facing another planting time with no seed to plant and no money to buy. I appeal to you to give them the seed to plant another crop; feed to keep their livestock alive until another harvest. I plead that you allow them to pay back in the substance of our pioneers—pay you back in seed when you lend seed; pay you back in feed when you lend them the feed; and pay you back in honest labor when their lands do not produce the seed and the feed. Our people are facing another planting time. I wonder, what will the harvest bring?

Any discussion, at this time, of the feed and crop production loan problem which leaves unstressed the time element, leaves unsaid one of the most urgent things relating to the problem, for, truly, time has become very much of the essence.

We are at the threshold of another planting season—in fact, time for planting is already here in some sections of the country. Farmers must have their seed now, or soon, or might as well not have it at all so far as this year is concerned. Mere authorization is not giving these farmers—your farmers, my farmers—very substantial assistance. We must appropriate the money for the authorized use. Because of the time that it takes to get the money to the farmers following the time that the appropriation is made, it is already beyond the time when the money should be available. Why are we delaying this appropriation, or at least the completion of all preliminaries to the making of the appropriation pending the time that Executive approval is given to the authorization? I call upon all parties to this program, executive and administrative, as well as legislative, to be diligent before it is too late.

I now call your attention to the second proposition. I have introduced H. R. 5273 to place the Post Office Department upon a basis of efficiency and economy, and for other purposes. This is a companion bill to that introduced by Senator NORRIS on the same subject. It is stated in the bill that its purpose is to remove the Post Office Department in its entirety from the control and domination of partisan, political influences, and to place the same upon a basis of merit, efficiency, and economy. The bill proposes to place at the Post Office Department a Postmaster General whose tenure of office shall exceed the span of a single national administration and whose term of office expires independent of the termination of a national administration. It is further provided that the Postmaster General shall operate his Department as nearly as possible upon the merit system and in the appointment of officials, the selection of employees, and in the promotion of any such officials, or employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency. Postmasters shall be appointed by the Postmaster General. Postmasters may be removed, or suspended, only for cause by the Postmaster General. Provision is made for the Postmaster General to call upon the Civil Service Commission to assist him in making rules and regulations for appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department and the Commission is directed to assist the Postmaster General in every possible way with a view to carrying out the intent and purposes of the measure.

This reform is designed to touch, primarily, 13,391 post offices in the country, known as Presidential offices, offices of the first, second, and third classes.

We can almost say that there is common assent to the proposition that as a matter of principle, this reform ought thoroughly to permeate this greatest business in the world. There is recognition of the fact that more businesslike administration of these offices, exempt from political cross fire, will do a great deal to eliminate annual postal deficits. If and when appointments and promotions in the Postal Service, up to and including postmasterships, are made upon the basis of merit and efficiency, the door will have been opened to careers in the Postal Service which may well challenge the ambition of every postal employee.

The concluding section of H. R. 5273 provides that "this act shall take effect and be in force on and after the first day of the fiscal year after its enactment." Another bill, introduced in this House 2 days following the introduction of H. R. 5273, in its opening declaration, defers the effective date of the proposed reform until January 1, 1938. Why the enforced delay? Why should the measure carry within itself the seeds of partial defeat of the professed objective? Why specifically reserve an intervening period of time of sufficient length to permit political spoilers to grab every Presidential office in the country, and, to that extent, establish a first lien upon the country's most important postmasterships for the balance of this generation?

Let us be sincere in our professions of the desirability, in fact, the necessity of this reform and work for its accomplishment at the earliest possible date, rather than to so sacrificially deny ourselves and the Postal Service these benefits over a 3-year period.

I ask you, therefore, to support the progress of H. R. 5273. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, this is an appeal for help in a cause which I believe is enormously important to the human race and to posterity.

The time to begin to erect safeguards against future involvement in wars is now, when we are at peace, not a year or two years hence, when it may be too late.

I have proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, House Joint Resolution No. 167, which I believe offers the best possible preventive of war.

The text of the proposed amendment to the Constitution follows:

SECTION 1. Except in the event of an invasion of the United States or its territorial possessions and attack upon its citizens residing therein, the authority of Congress to declare war shall not become effective until confirmed by a majority of all votes cast thereon in a Nation-wide referendum. Congress may by law provide for the enforcement of this section.

SEC. 2. Whenever war is declared, the President shall immediately conscript and take over, for use by the Government, all the public and private war properties, yards, factories, and supplies, fixing the compensation for private properties temporarily employed for the war period at a rate not in excess of 4 percent, based on tax values assessed in the year preceding the war.

My resolution has just two objects:

First. To give the people who have to pay the awful costs of war the right to decide whether there shall be war.

Second. To remove the profit incentive to war.

The first section of the resolution reserves to all of the people for all time to come, except in case of attack or invasion, when immediate action would be necessary, the right to a referendum on war, so that when war is declared it will be the solemn, consecrated act of the people themselves, and not the act of conscienceless, selfish interests using the innocent young manhood of the Nation as its pawn.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman believe that if his amendment is enacted into law we will see an end of war?

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say to the gentleman that I am positively convinced that it will be a very effective preventive of war.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Would it not be an excellent thing if every nation in the world would enact similar legislation, leaving it to the people of a country to say whether or not there should be a war?

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution to the discussion. I think he is absolutely right. I think it would be a wonderful thing for humanity if what he suggests could be brought about.

The second section curbs the activities of those who encourage and create wars for financial profit. This is to be accomplished by taking the profit out of war.

The hearings before Senator NYE's committee furnish the most damning evidence of the activity of the munitions manufacturers in fomenting wars. On reading these hearings one has a sense of utter shame that there are creatures who call themselves business men who are such strangers to the common impulses of humanity that they eagerly, by bribery and chicanery whenever necessary, promote wars to slaughter their fellow beings for the sake of filthy dollars. The reader who gives his attention to the direct wording of this testimony must conclude that the offenses committed against mankind by these avaricious salesmen of woe and misery are in keeping with an offense that was committed nearly 2,000 years ago, when the beloved Savior of mankind was betrayed for 30 pieces of silver.

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

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for bringing this important subject to the attention of Congress, and to the attention of the country. I deem it one of the most important subjects that is now before the people.

Undoubtedly, if the gentleman could take the profits out of war, there would not likely be any more wars. Selfishness, avarice, greed and lust for inordinate power, are the causes of war.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is one of the able and constructive leaders of this House, and with his influence and energy and pertinacity, I am hopeful of his getting early consideration and action on his measure. I promise him my support and vote for it.

While I am for his resolution, and will vote for it just as it is, may I not suggest that one thing further could be added to it which would make it complete, for if we want to take all the profits out of war, we must give the Government the right not only to take over all the property it needs but at the same time give it the right to take over

man power without restriction? During the war, respecting two brothers, one would be sent across the water as a soldier to fight in the trenches for \$30 a month. The other brother would be exempt from draft and would be kept in the New Jersey shipyards as a skilled laborer and paid \$30 a day.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the distinguished gentleman kindly for his very valuable support. I may say to the gentleman that the purpose and incentive of this resolution, as I conceive it, is to be a preventive of war. It was with that idea foremost in mind that I drafted it.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it is a good one.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Take the profits out of war and you will minimize the possibility of war, and that is what my resolution seeks to do.

I have proposed a constitutional amendment because a mere statute would not be permanent enough to accomplish the purpose. A statute might be repealed by the next Congress or the next day by the same Congress. Only a constitutional amendment will suffice.

CHILDREN SHOULD BE PROTECTED

To the statesman this resolution offers the highest opportunity for statesmanship. To the philanthropist this resolution offers the highest opportunity to show your love for your fellow men. To the mothers of the land this resolution offers the opportunity not to ask, but to demand, that the children who are your flesh and blood shall not be shoved into the horrible vortex of war to satisfy the merciless greed of interests that reap the dirty financial profits of war.

There is only one force that can put into the Constitution this amendment, which means so much to the future of the human race, and that is the force of public opinion. With other matters pressing hard upon Congress, this resolution probably will make no progress unless those who favor it get active and show to the lawmakers that it is supported and sustained by a great, wide-awake, Nation-wide manifestation of public sentiment. Parents must show that, while they are willing at all times to give their precious sons for the defense of the country they love, they are not willing that one American boy shall be sacrificed to carry out the inhuman schemes of the munitions manufacturers and professional war promoters.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. I would suggest to the gentleman that after his bill is in committee for 30 days that he place a petition on the desk and give me the opportunity to be the first one to sign it.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman for his observation. No two gentlemen in this House are more highly regarded or held in more affectionate esteem than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN]. I am proud to have the support of both of them.

It seems to me that every veteran in America should be for this resolution, heart and soul, because the veterans know the meaning of the word "war." It seems to me that every church should be for it; likewise every peace society and every women's organization and every individual who wishes to do his part to safeguard the peace and security of the citizen.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Those who have been through war and know about war from experience want no more wars.

Mr. LUDLOW. I take it that is one reason the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania is for this resolution.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. I am not an ex-service man. I lost my eyesight in the battle of life.

DEBT WE OWE TO HUMANITY

Mr. LUDLOW. In the present unsettled state of world affairs we owe to humanity of today, no less than to posterity, the adoption of this amendment. The agonized cries of

war mothers whose sons sleep in the fields of France demand it, in order that they may know that their children did not die in vain. Eighty cents of every dollar wrung from the taxpayers for the regular expenses of government goes to pay for wars past and for preparation for wars to come. The depression through which we are passing, with its inconceivable vastness of human woe and its spiritual and moral let down, is a backwash of war. If statesmanship has not entirely vanished from the earth, now is the time to assert itself, lest these things may occur again.

This amendment is not a pacifist proposition, and it has no root in pacifist philosophy. It interprets the thought of every typical and true American as follows:

I am willing to die for my beloved country, but I am not willing to die for greedy, selfish interests that want to use me as their cat's paw.

If the people arise and bring about the adoption of this amendment, we will have the blessed assurance of peace for many years to come.

Conditions at this moment are ripe for the adoption of the amendment. Now is the time to press for its adoption. Now is the time to render a major service to humanity. Now is the time to remember our children and the children of posterity by securing the adoption of an amendment that will protect them from being dragged into unjustifiable wars.

WE DREAM AS WAR CLOUDS GATHER

More important than the momentous problems of recovery, more important than all other problems before this Congress, in my estimation, is the urgency of taking adequate steps to protect the United States from involvement in future wars.

"Again we dream as war clouds gather" declares that wise old warrior, Gen. James E. Harbord, in a newspaper article sounding a sharp warning of war.

If we keep on dreaming and do nothing, we will wake up sometime to find that we have been maneuvered into another war.

To declare war is the highest act of sovereignty. It is a responsibility of such magnitude that it should rest on the people themselves and should not be delegated to any man or any body of men. Under the present system whoever happens to be President of the United States has it within his power to so coerce Congress that he can lead the Nation into any war, as President Polk led us into war with Mexico primarily for the purpose of gaining territory to the southwest. It is unfair to expect the Members of Congress, after all of the atmosphere of war has been created, to resist the terrific pressure and propaganda for war, thus subjecting themselves to the taunts and charges of treason that are always hurled at those who do not go along with the leaders in such circumstances.

In the absence of a constitutional provision taking the profits out of war, there is always a danger that those who deal in instruments of death will force the Nation into hostilities for the sake of the fabulous harvest which those of their ilk expect when war comes.

WHY STATESMANSHIP FAILS TO PREVENT WARS

The amazing testimony brought out before the Nye Committee reveals forces at work which explain why statesmanship fails to prevent wars and why it will always fail unless reinforced by a constitutional provision such as I have suggested. A review of that testimony shows how little regard the dealers in destruction have for solemn covenants and with what ease they sidestep embargoes and treaties.

On May 8, 1934, Congress adopted a joint resolution prohibiting the sale of arms and ammunition in the United States to the South American belligerent nations, Bolivia and Paraguay, and on May 28, 1934, the President issued a proclamation forbidding such sale.

What did the munitions manufacturers do in the face of this proclamation?

On June 7, 1934, the office of the Du Pont Co. in Buenos Aires received an inquiry from its agent in Paraguay calling for quotations on 2,000 kilos of TNT, presumably for the Government of Paraguay. This Du Pont agent, whose name is N. E. Bates, also was serving as joint agent for the munitions products of Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd. (a Brit-

ish company). Under a sales agreement between the two companies, Bates at once cabled Imperial Chemical Industries advising them of this prospective business so they could get in an immediate quotation. Then on the same day he wrote to the British company that Du Pont—

could not quote from this end owing to the embargo on munitions and military propellants decreed by President Roosevelt. In view of the fact that there is no similar embargo obtaining in England we suggested that you quote price to your office in Buenos Aires, who in turn would advise Ferreira (the agent in Paraguay).

Under the sales agreement between the companies, Du Pont receives a commission on all sales made by Imperial Chemical Industries in South America.

The intent of Congress and the President was that the United States should not aid either one of the belligerents in the merciless slaughter of human lives that was going on.

Now, how did the Curtiss-Wright Co. act in the same circumstances? Embargo resolutions were before Congress early in 1933 and that company in anticipation of the embargo began to take steps to circumvent it. It instructed its agent in Chile to ascertain whether airplanes manufactured in the Curtiss-Wright factory in Santiago, Chile, could be shipped at all times to the prospective belligerent countries.

C. W. Webster, president of that company, writing to the company's agent in Chile, said:

"This is in view of a possible embargo on the part of the League of Nations and the United States Government. In other words, would we be permitted to enter material into Chile for assembly and fabrication for such countries as Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and so forth?"

The reply of the agent was that there seemed to be no objection to the manufacture of planes in Chile for export to other South American countries.

The period between May 18, when Congress passed the embargo resolution, and May 28, when the President's embargo proclamation was issued, was a lively time among munitions manufacturers. They were grabbing for a harvest of future deliveries, which resulted in an animated scrimmage to get contracts signed. On May 25, 3 days before the proclamation, the American Armament Corporation signed a contract with Bolivia for war materials valued at \$2,043,000, or more than double the value of all earlier contracts between that company and Bolivia.

STATE DEPARTMENT UNJUSTLY ASSAILED

The effrontery of the munitions manufacturers, especially in their attitude toward the State Department's efforts to effect peaceful settlement of international disputes, has at times flared out in the most brazen manner. In 1928 L. Y. Spear, vice president of Electric Boat Co., wrote to Vickers:

It is too bad the pernicious activities of our State Department have put the brake on armament orders from Peru by forcing the resumption of formal diplomatic relations with Chile.

Think of that! Think of the hundreds, if not thousands, of fine young men who probably would have been slain, of the mothers' hearts that would have been broken, of the homes that would have been wrecked, of the wives that would have been made widows, and the children that would have been made fatherless if these armament orders had not been canceled and then examine your conscience to see whether you agree with this gentleman that the State Department was guilty of "pernicious activities" when it brought about the resumption of diplomatic relations between these belligerents! If the sons of munitions manufacturers were out on the firing line I do not think these manufacturers would look with so much disdain on the well-meant efforts of the State Department to bring about peace. I think that for once their fatherly instincts would get the upper hand of their love for profits. Can you imagine a more heartless communication than the one above referred to?

Similar to that outburst was one by Sir Charles W. Craven of Vickers (a British munitions concern) who, in a letter to the Electric Boat Co. in January 1933, expressed concern lest Geneva "or any other troublesome organization" should abolish the large submarines. Troublesome? Why? Because Geneva's peace activities were threatening to interfere with the sale of warships!

A mass of evidence was brought out showing that treaties solemnly entered into by nations to guarantee the peace and security of the world are but "scraps of paper" to avaricious munitions manufacturers. There is abundant testimony that armament firms in France, Great Britain, and the United States have flagrantly disregarded peace treaties and by their attitude have set themselves up as stronger than governments.

United Aircraft sales of airplanes and engines to Germany increased from \$2,000 in 1931 to \$1,445,000 during the first 8 months of 1934.

On March 29, 1933, Pratt & Whitney, a United subsidiary, signed an agreement with Bavarian Motor Works granting the German company the right to build air-cooled aircraft engines similar to those used in United States Army under a flat royalty of \$50,000 a year regardless of the number of engines manufactured in the Munich plant. Reports from the European sales offices of American Arms Corporations in 1933 and 1934 told of an enormous increase in the contraband of arms and ammunition into Germany.

"GREASE", "PALM OIL", AND PLAIN GRAFT

The heinousness of the arms traffic as it is carried on in the world today; its unsavory nature and its violent antagonism to public policy, is conclusively demonstrated, I think, to all right-thinking people by the fact that bribery, graft, and other forms of corruption are its inseparable concomitants. In the recorded transactions these unholy expenditures are variously listed as "commissions", "protection" "grease", "the needful", "palm oil", and just plain "graft." In a letter to Vickers, Ltd., L. Y. Spear, vice president of the Electric Boat Co., said, in regard to munitions sales in the Southern Hemisphere:

The real foundation of all South American business is graft.

The Soley Armament Co., Ltd., a British firm dealing in second-hand war materials, wrote to A. J. Miranda, of the American Armament Corporation:

We fully understand that armament deals are not usually done without officials getting greased.

The testimony of this man Miranda is a glowing exposé of the practices of munitions salesmen in the use of "palm oil", "grease", and women of shady reputation to put across their deals. In negotiating with the American Armament Corporation to act as agent in the sale of arms of the Soley Armament Co., Ltd., of England, John Ball, of the latter company, wrote:

We fully understand that arms deals are not usually done without some officials getting "greased", but if any "palm oil" is required it has to be added to the price and as our prices are at least 50 percent less than factory prices on the same arms they will stand a lot of "grease" and still be cheaper than the manufacturers' prices.

PEDDLING "GREASE" IN SOUTH AMERICA

The disgusting and subversive use of graft to advance sales of implements and materials for human destruction is further shown by the following bit of illuminating testimony:

Senator BONE. Do you know whether the British Government, through this semiofficial arm of the Government, approves of peddling of "grease" by the organizations?

Mr. MIRANDA. I do not know, Senator. I would have no means of knowing that.

Senator BONE. Of course some of the stuff which comes out of Europe might be in that category, but is it not rather unusual for a semiofficial agent of the great British Government to talk so freely of "peddling grease", "palm oil", and so forth, in a sale of arms to other countries? Does it not strike you as being a free way to put it, between ourselves?

Mr. SWEETSER. They are taking conditions as they are.

Senator BONE. I know they are very practical men. Is that not right?

Mr. MIRANDA. They are practical men.

Senator BONE. And being practical men, they are going to do business in a practical way, and if they have to "grease" the boys and girls down there, they are going to "grease" them?

Mr. MIRANDA. There is a condition down there which they recognize, and which they have to give effect to, and they figure if they are going to do business down there they have just got to meet that condition.

Senator BONE. I wish you would amplify the statement you have just made about the condition which all practical men understand exists and all practical men meet. I am speaking of the

condition which exists in South America. Do you mean that the condition which exists requires those people to be "greased"?

Mr. MIRANDA. I guess they have been doing business that way for a great many years, Senator. Maybe the Europeans taught them to do business that way.

Senator BONE. Do you think the Europeans seduced and debauched the South Americans, or were the South Americans willing to meet them more than half-way?

Mr. MIRANDA. Let us give them an even break.

Senator BONE. It is 50-50, or something of the sort? Of course, we cannot work miracles, but enough "palm oil" and "grease" ought to work miracles, do you not think, if there is enough of it? Can you tell us, in this connection, whether the European operators down there resort to the use of "palm oil" and "grease"?

Mr. MIRANDA. Probably.

Senator BONE also asked Mr. Miranda if he did not remember what was said about the Vickers firm using women of doubtful character freely.

Mr. MIRANDA. Yes.

Senator BONE. Do they use women of doubtful character in South America?

Mr. MIRANDA. They do sometimes.

Senator BONE. Are the women effective?

Mr. MIRANDA. Not with me.

Senator BONE. I mean, with certain folks in South America?

Mr. MIRANDA. Yes; they seem to be.

A STARTLING ADMISSION

Mr. Miranda proved to be a witness of amazing candor. Before he left the stand, Senator BONE, in the role of inquisitor, sought to develop his ideas as to whether this race of armaments is not leading inevitably to war, and Mr. Miranda said very frankly that, in his opinion, it is.

Senator BONE. Then, unless there is a change in the attitude of the national governments, the big governments, and the people of the world generally toward this armament race, it will continue in its present form. That is right, is it not?

Mr. MIRANDA. I believe so.

Senator BONE. Just as a business man, divorcing, if you can, yourself from your own business, and just limiting it to that and talking to the men on this committee who are trying to find out all they can about this matter, to recommend or suggest to the people of this country what should be done—what in your opinion is going to happen if this race continues throughout the world? You do not have to confine your answer to the United States or any country, but just tell us what you think will happen to the world if this continues.

Mr. MIRANDA. I think an armament race naturally leads into war. After that, when they are thoroughly armed, they want to try it out.

Senator BONE. In other words, when the boys and girls are all ready, they want to go out and see what the thing they have got can do. Is not that right?

Mr. MIRANDA. That is the way I would understand it.

Senator BONE. The world was pretty thoroughly prepared in Europe in 1914, and they had to try it out. The world, of course, as you are aware, is now spending more money than it ever did in preparation for war. Just as a business man, Mr. Miranda, do you think that that can continue and leave a fair margin of economic and financial security for the nations of the world?

Mr. MIRANDA. I do not think so.

This is the testimony of a man who certainly ought to be a capable judge. It is the testimony of a man who knows. It is the testimony of a man whose business it is to sell implements of wholesale human destruction which devastate peoples and destroy governments. He deals with nations, and he knows the influences constantly at work leading up to hostilities; and no one is in a better position to judge with unerring accuracy the incentives to war. When he says the race of armaments cannot continue without threatening the peace and security of the world, he believes it, and he has reason to believe it.

The wide range of "commissions", running into large figures, implies that private munitions interests may be so powerful as to shape and control governmental policies. It was brought out that over a period of 11 years the Electric Boat Co., of New York City and Groton, Conn., which manufactures submarines, paid commissions totaling \$766,000 to Sir Basil Zaharoff, a professional munitions dealer, of Europe, and an alleged relative of the royal family of Spain. It was shown that his services to the Electric Boat Co. were to "do the needful" in holding a Spanish contract against competition from German and Italian submarine companies. Millions on millions of dollars have been spent by munitions dealers as "grease", or "graft", to secure fat contracts, and the game has been conducted on so low a level that it is

considered legitimate to supply arms and ammunition simultaneously to both parties of an international conflict, to be used in killing off each other. During the Chaco war the Du Pont Co., according to reports from its sales department, was actively soliciting business from both Bolivia and Paraguay. The same company during the Leticia controversy sold 88,000 pounds of TNT to the Peruvian Government and at the same time sold 340,000 pounds of TNT to the Atlas Powder Co., for shipment to the Colombian Government. By arming and equipping both factions to a controversy, munitions manufacturers drive away every prospect for peace and set the stage for war. What chance has the peaceful citizen who loves his home and family against such a deal as that?

A WORLD-WIDE RACKET

That the munitions game is a world-wide racket, with manufacturers and dealers pressing their advantages for sordid profit and with humanity as the victim, is shown by a long list of secret agreements unearthed by the Senate Committee whereby it is revealed that leading American, British, and German armament firms are closely associated in the sale of war materials throughout the world; that they split profits, protect each other's bids on contracts with Governments, and seek to create monopolies in various parts of the world.

The activities of the munitions traffickers are in the highest degree antisocial. Munitions firms are private corporations responsible to shareholders, who are chiefly interested in the prompt payment of large dividends. It is obvious that dividends can only be paid out of profits, and profits depend on the sale of war materials, and as long as this situation continues the lure of enormous gain will cause the traffic to go on regardless of its social consequences and of its destructive effects on mankind.

ONE SENSIBLE THING TO DO

There is one sensible way to minimize the possibility of war and that is to take the profit out of war. The owners of war properties, dreaming of fabulous profits to begin when war is declared, will have a rude awakening if the amendment I have proposed is adopted. They will find that on the declaration of war they will become the servants and not the masters of the state; that thenceforth all their properties and resources will be used during the period of the war for the benefit of the state and for a nominal interest return of 4 percent on pre-war tax valuations, and that they will share with the rank and file some of the burdens and the sacrifices of war, which is as it should be.

There are some wars which as far as finite vision can discern are God-ordained and inescapable, such as the War of the American Revolution which was to enthrone in our social order great principles of human rights, and the War between the States, which was to write in blood and tears the fate of the institution of slavery, but history points out that a large majority of wars that have cursed the human race have been due to machinations and greed. It is to protect our children and our children's children and the remote generations of posterity for all time to come against a recurrence of these unholy wars that my amendment is directed.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON].

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is the one hundred and twenty-sixth anniversary year of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. He was a humane man, of kindly temperament, upon whom a bloody war laid its burdens and whose life became a sacrifice to its passions and hatreds. I should like to take advantage of this occasion to voice some observations upon the influence that war exerts upon the personalities of great men who have been called upon to deal with its emergencies and its exactions upon the humanities that would ordinarily control their actions and their dealings with their fellow men. I call to mind today three men whose characters we have come to consider almost wholly in their status as war leaders and military commanders, each of whom in the peaceful paths of civic life would have attained distinction as men of humane and cultural inclinations, if not as statesmen of the highest order, concerned in the advancement of the welfare of mankind.

Seventy years have elapsed since the close of the War between the States. Two days are annually observed in many parts of the United States in commemoration of three of the leading characters of that war.

One is January 19, when a joint memorial is held to Robert E. Lee and to "Stonewall" Jackson. The other is February 12, when Nation-wide homage is paid to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. These men are extolled and the largest measure of every excellence is claimed for them, mainly because we have come to regard them as leaders either in the field or in an executive capacity in one of the most devastating civil wars the world has ever known.

More books and articles have been written concerning Abraham Lincoln than, perhaps, any other American. There are contradictions in these writings. Some authors are unsparing in their criticism, while others praise him beyond the just deserts of man.

I am reminded at this moment of the story so often told of the old lady who finally reached the presence of President Andrew Jackson. For years she had listened to the praise heaped upon him, until she was awed by the very sound of his name. Then one day she saw him, and her comment upon leaving his presence was, "Law, me, he is only a man after all."

Lincoln, Lee, and Jackson were, after all, only men; and as it has been in the past, so it will be in the future, all government and all functions of government will have to be conducted by mere men—men whom military experience often has exalted into heroic attitudes, in disparagement of their nobler and more humane propensities.

Let me give you a single instance in the life of each of these three men that identify them as magnanimous human beings, whose finer qualities were too often subdued to the inexorable exigencies of war.

First, let me say that at the time Jackson and Lee were called upon to take part in the War between the States, they were practically unknown, save and except as soldiers who had participated in the War with Mexico.

When Lee and "Jeb" Stuart were sent by President Buchanan to Harpers Ferry to quell the insurrection promoted by John Brown, after the seizure was made, Stuart entered the building occupied by Brown and exclaimed: "Why, it is old Osawatimie Brown! I had you in Kansas." John Brown responded: "Yes; but you didn't hold me." Then followed the trial of Brown, and his execution. It was the human quality in Stuart, the dashing cavalry leader, that prompted that kindly recognition of the fanatical zealot, John Brown.

A beautiful story in the life of Thomas J. Jackson is the one told when, as head of the State Militia of Virginia, he was called to preserve order. The night before Brown's execution he prayed in the hope that Governor Wise would commute the sentence of death. Jackson was comparatively unknown at that time, but shortly thereafter, from his firm stand on the field of battle, he became renowned, and always to be remembered as Jackson, who stood like a "stone wall."

In the case of Lee, what could be more striking than his self-effacement from public life after the great conflict. Offers were piled upon him to commercialize his name, but he set them all aside and accepted, instead, a professorship at a Virginia university at small pay.

One of the many instances which revealed the intrinsic character of Abraham Lincoln occurred in the debates between him and Stephen A. Douglas. Douglas, on one occasion, asserted, "All the slaves that ever left Africa are not worth a disturbance in a single State of this Union, let alone the Union itself." Mr. Lincoln's response was, "But, Mr. Douglas, is slavery right?"

Also, growing out of those debates, Mr. Lincoln drove his great truth home in such language as this:

That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world.

They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time, and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity and the other the divine right of kings.

It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, "You toil and work and earn bread, and I'll eat it." No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor, or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle.

A MESSAGE TO FUTURE GENERATIONS

One could discuss either Lincoln, Jackson, or Lee for an evening, indulging in generous platitudes that would be most pleasing to the ear, and yet that alone would convey no message of importance to the auditors.

I feel that these 2 days—the Jackson-Lee day and the Lincoln day—should continue to be observed, but every observance of the days should carry with it a message, to the present and future generations, of the horrors of war, especially of civil war. The message should be delivered, not with the thought of arousing sectional feelings or hatred of any kind, but as a forceful historical lesson to Americans of what their forefathers did to one another while engaged in that bloody civil conflict.

There seems to be a popular belief that in order to get a truly horrifying picture of war one has to go to some distant land. I believe it would be most effective if young Americans were taught that war anywhere is just what General Sherman said it was—hell—and that the savage instincts of men are aroused as easily in the breasts of Americans as in those of other races once they are in the midst of strife.

The way to give the American boy a true picture of war is to tell him what really took place in the conflict between the States. Tell him the whole truth, without the embellishments of pomp, circumstance, and glory. Tell him of the ruthlessness practiced by those participants who were branded as "irregulars." Tell him of John Morgan; tell him of Mosby; tell him of Quantrell, on the one side. On the other side, tell him of Hunter; and tell him of Jennison and Lane, of the "red legs" of Kansas. Tell him somewhat in detail of the raiding back and forth, where the raiders and their victims were all Americans, preying upon their fellow Americans, robbing, looting, killing, in the madness and savagery of border warfare.

When you have told him the story sufficiently on the side of those leaders whom military history conveniently designates as irregulars, tell him the story of the so-called "regulars."

Tell him of the terror-spreading and destructive marches of the regulars. Tell him the true story of Sherman's march to the sea. Tell it just as it was told by the participants. Tell him the story of that scathing war order, attributed to Grant and inspired by Stanton, the record of which was lost from the historical archives. According to legend the message to Grant's commander in the famous raid through the Shenandoah Valley was couched in the following ruthless terms:

When you traverse the Valley, leave it so barren that a crow seeking to fly over it, will have to carry his rations with him.

Everyone seems to believe that a message of this kind was sent by Grant, although it has apparently not been preserved in its entirety by historians. As a verification of the fact that such an order was in fact carried out, we find this statement in *The Shenandoah and Appomattox Campaigns*, a book published by the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts:

The victories of Winchester and Fisher's Hill, September 19 and 22, 1864, sent Early and his army "whirling up the Valley." Sheridan pursued as far as Harrisonburg and Mt. Crawford with his infantry, and Staunton with his cavalry. Thence retiring at his leisure, he swept the Valley bare with a cordon of cavalry stretching clear across it, from the Blue Ridge to the North Mountain, burning all the mills and barns, driving off all the horses and cattle and sheep, and leaving so little subsistence that it was said that a crow, seeking to fly down the Valley, would have to carry his rations with him.

In McMaster's *History of the People of the United States* this is said concerning Grant's order:

New York Herald, October 1864, stated that Grant also required his order to be so carried out that a crow flying across the valley would have to carry his rations with him. In a letter to Halleck, written July 14, Grant said, referring to the pursuit of Early after his retreat from Washington:

"If the enemy has left Maryland, as I suppose he has, he should have upon his heels veterans, militiamen, men on horseback, and everything that can be got to follow to eat out Virginia clear and clean as far as they go, so that crows flying over it for the balance of this season will have to carry their provender with them." (Official Records, series 1, vol. 37, part II, pp. 300-301.)

In Sheridan's Personal Memoirs, he quotes from a letter of instructions from Grant, as follows:

In pushing up the Shenandoah Valley * * * it is desirable that nothing should be left to invite the enemy to return. Take all provisions, forage, and stock wanted for the use of your command. Such as cannot be consumed, destroy.

In another of General Grant's instructions to him, Sheridan quotes Grant as having said:

If the war is to last another year, we want the Shenandoah Valley to remain a barren waste.

In commenting on Grant's orders, Sheridan said:

The loss of property weighs heavy with the most of mankind; heavier often than the sacrifices made on the field of battle. Death is popularly considered the maximum of punishment in war, but it is not; reduction to poverty brings prayers for peace more surely and more quickly than does the destruction of human life.

Tell him of conditions in the South after the war as described by McMaster in his History of the People of the United States During the Administration of Abraham Lincoln:

In many parts of the South distress was great and growing greater, and especially in the track of Sherman's army. Official reports which came to its office told of women and children who walked 10, 40 miles for bread, and then got but a morsel or nothing; of naked beings crouching beside an old brick chimney, all that remained of what was once their home; of 10 counties in northern Georgia in all of which there was not growing as much food for man and beast as could be found on an ordinary northern farm.

The chief sufferers were the families of Union volunteers in southern Tennessee and northern Georgia, whose homes had been ruined by rebel armies or guerrillas.

Here is brought home to you, according to this historian, the devastating results of war as practiced by both the regulars and the irregulars.

THE LAW OF TOOTH AND TALON

Tell him of George A. Custer, a major in the War between the States. Custer is known to everyone as the hero of the last stand against the western Indians. Let it be known that this is the same Custer who, in the valley during the civil conflict, made the announcement that every member of Mosby's band caught by his men would be executed on the spot. Mosby's retort was:

For every one of our men executed under Custer's order, ten of Custer's men will be brought in and summarily executed.

It took a brutal counteraction on the part of Mosby to temper Custer's brutality and to cause him to withdraw his inhuman order.

Youth is easily deceived about war. The first places depopulated when war is declared are the universities, colleges, and high schools. The method of arousing the war spirit is always the same. The flag is waved. The bands play. Political orators come forth and talk of our country, right or wrong. Threatened with a foreign war or internecine strife, every citizen should be responsive to his duty, but he should not be rushed headlong into a conflict that may prove disastrous to American manhood and American ideals of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This is especially true concerning the youth of our country.

The history of that ruthless conflict reeks with war's inhumanities that left their trails of blood and misery and poverty for generations afterwards.

Take General Sherman's seizure of Atlanta. He proposed that a truce be declared so that the removal of all civilians living in that city might be made in an orderly way. General Hood's answer was:

Your letter of yesterday's date * * * is received. You say therein, "I deem it to be to the interest of the United States that the citizens now residing in Atlanta should remove," etc. I do not consider that I have any alternative in this matter. I therefore accept your proposition to declare a truce of 2 days, or such time as may be necessary to accomplish the purpose mentioned. * * *

And now, sir, permit me to say that the unprecedented measure you propose transcends, in studied and ingenious cruelty, all acts ever before brought to my attention in the dark history of war.

In the name of God and humanity, I protest, believing that you will find that you are expelling from their homes and firesides the wives and children of a brave people.

General Sherman replied:

You style the measures proposed "unprecedented", and appeal to the dark history of war for a parallel, as an act of "studied and ingenious cruelty." It is not unprecedented; for General Johnston himself very wisely and properly removed the families all the way from Dalton down, and I see no reason why Atlanta should be excepted. Nor is it necessary to appeal to the dark history of war, when recent and modern examples are so handy. You yourself burned dwelling houses along your parapet, and I have seen today 50 houses that you have rendered uninhabitable because they stood in the way of your forts and men. You defended Atlanta on a line so close to town that every cannon shot and many musket shots from our line of investment that overshot their mark went into the habitations of women and children. General Hardee did the same at Jonesboro, and General Johnston did the same last summer at Jackson, Miss.

The above exchange was between ranking regular officers of both sides.

Mr. Jefferson Davis, in his book *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government*, gave the following account of Sherman's seizure of Atlanta:

General Sherman, desisting from any further aggressive movement in the field, returned to Atlanta, which had been formally surrendered by the mayor on September 2, with the promise, as reported, on the part of the Federal commander, that noncombatants and private property should be respected. Shortly after his arrival the commanding general of the Federal forces, forgetful of this promise, and on the pretense that the exigencies of the service required that the place should be used exclusively for military purposes, issued an order directing all civilians living in Atlanta, male and female, to leave the city within 5 days from the date of the order (Sept. 5).

Since Alva's atrocious cruelties to the noncombatant population of the Low Countries in the sixteenth century, the history of war records no instances of such barbarous cruelty as that which this order designed to perpetrate. It involved the immediate expulsion from their homes and only means of subsistence of thousands of unoffending women and children, whose husbands and fathers were either in the Army, in northern prisons or had died in battle. In vain did the mayor and corporate authorities of Atlanta appeal to Sherman to revoke or modify this inhuman order, representing in piteous language "the woe, the horror, and the suffering not to be described by words", which its execution would inflict on helpless women and infant children. His only reply was:

"I give full credit to your statements of the distress that will be occasioned by it and yet shall not revoke my order, because my orders are not designed to meet the humanities of the case."

Remember that this was a great general saying, in effect, that the humanities of the case must give way to military necessity. Those who knew William Tecumseh Sherman in private life, both before and after the war, said he was a humane man—a good Christian—an affectionate husband. His letters to his wife even from the fields of battle were models of conjugal tenderness and most interesting as evidencing a sympathetic nature. But war transformed him in the field into an inhuman engine of destruction to whom the ordinary humanities of life made no appeal—it was war did that.

Mr. John Wanamaker, in a publication known as "The Wanamaker Primer on Abraham Lincoln", issued in 1909, described the Secretary of War of that period, Edwin M. Stanton, as follows:

And Stanton, brusque, bitter, caustic, overbearing, insolent, abusive Stanton, who had called Lincoln an "imbecile", an "ogre", a "gorilla", and a "fool" was transformed into a loyal, devoted, stanch friend and admirer of his chief. Mind alone could never have mastered Stanton. It was the great heart and the great will in the White House that finally conquered his domineering Secretary of War.

STANTON'S COLD DEAL IN HUMAN FLESH

Andrew G. Curtin was Pennsylvania's great war Governor. On three different occasions he appeared before Secretary of War Stanton and appealed to him for an exchange of 30,000 southern prisoners for a like number of Union prisoners. Upon his last appeal, when he was accompanied by his Attorney General Meredith, Stanton grew impatient and even insolent, retorting to the Governor's appeal:

Do you come here in support of the Government and ask me to exchange 30,000 skeletons for 30,000 well-fed men?

To which Curtin replied in righteous indignation:

Do you dare to depart from the laws of humane warfare in this enlightened age of Christian civilization?

Here it is again. Pennsylvania's great humane Governor fighting for what he believed to be right, taking the humanitarian view that northern prisoners, many of whom were from Pennsylvania, should be permitted to come home, and Stanton, the Secretary of War, standing for his position that in war all things humane should give way to military necessity. These soldier boys were left to suffer, and many to die, in southern prisons owing to the expedient called "military necessity."

All honor to Curtin. Every child in the United States should be told about this great man and his humane impulses.

Lincoln also was a humanitarian. No better view of Lincoln on this subject exists than in a letter written by David Davis, in which he said:

Mr. Lincoln was advised—and I also so advised him—that the various military trials in the northern and border States, where the courts were free and untrammelled, were unconstitutional and wrong; that they would not and ought not to be sustained by the Supreme Court; that such proceedings were dangerous to liberty. He said he was opposed to hanging; that he did not like to kill his fellowman; that if the world had no butchers but himself, it would go bloodless.

The uncivilizing of man by war is graphically described by that great and good man, John N. Edwards, who was one of Shelby's soldiers. He said this, partly in apology but wholly in truth:

The guerrilla organization of Missouri needs a word in its defense, although its warfare was pitiless, its banner the black flag, and its battle cry the fearful monosyllable death. Composed of men driven to desperation by the unceasing persecutions of Federals and militia, they had been outlawed and hunted from county to county as rabid animals. Their scalps commanded a premium, and their mutilated bodies were denied sepulture. Revenge is believed by philosophers to be one of the strongest passions of the human heart, and when stimulated by grievous wrongs and fanned into flame within the bosoms of men having western ideas and developments, it naturally becomes cruel and unsparing.

It made honorable men desert the Army that they might lose the uncertainty of regular battle and have the grim satisfaction of knowing that death followed the shots of their own revolvers and the thrusts of their own knives. They accepted the black flag as an emblem, because it suited their ideas of murder—and having no hope themselves, they left none to their victims.

In an association composed of men driven from all natural feelings by numberless outrages, some crimes would creep in, and often innocent persons were killed and Southern families plundered; but as a general thing the leaders, like the gladiators under Spartacus, only shouted "Kill, kill!" upon the bodies of their persecutors.

AN EXCHANGE OF MILITARY "CIVILITIES"

The history of the War between the States is replete with orders and proclamations of retaliation between officers of the Regular Army of both forces. As an illustration, read this amiable exchange of brotherly love between Maj. Gen. John C. Fremont, commander of the Western Department of the Union Army, and Brig. Gen. M. Jeff. Thompson, commanding officer of the first military district of the Missouri State Guard, on the question of taking human life.

Major General Fremont on August 30, 1861, proclaimed:

All persons who shall be taken with arms in their hands within these lines shall be tried by court martial, and if found guilty will be shot.

The very next day, August 31, 1861, Brigadier General Thompson sent his endearing reply:

Therefore, know ye that I, M. Jeff. Thompson, brigadier general of the first military district of Missouri * * * do most solemnly promise that for every member of the Missouri State Guard, or soldier of our allies, the Armies of the Confederate States, who shall be put to death in pursuance of the said order of General Fremont, I will hang, draw, and quarter a minion of said Abraham Lincoln.

Sad, indeed, were the tribulations of Abraham Lincoln. After the issuance of Fremont's proclamation of August 30, 1861, Mr. Lincoln, on September 2, wrote to Fremont asking that he modify his proclamation. Mr. Lincoln said, speaking in terms he thought a military man would understand:

Should you shoot a man, according to the proclamation, the Confederates would very certainly shoot our best man in their

hands in retaliation; and so, man for man, indefinitely. It is, therefore, my order that you allow no man to be shot under the proclamation without first having my approbation or consent.

These cases should suffice to demonstrate the ravages of war on the hearts of men, who in the ordinary phases of civil society and government would be dominated by humane impulses.

Every student of history in the South knows of the harshness of the orders of General Sherman as a commander. Very few realize that just a few weeks later, when confronted with the task of making terms of peace with Gen. Joseph E. Johnston in the field, Sherman's terms were far more liberal than those made by Grant with Lee. When Sherman's terms were sent to Washington for approval or rejection, Secretary of War Stanton, inflamed with war hatreds and prejudices, immediately proclaimed the rejection of the terms, and denounced Sherman as having surrendered, without authority, almost every issue for which the war had been fought.

The Chicago Tribune cried out and said: "To think that Sherman made such terms, knowing that Lincoln had been assassinated." But General Johnston did not know of Lincoln's assassination until after the terms of surrender were stipulated.

Stanton dispatched Grant to the field. Sherman was forced to recede, and new terms were made of the same kind as between Lee and Grant. Had Sherman's terms been approved, that awful blot upon American history—carpet-bag reconstruction—would have been averted. And in Sherman's memoirs it was revealed that in his original terms with Johnston he implicitly obeyed the directions of Lincoln.

Mr. Edward A. Pollard, in his Southern History of the War, said, concerning Sherman's terms with General Johnston:

Sherman's vivid vision of restoring "peace to the banks of the Rio Grande" did not take at Washington. The announcement there of the nature and terms of his conference with Johnston was the signal for the outpouring of such censure and denunciation as required all his military reputation to withstand.

In fact, Sherman had committed the unpardonable offense of attempting to substitute for the idea of subjugation that of a restored Union.

When you read about Lincoln, he is so frequently referred to as "Old Abe." But Abe Lincoln, when the assassin's shot ended his life, was only old in grief and care and the havoc of war.

There were three other memorable men of that period whose activities fill the pages of Civil War history. One was Frank P. Blair, a Kentucky-Missourian, who was a close friend of Lincoln's. He was a gallant soldier, and in civil life served with honor in both Houses of Congress. He was dead at 55.

Another was Stephen A. Douglas, a foremost statesman and political opponent of Lincoln. Upon Mr. Lincoln's inauguration as President, Mr. Douglas assured him of his hearty cooperation, went home shortly thereafter, and died at the early age of 48. And Lincoln was dead at 56.

The exigencies of public life and of war's responsibilities took their toll of these men long before they could claim the serenities and the awards of a life fulfilled with peaceful years and "old age superbly rising."

THE PROMISE OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE

In conclusion, I want to urge upon everyone here that if you expect ever to voice your opinions as to the folly of war, you must exercise that right at a time like the present—when peace reigns—for when war or rumors of war are in the air it is too late—the voice of peace is silenced; yes, even forcibly suppressed.

The War between the States was not the outgrowth of agitation of a day. It was 30 years or more in the making. And what have all the wars of the world ever gained for civilization, for humanity, for human welfare, or for the questions that we have been settling only by the bloody arbitrament of sword and gun?

The horrors of war are such that the sufferings and miseries endured by those involved, and the generations that follow them, remain indefinitely a cancerous growth in the

national polity. America, the land of peace and freedom, should be a solid phalanx against war. It is not a game or a tribunal to which our ideals of government "of, for, and by the people" are in accord. Nor is it in accord with our fundamental ideas of right and wrong.

In 65 years we will have reached the two thousandth anniversary of the birth of the Prince of Peace, whose gospel was peace and good will to all mankind. Let us hope that when that day is reached, we will have come to a full understanding of His message, and that organized war will have been banished from the world. And let us hope further that the great Republic of the United States of America, organized in the spirit of liberty and good will to all, will have been, not only a contributor, but a leader in the achievement of a new national and international order—the reign of universal peace and domestic tranquillity. The time to begin sowing the seeds of peace and good will is now—today—and it will be a glorious consummation if we shall be able to celebrate the second millennium of the Prince of Peace with the fruition of his gospel—a world at peace at last.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. AMLIE].

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Chairman, I was moved to ask for a few minutes when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] was speaking. Mr. Ludlow gave a very carefully prepared talk—a talk that could only have been prepared over some period of time. I was struck by the fact he felt it would be out of order to introduce a bill in this House for the reason it would probably be held to be unconstitutional, and to get around that difficulty he introduced a resolution calling for an amendment to the Constitution.

This merely goes to show how rapidly things are changing. A speech that is prepared a day or two before is already obsolete by the time it is delivered here in the House.

I notice by the Washington Daily News today an article by an old newspaper friend of mine, Mr. Herb Little, in which he quotes Justice McReynolds to the effect that "the Constitution is gone"—a statement made with all finality.

It was my pleasure to serve in this House with the gentleman from Indiana in the Seventy-second Congress. I can well understand why he is still laboring under the illusion that things are still unconstitutional, because just about everything that we tried to enact into law during that session was simply dismissed by the Membership of this House on the assumption that it was unconstitutional.

I follow a practice, which I suppose most of the Members follow, of writing a news letter to the weekly newspapers in my district. Ten days ago I wrote such a news letter, and in that news letter I indicated that the Supreme Court would support the administration in its decision of the gold cases. I also outlined the reasons why they would come to this conclusion, despite the fact that such a decision would be clearly contrary to past decisions of the Supreme Court. I based it largely on the reasoning of Mr. O. W. Sprague, of Harvard University, who was the economic adviser of the Treasury Department a year ago. He made the statement that if there were only one hundred or two hundred million dollars involved in this decision the Supreme Court would find the law unconstitutional, but because there was about \$100,000,000,000 involved the Supreme Court would not dare to find it unconstitutional.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks by including that portion of my news letter which was in the nature of a prognostication as to the Supreme Court decision to be rendered.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

THE GOLD DECISION

By Representative THOMAS R. AMLIE

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 9, 1935.—The probabilities are that the Supreme Court will render a decision in the so-called "gold-clause cases" before this letter is printed.

Following the Civil War and the development of the green-back movement, many corporations set out to sew up contract

rights beyond the reach of the United States Congress. They provided that bonds were to be payable in gold dollars at \$20.67 an ounce. There are in the United States today approximately \$100,000,000,000 in obligations thus defined. It is the contention of the holders of these obligations that the reduction of the gold content of the dollar to 59 cents served to deprive them of 41 cents to which they were entitled as a matter of law.

In the light of past decisions on this subject there is very little question but that the claimants are right in their contention as to what the law is.

But if the Supreme Court should hold with these bondholders, it would result in writing up the public and private debts of the country by \$69,000,000,000. It would add \$10,000,000,000 to the public debt. The increased annual interest charge would amount to two and one-half billion dollars a year. A decision upholding the gold clause would in theory wipe out the value of nearly all common stock. But despite the significance of this decision the stock market has hardly shown a tremor.

Obviously, such a decision would not be permitted to take effect even if it were the law. Congress is prepared to enact legislation that would circumvent any such decision by the Supreme Court. That is to say, if a man who owes \$100 had to pay \$169 under such a decision, the Congress would impose a tax of \$75 on the transaction and refund \$69 to the payer.

Since this is the situation, the Supreme Court will probably uphold the constitutionality of the act. As Mr. O. W. Sprague, a Harvard professor who was economic adviser to the Treasury on monetary matters a year ago, observed, "If there were only one or two hundred million dollars involved, the Supreme Court would find the law unconstitutional. Since \$100,000,000,000 is involved, the Supreme Court would not dare do so."

In either event the Supreme Court is bound to suffer a tremendous loss of dignity and prestige.

Mr. PARKS. 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. HILL of Alabama, 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. 5913, the War Department appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF PUBLIC PARKS, ETC., FOR THE SHRINE COMMITTEE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 49 and consider the same. The resolution is identical with the resolution passed by the House on February 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the lady from New Jersey? The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 49

Joint resolution authorizing the use of public parks, reservations, and other public spaces in the District of Columbia; and the use of tents, cots, hospital appliances, flags, and other decorations, property of the United States, by Washington, D. C., 1935 Shrine Committee, Inc., and for other purposes.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and the Architect of the Capitol are hereby severally authorized to grant permits to the Washington, D. C., 1935 Shrine Committee, Inc., a body corporate organized pursuant to the provisions of chapter 5 of title V of the Code of the District of Columbia (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") for the use of any buildings, parks, rivers, waterways, reservations, sidewalks, or other public spaces in the District of Columbia, under his, their, or its control, respectively on the occasion of the sixty-first annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient and Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, in the month of June 1935: *Provided*, That such use will inflict no serious or permanent injury upon any such buildings, parks, rivers, waterways, reservations, sidewalks, or other public spaces, or any portion, or the contents thereof, in the opinion of the person granting any such permit, in accordance with this authority: *Provided further*, That all stands, arches, or platforms that may be erected on the public spaces aforesaid, including such as may be erected in connection with any display of fireworks, shall be under the supervision of the said Washington, D. C., 1935 Shrine Committee, Inc., and in accordance with plans and designs to be approved by the Architect of the Capitol, the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and the Superintendent of National Capital Parks, and that no person or corporation shall be authorized to erect or use any such stands, arches, or platforms without permission of said committee: *And provided further*, That any such buildings, parks, reservations, or other public spaces which shall be used or occupied, by the erection of stands or other structures, or otherwise, shall be promptly restored to their condition before such occupancy, and the said committee shall indemnify the United States or the District of

Columbia, as the case may be, for all damage of any kind whatsoever sustained by reason of any such use or occupation.

SEC. 2. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to designate, set aside, and regulate the use of such streets, avenues, and sidewalks in the District of Columbia, under their control, as they may deem proper and necessary, for the purpose of said session, and to make and enforce such special regulations regarding standing, movement, and operation of vehicles of whatever kind or character, and all reasonable regulations necessary to secure the preservation of public order and the protection of life and property, from the 8th day of June 1935 to the 17th day of June 1935, both inclusive. Such regulations shall be in force during said period, and shall be published in one or more daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the expiration of said period shall not prevent the arrest or trial of any person for any violation of such regulations committed during the time same were in force and effect: *Provided, however*, That no penalty prescribed for the violation of any such regulations shall be in force until 5 days after the date of publication.

SEC. 3. That the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia is hereby granted authority to make such special regulations as in the opinion of said Commission may be necessary or desirable, regulating the standing, movement, and operation of taxicabs, street cars, busses, and other vehicles of conveyance under the regulation or control of said Commission, for the period commencing the 8th day of June 1935 and ending on the 15th day of June 1935, both inclusive.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized to loan to said committee such tents, camp appliances, trucks, motor equipment, benches, chairs, hospital furniture and utensils of all description, ambulances, horses, drivers, stretchers, Red Cross flags and poles, and other property and equipment, belonging to the United States, as in their judgment may be spared at the time of said session, consistent with the interests of the United States: *Provided*, That the said committee shall indemnify the United States for any loss or damage to any and all such property not necessarily incidental to such use: *And provided further*, That the said committee shall give approved bond to do the same.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized to loan to the said committee such ensigns, flags, decorations, lighting equipment, and so forth, belonging to the United States (battle flags excepted) as are not then in use, and may be suitable and proper for decorations and other purposes, which may be spared without detriment to the public service, such ensigns, flags, decorations, lighting equipment, and so forth, to be used by the committee under such regulations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the said Secretaries, or either of them: *Provided*, That the said committee shall, within 5 days after the close of said session, return to the said Secretaries all such ensigns, flags, decorations, lighting equipment, and so forth, thus loaned; and said committee shall indemnify the United States for any loss or damage not necessarily incidental to such use.

SEC. 6. That the Superintendent of National Capital Parks, subject to the approval of the Director of National Parks Service, is hereby authorized to permit the use of any or all public parks, reservations, or other public spaces in the District of Columbia, including the Monument grounds and the Ellipse, for use by said committee for the erection of grand stands, reviewing stands, platforms, and other structures for reviewing parade or other purposes; and said committee is hereby authorized to charge reasonable fees for the use of the same provided such fees are used to aid in meeting the necessary expenses incident to the said session.

SEC. 7. That the Superintendent of National Capital Parks, subject to the approval of the Director of National Parks Service, is hereby authorized to permit the use of such public parks, reservations, or other public spaces in the District of Columbia, under the control of the said Superintendent of National Capital Parks, as in the opinion of said Superintendent of National Capital Parks may be necessary, for the use by said committee for the parking of automobiles, the temporary erection of tents for entertainment, hospitals, and other purposes; and the said committee is hereby authorized to charge reasonable fees for the use of the same provided such fees are used to aid in meeting the expenses incident to the said session.

SEC. 8. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to permit said committee to stretch suitable overhead conductors, with sufficient supports, wherever necessary and in the nearest practicable connection with the present supply of light, for the purpose of effecting special illumination: *Provided*, That the said conductors shall not be used for the conveying of electrical currents after June 15, 1935, and shall, with their supports, be fully and entirely removed from the public spaces, streets, and avenues of the said city of Washington on or before June 25, 1935: *Provided further*, That the stretching and removing of the said wires shall be under the supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who shall see that the provisions of this resolution are enforced; that all needful precautions are taken for the protection of the public; and that the pavement of any street, avenue, or alley disturbed is replaced in as good condition as before entering upon the work herein authorized: *And provided further*, That no expense or damage on account of or due to the stretching, operation, or removing of the said temporary overhead conductors shall be incurred by the United States or the District of Columbia, and that if it shall be necessary to erect wires for illuminating or other purposes over any

park or reservation in the District of Columbia, the work of erection and removal of said wires shall be under the supervision of the officer in charge of said park or reservation.

SEC. 9. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to grant, subject to approval of said committee and under such conditions as they may impose, special licenses to peddlers, merchants, and vendors to sell goods, wares, and merchandise on the streets, avenues, and sidewalks in the District of Columbia during said session, and to charge for such privileges such fees as they may deem proper.

SEC. 10. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to permit the telegraph and telephone companies to extend overhead wires to such points as shall be deemed necessary by the said committee, the said wires to be taken down within 10 days after the conclusion of the session.

SEC. 11. That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Treasury are hereby authorized to assign to said committee for use and occupancy during said session such unoccupied public buildings or portions thereof in the District of Columbia as, in its discretion, may appear advisable: *Provided*, That any and all buildings so assigned shall be surrendered within 10 days after the close of said session: *Provided further*, That the said committee shall furnish a bond or other satisfactory assurance of indemnity against damage to said property while in its possession, incidental wear and tear excepted.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the lady yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Gladly.

Mr. BLANTON. The distinguished lady from New Jersey, who is the Chairman of the House District Committee, had her identical House resolution passed by the House in plenty of time to have had it substituted for the Senate resolution when the latter passed the Senate?

Mrs. NORTON. My understanding is that the Senate resolution was being acted upon about the same time that we passed the resolution in the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Was there any disposition on the part of the Senate to take up and pass her bill that was passed by the House?

Mrs. NORTON. If there had been, there was plenty of time to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. And the lady is unselfish enough to be willing to have the Senate joint resolution passed instead of her own and waive the courtesy that should have been extended to her as chairman of the House committee?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes. May I say that as far as the Chairman of the District Committee is concerned, she has no pride of authorship in this resolution; my purpose is to substitute the Senate resolution in order to give the committee on arrangements more time for perfecting their arrangements. There seems to be no good reason for further delay.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the lady from New Jersey is very unselfish. And I know that Shriners from every temple in the United States will appreciate her action.

They are going to put on another wonderful parade here next June. Their last one a few years ago was almost unanimously voted to be one of the most beautiful and colorful parades ever pulled off in Washington. The Iowa patrol mounted on pure white Arabian horses with their marching cohorts singing *Out Where the Tall Corn Grows* delighted all spectators from one end to the other of Pennsylvania Avenue.

On behalf of the Shriners of the United States I want to thank our colleague from New Jersey on her generous and unselfish action in expediting the final passage of this resolution.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

B. P. O. E. U. CIVIL LIBERTIES

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago I received a letter sent out at the direction of the editor and executive director of the Elks Magazine, as well as a copy of the February issue of that publication.

The magazine was quite obviously sent because of an article by Mr. Samuel Crowther entitled "Are the Pinks More Dangerous Than the Reds?" I say this because there was really nothing else in the magazine other than this

article. The article was so misleading and contained such serious misrepresentations of fact that I felt called upon to write to the editor.

It was not my intention to give the matter further publicity, but it has come to my attention during the past week that the sending out of these letters and magazines, on the part of the Elks organization, is only a part of a Nation-wide program to curtail the civil liberties of the people, in which the B. P. O. E. seems to be taking an active part.

An article, ostensibly written by the local exalted ruler of the Elks, appeared recently in a newspaper in my district, seeking to create the impression that recent strikes and other activities of labor, directed toward the achievement of better living standards, are the direct result of communistic activities in the United States.

As every fair-minded person knows, such an assertion is absurd. To identify the activities of organized labor with the Communist Party is clearly just a cloak for an attack upon organized labor itself.

The Elks' writers assign altogether too much importance to the Communist Party. The September issue of the magazine *Fortune* has an excellent article on the Communist Party in America. It sets forth the fact that the Communist Party has only 26,000 recognized members in the United States.

On the other hand, we have probably in excess of 15,000,000 unemployed people in the United States. We had 11,500,000 unemployed people 3 years ago. It is, indeed, a striking commentary that 5½ years of acute economic depression should have led only 26,000 people to join the Communist Party. It shows that the instrument of the class struggle as a means of bringing about social and economic change finds but scant acceptance with the American people.

The forces of reaction in the United States are fully aware of this fact. The forces of reaction are also fully aware of the fact that the American people are coming to the point of demanding a new order of things, so that they may share in the abundance which America is capable of producing. For this reason the forces of reaction are busy at this time seeking to place the Communist brand on all those who advocate the application of intelligence and common sense to our economic problems. Such is the purpose of the article in the *Elks Magazine*; and to give his argument the color of reason, the author makes the wholly false and indefensible claim that there is no unequal distribution of wealth or income in the United States at the present time.

A few days ago I read in the February 12 issue of the *Milwaukee Journal*, page 14, a news item to the effect that the Milwaukee Elks Club is participating in a Nation-wide grand lodge campaign to petition Congress to enact legislation which would have the effect of signing away our civil liberties. It was also stated that as a part of its Americanization campaign a meeting would be held February 13 at the clubhouse in Milwaukee and that petitions would be circulated to be presented to Members of Congress on February 22.

Because the Elks' organization is lending itself to a reactionary campaign of misrepresentation, I insert herewith a copy of the letter to which I have referred. It refutes, at least, the statistical basis of the article contained in the *Elks Magazine*.

FEBRUARY 9, 1935.

Mr. JOSEPH T. FANNING,
Editor the *Elks Magazine*,
50 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 6 and also copy of your February issue of the *Elks Magazine*.

In answer to your inquiry, I am not an Elk.

In reply to the obvious purpose of the letter and the magazine, I want to say that I have read the article *Are the Pinks More Dangerous Than the Reds*, by Samuel Crowther. In my opinion the article is altogether stupid and wholly ineffective insofar as the average reader of intelligence is concerned. The article develops the idea that the distribution of wealth in the United States is altogether reasonable; and that the arguments of the people who sound off about production for use and the redistribution of wealth, while their arguments may sound plausible, are none of them founded on fact.

I call your attention to a speech appearing in the February 8 issue of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, page 1714, by Senator BLACK of Alabama. The following paragraphs appear in this speech:

"For a number of years up to 1929 the share of the national income going to the farmer and the wage earner has been rapidly descending, while the share of the national income going to those with incomes so large that they do not buy consumable goods has been rapidly increasing.

"This is illustrated by the fact that from 1909 to 1929 the farmers' share decreased 50 percent.

"During that same period the number drawing incomes over \$25,000 increased from 40,000 people in 1921, to 102,000 people in 1929, and their total increase went from \$2,000,000,000 to \$8,000,000,000.

"In 1921 there were 21 people with an income of over a million dollars, and in 1929 this number had risen from 21 people to 513. The increase of income of those receiving over a million dollars has ascended from \$49,000,000 in 1921 to \$1,200,000,000 in 1929.

"A striking example of the difference between the small income families who buy the consumable goods of the Nation and the large incomes is that in 1929 one-tenth of 1 percent of the families of the United States at the top of the income list received as much income as 42 percent of the families at the bottom of the list. In other words, about 144,000 people received an income of about \$10,000,000,000, and at the same time and in the same year 47,000,000 people received incomes of about \$10,000,000,000.

"There is nothing strange about the fact that after 1929 the collapse of business occurred. Business had failed to distribute to its worker-purchasers a sufficient amount of income to buy its goods. Greed had reached such a point in 1929 that 513 people received as much income as 8,000,000 people."

The facts set up by Senator BLACK in his speech are all substantiated by a recent study entitled "America's Capacity to Consume", published by the Brookings Institution, of Washington, D. C. As everyone knows this is an eminently conservative research foundation.

I am sending you a copy of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* for that date so that you may have the opportunity to read all of Senator BLACK's speech. In justice to the members of Elksdom I would suggest that you publish Senator BLACK's speech, giving it the same prominence that you have given Mr. Crowther's article.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS R. AMLIE.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GRAY of Indiana was given leave of absence for 1 week, on account of illness.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business on Calendar Wednesday tomorrow be dispensed with in order to give opportunity to continue the consideration of the War Department bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 932. An act to postpone the effective date of certain restrictions respecting air mail contracts; and

S. 1144. An act to further extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Charles, Mo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 20, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(Wednesday, Feb. 20, 10 a. m.)

Public hearings, room 445, House Office Building, on the following bills; H. R. 146, H. R. 2739, and H. R. 5265, authorizing short form of naturalization for certain veterans of World War. H. R. 5799, declaring a citizen of the United States who votes in a foreign country loses his or her citizenship. H. R. 5839, providing for the shortening of stay in this country of aliens for spreading certain propaganda.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

225. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1935 in the sum of \$166,590, and a

supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1935 to remain available until June 30, 1936, in the sum of \$135,000, amounting in all to \$301,590, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 100); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

226. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1935, amounting to \$8,806.75, and draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 101); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

227. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department for printing historical and naval documents, for the fiscal year 1936, amounting to \$10,000, which is supplemental to the estimate of \$10,000 contained in the Budget for the fiscal year 1936 (H. Doc. No. 102); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. PARKS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5913. A bill making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 159). 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. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1299. A bill giving jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the Cherokee Fuel Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2126. A bill for the relief of Hugh G. Lisk; without amendment (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2132. A bill to extend the benefit of the United States Employment Compensation Act to Frank A. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2157. A bill for the relief of Howard Donovan; with amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2185. A bill for the relief of the estate of Marcellino M. Gilmette; with amendment (Rept. No. 164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2204. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Kenton; without amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2265. A bill for the relief of William Lyons; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2327. A bill for the relief of Chellis T. Mooers; with amendment (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Drivurself Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2386. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harry F. Stern; without amendment (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2422. A bill for the relief of James O. Greene and Mrs. Hollis S. Hogan; with amendment (Rept. No. 170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2443. A bill for the relief of Milton Hatch; with amendment (Rept. No. 171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2449. A bill for the relief of Floyd L. Walter; without amendment (Rept. No. 172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2464. A bill for the relief of C. H. Hoogendorn; with amendment (Rept. No. 173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2473. A bill for the relief of William L. Jenkins; with amendment (Rept. No. 174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2487. A bill for the relief of Bernard McShane; with amendment (Rept. No. 175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2551. A bill for the relief of C. B. Dickinson; with amendment (Rept. No. 176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2603. A bill for the relief of Anna Kotnyek; with amendment (Rept. No. 177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2606. A bill for the relief of the estate of Paul Kiehler; with amendment (Rept. No. 178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2663. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William G. Serrine; with amendment (Rept. No. 179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2679. A bill for the relief of Ladislav Cizek; with amendment (Rept. No. 180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2680. A bill for the relief of Mary F. Crim; without amendment (Rept. No. 181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2683. A bill for the relief of Henry Harrison Griffith; with amendment (Rept. No. 182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2689. A bill to extend the benefits of the Employers' Liability Act of September 7, 1916, to Mary Ford Conrad; with amendment (Rept. No. 183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2690. A bill for the relief of John B. Grayson; without amendment (Rept. No. 184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 3797. A bill for the relief of St. Ludgers Catholic Church of Germantown, Henry County, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 615. A bill for the relief of Meta De Rene McLoskey; without amendment (Rept. No. 186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DEEN: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 2439. A bill authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Public Service Coordinated Transport of Newark, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DEEN: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 2501. A bill for the relief of Mrs. G. A. Brannan; without amendment

(Rept. No. 188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1366. A bill for the relief of Stanley A. Jerman, receiver for A. J. Peters, Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 255. An act for the relief of Margaret L. Carleton; without amendment (Rept. No. 190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DEEN: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 4147. A bill to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of April 11, 1919, and the decision of the Secretary of War of date November 30, 1920, in favor of certain employees of the Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; of the St. Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; of the American Hoist & Derrick Co., St. Paul, Minn.; and of the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co., Stillwater, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs: H. R. 3911. A bill for the relief of Sarah J. Hitchcock; without amendment (Rept. No. 192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 3365. A bill for the relief of Lily M. Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARTER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5882. A bill for the relief of Claude Cyril Langley; without amendment (Rept. No. 194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 24. Joint resolution to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the bequest of the late Charlotte Taylor, of the city of St. Petersburg, State of Florida, for the benefit of Walter Reed General Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 492) granting a pension to Paul Chick; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1158) granting a pension to George R. Miller; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5685) granting a pension to Margaret M. Warner; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4434) granting a pension to Cordie Brandenburg; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5316) granting an increase of pension to Cecelia A. Burns; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2924) granting a pension to Frances C. Liebman; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2493) for the settlement of claim of the heirs of Richard H. Mahan and Eliza J. Mahan, his wife, formerly Eliza J. Nicholls, arising out of the confiscation of cotton during the Civil War, and for other purposes; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PARKS: A bill (H. R. 5913) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War

Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURNHAM: A bill (H. R. 5914) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held in San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 5915) to clarify Revised Statute 104 (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 194); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 5916) to authorize the conveyance by the United States to the State of Michigan of the former United States Lighthouse Supply Depot, St. Joseph, Mich., for State naval force purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 5917) to appoint an additional circuit judge for the ninth judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN: A bill (H. R. 5918) to provide for the creation of an Intermediate Credit Corporation for commerce and industry, to aid in financing small and medium-sized commercial and industrial establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 5919) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER: A bill (H. R. 5920) to authorize the conveyance of certain Government land to the Borough of Stroudsburg, Monroe County, Pa., for street purposes and as a part of the approach to the Stroudsburg viaduct on State Highway Route No. 498; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DIES: A bill (H. R. 5921) to authorize the prompt deportation of criminals and certain other aliens, to guard against the separation from their families of certain law-abiding aliens, to further restrict immigration into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 5922) to continue the Cotton Control Act, to exempt a limited quantity of cotton from the tax thereunder, to provide for the better administration of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5923) to provide for cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States and Territories in meeting the immediate crisis in public education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 5924) to revise air mail laws and to authorize the Postmaster General to extend the air mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PIERCE: A bill (H. R. 5925) to add certain lands to the Malheur National Forest in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 5926) to amend sections 1, 9, and 16 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 5927) to provide for the construction of four vessels for the Coast Guard designed for ice-breaking and assistance work; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 5928) to provide for unemployment relief through development of mineral resources; to assist the development of privately owned mineral claims; to provide for the development of emergency and deficiency minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5929) to promote the efficiency of national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK: Resolution (H. Res. 119) for the appointment of a special committee of five or more Members of

the House on emergency relief legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAMBETH: Resolution (H. Res. 120) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the Federal Coordinator of Transportation for 1934; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FULMER: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 176) authorizing the distribution of 500,000 bales of nontenderable grades cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of needy and distressed people; to be purchased on the cotton markets of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, regarding the immediate payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, supporting antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing Congress to purchase the Daniel Freeman farm in Gage County, Nebr., for the purpose of marking the filing of homestead no. 1; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, regarding the production of a motor fuel to contain grain alcohol; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing Congress for an adequate appropriation for the United States Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, supporting House bill 2024; to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 5930) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Nesseth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 5931) to authorize Lt. Comdr. Edward O. McDonnell, United States Naval Reserve, to accept certificate and Distinguished Service Cross from the Italian Government; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: A bill (H. R. 5932) granting a pension to Eleanor R. Gage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 5933) for the relief of Addie T. Caughman and Grace Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5934) granting a pension to Edna B. Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILDEA: A bill (H. R. 5935) for the relief of Jonathan A. Steiner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5936) for the relief of Charles J. Gallagher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5937) for the relief of Martha Palitis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5938) for the relief of Harvey A. Wildermuth, alias William H. Berkey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 5939) for the relief of the Barnhart Book Store (Allen W. Barnhart, proprietor); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALLECK: A bill (H. R. 5940) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Boze; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5941) for the relief of Francis F. Kingsley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 5942) for the relief of Harold E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5943) to correct the naval record of Edward Leslie Sanderson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 5944) for the relief of Roman Karp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 5945) for the relief of George F. Anderson and Vera D. Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCKEY: A bill (H. R. 5946) granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLARD: A bill (H. R. 5947) for the relief of Elsie Segar; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONTET: A bill (H. R. 5948) authorizing the Secretary of War to award a Distinguished Service Medal to Gaston J. Theriot; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5949) for the relief of Agnes Putnam Booth; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5950) for the relief of Clifton Francis Roche; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5951) granting a pension to Bertha C. Laux; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5952) granting a pension to Frederick Joseph Trott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5953) granting a pension to Vonnie D. Bright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5954) granting a pension to William F. Clohessy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5955) granting a pension to Joseph M. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5956) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah P. Nix; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 5957) for the relief of Lt. Thomas T. Mayo; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5958) to allow the Distinguished Service Cross for service in the World War to be awarded to Sgt. Samuel E. Swann; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 5959) granting a pension to Minnie Horner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5960) for the relief of Paul Henry Reeser; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5961) for the relief of Franklin Lewis Woodruff; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5962) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5963) for the relief of Clarence Fies; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5964) for the relief of Carl F. Yeager; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5965) granting a pension to Annie B. Pott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5966) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Ely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5967) granting a pension to Florence G. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5968) authorizing the western bands of the Shoshone Tribe of Indians, as defined herein, to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STACK: A bill (H. R. 5969) for the relief of Thomas H. McLain; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5970) for the relief of Israel Rickter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5971) for the relief of Charles Pine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTPHIN: A bill (H. R. 5972) granting a pension to Mrs. Vincent Applegate Clayton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 5973) granting a pension to Paul T. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5974) for the relief of Thelma L. Edmunds, Mrs. J. M. Padgett, Myrtis E. Posey, Mrs. J. D.

Mathis, Sr., Fannie Harrison, Annie R. Colgan, and Grace Whitlock; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 5975) granting a pension to Elmer E. Finley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5976) granting a pension to Emma Blosser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5977) granting a pension to Alice M. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5978) granting a pension to Fannie Brittingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5979) granting a pension to George W. Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5980) granting a pension to Carrie Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5981) granting a pension to Debbie Klingler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5982) granting a pension to Mary Emma Bussard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5983) granting a pension to Josephine Farris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5984) granting a pension to William Conrad; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5985) granting a pension to Mary Whitcraft Conkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5986) granting a pension to Orlando Kildow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5987) granting a pension to Margaret Keeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5988) granting a pension to Stella Littlejohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5989) granting a pension to Willard Fulk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5990) granting a pension to John W. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5991) granting a pension to Surelda J. Gilpin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5992) granting a pension to Fannie Himes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5993) granting a pension to Mary M. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5994) granting a pension to Maud E. Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5995) granting a pension to Eliza McBroom Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5996) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Noble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5997) for the relief of Esther M. Frey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5998) granting an increase of pension to Martha Buckingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5999) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6000) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Cutright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6001) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Devol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6002) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Consolver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6003) granting an increase of pension to Delilah Coffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6004) granting an increase of pension to Ida S. Fasnaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6005) granting an increase of pension to Susanah Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6006) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Meyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6007) granting an increase of pension to Alatha Hickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6008) granting an increase of pension to Nettie Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6009) granting an increase of pension to Anna Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6010) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6011) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1559. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Memorial of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, Group 347 of Niagara Falls, N. Y., requesting Congress to enact legislation commemorating the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1560. Also, resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Niagara County, N. Y., urging the Congress to enact legislation to preserve the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1561. Also, memorial of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, Group 689 of Buffalo, N. Y., requesting Congress to enact legislation commemorating the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1562. By Mr. BERLIN: Petitions of Groups 1211 of Mammoth, 364 of Mt. Pleasant, 2213 of Monessen, and 2357 of Latrobe, Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, all of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact House Joint Resolution 81 and Senate Joint Resolution 11, directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1563. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of C. B. Crandall, South St. Paul, Minn., president of the Central Co-operative Association (a Northwest States cooperative livestock selling agency), and its members, praying for the passage of an amendment to the administration farm-credit law providing for a reduction of interest rate on land-bank loans from the now 4½ to 3½ percent; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1564. Also, petition of George A. Malone, William and Myrtle Harding, of Bemidji, and about 700 other citizens of the communities of Bemidji, Turtle River, Tenstrike, Wilton, Solway, and Blackduck, Minn., praying for passage into law of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1565. By Mr. DARROW: Memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the provision of the Revenue Act of 1934 requiring publicity on income-tax returns and urging its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1566. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1567. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, California State Legislature, January 26, 1935, memorializing Congress to provide compensation, in lieu of taxes, for certain lands of the United States, within the borders of the several States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1568. By Mr. GUYER: Petition of citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for an old-age-pension law; to the Committee on Labor.

1569. By Mrs. KAHN: Petition of employees of the Reece Button Hole Machine Co., San Francisco, Calif., opposing any measure designed to limit further by statute the working hours per week in industry; to the Committee on Labor.

1570. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the City Council of Sacramento, Calif., relative to air mail transportation on the Pacific coast route; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1571. Also, resolution of the Congress for Permanent Rehabilitation, Los Angeles, relative to carrying out of the Federal Emergency Relief Act, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1572. Also, resolution of St. Kevin's Holy Name Society, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the religious situation in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1573. Also, resolution of Redlands Lodge No. 583 of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Redlands, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1574. By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of certain citizens of Garrett County, Md., with reference to old-age-pension legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1575. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Edison Post, No. 431, American Legion, Los Angeles, Calif., requesting that the present air mail law be permanently amended to provide that no restriction be made to any predetermined total mileage of routes or of miles flown, or to any formal designation such as "primary, secondary", and the like; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1576. By Mr. MILLARD: Petition of Dr. Errold D. Collymore, of White Plains, N. Y., and 771 other residents in the Twenty-fifth Congressional District of New York, urging the enactment of the antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1577. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of the Uintah Basin Railroad League and the Moffat Tunnel League, praying that the Denver & Salt Lake Railroad be required to remain an independent line, or that it be alined with the Rock Island or Union Pacific system in order that it may ultimately be extended through northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah to the Salt Lake Valley, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1578. By Mr. PETTENGILL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, for the improvement of the harbor at Michigan City, Ind.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1579. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Bricklayers' Union, Local No. 9, Brooklyn, N. Y., endorsing the McCarran prevailing rate of wage amendment; to the Committee on Labor.

1580. By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Florida in the counties of Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Duval, Escambie, Hillsboro, Jackson, Lake, Lee, Leon, Liberty, Marion, Okaloosa, Polk, Putnam, Suwanee, Taylor, Wakulla, and Watton, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1581. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of the State of Kentucky in the counties of Allen, Ballard, Boyd, Calloway, Cumberland, Daviess, Fayette, Hancock, Harlan, Henderson, Jefferson, Letcher, McCracken, Marshall, Mercer, Muhlenberg, Ohio, Simpson, Trigg, and Whitley, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1582. Also, petitions of certain citizens, resident of the State of Mississippi in the counties of Attala, Alcorn, Bolivar, Benton, Chickasaw, Copiah, Coahoma, Covington, Clarke, Clay, Calhoun, Carroll, De Soto, Franklin, Grenada, George, Holmes, Humphreys, Jefferson Davis, Kemper, Lowndes, Lauderdale, Lee, Lawrence, Leake, Lamar, Leflore, Monroe, Marshall, Montgomery, Madison, Neshoba, Noxubee, Oktibeha, Panola, Pearl River, Pike, Pontotoc, Prentiss, Quitman, Rankin, Sunflower, Tate, Tallahatchie, Union, Walthall, Washington, Winston, Yalobusha, and Yazoo, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1583. Also, petitions of certain citizens, resident of the State of Alabama in the counties of Autauga, Baldwin, Barbour, Bibb, Blount, Bullock, Butler, Chambers, Choctaw, Clarke, Clay, Coffee, Colbert, Conecuh, Covington, Crenshaw, Cullman, Dallas, De Kalb, Elmore, Escambia, Etowah, Geneva, Greene, Hale, Houston, Jackson, Jefferson, Lamar, Lauder-

dale, Lawrence, Limestone, Lowndes, Macon, Madison, Marengo, Marion, Marshall, Mobile, Montgomery, Morgan, Pickens, Pike, Talladega, Tallapoosa, Tuscaloosa, Walker, Wilcox, and Winston, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1584. Also, petitions of certain citizens, resident of the State of Tennessee in the counties of Bradley, Cumberland, Clay, Crockett, Chester, Carter, Cheatham, Cooke, Carroll, Dickson, Davidson, Fayette, Gibson, Giles, Grainger, Houston, Hardeman, Hardin, Hamilton, Humphreys, Hickman, Lauderdale, Lake, Maury, Marion, Morgan, Obion, Polk, Rutherford, Roane, Sullivan, Shelby, Smith, Sumner, Trousdale, White, Wayne, and Weakley, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1585. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Illinois in the counties of Alexander, Cook, De Witt, Effingham, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Johnson, Lawrence, Lake, Macon, Marion, Massac, Pulaski, Randolph, St. Clair, and Vermilion, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1586. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Georgia in the counties of Barrow, Carroll, Chat-ham, Coffee, Crisp, Calhoun, Dawson, Decatur, Emanuel, Franklin, Fulton, Grady, Green, Hall, Habersham, Irwin, Johnson, Jefferson, Jackson, Laurens, Lamar, Morgan, Macon, Madison, Pickens, Pike, Rabun, Rockdale, Richmond, Taylor, Tift, Telfair, Troup, Thomas, Union, and Worth, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1587. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Virginia in the counties of Dickenson, Giles, Grayson, Lee, Pulaski, Pittsylvania, and Wythe, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1588. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Oklahoma, in the counties of Lincoln, McIntosh, and Sequoyah, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1589. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of South Carolina, in the counties of Anderson, Alken, Beaufort, Edgefield, Greenville, Richland, and Sumter, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1590. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Ohio, in the counties of Hamilton and Mahoning, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1591. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Arkansas, in the counties of Ashley, Chicot, Crawford, Crittenden, Craighead, Conway, Crenshaw, Cross, Desha, Jefferson, Lonoke, Logan, Morgan, Mississippi, Phillips, Perry, Pulaski, Poinsett, St. Francis, Shelby, Union, and Yell, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1592. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of North Carolina in the counties of Buncombe, Brunswick, Columbus, Duplin, Iredell, New Hanover, Pender, Rutherford, Vance, Yadkin, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1593. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of West Virginia in the counties of Braxton, Grant, Harrison, Lincoln, Mineral, McDowell, Mason, Marshall, Summers, and Webster, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1594. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Kansas in the counties of Crawford and Neosha, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1595. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Texas in the counties of Bowie, Burnet, Cherokee, Clay, Coleman, Gonzales, Harris, Henderson, Hopkins, Houston, Jefferson, Kaufman, Lee, Leon, Liberty, Matagorda, Milam, Newton, Parker, Polk, Robertson, Sabine, Tarrant, Walker, Wharton, Wise, and Young, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1596. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Missouri in the counties of Cedar, Jefferson, St. Louis, and Scott, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pension of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1597. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Indiana in the counties of Henry and Posey, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1598. Also, petitions of certain citizens resident of the State of Louisiana in the parishes of Ascension, Allen, Bienville, Caldwell, Caddo, East Carroll, East Baton Rouge, Grant, Jackson, Livingston, Lincoln, Morehouse, Natchez, Natchitoches, Orleans, Pointe Coupee, Red River, Rapides, St. Mary, St. Charles, St. Landry, Sabine, St. James, St. Tammany, and Tangipahoa, all numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1599. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of the State of Arizona in the county of Coconino, numerously signed,

urging the enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1600. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of the county of Lincoln in the State of Wyoming, numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1601. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of the county of Allegany in the State of Maryland, numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1602. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Bricklayers' Union, Local No. 9, of Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the McCarran amendment to House Joint Resolution 117; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1603. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition of certain citizens resident of Tyler, county of Smith in the State of Texas, numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1604. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of De Berry, county of Panola in the State of Texas, numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1605. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of Pittsburg, county of Camp in the State of Texas, numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1606. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of the county of Rusk in the State of Texas, numerously signed, urging the enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1607. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of the county of Gregg in the State of Texas, numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1608. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition signed by John F. Petish, secretary, Polish National Alliance, Group No. 454, Uniontown, Pa.; memorializing Congress to enact legislation to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1609. By Mr. STUBBS: Petition of the Kern County Bar Association of California, urging Congress to create two additional district judges for the southern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1610. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of certain citizens resident of Ringgold, county of Catoosa in the State of Georgia, numerously signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per

month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1611. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of Acworth, county of Cobb in the State of Georgia, numerous signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1612. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of Austell, county of Cobb in the State of Georgia, numerous signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1613. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of Marietta, county of Cobb in the State of Georgia, numerous signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1614. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of Summer-ville, county of Chattooga, in the State of Georgia, numerous signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1615. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of Chickamauga, county of Walker, in the State of Georgia, numerous signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1616. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of Rome, county of Floyd in the State of Georgia, numerous signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1617. Also, petition of certain citizens resident of Waco, county of Haralson, in the State of Georgia, numerous signed, urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1618. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of W. M. Simmons and other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, urging and demanding that Congress enact into law the old-age-pension bill sponsored and approved by Dr. J. E. Pope as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1619. Also, petition of Local Union No. 501 of the United Brick and Clay Workers of America, Uhrichsville, Ohio, requesting the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, of the State of New York, to again introduce his labor-disputes bill in its original form at the convening session of Congress and urging their Senators and Representatives to support this bill in its amended form; to the Committee on Labor.

1620. Also, petition of F. H. Baril and other citizens of Lima, Ohio, urging that a bill be passed obligating the Government of the United States to pay every citizen of said Government whose record is free of habitual criminality and who has attained the age of 60 years a monthly pension of \$200 until the end of his or her life, the sole conditions that he or she retires from all further business or profession for gain and agrees, under oath, to spend the entire amount of the pension within the confines of the United States during the current month in which it is received; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1621. Also, petition of Local Union No. 19085, of the Hardesty Manufacturing Co., New Philadelphia, Ohio, requesting the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, of the State of New York, to again introduce his labor-disputes bill in its original form at the convening session of Congress, and urging their Senators and Representatives to support this bill in its amended form; to the Committee on Labor.

1622. Also, petition of the Mahoning Veterans' Association, of Youngstown, Ohio, by their secretary, Carl E. Rook, memorializing Congress to pass the necessary legislation to place the honorable discharged soldier who has reached the age of 60 on the same basis of pension as allowed by law to the Grand Army of the Republic veterans; a soldier with no dependents who is incarcerated in a Federal or State institution shall receive 20 percent of his pension during that period and those with dependents shall receive the full pension, 80 percent of which shall go to the dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

1623. Also, petition of stockholders of the Wyandot National Farm Loan Association, by their secretary-treasurer, H. L. Wenner, Carey, Ohio, petitioning that the interest rate on all outstanding Federal land-bank loans be further reduced to 4 percent, as it is their opinion that a 1-percent margin on the large volume of Federal land-bank loans should provide sufficient earnings to pay all overhead and to set up an adequate reserve; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1624. Also, petition of S. White and numerous other residents of the District of Columbia, urging the passage of House bill 2856, the WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, old-age-pension bill (the Pope plan); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1625. By Mr. TURNER: Petition signed by citizens of Lawrence County, Tenn., requesting the passage of the Townsend old-age-pension bill; also a Nation-wide Federal transactions sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1626. Also, petition of citizens of Lawrence, Giles, and Dickson Counties, requesting the enactment of old-age-pension bill as sponsored by Dr. J. E. Pope; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1627. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, relating to the cotton processing tax, so called, and for relief from the provisions thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1628. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petitions of William Kerr, of Bad Axe, Mich., and 148 other members of Verona Local, No. 159, of the Farmers' Union, urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1629. Also, petition of Abe A. Ruby, of Bay Port, Mich., and 49 other members of Pigeon Local, No. 124, of the Farmers' Union, urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1630. Also, petition of Frank Markel, of Richmond, Mich., and 49 other members of the Farmers' Union of Macomb County, Mich., urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1631. Also, petition of R. Patrick, of Deford, Mich., and 41 other members of the Farmers' Union of Tuscola County, Mich., urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1632. Also, petition of Harry C. Kennedy, of Port Austin, Mich., and 37 other members of Hume Township Local, No. 205, of the Farmers' Union, urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1633. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Air Reserve, Bloomington, Ill.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1634. Also, petition of the United Rubber Workers' Federal Labor Union, Akron, Ohio; to the Committee on Labor.